

A-LEVEL

History

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

Mark scheme

7042

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

A-level

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 the importance of American silver from the Indies for Spain. **[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 Parry's argument, students may refer to the following:

- although there was great wealth derived from the Indies, its value was often 'more imaginary than real': the American Empire was a drain on valuable resources and manpower
- the flow of silver 'created more problems than it solved' – especially commodity price inflation, both in Spain and more widely in Europe
- there is a particular emphasis on the 'rigidity of the Castilian economy'; the bullion from America *could* have been highly beneficial, but was not, because the Spanish economy could not recycle it effectively, placing Spain 'at a serious disadvantage' internationally.

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

- it might be argued that Parry's arguments have depth and are wide-ranging, with an impressive grasp of issues in the context of both the Empire and the Castilian economy
- own knowledge might be used to develop the point about price inflation and the problems it caused
- the 'rigidity' of Spain's economy might be developed through own knowledge, for example the long-lasting adverse economic impact of the expulsion of the Jews; or the imbalance in the economy between traditional landowners and the very limited merchant class.

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

- 'the empire meant wealth' – this was a great asset for Spain providing an income that was under control (not dependent on the Cortes)
- the wealth of the Indies was so important that by the end of Philip II's reign it was only American silver that staved off financial disaster
- it is wrong to claim that American silver ruined the country through price inflation.

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

- Scammell's view (from 1981) may be seen as a strong refutation of earlier theories about the role of the wealth of the Indies in causing price inflation
- own knowledge of the dependence on foreign loans (and the frequent royal defaults on them) could be used to suggest that Scammell's view is erroneous or exaggerated
- own knowledge of the structural problems of the domestic economy in Spain could be used to support Scammell's view that American silver was absolutely essential to avoid financial disaster.

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

- Philip II inherited an ‘alarming’ legacy, with colossal debts and immediate bankruptcies
- Philip made this legacy worse by further wars and overspending; he seems to have believed (wrongly) that American bullion could pay for everything
- but Philip over-estimated the importance of wealth from the Americas; other sources of income were more significant, such as ‘extortionate’ tax policies
- overall, the argument concludes Philip never managed to finance the costs of war.

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

- Dunn’s sarcastic view of the Prudent King, and his emphasis on negative phrases such as ‘extortionate’ and ‘skyrocketing costs’ could be developed and supported by additional own knowledge – perhaps of Philip’s obsession with advancing the Catholic religion whatever the costs
- own knowledge could be used to challenge Dunn’s assumptions: Spanish power was increased during his reign, not lessened
- it might be argued that all three extracts corroborate each other to an extent, especially on price inflation.

Section B

- 02** To what extent was there social and economic change in Spain in the years 1469 to 1516? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a 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.

Points made to support the view that there was extensive social and economic change in Spain in the years 1469 to 1516 might include:

- the Reconquista sparked significant social and economic change, with population movements and the exacerbation of religious tensions
- the convivencia of the 15th century was undermined by the edicts against Jews, the persecution of Muslims, and the rise of the Inquisition
- the economy was damaged by the expulsion of the Jews and the weakening of the emerging mercantile middle class
- the grip on society of the nobility was greatly increased
- there was economic growth, through the wool trade, and the emergence of Seville as a hub of the Atlantic economy.

Points made to challenge the view that there was extensive social and economic change in Spain in the years 1469 to 1516 might include:

- there was much more continuity than change
- the strong regional and local divisions within Spain remained almost untouched. Neither the monarchy nor the Inquisition made much progress towards unifying the country
- class divisions remained fixed. The power of the aristocracy was untouched, and there was no dynamic middle class as emerged in northern Europe in this period
- the economy remained feuded and stagnant. Growing port cities like Seville were the exception not the rule. Spain depended on Foreign tenure for investment
- the Reconquista (and the Inquisition) strengthened backward-looking mercantile attitudes, holding back social and economic progress.

This question requires an assessment of the extent of social change across an extended period of time: from the situation in the mid-15th century, through the reigns of Isabella and Ferdinand, to the situation that was inherited by Charles I after 1516. Answers cannot be expected to be comprehensive, or equally balanced between social and economic factors. Higher-level answers will use selected evidence to trace change (and continuity) over time.

03 ‘Charles I established stable and efficient royal government in Spain.’

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1517 to 1555. **[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.

Answers should be able to present a range of evidence and arguments to assess the extent of political stability and efficient government in Spain by 1529. The key words 'stable and efficient' relate to a single concept of effective government during Charles I's reign. Answers may bundle both terms together, or may separate the strands – either approach will be valid.

Arguments supporting the view that Charles I established stable and efficient royal government in Spain in the years 1517 to 1555 might include:

- Charles was skilful and successful in overcoming early difficulties as a 'foreign' king. He quickly established a system of capable and loyal advisers
- the revolts in the early 1520s were rapidly and efficiently suppressed; in any case they did not involve the high nobility. After 1523 there were no further internal revolts or instability
- the system of royal councils was extended and improved: such as the Council of Finance and the Council of the Indies, which kept firm control over the *conquistadores* after Cortes conquered Mexico
- Charles, his officials and later Regents, adopted sensible and conciliatory policies towards the Cortes, achieving local stability and a steady flow of finance
- the use of *letrados* was particularly effective.

Arguments challenging the view that Charles I established stable and efficient royal government in Spain in the years 1517 to 1555 might include:

- Charles suffered badly from his foreign Flemish background; and from his long-delayed arrival in Spain
- both the Germania revolt and the Comuneros revolt were serious challenges to royal authority, showing the stark limitations on Charles' power
- Charles made concessions to the Cortes because he had to; it was a sign of royal weakness, not strength
- the wars against France were a costly burden on the royal finances – a sign of worse problems to come after 1529.

One feature of higher-level answers may be the ability to make links between the various factors involved, perhaps explaining royal government made good use both of the high nobility and 'new men' from the 'lesser gentry'; or may show skilful differentiation between 'stable' and 'efficient'.

04 ‘The religious policies of Philip II were ill-judged and ineffective.’

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**

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 religious policies of the Crown over the whole reign. Answers should provide breadth but cannot be expected to be comprehensive. The key words ‘ill-judged and ineffective’ suggest that Philip’s religious policies failed and were counter-productive. Answers should address two strands; of the wrong policies being applied, and their consequences, though one may be emphasised more than the other.

Arguments supporting the view that the religious policies of Philip II were ill-judged and ineffective might include:

- the continued persecution of Jews, Muslims and Moriscos in Spain had damaging effects and drove dissent underground
- the Inquisition was an oppressive organisation and was mostly ineffective in gaining conformity
- Philip consistently mishandled Spain’s relations with the Papacy
- Philip’s religious fanaticism involved Spain in expensive and counter-productive wars; in the Mediterranean, against France, and against England
- Spanish policy in the Netherlands was a long-running disaster; fuelled by religious extremism.

Arguments challenging the view that the religious policies of Philip II were ill-judged and ineffective might include:

- Spain remained virtually free of the influences of the Reformation, while the rest of Europe was torn apart by religious wars
- the Inquisition was hugely effective in implementing Catholic orthodoxy: it was also a vital adjunct of royal power
- Catholicism was successfully established and defended as the one true religion of the American Empire
- Spain was recognised around Europe as the leading Catholic power, for example in the Holy League
- the Crown retained complete control over the Church in Spain.

One feature of higher-level answers may be the ability to make differentiated assessments according to changes over time; or of aspects of religious policy that were more or less successful. Some answers may differentiate between policies that were ‘ill-judged’ and thus doomed to fail, or were ‘ineffective’ because they were badly executed.