

Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
in History(8HI0) Paper 1A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2016

Publications Code 49847

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Paper Introduction

It was pleasing to see responses of a decent standard from candidates attempting the new AS Paper 1A which covers *The Crusades, c1095-1204*. The paper is divided into three sections. Section A and Section B contain a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in breadth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/ continuity, similarity/difference and significance. Section C contains one compulsory question that assesses the ability to analyse and evaluate historical interpretations (AO3) concerning the reasons for the failure of the Fourth Crusade. Candidates have to answer three questions - one from each Section.

Generally speaking, candidates found Section C more challenging mainly because some of them were not entirely clear about how to analyse and evaluate the extracts they were presented with. Moreover, the detailed knowledge base required in Section C to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the extracts was also often absent. Having said this, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A, B or C. The ability range was wide, but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. Furthermore, in Sections A and B, few candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section A and B essays was a lack of knowledge. It is important to realise that Section A and Section B questions may be set from any part of any of the four Themes, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important.

8HI0_1A_Q01

Question Introduction

On Question 1, stronger responses targeted the reasons for the launch of the First and Second Crusades and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (the need to free and defend Jerusalem) and a range of other factors (e.g. other religious factors such as remission of sins, political factors involving the papacy, and the motive of wealth acquisition). Judgements made about the relative importance of Jerusalem were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the reasons for the launch of the First and Second Crusades in the years 1095-1146. Low scoring answers were also often off focus or essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. Jerusalem as an important Christian city). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Examiner Comment on Example Script

This response has a well-focussed introduction which clearly sets out how the question will be answered. The stated factor, the need to free and defend Jerusalem is well treated. Jerusalem is located within other religious reasons for crusading and is used to develop the idea of Just War and the remission of sins. The stated factor is weighed against other factors and the political reasons involving the papacy are treated thoughtfully. The range is a little limited and there is some imbalance with the First Crusade receiving much more extensive treatment than the Second Crusade. The conclusion is sustained by being drawn from the material presented, and takes this response towards the top of level three.

Examiner Tip

Planning is essential to make sure that the time frame is fully covered and the question is answered fully. This response would benefit from having specific examples about why crusaders wanted to crusade.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

- ~~Intro - religious *~~
~~P1 - Jerusalem + other political~~
~~P2 - Religious~~
~~P3 - Cultural / Secular~~
~~P4 - Body / Land~~
~~Conclusion - Religious~~

The years 1095 - 1146 mark out the beginning of the 1st Crusade to the end of the Second Crusade. The first crusade was called in 1095 by Pope ~~Urban~~ Urban II at the council of Clermont, it was officially called in response to the request from the Byzantine Emperor Alexius asking for assistance against the growing Muslim threat to his territory. The second crusade was called by Pope Eugenius III immediately following the capture of the Frankish city of Edessa by the Muslim Warlord Zengi. However these were not the only motives for the crusades, the role of religion and the church were heavily involved ~~&~~ with the crusades and this was the main reason for the crusades happening as it had the most impact on the recruitment of knights, nobles and commoners in the crusades. ~~Political reasons such as the~~ The defence of Jerusalem is primarily a religious motivation because of the spiritual significance of Jerusalem in the Christian faith. In addition political motivations, such as the Popes expanding influence and cultural reasons, like the chivalric values of knights played significant roles. The 'main reason' will be the factor that contributed ~~to being the most significant~~. the most in



(Section A continued) motivating people to go on crusade.

Religious motives, such as the aim of freeing Jerusalem or protecting Jerusalem were the most important reasons for the crusade. The Christian faith ~~was largely~~ (and so the Catholic Church) was ~~highly~~ extremely influential in the middle ages in Europe which meant that a religious motivation for crusading would have been very influential. The city of Jerusalem was a key city in the Christian faith as it was the site of the church of the Holy Sepulchre and the hill of Calvary, both sacred places. The city had been ~~in the~~ controlled by Muslims (who also regarded it as holy) for several centuries and the road to the city from Christian pilgrims had become increasingly perilous. Pope Urban also emphasises the ~~for~~ suffering of Christians in Jerusalem. This would have made the crusades a 'Just war' an idea developed throughout the crusades by individuals such as Matilda of Tuscany. 'Just war' permitted Christians to break the commandment 'thou shalt not kill' and go to war. This was due to the ~~the~~ crusade having good intentions - to liberate Christians suffering ~~go on the attack~~ and a holy leader - Pope Urban. However this only meant the crusade wasn't a sin, the primary motivator was the idea of 'plenary indulgence' which meant that if people went on crusade their sins would be forgiven and they would get a 'golden ticket' to heaven. Because of the highly religious nature of middle ages Europeans, this would have been a powerful motivator to go on crusade. Overall this means that religious factors like the protection of Jerusalem and indulgences would have been important reasons to take part in a crusade, especially for knights who would have relished the chance to atone for the many murders they had committed during



(Section A continued) wars in Europe. The only limitations for this factor is the fact that Edessa was the city that was threatened in the second crusade, not Jerusalem. Edessa held little to no religious significance so would not have been a holy site to protect. However the sectarianism of Christians there - like the 15,000 killed by Zengi may have still been enough to class it as 'Just war'.

Political reasons also played a role in the crusades from 1095-1146. The church was not only a religious force, but it also held significant political authority over Europe. The Pope - Urban II ~~had~~ in the 1st crusade was in a dispute with the Holy Roman Empire emperor and anti-pope Clement. He was also in conflict with Phillip, king of France over an issue of illegitimate marriage. A crusade would provide the perfect opportunity to show his own authority over these other leaders. The 1st crusade could also have been motivated by a desire to improve the relations between the Western and Eastern churches with the ~~the~~ ultimate goal of uniting them - hence expanding the Pope's sphere of influence. However this is not likely in the second crusade as the Byzantine emperor had not asked for help from the west. The objective of defending the state of Edessa and stopping a domino effect in the second crusade was the ~~the~~ an important reason for the second crusade however this was not important in the first crusade as the states had not yet been established. Overall ~~the~~ political reasons had various degrees of significance in causing the crusade to be called (such as improving East-west relations) however these reasons would not have been important to average knights and nobles who would



(Section A continued) have seen the opportunity to earn a place in heaven as far more inviting. The political reasons are also heavily linked to religious reasons due to the church being a religious and political authority so it could be argued that reasons such as the expansion of the church ~~and~~ way out of a desire to convert people to Christianity rather than merely for political gain.

In conclusion religious factors - mainly the thought Just War combined with plenary ~~indulgence~~ indulgences was the most significant motivation for people taking the cross and going on crusade. Political reasons, although significant to the calling of the crusade were not as impactful ~~as~~ to recruitment. In addition political and religious factors are heavily linked due to the political and religious nature of the Catholic Church. Cultural and feudal reasons also had an impact - mainly on knights (especially in the 2nd crusade due to it being led by kings) however this is limited because many crusaders had no feudal ties and were not knights - like the people's crusade and so these cannot have been the main reasons. In addition the idea that crusaders went on crusade for gain of wealth and land can be mostly ignored due to the extremely high cost of crusading and the fact that the majority of crusaders did not settle in the holy land - especially in the Second Crusade. Religion was the most important factor.



8HI0_1A_Q02

Question Introduction

On Question 2, stronger responses targeted the reasons for Muslim military success after the unification of Syria by Nur ad-Din, and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (Nur ad-Din and the unification of Syria) and a range of other factors that explained increased Muslim military success (e.g. the importance of the concept of Jihad, the role of Saladin and divisions among the crusaders). Judgements made about the relative importance of the unification of Syria by Nur ad-Din were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the reasons for increasing Muslim military success in the years 1146-69. Low scoring answers were also often off focus or essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. one military consequence of Nur ad-Din's unification of Syria). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Examiner Comment on Example Script

This is a well focussed response with good knowledge and attention to detail used as the base from which to evaluate the substantial points made. The candidate successfully considers the central issue in the question which is the unification of Syria by Nur ad-Din and how that improved Muslim military success. There is good detail and telling points of analysis are made. The candidate offers balance in considering the limitations to some of Nur's tactics as well. The candidate confidently makes use of key concepts such as Jihad and uses this to broaden the analysis. The response is well argued and equally well organised and is secure level 4.

Examiner Tip

Good responses avoid using a one-sided argument and look to balance the argument. When planning always consider strengths and limitations in favour of the stated factor.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

Upon the death of his father, Zenghi, Nur ad-Din inherited control of the city of ~~Mosul~~ Aleppo. He was quick to make alliances and secure his position. This essay will discuss the extent to which Nur ad-Din unification of Syria in the years 1146-1169 contributed to the success of Islamic military incursions. Other factors that will be discussed include the successes of Saladin in Egypt, the affect of solidifying control in Edessa, and the growing concept of Jihad. This essay will also look at how Nur ad-Din contributed to difficulties for the Islamic military forces as well as focusing on making a judgement as to whether or not his contribution was the most significant between 1146-1169.

Nur ad-Din enjoyed great success in his aim to place all of Muslim Syria under one ruler. Unlike his father, Nur ad-Din first focused on securing his own territory and this included an assault against the principality of Antioch, together with his ally, the Sultan of Rum. Nur ad-Din was able to effectively wipe out the



(Section A continued)

threat posed by the crusader states and so was able to place more focus on his other targets, including Damascus. Nur ad-Din also ~~realized~~^{realized} the danger crusader castles could pose to his fledgling empire and so quickly focused on driving out Christians from the fortresses around Aleppo. Nur ad-Din's next aims were the cities of Damascus and Bebel'ek. As had been demonstrated in the conflict between Aleppo and Damascus in the 1090s, the resources of the Damascene citizens could pose a viable threat to any growing Muslim power. Nur ad-Din correctly identified this and set his resources against the city. With the threat from Antioch essentially neutralised, and the Egyptians pre-occupied, Nur ad-Din could afford to devote time and effort to capturing the city. When it finally fell, it marked a turning point for Nur ad-Din, as he had now proved himself as the greatest power in the Islamic world and, with the subsequent conquest of Bebel'ek a year later, Nur ad-Din had finally succeeded where his father had failed: uniting Muslim Syria.

However, Nur ad-Din's actions also proved to be to the detriment of the Muslim military forces. Though his campaign against Damascus was arguably necessary, it was certainly poorly



(Section A continued)

timed. This was demonstrated in the mass number of resources Nur ad-Din had been forced to put into capture of the city, which he had unsuccessfully assaulted at least twice before. In the decades that followed, Damascus would open its arms to embrace Saladin, but Nur ad-Din enjoyed no such treatment. He was intensely disliked by the city for his ~~get~~ constant warring against it and if he had attempted to actively take control of the city ~~rather than~~ through diplomacy rather than warfare, he may have been able to destroy the Crusader states over a hundred years ahead of time. The city would likely have been ripe for an alliance, after the actions of the Franks in unsuccessfully besieging it, but instead Nur ad-Din drove the Damascene into another alliance with it, something that ~~he~~ would haunt him throughout his campaign against the city.

Another important factor to consider is the successful consolidation of Edessa by Nur ad-Din and how this helped him to maintain Islamic military might. By continuing his father's work in driving the Franks out of the county, culminating in the fall



(Section A continued) of Turbessal in 1151, Nur ad-Din ensured that the land would not be taken by any of the powerful forces, including the Byzantine Empire, that surrounded the Middle East. Additionally, by destroying the city in 1146 and massacring its Christian population, Nur ad-Din made sure that the city could no longer serve as a base of attack for the Franks in the North of Akko.

In any discussion of the growth of Islamic military power in the 12th Century, it is important to make reference to the increasing popularity of Jihad. Unlike & with the Christian concepts of 'Crusade' and St. Augustine's 'Just War Theory', the Jihad was and had always been and deeply rooted part of Islam. The Prophet Muhammad had himself taken up the sword to defend Islam, and he is ~~now~~ seen as the perfect and ideal Muslim. Through Jihad, powerful Islamic leaders could rally unprecedented support from their people, arguably to a greater extent than that which the Crusade did in the Catholic world. While Nur ad-Din's work in Syria was mainly against other Muslims, it is important to remember that the divide between Sunni and Shi'ah was still very much prevalent in the 12th Century, and it may have been through



(Section A continued) manipulating this divide, as well as showcasing his numerous campaigns against Christians, most notably the Battle of Hattin. Nur ad-Din's forces massacred the army of Antioch and Prince Raymond of Moitiers was beheaded, that rulers like Nur ad-Din and later Saladin were able to command such absolute devotion from their troops. Undoubtedly, the concept of Jihad has throughout history been most of the most important factors in continual Muslim success.

In addition, the campaign against Egypt, and the subsequent work of Saladin, were among the greatest successes in Nur ad-Din's life time. Much of Saladin's work in Cairo happened after 1169 and so is not relevant for this discussion, however, ~~that~~ it is important to mention the ~~tactic~~ tactical ~~res~~ necessity of taking Egypt. Nur ad-Din had once again correctly identified the greatest threat to his empire as well as a much needed advantage. By taking control of Egypt, Nur ad-Din would ~~be~~ gain the immense wealth he needed to finance his continual work against the Crusaders, he would also have control of ~~the~~ one of the world's greatest ports at that time: Alexandria. Another



(Section A continued)

Key motivation was obviously the further unification of the wider Muslim world, as well as finally destroying the Seljuks' bitter rivals, the Fatimids. In contrast, Nur ad-Din now he had to act quickly as King Amalric of Jerusalem was proving himself a capable warrior and Nur ad-Din knew it would spell disaster for him if Egypt's resources fell into the hands of the Franks. ~~There~~ There was also the danger of a Franco-Egyptian alliance against him, as proved when the Egyptian vizier paid 600,000 dinars to the Franks in order to encourage them to fight Nur ad-Din. Luckily for ~~the~~ Nur ad-Din, his swift action paid off and by 1169, ~~Egypt~~ Egypt was under the secure control of Saladin. In the 1170s, Saladin would grow into a hindrance for Nur ad-Din, but at least for now, he had removed a significant threat and further secured his holdings.

In conclusion, there ~~are~~ were a number of factors that influenced Muslim success in ~~the~~ the 12th century. It is beyond dispute that Nur ad-Din's efforts in uniting Syria played a major role in military success of Islamic powers, however at times, for example



(Section A continued)

in his long campaign against Damascus, the Syria could prove to be a hindrance as much as a help. Arguably, Egypt represented a greater military success, although Nur ad-Din took little part in the actual conquest, as did his successes ~~later~~ against the Franks, both in Edessa and in Antioch. Despite this, ~~that~~ the factor that this essay would argue had the most impact on Muslim success between 1146-1169 was, as it has always been, the concept of Jihad. This ~~kind~~^{code} of spreading Islam by the sword has brought down some of the greatest Empires this world has ever known, (Ancient Egypt, Byzantine) and has forged mighty Islamic Empires like Persia, Arabia^{and} the Ottoman Empire. It is not surprising that Jihad was a massive aid to Nur ad-Din in his conquests, as well.



8H10_1A_Q03

Question Introduction

On Question 3, stronger responses targeted how far the government of the crusader states changed in the years 1100-87. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (change/continuity) in the question. Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument was demonstrated too (e.g. that there was difficulty in maintaining crusader unity over the period, that the ability to respond to the Muslim threat therefore changed, with some balance in terms of continuity such as the continued development of trade and agriculture, and continued if decreasing military success). Judgements made about the extent of change and continuity in the government of the crusader states were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the extent to which the government of the crusader states changed in the years 1100-87. Low scoring answers were also often off focus (didn't properly engage with change/continuity) or were essentially a description of changes in the rulers of the crusader states during the period under discussion). Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. by over concentration on the issue of the various succession crises and the actions of individual rulers such as Baldwin IV). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Examiner Comment on Example Script

Question 3 asks for focus on change and continuity over time. Candidates tended to struggle with this. This response shows how a good answer can be offered by establishing at the start what criteria will be used to inform the candidate's judgement. In this case stability of rule, the amount of territory occupied and the ability to deal with growing Muslim power are used to assess change over time. Each issue is given consideration and the time frame is covered. The candidate clearly exemplifies change from Baldwin's successful reign to points of disunity within the time frame. The candidate avoids simply showing government getting weaker, resulting in the fall of Jerusalem to Saladin, by bringing in the increased power of Muslim opposition to the crusaders. This balances the response nicely and although in places the detail is a little short, it retains a focus on the stated factor of government and change and continuity over time. This wins a level 4 award.

Examiner Tip

In order to show change and continuity over time divide the time frame into distinct periods and define them by showing turning points. Show that turning points change some features of the topic being considered and that other features either do not change, or only change a little.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4

To assert that the government of the Crusader States of Outremer changed in the years 1100-1187 would suggest that ~~the~~ its governance changed in terms of quality; the extent to which it was successful in key aspects of government. These aspects include the quality of leadership in terms of control over the nobility; military success and territorial acquisition, and good foreign policy (sound relations with foreign countries / states). When assessing the government of the Crusader states, it is important to consider the quality of rule demonstrated by the monarch of Jerusalem. Due to the primacy of Jerusalem, ~~the~~ ^{its} king or Queen ^{usually} usually had greater authority than other states.

~~The~~ 1100 saw the start of Baldwin I's reign. In the years ~~1101, 1102, 1104~~ 1100-1110



(Section B continued) he dedicated his time to executing a programme of territorial consolidation; capturing key coastal ports and cities including Haifa and ~~Ast~~^{Acro} in ~~1107~~ 1104 and Beirut and Sidon in 1113. Through his acquisition of these territories, Baldwin I also demonstrated his ability to effectively co-operate with external leaders and forces. In 1110, he received assistance from King Sigurd of Norway and in previous years received help from Genoese and Venetian fleets whilst campaigning for further coastal territories.

Baldwin I is also generally understood to have demonstrated a degree of military prowess through his repulsion of invading Turkish forces from Hama in 1113 and his success at the battle of Tel Baruth in 1115. He also asserted his control over the unsupportive patriarch of Jerusalem Robert of Pisa, by deposing him in 1102.

These military, territorial and political victories indicate that the



(Section B continued) initial governance of Outremer was strong. Between the years 1100 and 1118, Baldwin I displayed an excellent quality of leadership, which is traditionally interpreted to have deteriorated significantly between the end of his reign and the fall of Jerusalem in 1187.

The quality of governance noticeably declined under the joint premiership of Fulk of Anjou and Melisende in the years 1131-1143. Initial territorial disputes as a result of Fulk's decision to install ^{his} Angevin supporters in key governmental positions led to internal conflict; one likes of which were not experienced under the previous reigns of Baldwin I and Baldwin II. The political humor was so severe that in 1134, Hugh a Zenta, Melisende's ^{key} supporters, rebelled and even went so far as to sign a treaty with the Fatimid Muslims. This would suggest that the governance



(Section B continued) of Jerusalem, and therefore the crusader states, changed significantly, because ~~the~~ its quality diplomatic leadership fell drastically. Following as a result of the poor quality of government during their joint reign, ~~the~~ Fulk and Melisende felt compelled to ~~give~~ ^{surrender} ~~control~~ ^{control} of the famous castle, Krak de Chevaliers, ~~to~~ to the hospitallers in 1142. This can be interpreted as being a testament to their military weakness.

However, one might propose ~~an~~ ^{the} counter argument that this may in fact indicate good military decision-making on their behalf. It cannot be fully asserted that Fulk and Melisende ceded control of this fortification purely out of their lack of military capability. Perhaps they acknowledged that the hospitallers would be able to do a better job of ~~defending it /~~ making full use of its military / defensive function.



(Section B continued) Although they experienced some initial political turbulence, the eventual reconciliation between Fulk and Melisende led to firmer government and it could also be argued that Baldwin I's 'successful' reign was only successful due to the weakness of the Muslim opposition.

The unifying concept of Jihad and the successful rule of Emir Zengi only began in 1127 when he became governor of Mosul. Prior to this, the Muslim world was still riddled with residual internal conflict due to the existence of rival dynasties (Sunni and Shi'ah) and the collapse of the Seljuk Empire into rival territories run by atabegs following the death of Malik Shah in 1092.

On the other hand, ~~in 1187~~ from 1174 onwards, the leadership of Saladin came to prominence, and



(Section B continued)

he succeeded in uniting the whole of Syria and Egypt under a single Muslim ruler (himself). This is potentially why the government of the Crusader states in the years 1174-1187 under Baldwin IV (the 'leper' king) and Guy and Sibyll arguably deteriorated. Its deterioration is demonstrated by the fact that between 1170 and 1183, Saladin launched four successful offensives into the kingdom of Jerusalem, and in 1187, the Crusader Guy's forces faced heavy defeat at the Battle of Hattin, resulting in the subsequent fall of Jerusalem in 1187.

Although the quality of government of the Crusader States deteriorated in the years 1100-1187, indisputably it can be argued that it was not the ~~gover~~ quality of government in itself which saw significant change,



(Section B continued) but the obstacles it encountered / faced. Perhaps Baldwin I's success as a monarch is over-credited due to the post-first-crusade aura of sanctity he possessed, and perhaps the government of the crusader states would not have changed ^{^ for the worse} so drastically had the Muslim opposition not grown in strength. Therefore, the government did change in relation to the aforementioned areas, but only as a result of differing circumstances.



8H10_1A_Q04

Question Introduction

On Question 4, stronger responses targeted how significant the military orders were to the survival of the crusader states in the years 1120-87. These included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question. Sufficient knowledge was used to assess the significance of the military orders (e.g. their military and administrative roles, their appeal as a Christian militia to European rulers who offered funds, their prowess in key military campaigns such as at Montsigard) set against a range of other significant reasons for the survival of the crusader states (e.g. the role of castles and fortified settlements, the control of seaports and the growth of trade, as well as support from Byzantium and Europe). Judgements made about the relative significance of the military orders were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of how far the military orders were the most significant reason for the survival of the crusader states in the years 1120-87. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus (didn't engage with significance) or were essentially a description of the military orders during these years. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. limited comments on the importance of the military orders as a source of funding from European rulers). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Examiner Comment on Example Script

Question 4 asks candidates to assess the significance of the role of the Military Orders in the survival of the crusader states. Responses to this question were mixed. Many candidates had clearly prepared a list of factors which helped the crusader states to survive, and there was a tendency to get the Military Orders out of the way and get on with the other factors. This response has some good features but is fairly typical. It deals with the Military Orders first and has some accurate information about them. However, there needs to be a little more if their significance is to be properly evaluated. There is a decent range of other factors to weigh the significance of the Military Orders against, but the candidate ought really to weigh each factor against the significance of the Orders, rather than separate them. This is an example of writing at level 3 - broadly accurate and analytical attempting to establish the criteria by which a judgement can be made.

Examiner Tip

When exemplifying significance try to include several important features rather than just the main one. The Military Orders were important in providing a permanent military force to secure the crusader states; they attracted money and knights from Europe; they were clearly feared and respected; they acted as managers and administrators.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4 Question 4

~~The government of the crusader states changed largely in the years 1100-1197, as the states were~~

~~The military orders were reasonably significant to the survival of the crusader states in the~~

~~The government of the crusader states changed largely in the years 1100-1197, as the Jerusalem had over 8 different kings, as well as~~

The military orders were reasonably significant to the survival of the crusader states in the years ~~1100~~ 1120 - 1197, as they provided protection. However, other factors such as camel and fortified settlements, as well as sea ports and trade also held significant value towards the survival of the crusader states.

The military orders were significant to the survival of the crusader states, as both the Templars and Hospitallers offered protection. For example, the Templars were founded in 1116 and joined together to offer protection to pilgrims travelling to Jerusalem. This was significant to the crusader



(Section B continued) States, as they successfully protected the pilgrims from Muslim threats around Jerusalem. Between the 1130's-40's, the Templars had a much more military role, as they provided troops for the crusading armies and survived off donations, ~~rather~~ so were free for the crusaders to use. For example, Henry II provided 100 knights to spend a year in Jerusalem, which meant that the crusader states had a much bigger army so were able to survive. Another group known as the Hospitallers were also formed who began ~~with~~ as care-givers but soon acquired a much more military role as they were in charge of defending Caesarea and were also asked to defend the entire city of Sidon. The military orders were quite significant to the survival of the crusader states, as they protected and defended and also had available troops ready to help in any battle or to defeat any threats.

Castles and fortified settlements were also hugely significant to the survival of the states, as they ~~at~~ first began being used by Baldwin I, who used them for defensive purposes. For example,



(Section B continued) Edessa had become a fortified town and so ~~then~~ an entire wall was built around the city. This helped to tackle any ~~the~~ ~~threat~~ Muslim threats, because they would have to break the entire wall down and then face the city's garrison, which would have had time to prepare and wouldn't be exhausted ~~at the~~ unlike the Muslim threat, who would've just had to break through a wall. Castles became even more significant in the ~~the~~ survival of the Crusader states as their purpose changed over time. Castles began to be used as a symbol of authority after a town had been captured. They ~~also~~ ^{also} began to be used for submission, as all surrounding neighbours would have to submit to the lord and offer money or irrigation crops ~~to~~ for the city's garrison.* This new use of castles helped with the survival of the Crusader states as they allowed lords to establish and consolidate their power, which scared away any threats.

Method
Seaports and trade were another significant ~~method~~ used which were significant in the survival of the Crusader states. They provided important economic links, as ~~they~~ it allowed Outremer to set up a connection with Italy's trade network, which



(Section B continued) began importing goods. It also provided an income for the Ottomans, as they could also export ~~any~~ goods. The seaports also provided military links, as the control over Ottoman coast ~~the~~ allowed the Franks to defend the Crusader states and ~~that way~~ tackle any ~~the~~ external threats before they reached Ottoman. The seaport links ~~was~~ also created a means for outside help to reach the Crusader states quickly, without being intercepted by Muslims along the way. The seaports were significant method used in the ~~the~~ survival of the Crusader states, as ~~they~~ ~~the~~ they allowed Ottoman economy to thrive, as they were trading with the largest trade network and threats to the Crusader states were minimized, as the coast was defended and outside help could reach Ottoman incredibly quickly and easily.

* Castles could also be used in battle or sieges as a safe place for the Franks to retreat to, as the Muslim army or any other threats would have to ~~that~~ storm the castle first, which was incredibly expensive and exhausting to do.



(Section B continued) In conclusion, military orders were significant to the survival of the ~~the~~ crusader states in the years 1120-1187, as they provided troops and protection over pilgrims, as well as being capable to defend entire cities. However, ~~the~~ other factors were also significant, such as the use of camel to gain authority over an area, as well as the use of seaports and trade, which helped to maintain Outremer's economy and provide defence for any ~~the~~ external threats, as well as creating a means for outside help to gain Outremer quickly and easily during an emergency.



8H10_1A_Q05

Question Introduction

On Question 5, stronger responses were clearly focused on the extracts, and possessed the confidence and understanding to develop an extract-based analysis of how far the Fourth Crusade failed because it was in the interests of Venice to attack Constantinople. Higher scoring answers offered some comparative analysis of the two extracts, and used own knowledge effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views presented. Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question (whether it was the interests of Venice which led the Fourth Crusade to attack Constantinople), rather than the general issue of the failure of the Fourth Crusade, and put forward a reasoned judgement on the given issue, referencing the views in the extracts. Weaker answers tended to show some understanding of the extracts and attempted to focus on how far the Fourth Crusade failed because it was in the interests of Venice to attack Constantinople. Such responses, however, demonstrated limited development by relying on a basic 'Dandolo versus crusaders' approach. At the lower levels, basic points were selected from the extracts for illustration and comparisons made between the two extracts were fairly rudimentary. Weaker candidates sometimes also relied almost exclusively on the extracts as sources of information about the role of doge Dandolo and Venice generally. This in turn meant that weaker candidates tended to miss the counter argument in extract 1 and therefore failed to see that extract 1, unlike extract 2 did not blame Dandolo for the failure of the Fourth Crusade. Others made limited use of the two extracts and attempted to answer the question relying largely on their own knowledge. Moreover, in lower scoring responses, the candidate's own knowledge tended to be illustrative (e.g. just tacked on to points from the extracts) or drifted from the main focus of the question. Furthermore, these answers were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Examiner Comment on Example Script

This response shows understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis of their key features. For example the importance of Zara to the Venetians is dealt with quite well. The knowledge used by the candidate develops the extracts and allows the candidate to offer some discussion. The extracts are not simply used as sources of information. The interpretation in extract 1 is assessed before looking at extract 2. The candidate does expand on some issues in the extracts but does not develop the rival interpretations that they represent very far. This limits the judgement on offer and makes this a competent level 3 answer rather than level 4.

Examiner Tip

When analysing the extracts highlight the two historian's interpretations. Plan your response with the rival interpretations in mind and refer to them in both the introduction and conclusion.

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 Historians have different views about the reasons for the failure of the Fourth Crusade. Analyse and evaluate the extracts and use your own knowledge of the issues to explain your answer to the following question.

How convincing do you find the view that the Fourth Crusade failed because it was in the interests of Venice to attack Constantinople?

(20)

It is quite convincing that the reason for the failure of the Fourth Crusade was due to the fact that Venice wanted to attack Constantinople. Extract 1 disagrees as it states that it is unlikely for this to have occurred, whereas Extract 2 believes that the interests of the Venetians were apparent in the sack of Constantinople.

Extract One by Queller and Madden states that "it makes little sense" that it was in the Venetian interests to attack Constantinople as "there is no evidence for it and abundant evidence against it". It takes the view that it is unlikely that Dandolo would know that "there would never be 33,500 crusaders, nor would they ever come up with the agreed payment" that being of 85,000 marks which



(Section C continued) the crusaders could indeed not pay off, only 51,000 marks was collected. It is also true in the case that there were only 12,000 out of the 33,500 men agreed in the Treaty of Venice that actually arrived and it does appear that Dandolo did not want this debt as expressed in Extract One, considering the fact that he tried to get the crusaders to Zara to get the money they needed. Therefore it can be argued that Dandolo was trying to save the crusade, not cause it to become a failure. However Extract One can be disputed as it was in the Venetian interests for the crusaders to attack Zara not only to pay off their debts but also because Zara would be beneficial for the Venetians due to the port enroute to Outremer and due to the Dalmatian oak that could be used to build ships. Therefore we can see that Extract One makes a valid point in the sense that Dandolo was



(Section C continued)

putting Venice in a dangerous position that he wouldn't want to "expose to the republic" if he was essentially gambling for Constantinople to be attacked, however it has been seen before that Venetians have used the crusades before to benefit their own interests, and so diverted the crusade

Extract Two differs to Extract One so written by Michael Angelo describes the "commercial opportunities" that Constantinople offered. It is known that Byzantium had been hindering Venetian trade for a long time and the opportunity to attack Constantinople would have given Venice ~~at~~ an ~~extra~~ advantage over ~~trade~~ at the time. Angelo even states that they were at a "disadvantage" due to the empire, so being able to have that advantage would definitely be in the Venetian interests. We can see from the extract that "to secure its interests in Byzantium is such a way that its merchants were free to open up



(Section C continued)

markets ^{supplying} ~~and~~ would have been greatly in the venetian interests, and it would have been made possible by Alexius III's offer to the crusaders allowing the venetians to use the crusaders not only to get the approximate 34,000 marks allowed to them (which too would be in their interests) out of Alexius offer of 200,000 marks to them (of which he could only pay 100,000 marks of) but also a deal with Alexius offer trade.

Therefore we can see how the venetian interests could have led to the diversion of the crusade and so its failure, as they supported the diversion and it is clear that it would have been in their interests to attack constantinople.

However this also begs the question of the fact that it was Alexius who offered to divert the crusade, and couldn't hold up his promises (e.g. only getting 100,000



(Section C continued)

marking out of 200,000) therefore it can be argued that it was Alexius who caused the crusade to fail as he created the diversion which led to the end of the Fourth Crusade. This supports Extract One, as it could not only be the Venetian interests that caused the failure of the Crusade, and without Alexius' unexpected offer, Venetian interests would not be as possible to gain, supporting this theory.

Therefore we can see from Extract One that the Venetians would not have risked debt and lack of military support for the sake of their interests at Constantinople whereas Extract 2 believes it is entirely possible that the Venetians used the crusaders to protect their interests. This seems highly likely as their previous diversion to Zara supports this theory and they did support the diversion to Constantinople which inevitably caused the end



(Section C continued)

and failure of the crusade as the crusaders were forced to sack Constantinople and ended up remaining there after paying off their debt to Venice.



Paper Summary

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully - this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their thinking in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three question with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question - e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked - most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, of the issue within the question.
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

Section C responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground

