

Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS1A: The Crusading Movement and the Latin East, 1095–1204



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS1A Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: history@aqa.org.uk

AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers

General Introduction by the Chief Examiner

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

Unit 1

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

GCE History HIS1A: The Crusading Movement and the Latin East, 1095 to 1204

Responses to June 2009 Questions

Candidate 1

- 1(a) Explain why Byzantium was important in Pope Urban II's decision to call the First Crusade at Clermont in 1095. (12 marks)

One of the reasons which are occasionally cited for Urban's calling of the First Crusade is the call for help which Alexius Comnenus had sent to Urban at the Council of Piacenza.

This letter was sent in response to the loss of Byzantine land which had occurred after the battle of Manzikert in 1072, where Romanus Diogenese had been defeated by Alp Arslan. This had led to the loss of the previously Byzantine held Anatolia.

When Urban received this letter, it is debatable as to whether he was actually galvanised by the thought of helping the Byzantines. What seems more likely is that one of Urban's main motives was an attempt at ending the schism between the Catholic and Greek Orthodox churches. This is likely as it was one of the ideals of the papal reform movement which Urban belonged to, following in the footsteps of his predecessor, Gregory VII. By helping the Byzantines in their hour of need, it seems that Urban hoped to heal the schism.

This can be seen in how, during Clermont, Urban referred to the need to help fellow Christians who were under threat from the infidel, most likely referring to the Byzantines. The fact that Urban was even referring to them as fellow Christians shows good will towards them, as often they were seen as not really being Christian.

Principal Examiner's Comments

In answering this question candidates were expected to show an understanding of the various motives behind Pope Urban II's decision to call the First Crusade, especially the role of Byzantium in his decision. The response begins with a clear understanding of the short-term importance of Byzantium with precise evidence. The next paragraph again provides precise evidence, this time regarding the long-term context of Byzantium's position. Next, the response shows understanding of the possibility of ending the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches. The final paragraph is the weakest, but it does refer to Urban's possible intentions. A useful response then, with analysis of a range of factors, it gives 3-4 useful points regarding the Pope's motives with precise evidence, but is held to the bottom of Level 4 for failing to develop fully other possibilities behind the Pope's call. A mark of 10 was awarded.

Candidate 2

- 1 (a) Explain why Byzantium was important in Pope Urban II's decision to call the First Crusade at Clermont in 1095.. (12 marks)

Over 20 years before the calling of the First Crusade, the Byzantine empire was involved in the Battle of Manzikert (1071) against the Seljuk Turks; despite there being 3 times more men fighting for Byzantium, the Seljuk Turks won after Emperor Romanus split the troops. As a result of this victory, the Turks began to take over Byzantine territory and refugees flocked to Constantinople. Pope Urban VII was naturally angered by this, and as leader of the Catholic world, preached at Clermont that "you must guard the flock that is committed to you". The Byzantine Emperor's plea for help, was a clear cause for the calling of the First Crusade. While traditional historians such as Runciman believe that the Emperor asked Urban to call a crusade, modern historians believe that he only asked for some troops to help calm the situation. Another reason why the Byzantine Empire was important in the calling of the crusade was because the Pope was motivated by the idea of papal evangelism; the idea that he could spread his control over the Greek Orthodox empire. Overall, Byzantium was crucial as its call for help prompted the calling of the crusade and set the holy war off.

Principal Examiner's Comments

In answering this question candidates were expected to show an understanding of the various motives behind Pope Urban II's decision to call the First Crusade, especially the role of Byzantium in his decision. In this response the candidate was awarded 6 marks, that is, a high L2. This level of mark is used when an answer fails to analyse a range of reasons with sufficient range and/or depth, or more usually gives a descriptive overview without explicit links to the question. This response begins with a description of events surrounding the battle of Manzikert and implies that Pope Urban's speech, nearly 25 years later was a direct response to this. Some generalised remarks are made on the appeal by the Byzantine Emperor, but these show little specific evidence. Finally, another attempt at analysis is made with a reference to Papal religious motivation, but once again, the attempt is vague and imprecise. Therefore, an answer with some useful context, but with less secure range and appropriate information. Level 2, 6 marks.

Candidate 3

- 1 (b) How important was Muslim disunity to the success of the First Crusade? (24 marks)

By 1079 Christendom was in control of Jerusalem, the ultimate object of the 1st Crusade, it was a resounding success that resonated through Europe especially when we consider the odds stacked against the success of such a venture.

Muslim disunity no doubt contributed to the 1st Crusade's success as it allowed strength of numbers to actually be enforced on the Christian side which led to decisive victories at Dorylaeum June 1097 where the vanguard alone outnumbered their Turkish ambushers 2:1; an engagement that would no doubt have been lost when we consider that to the Europeans the Turkish warfare "was new to us all", defeat at Dorylaeum would no doubt have cost the crusade dearly.

Both religiously and politically Islam was disunited, the early Arab empire was too large to administer effectively and is quickly dissolved, the first regional dynasty being founded in North Africa 777AD, this led to warring war lords diverting much of the manpower that could have threatened the Christian incursion against themselves, allowing the Crusaders to engage in long sieges against strategic points, such as at Antioch Oct 1097–June 1098. What's more Islam was disunited religiously also, in 969 Fatimid Shiites seized power in Cairo whilst by 1054 Seljuk Turkish Sunnis held Baghdad. This religious schism meant that the Muslims were often much more willing to ally against one another than with each other; for example by 1098 the Crusaders held an alliance with Egypt against the Turks. It also meant that Islam had no counter against the notion of 'crusade', a jihad was impossible with such disunity. When we combine their effect in the Crusader states in the future such as in 1187 we find this significant. This disunity was not helped by the power vacuum at the time, 1054 was often described by historians "as the year of deaths of sultans and caliphs", such was the disunity that in the 50 years of Frankish settlements the crusaders were able to exact tribute from local Emirs, a united crusader force therefore was able to make massive grounds often only because of their advantage of numbers made up by either Muslim allies or the disunity of Muslim lords

However Muslim disunity cannot be attributed wholly to crusading success, the strength of belief in the crusading force was also significant not least in creating a force of such massive proportions; 60,000 the largest European army since the Romans. Although some were motivated by material interests the vast majority can be said to be motivated by the unprecedented papal indulgences offered. This common religion not only gathered such an impressive force but also allowed it to act with **** for a common goal, as shown at Dorylaeum 1097 or Ascalon 1099 ensuring the 1st Crusades success, which would otherwise have been impossible if we consider the language barrier between factions, for example. It also preserved morale when we consider that many felt "God wills" their success. This is seen to have occurred at the second siege of Antioch 1098 where a demoralised crusader force reduced by pestilence, famine and desertion such as Stephen of Blois moved against their besiegers despite being vastly outnumbered, routing them. Such an action can only be attributed to the ***** of the Holy laws and the fact they believed they fought for a higher purpose unlike the Muslim opposition who fought for fallible secular lords and priests, often leading to them fleeing without the same convictions as the crusaders. The experienced leadership too played an important role, such as that of Raymond of Toulouse who had fought against the Moors in Spain and their ability to inspire their men to carry on their massive undertaking the journey to the East itself was gruelling but its completion can only be attributed to the skills of the leaders, combined with their ability to win battles proving successful.

In conclusion we find that Muslim disunity was perhaps the most significant factor in the crusader success especially when we consider the effect Muslim unity has later, for example the loss of Jerusalem following Hattin in 1187. However we mustn't under value the role of religious conviction and leadership in determining success.

Principal Examiner's Comments

In answering this question candidates were asked to examine the relative importance of Muslim disunity as a reason for the success of the First Crusade. This example was awarded a mid-L5 mark of 23 because it analysed a useful range of factors which help explain the crusaders' success, and it did so with a

strong evaluative argument and a depth of precisely selected evidence. The answer begins with a well-expressed introduction, showing a clear understanding of purpose. The essay then analyses the impact of the key issue, Muslim disunity, with a precise example from the crusade and then a useful analysis of the issue with context and useful conceptual understanding, including the Sunni/Shia split, short-term issues in the 1090s and the concept of Jihad. After this impressive, wide-ranging analysis of the key issue other factors are evaluated, including the size of the crusaders' forces, the role of religion in uniting these forces and driving them on, and leadership. Throughout the essay the candidate has shown not only wider context, but also a clear understanding of the key events of the crusade. A balanced response then, with a clear conclusion on the issue. 23 marks, a mid-Level 5.

Candidate 4

1 (b) How important was Muslim disunity to the success of the First Crusade?
(24 marks)

The first Crusade succeeded in capturing the Holy Land, Jerusalem in 1099. It has been said that Muslim disunity was a major factor in the victory of the crusaders.

The Muslims, before the crusades even began, were split between the Shi'ites and the Sunnis. One believed that the leader of the Muslim faith should be elected whereas the other believed that the leader should be a direct descendent from Mohammed. This split prevented the Muslims from coming together and fighting the crusaders. If they had united then the numbers could have been significantly greater, and they may have managed to keep their hold over Jerusalem.

The Crusaders took advantage of this disunity by staying together, with the exception of Baldwin who became the leader of Edessa, and they took Jerusalem from Muslim hands.

However the success of the crusaders cannot be solely because of the disunity of the Muslims.

One reason for the success of the first Crusade in 1099 could be because of the military tactics of the crusaders. This is shown by the actual capture of Jerusalem when after one siege tower had been burnt, Godfrey of Bouillon moved the remaining tower to the least defended part of the walls. This also shows the lack of military tactics for the Muslims as they had left one part of the city walls undefended.

Another reason for the success could have been because of the amount of support the crusaders received, as were seen to be doing Gods work. Also the material incentives would have driven the crusaders to fight and they would have been determined.

Muslim disunity, although only one reason for the success of the first Crusade, has to be the most important because it meant the crusaders had to fight against a group of disorganised people without one clear leader to unite them, and if they had been united they may have won the crusade, as shown in the second Crusade.

Principal Examiner's Comments

In this response, the candidate has shown general understanding of the issue, that is the success of the First Crusade, and also of the key factor, Muslim disunity, but both are presented in a most generalised fashion without any specific reference to the actual events of the crusade. Unity and military tactics are presented as alternatives, but these and the references to religious and material incentives which follow are imprecise and underdeveloped, little more than general assertions. A response then which is coherent but weakly expressed, one which shows explicit comment but limited support. A mid-Level 2 was awarded, a mark of 9.

Candidate 5

- 2 (a) Explain why Bernard of Clairvaux preached the Second Crusade. (12 marks)

Bernard of Clairvaux preached the Second Crusade after being appointed by Eugenius III (Pope) to recruit crusaders and organise the crusade called by the papal bull 'Quantum Praedecessores' in 1145.

Pope Eugenius III called the crusade after Zengi called jihad – Holy war – on the crusaders. By uniting the Muslims in 1140 and 1144 by taking Edessa, this was now a threat to the security of the crusader states in the Holy lands. Raymond of Antioch was worried for the safety of his principality as Antioch was now under great threat from Zengi and the Muslims. Raymond of Antioch sent an embassy to Louis VII asking him to send an army to help, Louis VII was then convinced to join the crusade as he was already sending troops and Bernard of Clairvaux was recruiting big military leaders. Bernard of Clairvaux preached the crusade to gather enough military recruitment and popularity to make the crusade a success. He also devised the plan of attacking on 3 fronts against the Iberian Moors, Wends and the pagans. Bernard of Clairvaux virtually launched the crusade himself and he had tight control over the message of crusading, also stopping anti-semitic message being spread.

Principal Examiner's Comments

In answering this question candidates were expected to show an understanding of the various motives behind Bernard of Clairvaux's preaching of the Second Crusade. In this response the candidate was awarded 7 marks, that is, a low L3 for an answer which provided useful context on the events which predated Bernard's preaching, including the calling of the crusade by Pope Eugenius III in response to the victories of Zengi. Useful, detailed material then on the reasons behind the crusade, but a significant lack of range and focus on Bernard himself – aside from a brief reference to his purpose in halting anti-semitism, an important motive, but not developed in this response with any precise evidence. 7 marks.

Candidate 6

- 2 (b) How important was a lack of clear aims in explaining the failure of the Second Crusade? (24 marks)

The second crusade was launched in response to the first crusading bill 'Quantum Praedecessores'. His aim was primarily to recapture Edessa and defeat Muslim armies thus fortifying the position of the crusaders. Yet it failed in all these respects.

A reason that has consistently been cited as responsible for the defeat of the crusaders is that its aims were unclear. The crusaders never made any serious attempt to capture Edessa and much time was spent in Christian states like Antioch with the future of the crusade being discussed. A further indication that the crusaders were not motivated by the clear aim is the willingness of the German army to return to Europe. This contrasts strongly with the third crusade in which few people abandoned the cause in spite of marching away from Jerusalem the first time. Though the crusade lacked no clear goal to act as a motivating factor it could still have become a success, or less of a failure. Towards the end of the crusade Damascus was nearly taken by the crusading army and so the position of the Christians in the East was nearly fortified. Instead whilst a lack of a coherent goal is important in explaining the failure it is not the most important factor.

Instead historians like Runciman and Riley-Smith blame the leaders and their actions for the failure. Conrad may be criticised for his decision to march from Constantinople without waiting for Louis and his 20,000 men to arrive. Furthermore he took the same route as was taken on the first crusade. His army was massacred and played no more relevant part, therefore he seems responsible for the loss of 15,000 men from the second crusade. Louis may also be criticised as a leader. He divided his army and on the way to St. Simeon and half forced to take the land route were killed. He was also a contributor to the decision to attack Damascus in spite of the negative political implications for such an attack. Moreover it was his decision to move position and so allow the Damascans to defeat their siege. Although leadership was undoubtedly poor, it has been argued that many of the mistakes made were induced by the Byzantine Empire.

The Byzantine Empire certainly forced the decision made by Louis to divide his army. The Byzantines failed to supply the agreed number of ships. As a result half of Louis' army was forced to march through enemy territory. This led to the destruction of a large section of Louis' army and the crusade was invariably hindered as a result. It can also be argued that Damascus would have been taken had the appropriate number of ships been given. The battle was close and this is therefore plausible. The Byzantines have also been accused of supplying treacherous guides to Conrad. Though Riley-Smith argues this now not the case many other historians consider it possible especially given Muslim allegiances at the time. If this is the case then Byzantium was responsible for the destruction of half the German and French contingent.

Yet the crusaders were capable of winning, Louis' army did so near the Maender Valley. Given this and the fact no massive technological advances were made since the successful first crusade military inferiority does not seem a factor.

Instead the lack of a clear goal inhibited the crusaders but they still almost gained a success by taking Damascus. Instead the army was defeated by leadership

errors which weakened the army causing losses in subsequent battles. Yet this was, as we have seen, caused, at least in some part, by the Byzantines without them Damascus would almost certainly have been taken and the extra men could have granted more successes. Thus through a lack of a clear goal was a factor in the loss the involvement of Byzantium was the most significant factor.

Principal Examiner's Comments

In this response the candidate was awarded a high L4 mark of 20 for an answer to a question on the relative importance of a lack of clear aims in explaining the failure of the Second Crusade. The candidate has produced a well-balanced analysis with a range of depth of precisely selected evidence, and useful evaluation of the issue. After a concise introduction the key issue is analysed, although good understanding is shown this is a less impressive section than the analysis of the leadership skills of Louis and Conrad which follows. Balance is then provided with an analysis of the culpability of Byzantium. Evaluation and specific detail are then shown before a basic conclusion which repeats those points already made. 20/24