

A-level
HISTORY
7042/1B

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

Mark scheme

June 2020

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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.

Section A

- 0 1** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to Spain's international position in the reign of Philip II.

[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**

In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:

- Lynch's argument concedes that Spain was a global power with vast resources but equally was becoming over-extended and had reached the limits of its power by the end of Philip's reign in 1598
- significant, strategic Spanish victories are acknowledged underpinning Philip's international reputation and Spain's position
- Philip controlled a vast global empire across the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, its international power was unparalleled in the 16th century. Spanish defeats in the North Netherlands, the French intervention and failure to defeat England were a counterpoint to Philip's earlier successes
- the economic collapse in Castile, a consequence of hugely expensive wars, helped to highlight the limitations of Spanish power.

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

- Lynch highlights the extent of Spanish engagement internationally, through war
- Philip's foreign policy was fought on a global scale which the other states of Europe could not match. Only latterly, Dutch and English privateers challenged Spanish shipping in the Caribbean and Atlantic
- yet increasing numbers of Spanish ships nevertheless, tripled the wealth from the New World, reaching Castile by the end of Philip's reign
- in 1598, Spanish power, through religion, especially in the New World and Philip as champion of the counter-reformation, remained undiminished.

In their identification of the argument in Extract B, students may refer to the following:

- Woodward's argument reveals a more positive view of the international position of Spain. Spain was the largest and wealthiest global power, acknowledging Lynch's contention. Its credentials are personified by an empire on which the sun never set
- Spanish success is noted in defeat of the Turks and the annexation of Portugal and its empire
- defeats or impasse in Europe were turned to Spain's advantage
- continued expansion of empire and New World wealth generated a sense of Spanish power.

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

- this offers an interpretation highlighting the successes of Spain's international position
- the securing of the Mediterranean from Turkish influence after the Battle of Lepanto was a considerable achievement which even Charles V had failed to do
- the annexation of Portugal, similarly, was a major achievement, the benefits included: an ocean going fleet, the second largest colonial empire, the reputation of Philip secured a Western Atlantic seaboard
- Spain's failure to defeat the Dutch rebels and England after three successive armadas did not undermine Spain's international position as the greatest global power. In fact, after 1588 the Spanish fleet was larger, numerically and with faster, modern ships
- Philip's personal reputation was high; he left a powerful Roman Catholic Church in the New World, and despite the economic and social disadvantages, the silver still rolled in.

In their identification of the argument in Extract C, students may refer to the following

- Parker contends that, despite the extent of the wealth from the New World and Spain's ability to finance its imperial adventures, by the 1590s this was under threat and acknowledged as such, Spain's commitments were being scaled back. This offers a more realistic assessment of the extent of Spain's international position by 1598 where constant war was debilitating
- the wealth of the New World was, in 1598, still considerable, the Castilian economy powerful
- whilst Spanish power was challenged in the Americas by Dutch and English aggrandisement, it was largely ineffective
- the power of Spain was represented by the spread of Catholicism, both in Europe and the New World.

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

- constant war impacted on Spanish resources and revenues which ironically led to the decision to scale-back her expensive wars. The Treaty of Vervins with France, ceding the south Netherlands, were a recognition of a planned withdrawal
- expenditure was starting to outweigh the silver bullion, costly loans and huge interest rates imposed by international bankers, such as the Fugger's, bankrupted Spain in 1596 which ended Philip's imperial dreams of continued expansion
- the Potosi silver mines were producing less silver, a consequence of demographic disaster – plagues had diminished indigenous populations
- whilst English privateers preyed on Spanish outposts and shipping, key captains, such as Drake, died in this period, removing importantly real and symbolic enemies
- yet Spain remained the most powerful state, especially in religious terms, but its empire was increasingly a divided one.

Section B

0 2 'By the death of Isabella in 1504, Ferdinand and Isabella had successfully restored and consolidated royal authority in Spain.'

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**

Arguments supporting the view that by the death of Isabella in 1504, Ferdinand and Isabella had successfully restored and consolidated royal authority in Spain might include:

- political union of the kingdoms, Ferdinand given full authority in Castile in Isabella's absence, in 1479 Ferdinand became King of Aragon announcing they would rule jointly
- the War of Succession, 1475–1477, defined the personal monarchy and royal partnership needed to restore royal authority. In this, their relationship with the nobility was crucial
- Ferdinand and Isabella ruled jointly through the conciliar system and directly through the Royal Council, taking justice and law seriously through the Hermandad in Castile and the extension of officials, such as the Corregidores and Letrados
- they were peripatetic monarchs in that they presented a united front, as seen in 1486 on a visit to Galicia to control noble abuses. They worked together to restore or even to establish royal authority
- a 'unity of purpose' was established which challenged opposition, especially over Muslim Granada. The Reconquest strengthened royal authority with the fall of the last independent Islamic caliphate in western Europe.

Arguments challenging the view that by the death of Isabella in 1504, Ferdinand and Isabella had successfully restored and consolidated royal authority in Spain might include:

- royal authority was founded on the appearance of a personal monarchy, each was constrained, neither had effective power in each other's kingdoms
- their use of their respective Cortes defined the differences between the two monarchs. The Aragonese Cortes acted far more independently and invariably without Ferdinand's authority, the role of the Cortes remained limited in Castile
- the nobility had not been curtailed, as evidenced in 1504 with Isabella's death, where the nobility represented a dangerous threat in the future
- there remained a lack of direct royal authority over a corrupt and unfair financial system. Royal authority failed to address the respective differences between Aragon and Castile; different political institutions, economic constraints and cultural differences
- royal authority over the Church remained an issue.

Ferdinand and Isabella worked well as a partnership and as joint monarchs, the Catholic monarchs after 1492 – they were successful in consolidating, and in some cases creating, royal authority within Castile and Aragon. Spain was far more stable by 1504.

Yet royal authority was not fully achieved. In this they failed – the nobility remained problematic, and a continuing threat, corruption was endemic in the regions, and law and order remained outside of direct royal control.

0 3 To what extent did Charles V's foreign policies in Europe strengthen Spain in the years 1529 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**

Arguments supporting the view that Charles V's foreign policies in Europe strengthened Spain in the years 1529 to 1556 might include:

- in 1556 Spain was powerful, wealthy and militarily stronger than in 1529, control of Naples and Navarre left the Spanish border with France secure
- Charles' wars in Europe opened-up Spain to wider outside influences, contributing to its growing reputation as defender of Catholicism and increasing its international standing
- Charles' conflict with the Lutheran Princes impacted on the desire of the Spanish Catholic Church to strengthen internal religious unity and orthodoxy. The Society of Jesus (Jesuits, shock-troops of the Counter-Reformation) – greater orthodoxy left Spain the pre-eminent Catholic power
- Charles' absence from Spain had little effect on the running of royal government. The regency of his son, Philip, revealed the stability and security of government and administration, whilst Charles remained committed to his foreign policies against the Schmalkaldic League and the Habsburg-Valois wars against France. By 1559, Charles had settled these conflicts; the financial impact upon Spain's domestic economy was consequently significantly reduced
- the conflict with the Turks resulted in the capture of Tunis and partial control of the Mediterranean in protecting Spanish borders and interests and securing trade and prosperity.

Arguments challenging the view that Charles V's foreign policies in Europe strengthened Spain in the years 1529 to 1556 might include:

- Charles' pre-occupation with his foreign wars in Europe impacted upon the government of Spain, leaving a legacy of political and financial instability for his son, Philip, to inherit
- Charles' European foreign policies left Spain facing huge debts and a massive deficit on royal income and expenditure, which only the New World bullion, from late 1545, managed to mask
- by 1559, Charles had unwittingly created 'time bombs' for Philip both in Italy, against the Papacy and the Netherlands, on the verge of revolt – whilst not directly affecting Spain they nevertheless, contributed to years of subsequent debt and a weakened economy
- Charles' foreign policies in Europe were largely unsuccessful: they never fully destroyed the threat from France; Lutheranism was established in Germany and the Turks made advances in the Mediterranean. This did not strengthen Spain
- Spain remained a means to funds Charles' foreign policy in Europe, largely through excessive taxation imposed upon the poor, crippling the economy through lack of investment both in agriculture and industry and commerce and communications.

Charles arguably offered the Spanish an opportunity to fulfil their role as the Catholic leaders of Europe combating both heresy and Islam. Spain's international reputation was confirmed and strengthened. Yet equally, the Spanish suffered at the hands of Charles' foreign policies in Europe, the lack of personal authority in Spain, crippling taxation, the massive drain on manpower and wars which it proved difficult to extricate from, leading to the division of the Holy Roman Empire.

0	4	'Philip II was an absolute monarch.'
----------	----------	--------------------------------------

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**

Arguments supporting the view that Philip II was an absolute monarch might include:

- Protestant propaganda, the ‘Black legend’, maintained Philip ruled Spain and his Empire as an absolute ruler, controlling every aspect of the bureaucracy of Spain and the Empire from his palace in Madrid believing in the divine right of kings whose authority was derived from God
- Philip’s control of the minutia of day to day affairs across the vast empire required an army of conciliar administrators closely observed by Philip
- Philip did exercise absolute control over both the military and the Church. He exercised absolute authority when faced with rebellion and opposition in Granada, the Netherlands and Aragon, in which he was driven by the ‘will of God’ and a determination to make Spain the leading Catholic power in Europe
- his later government reforms to the *Juntas* and the *Junta da Noche* reflected his insistence on maintaining direct personal and absolute control. The *Junta da Noche* met at night to formulate policy to the exclusion of many of the Castilian Grandees in the Council of State
- Philip insisted that all government business come to him in the form of *consultas*, prepared by the conciliar secretaries led by his personal secretary, Vazquez, from 1573.

Arguments challenging the view that Philip II was an absolute monarch might include:

- Philip oversaw a vast administrative government bureaucracy, yet colonial viceroys were able to exercise considerable independence of judgement
- Philip was faced with, and even misguidedly, encouraged factional conflict within the court and government, from individuals and groups
- internal rebellion – the Aragonese revolt represented the potential to challenge Philip’s authority, revealing the limitations of the exercise of power within both Church and State as late as the 1590s
- despite Philip’s attempts to codify the laws of Spain, Castile and Aragon remained separate kingdoms until 1598
- the creation of the *Junta Grande* and *Junta da Noche* were an acknowledgement by Philip after the Perez Affair that court factions were a liability and that government was too immense to be carried out by the King alone.

Philip did have the belief that he was divinely appointed by God to whom he alone answered for his actions. This was an age of absolute monarchy in as far as it could be exercised without, opposition, rebellion and open factionalism. Philip oversaw an administrative and governmental structure which was, for the age, colossal. Philip made distinctions when it came to absolutism, the military, the personal preserve of all kings and the Roman Catholic Church, as Defender of the Faith. Similarly, as the *Junta da Noche* demonstrates, Philip found it impossible to just let go. Philip retained complete control over the Spanish Church, keeping Spain free of the Reformation.