

ND047475605



# History

**Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 1: Breadth study with interpretations**

**Option 1A: The crusades, c1095–1204**

Wednesday 18 May 2016 – Afternoon

**Time: 2 hours 15 minutes**

Paper Reference

**8HI0/1A**

**You must have:**

Extracts Booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

**44**

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- There are three sections in this question paper. Answer **ONE** question from Section A, **ONE** question from Section B and the question in Section C.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 60.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

**P49847A**

©2016 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1/1/1



**PEARSON**

## SECTION A

Answer EITHER Question 1 OR Question 2.

**EITHER**

- 1 Was the aim to free and then defend Jerusalem the main reason for crusading in the years 1095-1146?

(Total for Question 1 = 20 marks)

OR

- 2 Was the unification of Syria by Nur ad-Din the main reason for Muslim military success in the years 1146-69?

(Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)



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 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

11 SecA

The First and Second Crusade did appear to have the main goal of freeing and protecting Jerusalem between 1095 - 1146, however, for the First crusade other factors contributed to individual goals, such as Pope Urban's power, therefore Jerusalem was not the main goal to an extent.

Pope Urban II called for the first crusade at the Council of Clermont in 1095, in response to the Byzantine Emperor's Alexius I plea to retake Iconium which had recently been taken by the Seljuk Turks. This, along with the Muslim threats to areas around Jerusalem such as Aleppo, Antioch and Edessa and Asia Minor, shows how the crusade did intend to free and defend Jerusalem due to the fact that the area around it had been compromised and threatened, and so it had to be defended due to its religious importance. However, we can also see here how Jerusalem was not



(Section A continued)

the main reason for the First Crusade, as it was a response to help the Byzantines take back Nicaea not Jerusalem. It can therefore be argued that Jerusalem was not the main reason for the crusade as it was Alexius I's plea for Nicaea which triggered it.

The Second Crusade (1145-1148) was the response to Zengi's capture of Edessa. The main goal of the crusade was to take back Edessa from muslim control (although this was later found to be impossible) and primarily to defend Jerusalem from the possible muslim threat. Therefore we can see that although the crusade was triggered by the capture of Edessa, it was the defence of Jerusalem which was most important to the crusaders out of the political options.

However, although the capture of Jerusalem was important to the crusaders as it had religious importance for them as that was where the true



(Section A continued) cross was and where they would go on pilgrimages, there were other aspects which increased crusading.

Pope Urban II had ulterior motives for calling the first crusade as he disputed with Henry IV of Germany over the Investiture Controversy and Philip I of France. He was also ignored by bishops and therefore wanted a crusade in order to show and consolidate his power, so we can see that simply capturing Jerusalem was not the main reason for the crusade.

Many people also joined and went crusading due to the offer of P Indulgence in the First Crusade. This was the idea that if you went on the crusade you would be forgiven for all your sins and get into heaven (the primary motive for Christians). This was further used and changed into Plenary Indulgence in 1145 by Pope Eugenius III as it now had the backing of the church to support.



(Section A continued)

its claims. Therefore we can see that a reason for crusading during this time was the idea of being forgiven while going on this pilgrimage. While capturing and defending Jerusalem was still an aim, it was not the main aim and reason for some crusaders taking part, as it's defence was simply a means to an end of being forgiven.

Also the changing views of chivalry and the issue of violent knights in France were another reason for crusading. With knights becoming increasingly violent towards each other, a crusade would be the perfect solution for the knights to fight for a cause instead of at each other. Also, during the First Crusade knights saw the crusade as a pilgrimage and again a chance to be forgiven. However this view changed by 1145, as knights saw it as their duty to go on a crusade, defend Jerusalem and protect the pilgrims there. So, we can see that the





(Section A continued)

defence of Jerusalem and its security was not initially a main reason for people to go crusading, but over time its protection was seen as a necessity, so we can see how this attitude changed significantly between 1095-1146.

These views would have been supported and influenced by preachers such as Bernard of Clairvaux who would have also caused many people to go on the crusade, reassuring them that it was a "just war" as there were good intentions to recapture Jerusalem for Christians and an official leader being the pope that supported the crusade. So the influence of preachers would have been another reason to go crusading, but we can also see how the defence of Jerusalem was also a motivation for people to go crusading.

So, in conclusion we can see that although the defence and freeing of Jerusalem was an influential factor



(Section A continued)

as a reason for going on the crusade, it was not the main reason for many other factors contributed as reasons for crusading such as the offer of plenary indulgence.





(Section A continued)



P 4 9 8 4 7 A 0 9 2 8

(Section A continued)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 20 MARKS

11



## SECTION B

Answer EITHER Question 3 OR Question 4.

EITHER

3 To what extent did the government of the crusader states change in the years 1100-87?

*Bald I / Bald II*

(Total for Question 3 = 20 marks)

OR

4 The Knights Templar were founded c.1119.

How significant were the military orders to the survival of the crusader states in the years 1120-87?

*Castles - build, defend, front line*  
*114 S. & Antioch - Baldwin II 823 - Jerusalem*  
*Dependent on Western Europe*

(Total for Question 4 = 20 marks)



P 4 9 8 4 7 A 0 1 1 2 8

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 ☒

14 Dec B

The knights Templar and the Hospitaller military orders were quite significantly important to the survival of the crusade states due to the many roles they fulfilled, but, there were other factors which contributed to its survival.

The knights Templar were originally created in 1119 primarily for defense of the crusader states. They took part in many campaigns in order to protect the states, such as the fact that in 1149 they successfully repelled a muslim attack on Antioch, and was able to secure the city under christian control. Therefore they were significant in the survival of Outremer as they repelled invading forces from taking land and so protected the kingdom.

The military orders were also important as they had the resources and troops in order to build and garrison castles along the states. Castles were significant as they were initially



(Section B continued)

built as a sign of consolidation and power, then to a role of administration and finally to be used primarily for defence in the 1160s. By manning castles the Templars and Hospitaliers were the first line of defence from invasions from the East as there were no natural borders to protect the crusader states. Also from the castles the military orders were able to provide protection for pilgrims in the surrounding area and keep the administration of the kingdom stable as taxes were collected at the castles, therefore there was also economic stability thanks to the military orders and their ability to keep the kingdom stable, secure and protected. It also appeared that the leaders of the crusader states became dependent on the orders for protection, in the times when they were unable to protect their kingdom. So we can see that the military orders were significant for the survival of the crusade.



(Section B continued) States as they provided front line protection to the areas of Outremer, and were successfully able to contribute to the administration of the kingdom.

However, there were other reasons why the crusader states were able to survive between 1120-1187, the main one being that there were not many significant muslim threats or attacks at this time. This is due to the fact that both Nur ad-Din and Saladin were trying to unite Syria under one ruler or were attempting to consolidate power over Egypt. Therefore the relative lack of threats or successful attacks on the crusader states would have been a reason for its survival, although Zengi did take Edessa the other states managed to survive and ~~can~~ face any other threats.

Another reason the crusader states were able to survive was because Baldwin II was able to secure the patriarchy after they threatened Jerusalem and also as he was able



(Section B continued)

to stop the developing succession dispute in Antioch by becoming regent there. His actions allowed the crusader states to stabilise, meaning there would be no other disputes within the states and also remove the Turkish threat themselves. This was further kept stable during the reign of Baldwin II who succeeded in the Acquisition of Ascalon and significantly expanded his territory in order to secure Jerusalem and the crusader states. Also all lords submitted to him and other rulers even looked to him for help, therefore this reliance on the rule of Jerusalem meant that there were no internal issues with the states and so they could focus more on any muslim threats and deal with them accordingly. He was also able to secure his succession as he named ~~His son, Count Fulk and Amalric~~ as heir and he succeeded without any dispute. So we can therefore



P 4 9 8 4 7 A 0 1 5 2 8



(Section B continued)

So that the successful reigns of Baldwin II and Baldwin III also helped the survival of the crusader states as they eliminated any threat quickly and were able to stabilise and secure any succession issues within the crusader states, minimising the issues of distraction or infighting.

In conclusion, the military orders were quite significant in the survival of the crusader states as they protected the kingdom and secured it, however there were other factors which contributed such as the lack of muslim threats and the successful rule of Jerusalem leaders at the time.



(Section B continued)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



(Section B continued)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



(Section B continued)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 20 MARKS **14**



P 4 9 8 4 7 A 0 1 9 2 8

## 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) 1905

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 debt but also because Zara would be beneficial for the Venetians due to the port enroute to Acre 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 as 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 ~~attracted~~ an ~~extra~~ advantage over Greece 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 in such a way that its merchants were free to open up





(Section C continued)

~~success~~ <sup>success</sup> ~~emerging~~ <sup>emerging</sup> markets ~~it~~ would have been greatly in the venetian interests, and it would have been made possible by Alexius II's offer to the crusaders allowing the venetians to use the crusaders not only to get the approximate 3 L, 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) mark 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  
leave Constantinople and ended up  
remaining there after paying off  
their debt to Venice.



(Section C continued)

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks) **19**

**TOTAL FOR SECTION C = 20 MARKS**  
**TOTAL FOR PAPER = 60 MARKS**



P 4 9 8 4 7 A 0 2 7 2 8

**BLANK PAGE**

