



A-LEVEL History

7042/1B - Spain in the Age of Discovery, 1469-1598

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.

Component 1B Spain in the Age of Discovery, 1469–1598

Section A

- 01** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to Philip II as a ruler. **[30 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:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. 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 assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

Extract A: In their identification of Lynch's arguments students may refer to the following:

- Philip acted as any contemporary monarch might do facing similar circumstances, answerable only to his own perceived sovereignty, sense of justice and God's higher authority, the perfect master in the art of ruling
- Philip was a pragmatic and ruthless ruler, successfully exercising his authority as he saw fit
- the judicial murder of Montigny in 1570, in order to preserve peace within the Low Countries, reveals this
- Philip was capable of ruling through direct and incisive intervention, executive and absolute power invested in the sovereignty of the Crown who sought to prevent the Crown becoming the tool of powerful factions.

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

- students may refer to the wider context of the Low Countries and the treatment of Montigny's masters, Egmont and Hornes by Philip as further evidence of his ruthless direct intervention which became a hall mark of his rule
- whilst Philip could sanction the judicial murder of Montigny to avoid conflict his decision to execute Egmont and Hornes publicly led directly to open conflict revealing a lack of judgement, challenging Lynch's claims
- Philip often failed to maintain a direct personal control and the nature of that rule changed after the Spanish Fury of 1572 and the rapid successional appointment of governors such as Alva, Requesens and Don John, men of varying ability whose actions failed not only to maintain Philip's authority but significantly undermine it
- Philip's control and authority was invariably compromised in the Netherlands, leading to a declaration of independence from Spanish rule and the creation of the United Provinces, splitting the Spanish Netherlands in two leading to a conflict unresolved by Philip's death in 1598.

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

- Woodward claims Philip exercised a good deal less than total control making him an effective ruler
- he struggled to control powerful factions at court such as Eboli and Alva
- he remained cautious and indecisive, making disastrous decisions, especially in his conduct of the revolt of the Netherlands and the war with England
- domestic government similarly reflected a lack of authority with Philip struggling to control the Cortes and rule the many kingdoms of the peninsular.

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

- Philip failed to control the excesses of Alva's uncompromising rule of dubious legality in the Netherlands: The Council of Troubles legitimised the rise of national leaders such as William of Orange, and later Maurice of Nassau, and Philip's decisions over the plans for the Armada and constraints imposed upon Parma's military campaigns determined Spanish failure
- domestically Philip's rule was limited by the lack of co-operation from traditional landowners and nobles and the passage of Crown authority to local regional governments left royal authority questionable
- yet in challenging Woodward's arguments, Philip defeated the Turks in the western Mediterranean and brought peace with France in the Treaty of Vervins
- the Counter-Reformation was rigorously pursued and enforced with single minded determination through the use of the Inquisition, again challenging the argument within the extract.

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

- Parker offers a forensic dissection of Philip's capabilities and rule, offering a sympathetic assessment of Philip's ability to rule an empire of 'fifty million subjects'
- Parker sets out the problems Philip faced in his rule, Philip's ability to deal with the many problems in such a global monarchy overwhelmed him; whilst good at detail, such as the supervision of the construction of the Escorial palace, his prodigious problems swamped him, he failed as ruler
- Parker does scatter negatives throughout his judgement on Philip's capabilities to rule: 'preventing him', 'his inability', 'avoid delegating', 'undermined Philip's ability', 'compromised his ability'.

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

- the overstretched nature of empire: limited action in the Mediterranean after 1566 was determined by Alva's involvement after 1567 in the Netherlands and Don John suppressing revolt in Granada in 1569–70 and whilst Lepanto, in 1571 was a great victory, it failed to strengthen overall Spanish power, his inability to delegate without interference undermined genuine success
- he faced unrelenting religious war against French Huguenots, Dutch Calvinists, English Protestants and Ottoman Muslims and confrontation with the Moors in Aragon in the 1590s revealed the delicate balance of his rule
- yet in challenging the arguments within the extract, Philip resolved the conflict with French Huguenots, defeated the Ottoman Muslims acknowledged freedom of worship for Dutch Calvinists whilst maintaining Catholicism of the South Netherlands and an uneasy stand-off with Protestant England
- Philip ruled the largest and richest empire in the world by 1598
- he oversaw Spain's 'Golden Age'.

Section B

02 'Ferdinand and Isabella failed to deal effectively with domestic challenges to the Spanish Crown.'

Assess the validity of this view of the years 1474 to 1504.

[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 supporting the view that Ferdinand and Isabella failed to deal effectively with domestic challenges to the Spanish Crown in the years 1474 to 1504 might include:

- the nobility were a constant challenge: military orders, failure to enforce the resumption of alienated Crown lands, nobility constrained only through concessions and bribes. Their power revealed in 1504 with the succession crisis
- government remained difficult, hampered by divisions between Castile and Aragon and Ferdinand's inability to off-set challenges from the Cortes
- law and order remained a challenge to the Crown's authority, the administration of justice was increasingly corrupt. The Santa Hermandad was disbanded in 1498, a symbolic failure of Isabella's determination to maintain its survival and a challenge to her personal rule
- financial and economic challenges to the Crown remained and by 1504 increased with the cost of war, inflation and regional corruption and inertia
- reform of the Church remained unfulfilled and the challenge of heresy, despite conversions, expulsions and the Inquisition, became a growing problem and Isabella's will in 1504 revealed a sense of failure to deal effectively with the domestic challenges.

Arguments challenging the view that Ferdinand and Isabella failed to deal effectively with domestic challenges to the Spanish Crown in the years 1474 to 1504 might include:

- royal government was significantly improved, the Royal Council and Letrados flourished within a secure conciliar system, the Castilian Cortes fell into relative disuse, Isabella relying on absolute power further reducing the role of the nobility in government
- conquest of Granada strengthened the personal prestige of the 'Catholic Monarchs' after 1492, strengthened royal control of the Church and the Inquisition dealt with Conversos and Morisco threats
- no major revolts. Instrumental in maintaining law and order through, initially Santa Hermandad, latterly through more professionally organised and importantly centralised corregidores, alcaldes, Letrados and a conscious policy of a peripatetic public exposure
- genuine attempts made to bolster the economy, especially through financial reforms and a new currency
- the death of Isabella in 1504 left Ferdinand in a stronger position in Castile as a consequence of their joint rule, supported by effective royal propaganda, challenges had been effectively dealt with.

The question is defined by the years of Isabella's reign 1474 to 1504. The key domestic challenges and Ferdinand and Isabella's ability to deal with them reflect their success in establishing royal authority after years of civil war and divided loyalties. Control over the nobility remained sufficient and an uneasy partnership. Restoration of control within the regions was equally successful made so by effective administrative reforms, and their personal monarchy and intervention at least until 1504. Threats posed by religious divisions had been mollified after 1492.

03 'Religious dissent was never a serious threat to the Catholic Church in Spain.'

Assess the validity of this view in the years 1517 to 1556.

[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 supporting the view that religious dissent was never a serious threat to the Catholic Church in Spain in the years 1517 to 1556 might include:

- the monarchy was staunchly Catholic; Charles was Defender of the Faith, campaigning exhaustively against the rise of Protestantism, Erasmianism and Illuminism. Royal authority over the Church was absolute
- censorship: introduction of the Index, banning of heretical literature, refusal to allow students to study abroad. There were few printing presses in Spain and all were controlled by the Church, all limited spread of dissent
- Charles benefited from the earlier reforms of Cisneros. The founding of the University of Alcalá in theological studies, the Polyglot Bible in 1522 and monastic discipline, maintained a focus on Catholicism and orthodoxy
- the work of the Inquisition, whilst its evangelical response was largely over by 1520, it remained a key weapon in rooting out heresy and enforcing orthodoxy throughout Charles' reign
- the development of the Counter-Reformation: Society of Jesus in 1534 and the early sessions of the Council of Trent from 1545, important as an exposition of Catholic re-affirmation.

Arguments challenging the view that religious dissent was never a serious threat to the Catholic Church in Spain in the years 1517 to 1556 might include:

- the Inquisition, in the pursuit of heresy, revealed the size of the perceived dissident threat posed especially from Erasmianism and of a largely illiterate priesthood, a lack of spirituality, doctrinal knowledge and endemic abuses
- censorship and control of the printing press, linked to an historic determination to cling to the old ways, further defined the potential threat to orthodoxy posed by intellectual inflexibility
- Charles, and later after 1543, Philip, as regent, failed to face the problem head on, relying almost exclusively on an Inquisition whose own authority was challenged by the Cortes and regional limitations
- Catholicism was not an all-inclusive religious faith, despite the ending of Convivencia and establishment of official orthodoxy
- Spain remained fractured by Erasmianism, after 1517 by the spread of Lutheranism in the more remote regions of Spain. Concerns prevailed over Jews (Conversos) and Muslims (Moriscos), the Granadan revolts of early 1520s and after 1527 the Alumbrados and Illuminist threats.

The question requires an assessment of the extent to which the Church in Spain was threatened by the lack of internal reform to meet the rise of religious dissent posed by Lutheranism, Erasmianism and Illuminism and the growth of the Reformation impacting on an orthodox Spanish Church. There may be some contextual references to the period before and after, but these should not become the focus of the answer. Students might well suggest that heresy in all its forms may not have been a threat in reality had there been a greater willingness to reform the Church in Spain. The Spanish Church remained fundamentally one of change within a framework of continuity.

- 04** To what extent was the conquest of Portugal beneficial to Spain in the years 1578 to 1598? **[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 supporting the view that the conquest of Portugal was beneficial to Spain in the years 1578 to 1598 might include:

- Philip's dynastic challenge for the Crown unified the peninsula for the first time since the Roman occupation, the prestige was considerable, by 1581 Spain's imperial power was at its height
- Portugal was a global mercantile state with a considerable overseas empire including: Brazil, territories in West Africa, the Spice Islands and the Azores, which would add to the significant territories of the Spanish empire. These territories were strategically and commercially significant, especially the Azores, as a staging post to and from the New World
- Portugal's huge mercantile fleet and western Atlantic seaboard allowed access to trade with India, South East Asia and China
- Portugal would become the means by which Spanish foreign policy would turn from the Mediterranean to the west, Spain's influence shifted. It would make possible future actions against the territories in northern Europe and especially England
- Philip was conscious of the need to treat Portugal with respect and considerable moderation, maintain its laws and traditions. He even resided in Lisbon for three years learning the language and adopting its customs. Portugal, as a largely autonomous state, was expected to be the western barricade protecting Spain.

Arguments challenging the view that the conquest of Portugal was beneficial to Spain in the years 1578 to 1598 might include:

- the conquest was not popular amongst ordinary Portuguese and many of the nobility had to be bribed into compliance
- Spain financed much of the administration and government of Portugal, not imposing Castilian style taxes or benefiting from its considerable trade profits, this led to Portugal becoming a considerable financial burden for Spain which had undergone, despite the wealth of the New World, financial crisis and bankruptcy
- Spain equally shouldered the cost of the defence of the increased empire; in this sense the economic and financial advantages were limited. Spain failed to exploit the wealth both of Portugal and its empire
- the conquest through annexation led to factional realignment within the court. Perez, the leader of the 'old peace' faction, was replaced by the aggressive war mongering Genville, who saw the purpose of Portugal as a strategic base to strengthen Spanish influence in northern Europe and as a staging post for invasion. The consequences of this for Spain would be profound and lead to the Armada failure in 1588 and two more successive attempts in the early 1590s against Ireland, at prohibitive cost, financially and in terms of prestige
- whilst the western Atlantic seaboard was a defence barrier, equally it offered the means by which French support in 1582 in the Azores and later English attacks in support of the pretender Don Antonio would be made in the 1589 invasion.

Whilst there are clear advantages for Spain in the conquest of Portugal between 1578–1598 in terms of personal and national prestige, vast overseas territories to add to Spain's existing empire and later strategic importance in her wars in the Netherlands and against England.

Yet equally, it remained a union of Crowns not a union of states. The desire to maintain Portugal's autonomy created a huge financial burden which contributed significantly to the economic and financial crises Spain faced. The cost of the protection of the Portuguese empire and the Spanish failure to exploit the wealth similarly added to the burden. The conquest through acquisition contributed significantly to

Spain's later disastrous foreign policy with England. Whilst there were clear advantages, equally there were significant disadvantages.