



AS

History

Spain in the Age of Discovery, 1469–1598

Component 1B The establishment of a 'New Monarchy', 1469–1556

Mark scheme

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

Spain in the Age of Discovery, 1469–1598

AS History Component 1B The establishment of a ‘New Monarchy’, 1469–1556

Section A

- 01** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these extracts provides the more convincing view of the authority of the Spanish monarchy under Charles I in the 1520s? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO3

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. 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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate or challenge.

Extract A: In their identification of Hunt's argument, students may refer to the following:

- Hunt shows a direct link between Charles I and his predecessors (especially Aragon and its familiarity with absentee rulers)
- Hunt emphasises the effectiveness, and the continuity, of the system of councils
- Hunt argues that this consolidation of authority was lasting – 'nobles remained loyal'.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- it might be argued that Hunt's view is too ready to credit Charles I's rule with success and stability; it is relentlessly positive. For example, it is true that Charles had access to important new sources of royal wealth, especially from the American empire
- there are many examples of the effectiveness of the system of royal councils, such as the Council of Finance
- but it can be argued that Charles was indeed an absentee monarch and can be accused of neglecting his Spanish possessions; and he was often compelled to call the Cortes because of financial problems, not because he wanted to have good relations.

Extract B: In their identification of Kamen's argument, students may refer to the following:

- Kamen sees the consolidation of power after 1521 as very limited – 'no victory for absolutism'
- his view emphasises compromise; both with the aristocracy and the towns. The King did not dominate them but avoided the need for conflict
- Kamen specifically rejects the idea of Charles imposing 'foreign rule' on Spain.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- the Crown did rely on force and compulsions after the revolt. For example, hundreds were executed in Valencia
- it can be argued that Charles I responded to the challenge against his rule by deliberately making his approach 'more Spanish' and less 'foreign'; he respected the autocracy of the different Kingdoms
- Charles used effectively the system of Royal Councils and 'letrados' to build up administrative efficiency (and to reduce the influence of the high nobility) and he managed the Cortes well, both in Castile and Aragon; giving them respect but not allowing them to become too powerful (it could be argued this represents continuity, not change, in following on from Isabella and Ferdinand).

Students may argue that Kamen's view is more convincing because of his critical approach, challenging assumptions about the degree of royal authority; though it also can be argued that this explains the continuity of rule from the Catholic Kings. Students may argue that Hunt's views are

more flattering and less rigorous; although there are valid reasons for regarding them as convincing.

Section B

02 ‘The religious policies of Isabella and Ferdinand had harmful consequences for Spain.’

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view of the years 1474 to 1516. **[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.

The focus of this question is on the impact of the religious policies of Isabella and Ferdinand; these consequences were not only religious, but also included, for example, the economic effects of the expulsion of the Jews. Isabella died in 1504 but the key word 'consequences' should lead to consideration of later developments up to 1516.

Arguments suggesting that the religious policies of Isabella and Ferdinand had harmful consequences for Spain might include:

- there are numerous examples of Isabella's extreme religious devotion; she dominated religious policy up to 1504; this can be seen as having a distorting effect
- crusading religious fervour underpinned the Reconquista to its final triumph in 1492. This went hand in hand with the rise of the uncontrolled powers of the Inquisition
- the expulsion of the Jews was based on religious intolerance and badly damaged Spain by taking away a large part of the business class exactly when Spain was in need of it
- the persecution of Muslims caused needless divisions and undermined the convivencia.

Arguments challenging the view that the religious policies of Isabella and Ferdinand had harmful consequences for Spain might include:

- there were very positive achievements to balance any harmful consequences – such as the Reconquest, the launch of the Spanish American empire
- by 1516, religious unity was essentially achieved. Spain would not experience the religious divisions that tore apart France, England and the German States
- Isabella was a genuinely pious religious reformer. Cisneros improved the spiritual qualities of the Church and reduced corruption
- education was enhanced.

One feature of very good answers may be differentiation: seeing change over time (before and after the death of Isabella) or regional variations. Some answers may go beyond 1516 to look at longer term effects, for example with the expulsion of the Jews, or the Inquisition – if done well, this should be rewarded but it is not a requirement for top marks.

03 'Spain gained little from its American Empire in the years 1519 to 1556.'

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.

The focus of this question is on the consequences of Spanish rule in the Americas between the arrival of Cortes in Mexico in 1519 and the end of the reign of Charles I.

Arguments suggesting that Spain gained little from its American Empire might include:

- the Crown took far too long to establish coherent systems of rule: until 1535 in Mexico and until 1551 in Peru
- the system of administration was slow and bureaucratic (such as keeping the headquarters at Seville, a hopelessly inefficient main port for modern shipping). There was a serious failure to run trade in a way that suited the needs of the colonists
- the vast wealth of the bullion extracted from the New World was frittered away and went into the coffers of foreign bankers like the Fuggers and the Welsers; what wealth the Crown received went mostly into imperial armies; all Spain got out of it was inflation and royal debt
- the Indian populations were destroyed by Spain's failure to control the ruthless rule of the conquistadores – the population of Peru dropped from 9 million to 600 000. This destroyed the potential economic base of the Americas.

Arguments challenging the view Spain gained little from its American Empire might include:

- the wealth from the New World financed the growth of Spain as the pre-eminent military power in Europe
- Charles I maintained royal supremacy from the beginning and the Crown's monopoly was secure over the long-term
- the Empire was indeed bureaucratic but this was a strength. Once the conquistadores were reined in (or killed themselves in civil wars) administrators like Mendoza established rock-solid structures of government that stood the test of time
- the maritime link between America and Spain was reliable and secure; the 'Silver Fleet' was a massively reliable and predictable flow of wealth into Spain.

Good answers will show understanding of breadth and change over time – for example, in the way that Crown authority was slowly enhanced, after 1535 in Mexico and after 1551 in Peru. Answers need to evaluate what Spain gained, or did not gain from the Empire: was it well governed or mismanaged? Did the riches found in America benefit Spain, or was it a costly burden.