



MARKSCHEME

May 2012

HISTORY

Route 1

Higher Level and Standard Level

Paper 1

11 pages

*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 battle of Siffin and negotiations between Ali ibn Abi Talib and Mu‘awiya ibn Abi Sufyan.

1. (a) Identify the key points made in Source D concerning the sources of dispute between Ali and his Iraqi allies, and Mu‘awiya and his Syrian allies. [3 marks]

- The Iraqi factions had gained a certain independence in the time of Uthman. The Syrian factions wanted to have a similar arrangement;
- The Syrians opposed Ali because they thought that a strong caliph was more likely to reduce their independence;
- It was not a dispute about who was to be the ruler, but about political and monetary concerns between Ali, Mu‘awiya and their respective factions.

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

(b) What is the message conveyed by the images in Source E? [2 marks]

- Since his death to the present day, Ali has continued to be a revered figure;
- Ali’s alleged burial places are the sites of large and important shrines;
- These shrines, named after Ali, are considered holy centres of pilgrimage;
- His final burial place is disputed.

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

2. **Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B about relations between Ali, Mu‘awiya, and their respective allies.** *[6 marks]*

For “compare”

- Both sources mention that Ali’s allies were not united;
- Both sources mention that a religious issue was a cause of division in Ali’s forces;
- Both sources mention the Battle of Siffin, which involved Mu‘awiya and his Syrian supporters versus Ali and his Iraqi supporters, and explain possible reasons for the outcome.

For “contrast”

- Source A states that the reason for arbitration was a general dislike of the fighting; Source B claims that the Syrians started to negotiate because they were losing the battle;
- Source A states that factions within Ali’s army rebelled against him of their own accord; Source B states that Mu‘awiya tried to divide Ali’s forces by putting copies of the Qur’an on their lances;
- Source A mentions two envoys who negotiated a signed truce prior to the negotiations; Source B does not mention this;
- Source A mentions the Kharijites Affair; Source B does not.

End-on description of both sources would be worth up to *[3 marks]* if the comparative element is only implicit, and *[4 marks]* with excellent explicit linkage. If both sources are used with a good running linkage of both comparison and contrast award a maximum of *[4–5 marks]*. For the maximum of *[6 marks]* expect a detailed, comprehensive, running, comparison and contrast. If there is only either comparison or contrast award a maximum of *[4 marks]*.

3. **With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source C and Source D for historians studying the leadership of Ali.** *[6 marks]*

Source C

- Origin: A narrative compilation from a well-known, medieval Arabic source.
- Purpose: To give an account of the history of the First Civil War.
- Value: Al-Tabari was a Muslim who wrote a vast history. He is one of the earliest historians of the Islamic Empire. The source concentrates on the First Civil War.
- Limitations: Al-Tabari was not a contemporary observer. He was writing from within his own frames of reference which may have been biased. The source is an English translation and may not necessarily be accurate. Al-Tabari was the court historian of the Abbasids and may have a bias against Mu‘awiya.

Source D

- Origin: An academic book dealing with medieval regional and religious history, first published in the UK in 1986.
- Purpose: To provide a historically critical interpretation of the first four centuries of Islamic history.
- Value: A modern and up-to-date account written by an established historian of Islam, whose book is a product of much research and reflection.
- Limitations: The author is distant in time and place from the events about which he writes. He was writing from within his own frames of reference which may have been biased.

Do not expect all of the above. 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 marks]* split. If only one source is assessed, mark out of *[4 marks]*. For a maximum of *[6 marks]* candidates must refer to both origin and purpose, and value and limitations.

4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, assess to what extent they are important for understanding the reasons for conflict between Ali and Mu‘awiya.

[8 marks]

Source material

- Source A: This source emphasizes the attempts by both sides to resolve the dispute and stop the fighting by means of negotiation. It claims that the key issue was about the leadership of the entire Islamic community (*Umma*). It blames the split in Ali’s army on the Kharijites, who are reported to have taken an absolutely uncompromising position that did not allow any room for political arbitration.
- Source B: This source emphasizes the attempts by Mu‘awiya and the Syrian factions to exacerbate existing splits within Ali’s army. He states that the army was composite and was not made up entirely of Iraqis.
- Source C: The speech, which is said to be that of Ali himself, implies that Mu‘awiya and his supporters were misleading the Muslims and had rejected Islam. It was only because of this that Ali was forced to take action to restore order.
- Source D: This source emphasizes the human, rather than the divine, dimensions to the conflict. The author thus characterizes it as a regional power struggle for greater levels of political and monetary control.
- Source E: This source shows a strong division in the Islamic world, with the east, including Iraq, supporting Ali until today.

Own knowledge

Longer-term causes: ultimately these could be traced back to the succession problem after the death of Prophet Muhammad. However, candidates should not attempt to explain this except in terms of historical context. Rather, they should focus on more immediate political causes following the murder of the caliph Uthman at the hands of disaffected soldiers in the year before the battle and negotiation at Siffin. Some factions, especially from the Umayyaa clan to whom both Mu‘awiya and Uthman belonged, felt that Ali had not done enough to bring Uthman’s killers to justice.

Candidates should also be aware of increasing regional tension in an expanding Islamic empire: Mu‘awiya was the powerful provincial governor based in Damascus, and had strong support there among the Syrian soldiers and the Umayyaa clan; Ali had support in Iraq among the Arab soldiers who still had grievances over the division of spoils. Ali also had support from among factions from Medina and from those who had opposed Uthman.

Do not expect all the above and accept other relevant material. If only source material or 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 events known as “The Sicilian Vespers” during the rule of Charles I of Anjou, King of Sicily, in 1282.

5. (a) Why, according to Source A, did The Sicilian Vespers occur? [3 marks]

- There were high taxes in Sicily;
- Sicily was ignored and overlooked by Charles I of Anjou;
- There was a conspiracy against Charles I of Anjou by John of Procida, a servant of Peter of Aragon;
- The Sicilian rebels called on Peter of Aragon for help, and he invaded;
- The invasion by the Aragonese intensified the revolt, helping to make it successful.

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

(b) What is the message conveyed by Source E about the causes of the Sicilian Vespers? [2 marks]

- That an assault by a French official, against a Sicilian woman, caused the revolt;
- That the assault took place on a religious festival, Easter Tuesday, 31 March 1282, which made it even more unacceptable;
- That the assault took place near a church, making it sacrilegious;
- That the French treated the Sicilians with contempt and cruelty, and were oppressive;
- That the French were armed and that the Sicilian woman was an unarmed victim.

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

6. **Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B about the causes of The Sicilian Vespers.** *[6 marks]*

For “compare”

- Both sources refer to an Aragonese “conspiracy” or plot against Charles I of Anjou;
- Both sources mention Peter of Aragon’s opposition to Angevin rule in Sicily;
- Both sources mention the legend that John of Procida was a go-between in the plot;
- Both sources mention the role of Emperor Michael of Constantinople, and his attitudes;
- Both sources mention that Charles ignored the island of Sicily, and had not visited it since 1271.

For “contrast”

- Source A states that Charles I of Anjou was merely a nuisance to the Aragonese; Source B shows that the Aragonese actively involved the Emperor of Constantinople in a plot against Charles;
- Source A regards the role of the Aragonese in the revolt as being less important than the actions of the Sicilian people; Source B regards the Aragonese as the main actors in the revolt;
- Source A mentions that the revolt was already underway when Peter of Aragon landed; Source B makes no mention of this;
- Source B mentions that Emperor Michael gave Peter of Aragon money; Source A makes no mention of this;
- Source A mentions the role of taxation as a cause of the revolt; Source B makes no mention of this;
- Source B claims that Charles was an able and conscientious ruler; Source A makes no mention of this;
- Source A mentions the significant role of the Sicilian people in the Sicilian Vespers; Source B makes no mention of them.

End-on description of both sources would be worth up to *[3 marks]* if the comparative element is only implicit, and *[4 marks]* with excellent explicit linkage. If both sources are used with a good running linkage of both comparison and contrast award a maximum of *[4–5 marks]*. For the maximum of *[6 marks]* expect a detailed, comprehensive, running, comparison and contrast. If there is only either comparison or contrast award a maximum of *[4 marks]*.

7. **With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source C and Source D for historians studying the origins of The Sicilian Vespers. [6 marks]**

Source C

- Origin:** A collection of accounts of events in French History, published in France in 1835, by François Guizot.
- Purpose:** To explain events in France’s history during the Middle Ages, up to the thirteenth century, for a French readership.
- Value:** It was compiled by a university historian, using French medieval sources. Writing several centuries after the events he describes, Guizot had access to a broad range of sources.
- Limitations:** Guizot was a French politician as well as being a historian, who compiled his account from French sources alone. The source is not specifically about Sicily, but a general survey of French history, seen from a French perspective. As a politician, Guizot’s view may have been influenced by patriotic feelings. The extracts are adapted from the original text.

Source D

- Origin:** A history of The Sicilian Vespers, published in Italy in 1846, by Michele Amari.
- Purpose:** To give a full account of The Sicilian Vespers, in Italian.
- Value:** It was written by an Italian historian, using Italian medieval sources. As he was writing several centuries after the events he describes, Amari had access to a broad range of sources. His work is focussed entirely on the Sicilian Vespers.
- Limitations:** Amari was an Italian politician and patriot, who used predominantly Italian sources. His account of The Sicilian Vespers is written entirely from an Italian perspective. His patriotism may have influenced his historical understanding.

Do not expect all of the above. 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 marks] split. If only one source is assessed, mark out of [4 marks]. For a maximum of [6 marks] candidates must refer to both origin and purpose, and value and limitations.

8. **Using the sources and your own knowledge, analyse the statement in Source D that the “cruel and rapacious” nature of Charles I of Anjou’s rule caused The Sicilian Vespers.** *[8 marks]*

Source material

- Source A: This source emphasizes the importance of the Sicilian people’s role in the uprising of 1282, noting that it was a spontaneous popular uprising. It also mentions that there was a 150 % tax rise just before the revolt, and that Charles’s “greatest mistake” had been to ignore Sicily after 1271. It states that the Sicilian rebels made desperate pleas for Peter’s help, suggesting the unpopularity of Charles’ government. It also notes that Aragonese intervention helped to prolong the revolt, and change it into a war against kings.
- Source B: This source emphasizes the importance of a conspiracy by Charles I of Anjou’s foreign enemies. It focuses on the ambitions of Peter of Aragon, and the diplomacy he conducted to gain the support of Emperor Michael of Constantinople. It also shows that Charles was an able and conscientious ruler, who lived near his subjects, and whose officials were not oppressive. However, it also notes that Charles ruled Sicily from Naples, and that he failed to visit the island after 1271, neglecting its economy.
- Source C: This source claims that Peter of Aragon lied to the Pope when he said that his fleet was sailing to Africa, whereas in fact it was destined for Sicily. It also states that Peter invaded Sicily, forcing the kingdom to submit to him, and that he crowned himself as king. It notes that Charles was severe in punishing the Neapolitans who revolted against him, and that he failed to attend a battle that he had arranged with Peter.
- Source D: This source claims that the cruelty and rapacity of Charles’ rule were the main reasons for the uprising, and that the Sicilians rose up before Peter of Aragon’s invasion. Also that evidence for a conspiracy between Charles’ Sicilian enemies and Peter of Aragon was “not confirmed by any valid historical source”. It emphasizes the popular opposition within Sicily against French rule, and the importance of the assault on a Sicilian woman as the spark for the revolt.
- Source E: This source depicts the attack on a Sicilian woman by a French official, near the church of Santo Spirito, Palermo, Sicily, on 31 March 1282, as the cause of the revolt. It shows the Sicilian people as victims of French oppression. It shows how there was also a religious dimension, as the assault occurred near a church on a holy day, Easter Tuesday.

Own knowledge

The 1282 Sicilian revolt was due to a combination of internal pressures, and the actions of Charles I of Anjou’s external enemies.

During his reign, Charles had raised heavy taxes in Sicily, including a new “General Subvention” and a re-issue of coinage that profited the crown. In order to undertake his military expeditions in Tunisia and against Constantinople, Charles had conscripted large numbers of sailors and soldiers from his lands, which was a very unpopular measure.

Charles also relied on non-Sicilian advisers, whether French or mainland Italians. Some Sicilian-born officials, such as John of Procida, had abandoned the kingdom and took up service with Charles' enemy, Peter of Aragon. Charles himself lived in Naples, and was viewed as a distant and out-of-touch ruler by many of his Sicilian subjects, especially by the nobility. He had further angered them by taking much land back into royal control.

The incident on 31 March 1282, when a French official assaulted a Sicilian woman at the church of Santo Spirito, outside Palermo, ignited grievances that had been growing for many years.

Charles I of Anjou also had external enemies. In 1262 Peter of Aragon had married Constance, the daughter of the former Hohenstaufen King, Manfred, making him a rival to Charles for the Sicilian throne. Charles' execution of Conradin, the last male Hohenstaufen heir in 1268, strengthened Peter's reasons for supporting a revolution in Sicily. Peter and Charles also had conflicting strategic interests – both vying for influence and power in Provence, Sardinia and Tunis. By the early 1280s, Peter was in contact with Sicilian enemies of Charles I of Anjou, and may even have promised them land in the event of a successful revolution.

Another enemy was Emperor Michael of Constantinople. Charles' alliance with the Hungarians, the Serbs and the Bulgarians, and his ambitions to become a power in the Adriatic, put him in conflict with Constantinople. In 1281, Charles was planning an attack against Constantinople. Although Emperor Michael died in 1282, he is believed to have had contact with Peter of Aragon before his invasion of Sicily, and may have supported him with money.

Do not expect all the above and accept other relevant material. If only source material or 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.