



Pearson

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel AS

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 2017

Publications Code 8HI0_1A_1706_E

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

PE Report SHIO 1A 2017

Overall, there were some very pleasing responses to the paper this year. In Sections A and B, the essay questions elicited a full range of answers. Most candidates were able to identify the conceptual focus of the questions and were able to harness a range and depth of evidence in coming to a judgement. In Section C, the majority were able to identify the representations outlined in the two extracts and use information from them to construct an answer though a small number completed their response with no or scant reference to them.

Question 1

The vast majority of candidates answered this question in Section A. Most demonstrated good knowledge of both the Second and Third Crusades with many opting to argue that the Second Crusade was more badly prepared than the Third which had significant resources at its disposal but was more impeded by political differences between the main protagonists and the premature death of Barbarossa. Poor preparation focused on the lack of supplies organised by Conrad III and Louis VII as well as the lack of ships to transport their armies leading to their disastrous journeys across the Anatolian plateau. The best answers were able to make a clear distinction between poor preparation and poor execution, particularly in terms of the leadership of Louis and Conrad. Other candidates included the increased unity of the Muslim world and poor relations with the Byzantine Empire. Weaker candidates struggled to define poor preparation as opposed to how the Crusades were carried out, while some had a slightly loose definition of the Third Crusade by including the events of the 1180s which moved outside of the focus of the question. Most candidates were able to write answers that attempted analysis but a number did end up writing sections which were quite descriptive or failed to give both crusades equal treatment.

Question 2

A very small number of candidates attempted this question and many struggled with the focus, the consequences of Baldwin's consolidation of crusader territory. Most were generally lacking in detail of the castles of the first phase of the Frankish States with only a handful being able to talk about the issue with any specific examples. Some were able to discuss the establishment of lordships across the Frankish territories but several ended up discussing the significance of the Military Orders which at best can be

argued to have begun in 1118 and even then to have been of marginal significance until 1129 meaning it was not relevant.

Question 3

The vast majority of candidates answered this question in Section B. Many were able to demonstrate impressive knowledge of the evolution of the spiritual rewards granted by Urban II and Eugenius III and the development of papal indulgences in the first half of the 12th century. There was also an awareness of the importance of Jerusalem and the increasing importance of pilgrimage in the devotional life of the western Latin world, especially to the Holy Land. In terms of alternative motivations candidates were able to provide a range of ideas such as a desire for land, with the idea of the 'disinherited younger sons' often used, as well as the examples of Bohemond (Antioch), Baldwin of Boulogne (Edessa) and Raymond of Toulouse (Tripoli). Some candidates also explored the ideas of the development of chivalry as a motivation for crusading or political factors such as the wish to recapture Edessa. Weaker candidates tended to give very generalised answers that lacked precise examples, sometimes restricting their discussion to the First Crusade or making only passing reference to the Second.

Question 4

Only a few candidates attempted this question. These candidates generally showed good knowledge of Nur ad-Din and Saladin, but while candidates were able to discuss the importance of *Jihad* and the strategy of reuniting the Muslim world of Syria and Egypt, there was generally more description of what both rulers did, rather than a comparison. Most confined themselves to noting how far Saladin followed Nur ad-Din's template, or how both could be argued to have used religious ideology for their own narrow political ends.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to demonstrate a good grasp of the origins of the Fourth Crusade. The majority were able to use the extracts and demonstrate understanding by identifying the key arguments both authors were making and their differences. Generally though, candidates tended to treat the extracts separately, rather than combine their insights to make comparisons and interrogate them as fully as they could. Candidates used the extracts as illustrative material before supplementing them with their own knowledge, and thus, constructed more conventional essays on the reasons for the Fourth Crusade's failure, rather than evaluating the

different interpretations and their validity. Some candidates failed to read Asbridge's extract closely and believed he was arguing for an anti-Greek Venetian conspiracy rather than criticising the idea. Some candidates almost entirely ignored the extracts or only used one. Some candidates also attempted to evaluate the reliability of the accounts by making generalised points about the author's intentions and the date of publication which weren't at all helpful. In terms of knowledge, many candidates were very well informed about the policies of Innocent III and the progress of the expedition and its problems.

Exemplars

Exemplar 1

This L4 response considers a range of factors relevant to the question, soundly addressing the factor of 'poor preparation' for both Crusades. There is a range and depth of knowledge and a substantiated judgement is reached.

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

Arguably, the success of the First Crusade was never achieved by its followers, the Second, Third and Fourth crusades. The First Crusade had set the scene for a century of religious battles of the territory in Outremer known as the Holy Land. With the eight princes of the First Crusade first consolidating the counties, they created the need to defend them, which created the need for further crusades. The Second and Third Crusades could easily be argued as failures, yet the reasons why must be explored. A prominent reason was the poor planning and preparation, for instance the ~~second~~ second crusaders inability to contact with the leaders of Outremer. However, the increasing Muslim threat and poor leadership of each campaign must be explored.

In the case of the Second Crusade, planning was necessary. The campaign in itself had been launched in retaliation to the capture of Edessa by Emir al-Din Zengi in 1144. Zengis power had ~~ever~~ been ever-increasing and this was its pinnacle. The leaders of the Second Crusade, Conrad III and Louis VII made a fatal by not conferring with the leaders of Outremer before launching the crusade. This can be shown by the fact that when the crusaders finally arrived in Outremer, they found an entirely non-salvageable, destroyed Edessa. Their entire campaign and aim

(Section A continued)

was rendered futile as they could not carry out what they intended to do: recapture Edessa, since there was no Edessa to recapture. This left the crusaders in a months-long purgatory, unsure of what to do next. At the council of Acre in 1147, various plans were proposed to the leaders, yet in the end, none proved useful or successful and the crusade ended miserably in ^{July} 1148. Had the crusaders communicated with the leaders of Outremer and learned about the destruction of Edessa, they ~~also~~ could have planned a more effective and therefore successful campaign.

One of the key issues with the Third Crusade was its delayed progress. This can be credited to poor planning on Richard's part. King Richard I of England, also known as Richard Lionheart, ~~was~~ played a key role in the Third Crusade as its most powerful leader next to King Philip II of France. However, ~~he~~ Richard caused massive delays in the crusade due to his determination to acquire wealth. Richard's first diversion was in Messina, where he initially went to collect his sister's dowry, which the ruler of Messina refused to pay. In retaliation Richard sacked the city, using up more precious time. Furthermore, Richard caused delay when he decided to attack Cyprus. Two of his ships had shipwrecked there and been imprisoned. Richard attacked the island, seizing it and then selling it to the Templars for 100,000 bezants. These two major diversions won the king of England a large sum of money, yet lost the Third Crusade a great deal of time, which

(Section A continued)

could have been avoided with better planning and time management. Had Richard found a way to acquire his funds for the crusade before setting off, ^{for Outremer} like he did with the Saladin letter, time the opposition spent preparing themselves could have been avoided.

However, poor planning was not the only reason for the failure of the Second Crusade and subsequent failure of the Third. The ever-growing Muslim opposition must also be taken into consideration. Prior to the Second Crusade, Muslim Syria had been split into warring territories with no one leader. Yet, with the rise of Zengi, the opposition became much more effective and therefore successful. Zengi was the first Muslim leader to establish himself as a leader of a jihad with the goal to unite Syria under one ruler. He proved fairly successful as he managed to use the distraction of count Joscelin of Edessa with the Artuqids ^{in 1146} to tunnel under the walls of Edessa and ~~setting~~ ^{set} them on fire, effectively seizing the city for himself. When ~~that~~ he died in 1146, murdered by one of his Frankish slaves, he was followed by his son Nur ad-Din who proved an effective force against the Second Crusaders. Even during the Third Crusade, Muslim forces were at their peak, with Egypt, Syria and Jazira united under one ruler, Saladin. Saladin managed to take Jerusalem after the battle of Hattin in 1189 and won many decisive victories against the Franks, ~~such as~~ The forces of Richard I and Philip II were simply not enough to match Saladin's

(Section A continued)

Moreover, another reason why the Second and Third Crusades failed was simply the poor leadership of the crusaders. For instance, during the Second Crusade, once the leaders realized they couldn't take back Edessa, they attempted to besiege Damascus. The siege began well enough, with forces concentrated in an area with abundant food and water supply. However, on the 25th of July 1148, the leaders made the fatal decision to switch their attack to focus on the eastern walls. With their troops fighting in a place with no water or food, the attack weakened until finally, after only 2 days, they gave up and the siege ended. Poor leadership can also be seen during the Third Crusade with the rivalries of Richard I and Philip II. Richard had been engaged to Philip's sister Alice, yet wanted to marry Berengaria for political reasons. If Richard went back on his promise it would result in a national embarrassment for Philip, which resulted in soured relations. Philip eventually let Richard out of the agreement for a fee. This paired with the fact that Philip was threatening Richard's borders in Europe meant that the crusade suffered losses due to their rivalry. Such as the fact that when Richard besieged Messina, Philip was present but did not help and some chroniclers even state that his men fought against the English or the fact that Philip did not let Richard into Tyre immediately when he arrived and so his exhausted troops were forced to march immediately to Acre.

(Section A continued)

In conclusion, although poor planning proved significant to the failure of the Second and Third Crusades, it was not the main reason. The fact that Muslim opposition had become so strong paired with the poor leadership decisions made by the crusaders ultimately led to their demise, or the failure of their campaigns.

Exemplar 2

Here, the candidate has only a limited appreciation of the conceptual focus of the question. Some relevant material is used but it is lacking in range and depth and the judgement is weakly substantiated. It was awarded a low L2 mark.

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

The creation of strategically placed castles played a huge factor in the consolidation of Baldwin I's power. *Baldwin I was one of the Seven princes during the first crusade. He originally set out off with the main goal as to capture ~~Jerusalem~~ Jerusalem from the Muslims.

However along the way there were many setbacks and in the end he decided to give up on Jerusalem and travelled north to Edessa, when he got there he found it under Armenian rule. He became quite close to the Armenian rulers and ~~he~~ became a trusted person within their community to consolidate his power they named him heir to the throne, Baldwin I saw this as an opportunity to consolidate his power and had the Armenian ruler assassinated. Therefore he became the ruler / count of Edessa. I believe this is a main point in the consolidation of his power as he didn't fight to become count he simply became trusted enough to be named as heir.

Although the creation of strategically placed castles also

(Section A continued) a huge part in the consolidation of his power. After battles had been fought and land won a castle would be placed/built, as when castles are placed it creates fear and intimidation within the locals.

Edessa being a landlocked state was low on natural borders which created high opportunity for people to attack and de-throne Baldwin I. He would place castles on the land borders in order to stop this happening. If someone decided still to attack they would be faced with Baldwin's defence mechanism (also known as the Templars - After the temple of Solomon - and the hospitallers) this army would be placed inside the castles and then would ~~attack~~ attack ~~any~~ ^{any} threats. Any more wins would lead to more castles being built.

An example of a castle built is the castle Margat built by the templars and hospitallers after a fight or siege had been completed.

To conclude my answer I believe that the main reason for the consolidation of Baldwin I's power was castles as they were

(Section A continued) Strategically placed and created fear and intimidation. Although as I have shown there was also the part of the Templars and Hospitallers and the ~~lack~~ trustworthiness of the Armenian kingdoms.

* but it was not the only factor there was also Templars and Hospitallers (Baldwin I's Army) and the way he became Count of Edessa.

Exemplar 3

This L3 answer is focused on the question but lacks sufficient attention to the Second Crusade and therefore does not fully meet its demands. Mostly accurate material is used and criteria are established for judgement while the argument is clear and proceeds logically.

The First Crusade was called in 1095 by Pope Urban II, in order to get the Holy Land back into Christian hands. The trigger for this crusade was the call for help from Alexius I, the Byzantine Emperor who was continuously losing power for the Muslims that had been taking huge parts of Asia Minor such as Nicaea and Antioch.

The Second Crusade was called by Eugene III following the capture of Edessa in 1145. Religious motives did not change very much during these crusades. Kings and nobles were greatly influenced to go in order to atone for their sins, however the opportunity to get more land, wealth and power also played a big role, along side with the political motives like getting back Jerusalem and Edessa and in the case of the First Crusade, respond to the cry ~~from~~^{for} help from Alexius I.

At that time, people were greatly influenced by the church, and extremely afraid of going to hell. Going on a crusade implied killing other people which was breaking one of the 10 Commandments. In order to convince people to go on a crusade

(Section B continued) Pope Urban II came up with the indulgence, which was the remission of sins 'remissio peccatorum'. This appealed extremely to knights who led a life of fighting, and spilling blood. Going on a crusade ~~set~~ would grant them a safe passage to heaven. Urban also came up with the 'just war theory' which said that it was ~~not~~ acceptable to go on a crusade if they had a official leader, good intentions and a valid reason. Which was mostly the case for both crusades.

However appealing the indulgence might have been, it was not the only motive that led the people to join the crusades. Titles, lands, wealth and power played a big role in their decision as well. At that time people, especially knights and kings were always striving for greatness and ~~so~~ joining the crusades would grant many of them a way to empower themselves. We have the example of Bohemond of Taranto who left the main army and became the ruler of Edessa in 1097 after it's previous ruler asked him to become his son and heir died ~~the~~ sooner after Bohemond's arrival.

Furthermore, the threat from Muslims was also a trigger. In 1095, Alexius I asked Urban II for help who responded positively. The Byzantine Emperor

(Section B continued) tried to negotiate and stop the Muslim invasion but failed to do so, and was forced to ask for help. This along side with the Muslim power over Jerusalem became the trigger for the first Crusade and ~~was~~ were two of the main motives it happened. In 1145, it was the capture of the city of Edessa that motivated the Second Crusade as well. However, religious motives continuously played a significant role.

In conclusion, people were significantly led by religious motives to join the crusades, such as the granting of indulgence by the Pope. However, this was not the only motive. They wanted to better their lives, gain land and power and acquire wealth. Along side with political motives, all of these facts played an huge role on the crusaders' recruitment.

Exemplar 4

This response does attempt to compare the leadership of Saladin and Nur ad-Din and uses some relevant knowledge before coming to a judgement. It was given a L3 mark.

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4**

Sec B

I strongly believe that the leadership of Nurad-Din was vastly different to that of his eventual successor, Saladin. A certain key factor as to why the two are so different is in their diplomacy with their enemies. Nurad-Din was much like his father Zengi, who both showed no mercy and no compromise in their respective campaigns and Saladin was more of a negotiator, offering the chance for compromise and peace so long as the other side were willing to do so. However Nurad-Din and Saladin did both have their similarities as their punishment was harsh and the loyalty from their vassals was absolute, making a united Muslim army a reality and helped bring down the Crusader.

Saladin's leadership style was one of conquest and compromise, he would only attack those who had provoked him first. For example, whilst second in command to Nurad-Din in Egypt, he was able to beat the Frankish settlers as fast as he did in the late 1160's due to their choice of massacring a bunch of villagers in his territory, he sent a cavalry of men to destroy this invasion into their land and furthermore cement his place as successor to Nurad-Din, in addition, Saladin in the third crusade offered Richard's army peace after

(Section B continued) his own Counter-attack Caused by the retreat from Jerusalem by Richard. ~~It showed~~ It resulted in the port Cities, Tyre and Acre remaining in the Outremer and the retaining of Jerusalem, but free to travel for all pilgrims who wished to enter. Furthermore, Saladin managed to Unite both of the Sunni Seljuks under Nur ad Din and Shi'a Fatimids of Egypt under one Cause - Jihad, a feat even Nur ad-Din had failed to accomplish, only made possible thanks to Saladin's Shi'a routes in Egypt, allowing their armies to merge and become a Superpower in the Middle East. This links back to the question as it shows that the accomplishments during Saladin's reign far ~~outweigh~~ ^{differs} the leadership and legacy of Nur ad-Din.

Nur ad-Din's leadership was one of Conqueror and power grabbing, that allowed him to push on from what his father achieved before him. For example, he managed to take his territories from Aleppo and later Mosul, to stretch the majority of Syria and unite it under one leader, which allowed him to become a beared figure in the Middle East and the Outremer. As stated before, he and his army took part in the Conquest of Egypt in the 1160's, but he was mainly a bit figure in the grand Scheme of things, as he was on the sidelines and didn't take part in much of the fighting itself, unlike Saladin, it was this lack of participation that probably prevented Nur ad-Din from leading the Egyptians as well, and was looked down upon

(Section B continued) by those he helped, preferring to Choose Saladin as their leader due to his involvement in the Conquest as a great general and a homegrown leader. This links to how the two differ as it illustrates how their battle and Fighting Styles differed from one another and made and Shaped how they were seen as different kind of leaders to one another in the eyes of the Sunni and Shi'a territories.

However, to say that their leadership ~~was~~ as a whole ~~was~~ are different, is completely false to assume. Both leaders were seen as the leader of 'Jihad' by their supporters enough so to threaten the Catholic Church and Outremer to go to war with both of them, furthermore they were able to use the mistakes of the Crusaders to their advantage and capture and raid the key strongholds of the Outremer and gaining on what their ~~past predecessors~~ former leaders had done before*. Furthermore, from the territories they controlled, support from both Nur ad Din and ~~Saladin~~ Saladin was absolute, meaning that a United Muslim army was finally possible to dominate the outcome of Crusade and politics in the Outremer for decades, long both whilst they were alive and after they were gone. This links to how the leaderships of Nur ad Din and Saladin were similar, as it shows how the unity within their dominions (large) allowed them to greater and greater success, mirroring each other in being able to push back the Crusader States more and more as time went on.

(Section B continued) In Conclusion, I believe strongly that both leaderships were for the most part different, which allowed for the ideas of 'Jihad' to spread more and more, giving ~~the~~ future leaders the ability to destroy the Outrigger. Saladin showed mercy and was able to compromise with foes, giving them the ability to stay in 'power', whereas Nur ad Din had failed to take part from the frontline, which gave the Shi'a ~~and~~ Muslims the ability to choose a leader who was able to improve on the actions of Nur ad Din. Despite Nur ad Din's shortcomings, both share an important common trait - loyalty, one which never wavered during their time as leader and led to the unification of a Muslim army under one common belief - Jihad and this combined with loyalty, meant his leadership to take his territory forward is similar to that of Saladin.

* The Siege of Edessa and ^{the} Battle of Hattin + Capture of Jerusalem
by Nurad-Din by Saladin.

Exemplar 5

This answer displays understanding of the debate contained in the extracts and uses own knowledge to expand upon and challenge the interpretation in Extract 1. However, its use of Extract 2 and its evaluation are substantially curtailed. As a result, it was awarded a top L3 mark.

The Fourth Crusade failed because ~~the~~ the Crusaders were occupied with the acquisition of the Christian city of Zara and the ~~destruction~~ destruction of the Christian Capital of the Byzantine Empire; Constantinople. However, it is open to inquiry whether the Crusaders did this ~~of~~ out of personal selfishness and greed, because it was their intention in the first place, or because they were forced to due to the circumstances. Extracts 1 and 2 refer to these different influences and suggest that perhaps this desire for "the acquisition of wealth" stems from ~~the~~ Pope Innocent III's influence, or even "venetian interests" or those of the Crusader leaders.

Extract 1 claims Pope "Innocent shifted the motivation for crusading away from an avowed religious duty" ~~to~~ and "made the acquisition of wealth decisive in the minds of the Crusaders". By permitting "borrowing from Jews" and ~~also~~ guaranteeing "protection of crusaders' property", the Pope may have emphasised too much the financial implications of the crusade, ~~the~~ consequently causing the Crusaders to seek

(Section C continued) any opportunity for financial gain which they did at Zara and Constantinople. Innocent also reformed the indulgence offer, by providing plenary indulgence to anyone who funded a crusade, without taking up the journey. This may also have emphasized financial influence and caused the Crusaders to divert from their original plan, in order to gain financial profit, which they may have felt they deserve, for going on crusade rather than just funding it.

However, the Crusaders did not capture Zara ~~with reason~~. ~~They~~ purely for financial gain. They did it in order to postpone the debt they owed to Enrico Dandolo, doge of Venice. By giving him this land, which served "venetian interests", they could extend the period of time they had to pay the debt they owed, which was a consequence of Pope Innocent's and the Crusade leaders' overestimation of the size of the Crusader force; they predicted 33,500, but only 12,000 men arrived. Zara was a significant turning point in the Fourth Crusade, as it was the first instance in which Crusaders ignored the Pope and diverted from their cause, leading to a much-less religiously motivated Crusade, as a result of the Venetian debt.

~~Constantinople~~ Constantinople was also ^{destroyed} ~~captured~~ in response to Alexius' promise of 200,000 marks, which he failed

(Section C continued) to pay due to his death. The Crusaders needed this money to pay the Venetian ~~debt~~^{debt}, but also undoubtedly desired these funds for the Crusade and for their own personal interests. Alternatively, Extract 2 suggests due to decreasing "Crusader-Byzantine relations," the seizure of Constantinople was the crusaders' deliberate and intended goal from the outset. This would ~~contrast~~ oppose the view that they needed the money to pay the debt and fund the Crusade and suggests that they sacked Constantinople in 1204 to destroy Byzantine forces and profit from their city.

~~Overall, Extract 1 suggests that although Extract~~

Overall, despite what Extract 1 suggests, the argument that Pope Innocent influenced the acquisition of wealth is unconvincing.

