Example 1

During the era of imperialism, the countries of Britain, Spain, and France all colonized several areas of the Caribbean. Each of these countries laid huge sugar plantations in which several profitable cash crops were also grown such as indigo and coffee. However, due to the extremely competitive nature of the European countries, several strict legislations and policies were put in place in the colonies that prevented the legal trade of exports between islands that belonged to different countries so that all of the profit made from the plantations would solely benefit the mother country. These restrictions soon led to an increase in smuggling in these areas. However, beginning in the 20th century the smuggling was less of a necessity due to the newly gained independence in many of the Caribbean colonies. Common responses and causes to the smuggling activities in the Caribbean included paying private payments to individuals due to the insufficiency of labor and necessary products (Doc 1,3,7) and the direct government interference into the Caribbean trade caused by cheap French products (Doc 2, 4, 5). An example of direct government interference includes the seizure of all smuggled French products, while an example of private payments included taxes collected by port officials allowing smuggling.

Many governors, advertisers, and agents received private payments as a result of the smuggling due to the lack of necessary materials and laborers in the region. **The Caribbean plantations supplied about 80 percent of the sugar used in Western Europe. These sugar plantations, as a result, not only became essential to the economy of the Caribean but the needs of Western Europe. Because the African slaves were the most efficient and common form of labor on the sugar plantations they were seen just as vital to the cash crop export trade as the cash crops themselves.** Thus the demand for the Caribbean exports of sugar, molasses, etc was extremely high and so was the constant need for laborers, ultimately leading many colonists to smuggle these products. In Doc 1 Taggart is a being trialed for illegally accepting smuggled goods onto his ships, In desperation for a lower sentence, the sailor conveniently explains the normality of accepting smuggled exports. He explains that there is simply no way to collect these exports any other way due to the lack of availability in the port region, to further justify his actions. Lastly, to push the blame farther from him, Taggart explains that the port governor himself would accept small payments authorizing the smuggling. Thus, Taggart's ulterior motive is to receive a shorter sentence or lighter punishment for his actions. In Doc 3 Roger blames the Spanish government for allowing the smuggling of slaves and for limiting the rights of plantation owners because he is an agent paid to represent them. Because the Jamaican plantation owners are paying Roger to defend them and prohibit smuggling he portrays these plantation owners as the victims in the smuggling crisis for they are losing their power and rights over their laborers, The document is written in efforts to persuade the Spanish government to return or at the least prohibit the smuggling of slaves from their lawful owners, because that is what agent Roger is paid to do and ultimate purpose in his occupation. In Doc 7 a paid advertisement emphasizes the terrible results and decreasing rights of plantation owners as a result of illegal slave smuggling. The newspaper ultimately is trying to encourage the public to refrain from buying slaves or even products from these smugglers because of the cruel actions toward slaves and heir owners. Similar to the agent in Doc 3, the newspaper will do all it can to portray the slave owners as victims in the smuggling issue because they are receiving money for preventing the public from engaging in such activities. The motive of the document is propelled through the extra finance received by the newspaper company and ultimately warns the public from supporting such cruel and unethical smugglers.

Direct government interference caused primarily by cheap access to French goods was another common response to smuggling in the Caribbean. British regulation in their colonies began to tighten as the wanted to secure profit and control directly to the mother country. **Because of this, several restrive acts such as the Molasses Act were put into place, ultimately increasing the prices of British products and necessities due to the additional taxes associated. Because citizens in Britsh colonies were only offered expensive British products, several of the colonists began to smuggle French good that was much cheaper and far more accessible to the public, anger the British government as a whole.** In Doc 2, the British admiral, Tyrell, is encouraging the more resistive or even violent action against the French imported goods for the prosperity of British merchants. As a representative of the government, Tyrell ultimately benefits from the large profit earned through trade in the Caribbean. Thus, as the control of the trade is slowly drifter from the British state, his position as admiral is also threatened. This causes him to then use a sarcastic and worried tone to explain the crisis and encourage the navy to take stricter actions against such smuggling to overall benefit the economy and power of the British nation. In Doc 5 John Orde wants to secure his position as a British governor in that area and draws any threats that may result in his response to the government's questionnaire. To make himself seem irresponsible and not guilty for the smuggling occurring in his port Orde emphasizes the causes for the smuggling such as cheaper French products, things out of his control. Perhaps more importantly, Orde also assures that the increase in French products is not an extreme threat for they are still economically inferior to the British to flatter the government and believe he is still doing his job well.

Basing on reading the above it was easy to conclude that causes and responses to the smuggling in the Caribbean region included direct government interference as a result of threatening cheap French goods (Doc 2,4,5) and the lack of necessary resources and laborers for the large demand in these regions leading to private payments to individuals such as officials in ports and agents( Doc 1, 3, 7).

Example 2

There were many caused and responses to smuggling in the Caribbeans during the 18th century including that people smuggled because they wanted to move goods to other areas that to make a profit(doc 5, doc 7), and responses include that governments would put laws or confiscate smuggled goods(doc3, doc2) while some people wanted goods and would react violently(doc6, 1) . During this time, many different countries owned colonies and prohibited trade between them as they didn't want to suffer when one place had a cheaper market for certain items than them, thus they protected this by prohibited trade between. In response a lot of smuggling occurred as forgien goods were often times cheaper.

For instance, people smuggled as it was their way of making money. One doc explains why the French smuggle as their goods are cheaper in English colonies thus they can make money by selling there. **He is the Dominican governor explaining why so many French are smuggling, because the French are ecomimally behind the Brithish. He has this point of view as its his rational for French suggilers, thus giving them a good reason to do it as he is apart of the French colonies**. One reason why the French were still comically behind the Britiish was that they were more industrialized than the French. Britan had large coal reserves and was surrounded by water(access to trade routes and protected for invaders) thus was able to industrialize quicker. Another document describes a man who has smuggled slaves and is smuggling other goods, they warn about buying form him as it is an advertisement trying to stop the smuggling of goods. This is a British advertisement, and as the Bristish are suffering from their people buying cheaper french goods, so advertising against it to improve Britains economic status.

One response to the smuggling was that laws were put in place or they cracked down on it. For instance a British admiral told his commanders to seize the Frech good on their ships as they were out competing the small English markets there. **He wants to stop Frecnch smuggling as it is harming the British economy as the British are buying French goods, giving their markets money, while no one is buying English goods. This is the opposite of the ideal merticlism that many countries were trying to implement.** Furthermore, one agent was reporting about the smuggling of slaves and how it was hurting markets there. Slaves were beginning to be smuggled for humanitarian reasons or escaping themselves from the harsh lives of the plantations. There are later slave revolts like in Hati, further inspireing slave rebellions, but also making governments crackdown on their regulations as they got scared. **As he is an Jamacian agent, he knows he'll be paid a money from the slaveholders if he can prevent or stop the smuggling of slaves which is losing them so much money.**

Another response was that the people wanted smuggled goods and reacted violently if taken. For instance there was a mob that beat someone who informed the government about the smuggling activity. One can assume those people were involved with it and were either making money off of it or knew that their cheaper foreign goods would be stoped. There have been other violent actions against the British government in colonies as, like the Boston Tea Party, as the colonist feel like they are being misrepresented and the governments in Britain cannot understand their situation. Colonies would be heavily taxed thus they couldn't survive and would resort is smuggling cheaper goods from foreign countries. Additionally there are

Therefores the causes of smuggling was to by pass the restrions of goods between forgin areas as some places didn't have those goods, which reactions included government regulation and protests from the people.

Example 3

Imperialism had intensified rivalries between competing states, as mother countries began to rigorously enforce mercantilist ideals between them and their dependent countries. However, as Western European countries prohibited trade between different colonies, illegal smuggling began to emerge, as shown by the smuggling of French goods and slaves from and into the Caribbean Island. There are various reasons for this smuggling, one being the intention of redistributing French products at a lower price to undermine the prices of British and to gain more profit (Doc 2,5,7,8). In response to this smuggling, direct government intervention caused strict regulations to be enforced and paid letters to be commercialized to find illegal smuggling. (Doc 3, 4,6)

Since French goods were cheaper than that of British goods, people in the Carribean were attracted to the economic profit they could gain from smuggling these goods and redistributing it to other inhabitants. In this region, slaves were also smuggled from Carriben plantations and resold to relocated to different plantations as well. In Document 2, Richard Tyrell's position as a British Sailor caused him to be hostile to the smuggling of French products. This was because if the British economy is supplanted by France, the decline in profit could potentially cause his earnings to lessen. **Also, the French and Indian War that occurred one-year prior to this event pitted French and Indian allies against the colonies of British.** This may have added to the resentment of France displayed by Tyrell. In Doc 5, Dominican governor John Orde's response to the British secretary can be seen. John Orde's intention can be displayed here, as he uses France as a scapegoat, and blames them of illegal smuggling into the state as a means of hoping to keep economic ties with the British. By siding with the British and denouncing France, Orde's determination to keep trade between Dominica and Britain is displayed. Also in Document 8, it shows how George Lipscomb, an English Physician, responded to the smuggling of goods. Since he was not a native, he was not accustomed to people who looked different from him, which may lead to exaggeration in the description of the native people, as seen by his comments pf "heavily laden people" and "grotesque".

In response to this smuggling, direct intervention of states caused strict regulations on trade to be enforced. In Doc 3, Roger Hope Elletson makes an argument to the Spanish Government about the smuggling of slaves in the Caribbean. Elletson, however, is an agent paid to represent the Jamaican planters. Thus the economic benefit of his position has caused him to structure his argument on the rights of the plantation owners and to make his plea based on the planter's satisfaction. In Doc 4, John Orde orders British officers to follow a set of rules so to prevent the increasing smuggling to keep economic ties. **Similarly, one kind of regulation that was enforced during this time period was the the American Revenue Act of 1764, also known as the Sugar act. This act was a law passed in an attempt to curve the smuggling of sugar and molasses by taxing those who imported foreign molasses. However, incidents like these increased the concerns of colonists about the British government, which fueled the growing movement that eventually became the American Revolution.** Another act that also restricted trade was the Navigational Act of 1763. **This act passed by Britain in order to control trade between Britain and its colonies. This law meant that American colonies could only export goods using English ships.**  
  
One document that would help the analysis of the causes and responses would be a first hand document of the inhabitants of the Caribbean Island explaining what was their opinion of smuggling. This would help readers understand the internal reactions to the response of mercantilism and would explain the circumstances leading to the prohibition of smuggling. Also, document showing the amount of goods smuggled could help put the crisis of smuggling into perspective and explain why foreign intervention was necessary.

In conclusion, illegal smuggling became increasingly dominant in the Caribbeans, due to the economic prosperity redistributing cheap French goods can bring to Caribbean inhabitants. However, in response to this crisis, Western European states increased direct government intervention by enforcing laws and regulations to control trade, as seen in the Sugar Act.