

AS

History

Spain in the Age of Discovery, 1469–1598

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

Mark scheme

7041

June 2017

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 2017

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 two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of relations between the Spanish Crown and the nobility in the years 1492 to 1516? **[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 Fernandez-Armesto's argument, students may refer to the following:

- Fernandez-Armesto's main argument is that the great nobles were 'natural allies' of the Crown; and that the monarchs were allowed to rule successfully when society was 'obedient'
- the importance of the great nobles is emphasised by the references to their great wealth and status. This argument is developed by references to the great nobles as natural allies of the Crown
- a further argument is the 'marriage market' which the Crown manipulated to reinforce its influence over the great noble families.

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

- in support of the argument, answers might use own knowledge of specific examples of Crown cooperation with the nobility, such as the personal rule of Ferdinand and Isabella, or the use of the Hermandad
- to challenge Fernandez-Armesto's arguments, answers may use own knowledge of specific examples of the difficulties the monarchs faced in 'taming' the nobility
- own knowledge could also be used to further develop the evidence of the riches and power of the great nobles, as illustrated by reference to the Bishop of Toledo.

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

- Kamen argues that the Crown succeeded in 'taming' the nobility and that this was an outstanding achievement
- he agrees with Fernandez-Armesto about the nobles – but this is not because they were natural allies but because the Crown exerted control. Noble power was reduced and by-passed by taking control over cities and selecting royal officials from the lower gentry rather than the high nobility
- the absence of any fixed capital or court was important in preventing the aristocracy from congregating together to pressure the Crown; so was the personal influence of the sovereigns, especially Queen Isabella up to 1504.

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

- in support of the argument, own knowledge could be used to exemplify royal successes in 'taming the nobility; such as the effectiveness of 'peripatetic rule' as the joint monarchs travelled around the country
- to challenge the argument, own knowledge could be used to explain examples of the power of the nobles to resist Crown control, such as the fact that the Crown had much less authority in Aragon than in Castile.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each extract, students may conclude that Kamen may be seen as relatively more valuable because he does corroborate Extract A to a considerable extent on the essential 'partnership' between Crown and nobility, but his argument shows the skill and success of the Catholic Kings in the difficult task of taming the nobility. Fernandez-Armesto's arguments may be seen as convincing because allowance is made for exceptions and change over time; perhaps also reflecting a more realistic view of the limitations of royal power.

Section B

- 02** ‘The expansion of Spain’s American Empire in the years 1519 to 1556 was due to the personal ambitions of the ‘conquistadores’.’

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.

Answers should present a range of evidence and arguments to identify and evaluate the reasons why Spain achieved rapid expansion of the American Empire between 1519 and the 1550s, including the Conquest of Mexico by Cortes in 1519–21, and the Conquest of Peru begun by Pizarro and finally completed by his successors in the 1540s after civil wars between the ‘conquistadores’. In each case, the dynamic actions of individual leaders culminated in formal administration by a royal governor – of Mexico (New Spain) from 1535, and of Peru from 1551.

Some answers may consider other areas of expansion, such as Chile and Central America, but this is not an essential requirement; Mexico and Peru is enough.

Arguments suggesting that the expansion of Spain’s American Empire in the years 1519 to 1556 was due to the personal ambitions of the ‘conquistadores’ might include:

- the initiative in the great conquests was taken by the ‘conquistadores’. It was the existence of this bottomless reservoir of restless adventurers seeking land, gold and glory that was the key factor. However many failures there were, they just kept on. Mexico was a typical example – the plans of the Governor of Cuba were high-jacked by the ambitions and leadership ability of Cortes
- in the Conquest of Peru, Pizarro and Almagro were individualistic leaders of a wild gamble by a small band of adventurers. The conquest was shaped by their ambitions, and by the constant infighting amongst themselves
- the Crown had little or no control over events in the beginning. Royal power was so far away that the Crown knew little about what was happening, and gave its backing to the ‘conquistadores’ because it had no alternative
- royal power was indeed exerted in the end and the ‘conquistadores’ were sidelined; but this took 14 years in Mexico and nearly 20 years in Peru.

Arguments challenging the view that the expansion of Spain’s American Empire in the years 1519 to 1556 was due to the personal ambitions of the ‘conquistadores’ might include:

- the Crown was all-important to provide the ‘conquistadores’ with authority and legitimacy. Everything men like Cortes did was in the name of the Crown; and whenever rule by conquistador leaders clashed openly with the Crown, there was only one winner. This was shown by the marginalisation of Cortes from 1522; and by imposition of royal authority in Peru between 1548 and 1551
- the real reasons for Spanish success were military and technological; guns, horses and steel weapons that ensured military dominance; it might also be argued that the native empires were too politically weak and divided
- the real reasons were economic. It was when gold and silver were found in large quantities that the rapid expansion began. The Crown was as interested as the ‘conquistadores’ in getting rich; and it was the Crown and the Council of the Indies that controlled all aspects of trade and economic exploitation
- the real reasons were crusading religious motivations. The Church, closely linked to the Crown, played the key role in justifying and implementing Spanish rule.

- 03** 'In the years 1529 to 1556, Charles V's commitments as Holy Roman Emperor badly weakened Spain.'

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.

Answers should be able to present a range of evidence and arguments to assess the strengths and weaknesses of Spain by the time Charles abdicated.

Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1529 to 1556, Charles V's commitments as Holy Roman Emperor badly weakened Spain might include:

- Charles had spent so long in imperial wars that he was almost never in Spain, leaving an unstable political legacy; his ambitions were so wide-ranging that maintaining imperial possessions became impossible and the Habsburg inheritance had to be split
- there was no coherent system of royal government, as power was scattered between local power centres and various royal councils. This meant central rule depended on the personalised authority of the King, but he was absent
- Charles left Spain facing huge debts (36 million ducats) and a chronic deficit on royal income and expenditure (more than one million ducats annually)
- there was a disastrous situation in Italy, sucking Charles' successor into war and conflict with the Papacy. The Spanish Netherlands was on the edge of popular revolt. Spain would find it impossible to disengage from the wider conflicts Charles had caused.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1529 to 1556, Charles V's commitments as Holy Roman Emperor badly weakened Spain might include:

- Spain was a rising power in 1556, wealthy and militarily powerful. The future reign of Philip II would demonstrate this. Under Charles V, Spain became stronger, not weaker
- the prolonged absences of King/Emperor Charles had not had seriously adverse effects upon royal government in Spain. The regency of Prince Philip from 1543 showed how stable and secure government was without Charles needing to be present
- Spain's American Empire was both a symbol and a cause of national power and prestige
- Spain had preserved internal religious unity throughout the upheavals of the Reformation between 1529 and 1555.

One feature of higher-level answers may be the ability to make links between the various factors involved – political, economic, military and religious – or to analyse convincingly how Charles V's commitments as Emperor impacted upon Spain.