



AS History

7041/1A - Spain in the Age of Discovery, 1469-1598

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

Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 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

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Spain in the Age of Discovery, 1469–1598**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 two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the work of the Inquisition in the reign of King Charles of Spain? **[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 James Reston Jr's argument, students may refer to the following:

- Reston's main argument is that the work of the Inquisition was unequivocally harsh in its determination to carry out God's vengeance at all costs, that the eradication of growing heresy amongst the general population was vital, especially after 1519, as a consequence of the Reformation and New World expansion
- the considerable task the Inquisition presented itself with demanded a conscientious approach which embraced, despite the fear and climate of accusation, the belief that a reign of terror was a pragmatic necessity
- Reston makes the claim that the Inquisition dominated life in Spain and there is a strong element here of the traditional interpretation of the horrors of the Inquisition.

In their assessment of the extent to which the argument is convincing, students may refer to the following:

- the view of the 'Black Legend' as Protestant propaganda, defining the Inquisition is well-supported in the choice of words and views of a vast organisation whose primary function was the continuation of the forcible conversion of Jews and Moors to Christianity under Charles, a policy begun by Ferdinand and Isabella
- Reston does acknowledge that the Inquisition in Charles' reign used a range of methods in its work and own knowledge of specific examples, such as the role of individuals, the widening of the jurisdiction of the Inquisition to include Erasmianism, Illuminism and the Alambrados in imposing sanctions and reaching judgements
- Reston's arguments may be challenged using own knowledge of specific examples of the limitations of the Inquisition to act in imposing its 'enormous, nationwide system of repression during Charles' reign.

Extract B: In their identification of Thomas F Madden’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- by contemporary standards, the Inquisition was positively enlightened and progressive in its approach and legal procedures
- it had considerable popular support, initially against *conversos*, and after 1530, against the spread of the new Protestant Reformation, acting as a guard against the threat posed by increasing heresy from the 1530s
- Madden questions the tradition of the ‘Black Legend’ and states the Inquisition was committed to reconciliation, executions and torture were rare in Charles’ reign.

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

- Reston’s argument could be supported through own knowledge of the traditional interpretation of the work of the Inquisition, such as the statistical data for *auto de fey*’s, burnings, torture and imprisonment. The Inquisition was a vast organisation which brought terror and impacted significantly on all aspects of Spanish society, especially after the growing threat of heresy in the 1530s
- to challenge the argument own knowledge could be used to argue through example the regional limitations of the authority of the Inquisition, support for its actions and the view that heresy was within the context of late medieval Spain the worst crime
- within the period 1517–1555, greater challenges to orthodoxy emerged within Spain, Erasmianism, Illuminism, Lutheranism and continuing problems with *conversos* and *Moriscos* brought a continued need to eradicate heresy which Madden sees as largely popular and reflecting cotemporaneous support for the institution in the context of growing heretical challenges.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might conclude that Madden may be more valuable because he does corroborate Extract A to a certain extent, on the role of the inquisitors acting with the support of the people and on behalf of God, both acknowledging the problem of heresy and contemporary support for the Inquisition. Madden suggests equally, that the Inquisition was not the terrible institution of the later Protestant propaganda and similarly acknowledges that many were ‘reconciled’ with the Christian faith. Madden’s claim that there was no overt rejection of the Inquisition is compelling. Madden’s argument seems convincing in that only recently has the Spanish attitude towards the Inquisition been expressed as a counter to the traditional view. Both acknowledge cotemporaneous views but differently.

Section B

02 'Political unity was not achieved in Spain in the years 1492 to 1516.'

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.

Students should be able to debate the extent to which Ferdinand and Isabella actively sought political unity through control of the institutions of government: Cortes, Royal Court, control of the regional administrative centres and the towns. The role of the nobility and their own respective personal engagement, progresses. The nature of Iberia, regionalism, the growing significance of Castile and the consequent death of Isabella in 1504 and the succession crisis. Followed by the breakdown of royal administration, between 1506 to 1516, and the rise of regional revolts, defined by a Castilian aristocracy which had never been fully tamed by the Catholic Monarchs.

Arguments supporting the view that political unity was not achieved in Spain in the years 1492 to 1516 might include:

- Conciliar administration and its relationship with the royal council and the towns remained tenuous, whilst control of the nobility was equally elusive, based on concessions and rewards, failing to strengthen royal control or promote political unity after 1492
- the differences between Castile and Aragon were fundamental and remained unresolved, even after Isabella's death, where regional revolts lasted from 1504–1510, followed by a successional crisis a few years later
- Ferdinand and Isabella never purposely sought to unify their kingdoms despite their pre-occupation with progresses, these reflected their inability to secure stability
- Ferdinand and Isabella oversaw an itinerant court which obstructed the establishment of a capital and meant a centralised administration was out of the question.

Arguments challenging the view that political unity was not achieved in Spain in the years 1492 to 1516 might include:

- political power was defined by the union of the respective Crowns creating a strong power base centred around effective Conciliar administration, the Cortes and the royal council
- their personal rule, husband and wife sharing the sovereignty of their kingdoms expressed through elaborate progresses, revealed the need to create a clear political unity
- the completion of the Reconquest in 1492 was a huge step towards political as well as religious unity, greatly increasing Ferdinand and Isabella's prestige: the papal accolade of: 'Catholic Kings,' enhanced their political control as did their control of the nobility through, 'unity of purpose'
- the Inquisition created in 1478 was used effectively as a powerful political tool, ensuring strong royal control within an increasingly independent Spanish Catholic Church. By the end of the reign the term 'Spain' was in official usage.

Despite the union of the Crowns and the promotion of political unity expressed through the need to secure the loyalty of the nobility, the Cortes, law and order, the towns and religious policy expressed through the Reconquest and the acquisition of Granada strengthening the Crown both nationally and internationally, Ferdinand and Isabella failed to achieve political unity. Their partnership lasted only until 1504 and Isabella's death led to a succession crisis, the power and ambition of the nobility re-surfaced, regionalisms highlighted the failure of a political unity and fundamental trust in a Crown which operated favouritism. Ferdinand's declining years revealed the strength of factional ambition, challenging his own choice of successor. The Dual Monarchy was fragile.

03 'Despite Charles' absences Spain was governed effectively in the years 1529 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.

Students will need to identify a range of evidence and arguments to assess the strengths and weaknesses of how Spain was governed during Charles' absences in the years 1529 to 1556. The emphasis of the question is on the role of powerful individuals, advisers, Royal Secretaries and regents within the context of the reformed Conciliar system and the royal court. Whilst there may be contextual reference to the period from 1522 and Charles' growing working relationship with the Castilian Cortes, the emphasis is on the years of absence necessitated by challenges to and for imperial authority within the wider HRE and Monarchia.

Arguments suggesting that despite Charles' absences, Spain was governed effectively in the years 1529 to 1556 might include:

- by 1529 Charles had successfully created the origins of Spanish greatness, political security, domestic stability and economic prosperity
- Charles' reforms to the Conciliar system of government, the creation of the key office of Royal Secretary and greater respect for the Castilian Cortes, overseen by capable ministers; Gattinara and Los Cobos whose role proved invaluable, became the politically influential force as the primary medium of communication between King and the royal Council during Charles' increasing absences
- the compliance of the nobility, stronger finance through the Council of Finance, established a sense of security within Spain whilst allowing Charles to engage in wider enterprises within the HRE and Monarchia, confident in the role of his secretaries and regents, Adrian, Isabella and after 1543, his son Philip, who proved to be a most reliable and successfully capable regent
- the conciliar system effectively administered Spain and consequently the emerging Empire through the work of Gattinara until his death in 1530 and then Los Cobos, appointed in 1529 to the council of State.

Arguments challenging the view that despite Charles' absences, Spain was governed effectively in the years 1529 to 1556 might include:

- the government relied significantly on the rule of one man at the centre, inter-council rivalry, the relationship between the towns, regional nobility remained tenuous within a wider context of the distraction of continuous international war
- Charles' rule and growing absence fostered a latent disaffection, especially in Aragon where dangerous levels of resentment, faction-fighting and violence built up, resulting in rebellion in the first three years of Philip's reign
- key individuals, especially Los Cobos, became very powerful and wealthy which was not lost on contemporaries. He eventually dealt with the tasks which allowed him to circumvent the councils which failed to function effectively, especially finance, yet he was seen increasingly as a corrupt secretary who gathered power to himself in Charles' absence in the 1530s and 1540s, revealing a conciliar system which remained fundamentally inefficient and cumbersome
- the recognition that ineffective government and increasing financial problems within Spain and the wider Monarchia defined the decision taken by Charles between 1554–1556 to separate his inheritance.

Spain was governed effectively during Charles' absences in the 1530s and 1540s by a succession of powerfully influentially royal appointees, initially Gattinara, after 1530 by Los Cobos. They worked with a system of reformed conciliar government, Cortes, the Royal Council and regents. Spain was transformed from a disparate collection of states into a more centralised state with an overseas empire. Yet despite

the years of 'no history', effective regencies and strong government the economy remained under-developed and financially crippled.