



MARKSCHEME

November 2010

HISTORY

ROUTE 1

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 1

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IB Cardiff.*

SECTION A

Prescribed subject 1 The origins and rise of Islam c500–661

These questions relate to the beginnings of the Islamic Empire during the Rightly Guided Caliphs.

1. (a) **According to Source C, what were the state policies introduced by Caliph Umar in the conquered provinces?** [3 marks]

The key policies are:

- as a new regulation, soldiers are to be confined in the *amsar*, or military camps, thus preventing the softening of their soldiery, as well as avoiding friction with and resentment of the indigenous population;
- fixed pensions from the public treasury, collected from the *fay* would be distributed to the soldiers instead of the old booty of war;
- regular levying of the *kharaj* is calculated according to the productivity of the fields and is a measure against extortion;
- a poll tax is paid by the non-Muslims for protection of life, goods and religion, with a probable exemption from military service.

Award [1 mark] for each relevant point up to a maximum of [3 marks].

- (b) **What is the significance of the picture of the Mosque of Umar in Source E?** [2 marks]

- It was Caliph Umar's site of prayers when he arrived in Jerusalem;
- The mosque is opposite the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and not encroaching on it.

Award [1 mark] for each valid point up to [2 marks].

Do not enter half marks or + and – but compensate between (a) and (b) if necessary for a final mark out of [5 marks].

2. **Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B on the relations between the Arab rulers and the conquered subjects.** [6 marks]

For “compare”

- Both speak of the *jyzia*, or poll tax, as payment by the non-Muslims to the Arab authorities;
- Both acknowledge that the *jyzia* payment is in exchange for a secure life and freedom of worship;
- Both indicate a difference of civil status between non-Muslims and Arab/Muslims;
- Both Sources A and B underline the religious context and aspect of the *jyzia*: in Source A through the encounter of the two religious heads – Caliph Umar and Patriarch Sophronius; and in both through the use of religious symbols and references (crosses, churches, places of worship, sanctuary, in the name of Allah, the word of God, covenant of the Messenger and the believers, *etc.*).

For “contrast”

- There is a difference of emphasis of the *jyzia* issue in the two sources;
- Source A has a somewhat reticent, if not negative point of view, concerning the treatment of the *dhimmis*. It uses the term *dhimmis* – while Source B calls them the “people of Illyaa” – with its connotation of inferiority status, frankly stating that they are second-class citizens in spite of the mitigating “protected”. Thus, it points to the discriminatory aspect of the *jyzia*, by qualifying it with the adjective “punitive”. By the same token, the freedom of worship is minimized by the mention that they have to worship “discreetly”. It also underlines the relationship of superior and inferior status, through the use of “overlord” and, “sufferance of Arab authority”;
- In contrast, Source B highlights the advantages offered to the ruled by the new rulers, and spells out their gratifying clauses. Only at the end of the pledge, as if to minimize its effects, does the sting of the *jyzia* appear.

If only one source is discussed award a maximum of [2 marks]. If the two sources are discussed separately award [3 marks] or with excellent linkage [4–5 marks]. For maximum [6 marks] expect a detailed running comparison/contrast.

3. **With reference to their origin and purpose, discuss the value and limitations of Source A and Source D for historians studying Umar’s administration of the Arab Empire.**

[6 marks]

Source A

Origin: An extract of a historical study (2006) exploring and accounting for the rapports between Islam and Christianity in the medieval Mediterranean world. Stephen O’Shea is a journalist.

Purpose: To present an important episode of one of the first encounters between Islam and Christianity. The setting is Jerusalem, which is a holy site for both religions. Each of the actors represents his faith. The action depicts the surrender of the Christian city to the Caliph, by its highest religious authority, Patriarch Sophronius.

Value: This is a lively modern Western rendering of the surrender of Christian Jerusalem to Caliph Umar, Islam’s head of state. The journalistic background of the author results in a great readability of the text. The characters are humanlike; the narrative is enlivened by the depiction of certain details in the appearance and state of mind of each character. The basic historical facts are in accordance with other sources.

Limitations: Written in the aftermath of 9/11, and broaching the present issue of the strained relations between Islam and the West, the book, in this extract goes back to the beginning of the relationship between Christianity and Islam. The voice of the author, with a veiled Western bias is detected in the ironical rendering of Umar’s entrance in the city; of Umar’s speech, rebuking the Patriarch’s invitation to enter the church; in the author’s reporting on the new status of the People of the Book; and in his denunciation of the *jyzia*.

Source D

Origin: This is an extract from *The Origins of the Islamic State*, a medieval Arabic chronicle, *Kitab Futuh al-Buldan* written some two hundred years after the events, by the Muslim chronicler Ahmad ibn Jabir al-Baladhuri.

Purpose: To report on the origins of the Islamic state, through the narration of the exemplary protest of the inhabitants of Hims – Christians and Jews – when the Arabs, on the eve of the decisive Arab victory of Yarmuk decided to abandon them to their prior Byzantine yoke; but not before they restored to them the *kharaj* that they had levied, as they could not protect them anymore.

Value: An account from a medieval Arab historian, built on the Islamic methodology of *isnad*, which usually relies on scrupulously established chains of testimonies, going up to the time of the event. The document could be considered a primary source, thus acquiring some authority. Also the opposition of the provinces to the Byzantine rule, whether for religious or cultural reasons, is generally acknowledged by a variety of other sources.

Limitations: As the writer is a Muslim chronicler, who is not himself a contemporary of the Arab conquests, his account could be tainted with partisanship, and a bias in favour of Islam and the Arabs. There is too much praising of the Muslim warriors who too readily handed back the *kharaj* (in contrast, see the preventive measures taken by Caliph Umar, in Source C to avoid expected “lawless extortion” from warriors). On the other hand, the oaths of allegiance of the Christians and the Jews are too exaggerated, coming from subdued people, as well as the atmosphere of “singing and playing” surrounding the repayment of the *kharaj*.

Do not expect all the above and allow other valid points. Ideally there will be a balance between the two sources, and each one can be marked out of [3 marks], but allow a [4/2 mark] split. If only one source is assessed, mark out of [4 marks]. For a maximum [6 marks] candidates must refer to both origin and purpose, and value and limitations.

4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, assess Caliph Umar’s administration of the conquered provinces. [8 marks]

Source material that could be used:

Source A: The surrender of Jerusalem to Caliph Umar in person (because of his reputation of fairness and his sense of honour). The *dhimmi* status (second-class citizens). The payment of the *jyza* for the freedom of worship. Umar’s refusal to step in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, for fear that it would be claimed later as Muslim property (protection of the People of the Book’s places of worship).

Source B: The candidates should discuss all the clauses stated in this extract of Umar’s Covenant. They should note the religious/moral tone of the Covenant with the Peoples of the Book.

Source C: The candidates should infer the purpose of Umar’s ordinances and their value, as in the fiscal regulations of *kharaj* and *jyza*. Also the candidates should note Umar’s consolidation of the State Treasury, as well as the creation of separate military encampments and its rationale. They should point to the creative solution of the *fay* and the exemption of the *dhimmi* from military service and the justification for this.

Source D: The dissatisfaction of the Syrian cities with the Byzantine oppressive rule. The acceptance – if not the welcoming – of the Muslims as overlords in replacement of Byzantine tyranny.

Source E: The mosque of Umar erected in remembrance of the historical trip of Caliph Umar to Jerusalem, at the invitation of Patriarch Sophronius is not replacing the Holy Sepulchre Church, but neighbouring it. It attests to the peaceful cohabitation of the two religions during the Islamic Empire.

Own knowledge:

Own knowledge could include more details on Umar’s administration of the ever-expanding Empire, like the *diwan*, its definition, its purpose and its short-term and long-term effects. Also, more details on the establishment of the *amsars* and Umar’s objective; what was expected from the governors. Some mention should also be made of the *shura* council nominated by Umar on his deathbed. A conclusion could assess Umar’s rule, taking into account his strong personality, his piety, his sense of justice, his strictness, even harshness when it comes to applying justice, and his high moral standards.

Do not expect all the above and credit other relevant material. If only source material or only own knowledge is used, the maximum mark that can be obtained is [5 marks]. For maximum [8 marks], expect argument, synthesis of source material and own knowledge, as well as references to the sources used.

SECTION B

Prescribed subject 2 The kingdom of Sicily (1130–1302)

These questions relate to the reign of King William II of Sicily.

1. (a) **According to Source B, why was William II a good king?** **[3 marks]**

The first mark should be awarded for identifying his strength and power. The second mark should be awarded for identifying that he protected the weak. The final mark should be awarded for identifying that he upheld the law.

- He was unequalled among other kings;
- He was wealthy, strong and intelligent;
- He protected his subjects.

Award [1 mark] for each relevant point up to a maximum of [3 marks].

- (b) **What message about William II is conveyed by Source E?** **[2 marks]**

Marks may be awarded for any of the following inferences:

- the source shows that William II commissioned fine buildings;
- it shows that William II was devoted to the Virgin Mary because he is shown presenting the cathedral to her;
- it shows that he was a patron of the arts.

Award [1 mark] for each valid point up to [2 marks].

Do not enter half marks or + and – but compensate between (a) and (b) if necessary for a final mark out of [5 marks].

2. **Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources C and D about the qualities of William II as King of Sicily.** **[6 marks]**

For “compare”

- Both sources refer to William II’s wars: Source D states that the attack on the Greek Empire failed, agreeing with the criticism of William II in Source C;
- Both sources refer to the marriage of Constance to Henry, heir to the German Empire.

For “contrast”

- Source C states that William II’s foreign policy was “dangerous and irresponsible”, while Source D states that it was “increasingly ambitious”;
- Source C states that his enterprises “brought him nothing but defeat and humiliation”;
- Source C refers to the marriage of Constance and Henry of Germany as a “disastrous decision”, whereas Source D states that it was a sign of Sicily’s “high status”;
- Source D refers to William’s peace treaty with the German Empire in 1177;
- Source D refers to his leadership of Christendom and his support for the Crusades.

If only one source is discussed award a maximum of [2 marks]. If the two sources are discussed separately award [3 marks] or with excellent linkage [4–5 marks]. For maximum [6 marks] expect a detailed running comparison/contrast.

3. **With reference to their origins and purpose, discuss the value and limitations of Source A and Source B for historians studying William II's reputation as king.**

[6 marks]

Source A

Origin: A letter written in the early 1170s by a man who had served William II.

Purpose: To complain about William II's conduct towards the Church.

Value: A contemporary account by a man who knew William personally and who had worked for him.

Limitations: This is a source by a man with a personal grudge against William II, who took the Church's side of the argument.

Source B

Origin: An early thirteenth century chronicle written at Monte Cassino in Italy.

Purpose: To compile a record of the main political events of the age.

Value: A near-contemporary chronicle that gives an Italian perspective of the reign of William II.

Limitations: This is an Italian source that looks favourably on the reign William II, and praises him in extravagant terms.

Do not expect all the above and allow other valid points. Ideally there will be a balance between the two sources, and each one can be marked out of [3 marks], but allow a [4/2 mark] split. If only one source is assessed, mark out of [4 marks]. For a maximum [6 marks] candidates must refer to both origin and purpose, and value and limitations.

4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, analyse the statement in Source B that William II was “the flower of kings”. [8 marks]

Source material that could be used:

Source A: States that William II mistreated the Church by taking its possessions. He also followed the advice of sinners. Furthermore, Source A predicts that God will be angry with William II.

Source B: States that William II had excellent qualities as a king: intelligence, power, wealth, care for the poor and vulnerable, commitment to the law, and that he compared well with other rulers.

Source C: Emphasizes the failures of William II’s foreign policy. His defeats were humiliating, he wasted money, and he did not lead his armies in person. He can also be blamed for the marriage of Constance to Henry of Germany.

Source D: Emphasizes the successes of William II’s foreign policy. He made peace with the German Empire in 1177. His attack on the Greek Empire and his support for the Crusade showed that he was one of the leaders of Western Christendom. The marriages of William II to Joanna, daughter of Henry II of England, and of Constance to Henry of Germany, shows that other rulers wanted to make alliances with Sicily.

Source E: Shows that William II was a major patron of building, religion and the arts.

Own knowledge:

Royal government was intensive during William II’s reign and the master-justiciars, such as Tancred of Lecce and Robert of Caserta, enforced the King’s rule. The barons and churchmen looked to royal justice to solve their disputes. William II ordered the building of Monreale Cathedral in 1174, at enormous expense. Its mosaics were one of the great artistic achievements of the century. William II was involved in the Crusades and in 1174 he sent his navy and army to Alexandria, but failed to capture the city, and suffered a major defeat. The Sicilian navy attacked Muslim lands in North Africa on several occasions.

Sicily was attacked by Emperor Frederick I between 1167 and 1177, and again between 1174 and 1176, but this ended with a peace negotiated in 1177. William II also made treaties with Genoa and Venice in 1174 and 1175. In 1185, Sicily attacked the Byzantine Empire and although they captured Salonika, they were defeated repeatedly on land and at sea, and lost many soldiers and ships. The war lasted for two years but ended in total failure for Sicily.

Between 1187 and 1188 William II was planning again to send forces to the Holy Land to fight Salah al-Din (Saladin), but this was prevented by his death in 1189.

Do not expect all the above and credit other relevant material. If only source material or only own knowledge is used, the maximum mark that can be obtained is [5 marks]. For maximum [8 marks], expect argument, synthesis of source material and own knowledge, as well as references to the sources used.
