
A-level **HISTORY**

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

Mark scheme

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

A-level History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

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

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the impact of the Inquisition in 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 historic 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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to analyse and evaluate each extract in turn, or they may adopt a more comparative approach linking the evidence of the extracts to particular themes, issues or interpretations. Either approach is valid, as long as all three extracts are considered and evaluated.

Extract A

In their identification of Edwards' arguments, students should refer to the following:

- the Inquisition moved from an initial fear and loathing to become a popular institution
- Edwards points to the reasons for that loathing, mentioning the conflict between the new Inquisition and traditional customs (particularly valued in Aragon), as well as the fears of the *conversos*, but he identifies that under subsequent monarchs the Inquisition was seen as a 'pillar of society' and respected
- he argues that the Inquisition could only operate in an atmosphere of co-operation (citing evidence that secret denunciations and interrogations were part of its operation)
- he suggests that torture was widely accepted at the time and therefore did not provoke criticism, although he himself suggests that such torture was horrifying and too frequently used.

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

- knowledge of the separatism of Aragon, Spanish anti-Semitism and the position of the *conversos* could be used to corroborate Edwards' view of the initial reaction to the Inquisition
- the reliance on informers and the process of extracting information can also be corroborated from knowledge of the workings of the Inquisition
- acceptance of the Inquisition as a pillar of society is harder to prove and might be questioned as a value judgement. Knowledge of its longevity might, however, be cited in support
- the comments on torture can be both corroborated and criticised with reference to own knowledge of its practices and to the opinions given in the other extracts.

Extract B

In their identification of Fernandez-Armesto's arguments, students should refer to the following:

- Fernandez-Armesto argues that the setting up of the Inquisition was seen as a 'startling triumph' by Ferdinand and Isabella
- he believes the use of the Inquisition was pursued with 'excessive zeal' by themselves and their successors
- he refers to the monarchs working to 'burn heresy out of the kingdom', thus suggesting it was an instrument of royal authority

- he then argues the Inquisition was more than this – it was a 'social safety-valve' for the poorer classes
- he therefore concludes that it was not a 'bloody religious tribunal' alone but that it had a negative impact by spreading insecurity through its secretive and divisive practices.

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

- own knowledge of Isabella's religious zeal and the high regard in which the monarchs were held by the Pope ('the most catholic monarchs') might be used to reinforce the image of their religious success in founding the Inquisition
- reference to the use of the Inquisition against Jews, Moors and Protestants might be used to support Armesto's view of 'excessive zeal'
- comments on the practices of the Inquisition within society may be corroborated from own knowledge or with reference to Extract A although his view of the insecurity spread by 'secretive procedures' might be seen as not easy to find evidence for
- issue could also be taken with his view of the 'bloody religious tribunal' image (which may be contrasted with Kamen's view in in Extract C).

Extract C

In their identification of Kamen's arguments, students should refer to the following:

- the argument that the Inquisition was 'not a bloodthirsty' institution – there were 'no more' than 2000 executions of *conversos*
- his view that ideas spread freely and Spanish literature did not suffer unduly as book control and censorship were easily evaded because there was freedom of movement between the peninsula, France and Italy (evidence: to the mid-sixteenth century, no notable writer was prosecuted; technical backwardness explains limitations to publishing)
- Kamen takes trenchant and developed view of the lack of success in censorship of books and suppression of ideas.

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

- the tribunal never acted as an effective tool of 'social control' – activities were mainly confined to important urban centres and there was little activity in the small towns and countryside where most people lived. (For example, 'five times as many townspeople as peasants were tried by the tribunal in Toledo')
- Kamen is correct in suggesting that the Inquisition was not a 'secret police' – fewer killed in Spain for religion than in France or the Netherlands in 16th century
- outside Castile, the Inquisition had little effect as it was opposed by the 'fueros' protected by the elites and clergy. The fueros saw it as a 'foreign institution'
- own knowledge suggests Kamen may be right to point out that most banned books were in foreign languages so Inquisition prohibitions had little effect on average Spanish readers. Against this it can be argued that censorship (and self-censorship through fear) was effective (Philip II's law of 1558 imposed the death sentence for importing a prohibited book and there was a block on Spaniards studying abroad).

In summary, overall, the extracts provide useful information and ideas about the impact of the

Inquisition. Students might extend their evaluation of interpretations through comparisons, links and connections in order to reach a judgement using their own knowledge.

Such a judgement might conclude:

- Extract C offers the most balanced interpretation, absolving the Inquisition from some of the more damning allegations that it stultified Spain and its people
- aspects of this traditional interpretation are found in Extracts A and B (although both emphasise that the Inquisition had an impact beyond the religious) and students' own knowledge of the fate of non-Christians and the absence of a Protestant 'presence' in Spain might be used to corroborate the view that the Inquisition's activities were of importance religiously; whilst evidence of political developments could be used to suggest that the Inquisition had great influence on Spain as instrument of royal authority
- nevertheless, the evidence that can be found to support Kamen's view is likely to lead most students to suggest that the power of the Inquisition has been traditionally over-emphasised.

Section B

0 2 'The New World had made little impact on Spain before 1556.'

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.

Arguments supporting the view that the New World made little or limited impact:

- initial discoveries had little impact beyond satisfying curiosity; the main concerns remained Europe and North Africa, and trade with the East
- new goods such as peanuts, tomatoes, turkeys and tobacco were found but there was little interest in, or profit from, them in this period
- although gold was found and the fall of the Aztecs and Incas provided windfalls, further discoveries in Chile and Columbia were difficult to extract
- silver was more plentiful but the major sources in Central Andes were not opened up until 1545, and even then were difficult to reach
- income from the New World was insufficient to meet Charles' financial needs
- Castile benefited more than Aragon.

Arguments suggesting the New World had a significant impact:

- vast new lands had opened up new prospects of affluence and outlet for the energies of restless Spanish noblemen; by 1521, Cortes had imposed control over Aztec Mexico; by 1536, Spain controlled Inca Peru
- the system of encomiendas (officially ended in 1542) provided new opportunities for agricultural profits (based on slavery) and precious metals lured the conquistadores.
- new products such as cochineal, chocolate (cocoa) and cattle hides were important, profit-making commodities
- the Crown was entitled to revenue from taxes, customs duties, Indian tribute and a fifth of all precious metals; all vital for the royal finances
- gold and silver from the 1530s gave Spain a position of pre-eminence as these enabled Spain to obtain credit; increased self-confidence
- New World wealth changed Spain's position to one of pre-eminence within Europe.

- 0 3** To what extent were Philip II's methods of government responsible for the problems he faced in Spain and its possessions? **[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.

Problems stemming from Philip's methods of government:

- he became known as the 'Paper King'; excessively bureaucratic and insisting on seeing every document and too concerned with trivial details
- his approach to decision making was cautious, hesitant and slow
- he was over reliant on his secretaries, such as Gonzalo Perez – but never fully trusted them
- he was too favourable to Castilians, alienating other subjects and regions
- he encouraged factions (especially the Eboli and Alva factions). His belief 'divide and rule' brought constant disruptive in-fighting
- he used councils, which were extended to meet needs but also became centres of faction; later in the reign, he turned to the Juntas, suggesting the conciliar system had broken down
- his arrogant treatment of the Cortes led to challenge over Millones and to the Aragonese revolt over fueros.

Positives stemming from Philip's methods of government:

- Philip kept himself well informed and could see the bigger picture; he was known as 'El Prudente'
- he followed a 'wait and see' policy which avoided rash decision making
- the Conciliar System allowed for some professionalism and spread of expertise
- centralised government, based in Madrid from 1561, enabled him to codify laws across his Kingdom
- the Cortes was largely kept under control and was a rubber stamp to Philip's demands
- Ambassadors at all the major courts of Europe kept Philip well informed.

Other factors responsible for problems might include:

- finance and the economy
- localism and the power of the nobles
- the fueros and traditional rights and customs
- religion and the Church.

0 4 'The battle of Lepanto in 1571 marked a turning point in Philip II's foreign policy.'

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.

Arguments supporting the view that Lepanto was a turning point:

- victory at Lepanto decisively blocked further Ottoman expansion into the western Mediterranean
- Spain maintained reasonable relations with England at first. There were some trade disputes but no outright war; after 1571 there was a decline in relations with England (the Netherlands; the Armada in 1588)
- 1559 Cateau-Cambresis meant good relations with France; later the rivalry with France led to the Triple Alliance against Spain in 1596
- success against Turks up to 1571 was followed by Turkish recovery later
- the rebellion in the Netherlands ran out of control from 1572.

All the above suggests a successful foreign policy until 1571 (when the stance of foreign policy was mainly defensive) but failure thereafter, when policies became more aggressive.

Arguments against the view that Lepanto was a turning point:

- westward Ottoman expansion had already been slowed to a stop by the defence of Malta in 1565
- relations with England were never good and were certainly already deteriorating before 1571 for reasons that had nothing to do with the Mediterranean
- Spain completed the successful annexation of Portugal in 1580 (after 1571) while policy against the Turks had already failed before 1571
- trouble in Netherlands had already flared before 1571 which led to the despatch of Alva and Spanish troops in 1567
- the turning point in relations with France came much later than 1571, with the death of Anjou in 1584
- the turning point of relations with England was much more 1584–1585, when English intervention in the Netherlands began after the assassination of Orange in 1584.

