



Examiners' Report

June 2023

GCE History 9HI0 1A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2023

Publications Code 9HI0_1A_2306_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this year's A Level paper 1A which deals with The Crusades: c1095-1204.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity/difference and significance with a time frame of not less than ten years. Section B offers a further choice of essays using an extended time frame of not less than one third of that offered by the specification as a whole. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section B questions covering a broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence offered by both the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

Question 1

Question 1 asked candidates to consider whether the leadership of the Second Crusade was very different to the leadership of the First Crusade. This was, marginally, the more popular question in Section A. The question was accessible and posed no particular difficulties for candidates that chose it.

Most candidates had prepared well for a question on the nature of crusader leadership and were able to offer a decent list of differences and similarities. The main differences offered concerned the vigour in battle, siege and conquest of the princes in the First Crusade, compared to the less impressive results of the two kings in the Second Crusade. The similarities of the two leaderships that candidates considered tended to be about the need to take and defend Jerusalem, and the piety required to take a crusading vow.

At the top end quite a few candidates offered good detail on how the leaderships undertook to cross Anatolia, their battles with enemy forces, and the differing levels of cooperation between the leaders. Quite a few offered good detail on crusader-Byzantine relations too.

A minority of candidates turned the question into a discussion of crusader motives and failed to focus adequately on the concept of similarity and difference. Less successful candidates tended to offer some narrative on the two crusades, often making the majority of their answer about the First Crusade.

The following two examples of candidate responses show the importance of focussing on the demand in the question to analyse differences and similarities in the leaderships of the First and Second Crusades.

The first Crusade lasted from 1096 - 1099, and began after a plea for ~~the~~ help from the Byzantine Emperor Alexius I, in 1095. As a result, Pope Urban II called a crusade, in which men would travel to Constantinople to provide assistance. The reason, at first, for leaders such as Bohemond of Taranto, Raymond of Toulouse and Godfrey of Bouillon to take the role as leaders may have spurred from religious intent. The idea of 'just war' and plenary indulgence would've been essential to their leadership, as their morale and motivation would've transpired to their men. The first Crusade was full of fighting and merciless

(Section A continued) attacks almost as soon as the leaders and their troops met in Constantinople, 1096. One of the first moments that began to divide the leaders was the requested oath to Alexius I, promising to return any Byzantine land. With Raymond and Bohemond unable to agree, the leadership began its ~~shape~~^{shaping}; this is evidenced after Edessa is taken in 1097, forming the first Crusader state, held by the crusading army of Baldwin. After successes at Nicaea, Bohemond's defensive strategy at the Battle of Dorylaeum ensured the morale and high hopes of the crusaders. The leaders themselves were driven by greed as much as religious intent, yet their clear aims and vicious results showed the success in their style of leadership.

The leadership of the crusade from the very beginning was different to that of the first crusade, with only two leaders. As a result of Edessa falling to Zengi in 1144, Pope Eugenius III called for a crusade as well as issuing the first papal bull of the crusades, *Quantum Predecessores* (in 1145). However, Eugenius' lack of involvement is notable, as Bernard of Clairvaux took the reins in recruitment. The two leaders

(Section A continued) of the Second Crusade were Louis ^{VIII}, King of France, and Conrad III King of Germany. A strong difference in their reasons for leadership is clear; Louis wanted to go to Jerusalem as an act of piety, after burning down a Christian church. Whereas Conrad wanted to consolidate and potentially expand his land. From the beginning, it is clear their leadership is different. ~~However~~, Louis and Conrad faced a far more united Muslim force after the death of Zengi in 1146, replaced by Nur-ad-Din. Nur-ad-Din and Usur of Damascus defeated the crusading army at Damascus in 1147; the reason of defeat however was partly down to Louis' decision to attack the east side, which had no water supply, and led to their inevitable ~~of~~ surrender.

The leadership of the Second Crusade failed to listen to Outremer leaders at the Council in Acre ~~the~~ ~~1148~~ ¹¹⁴⁹, advising them to halt, as any further attack would end terribly. Their response was to ignore, and predictably ended in failure, with the failure at Damascus marking the end of the Crusade. Whilst their conditions were more difficult, the leadership of the Second Crusade was far poorer. Their lack

(Section A continued) of ability to lead successful attacks and end result making no gain displayed their failure. It would be incorrect to argue that the first crusade's leadership was worse than the second's, as theirs finished with the successful capture of Jerusalem in July 1099.

Due to very different circumstances, the First and Second crusade's leadership can often be ~~perceived~~ ^{perceived} as a result of ^{only} how successful they were. On the one hand, ~~the~~ Louis and Conrad would've had to have been extremely brilliant leaders to be more successful than the First Crusade, which would've been especially tough as Jerusalem was in Christians' hands. Their motives were not wildly dissimilar, but a failure to prepare well and listen to advice was costly. With two vastly different results, the second crusade's leadership should be labelled as inferior, although there were not blatant differences in what they aspired to do; however their inability to do so does rightfully set them apart from the leadership of the First Crusade.

⊛ Despite their different personal intentions, Louis and Conrad showed no sign of dispute; evidenced by Louis following Conrad's route to Constantinople out of ~~his~~ respect for his feud with Roger of Sicily (who had offered transport to Louis).

⊛ This decision ~~me~~ could've been avoided if more care was taken and arguably if their leaders were more experienced.

⊛ ; thanks to the success of the First Crusade.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

In this response to the question the candidate only gets round to analysing similarity and difference towards the end of the essay. This response was awarded bottom of level 4, 13 marks. Had this candidate started off with their analysis and developed it throughout the essay, the mark could well have gone up to level 5.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Read the question closely and make certain that you understand what is being asked for. Make a plan that delivers this result before you start to write.

The first area of difference is in the nature of the leaders themselves. The first crusade had many different leaders, from the religious preachers leading the Peoples' Crusade to the Dukes and Princes of the Princes' Crusade. However, none of them had the stature of the leaders of the Second Crusade. The Second Crusade was led by the kings of France and Germany, the two great powers of Europe, Louis and Conrad. In contrast, the main contingent was led by figures such as Bohemond, the son of the Duke of Sicily, and Duke Robert of Normandy. None of these had anywhere near the prestige and influence

of those two Kings. Furthermore, no Kings had deigned to join the first crusade. This also meant that there was a clear difference in structure and hierarchy. Louis and Conrad were the undisputed leaders of the Second Crusade, and each had brought their own sizeable army, loyal to them. The First Crusade had no clear leader, leading to conflict between the various Dukes and Princes about who should lead, particularly between Godfrey and Raymond. This can be seen through the independence of the various leaders, such as when Tancred and Baldwin took a detour through Cilicia, or when Baldwin left to capture Edessa. This all goes to show that the leadership was very different.

Another difference is how prepared the leaders were for the crusade. The leaders of the First Crusade were rather unprepared for the harsh reality of a crusade. They turned up independently at Constantinople, and had to petition for aid, as none had brought the required supplies. This led to their journey through Anatolia becoming hellish, with nearly

a third of their number dying. Additionally, many non-combatants joined the crusade, not fully understanding what it was, and a lack of organisation meant they weren't sent away. The Peoples Crusade was so poorly prepared that all 60,000 of them were slaughtered by Turks shortly after arriving in Anatolia. In contrast, the Louis and Conrad made more considered preparations. They had access to the necessary funds to supply the crusade, and also demanded that any knight who joined had the means to pay for themselves. This ensured they weren't too large a drain on the crusade. Conrad also wrote messages to both the Byzantine Emperor and the leader of the Turks in Anatolia, in an attempt to secure safe passage through their lands. Although neither worked as intended, it showed a level of foresight missing from the leaders of the first crusade.

Finally, the difference in their leadership can also be seen through the success of the crusade itself. While this is ~~also~~ influenced by other factors, it can be used to show

how the leaders handled the challenges they faced. For example, Louis and Conrad met many challenges on their journey, and arrived in Outremer with much diminished forces. They held a council with the leaders of Outremer and decided to abandon the intended target of Edessa in favour of attacking Damascus. After an unsuccessful siege, Louis and Conrad left Outremer, abandoning the Crusade. In contrast, the leaders of the First Crusade were widely successful, capturing important cities such as Nicaea, Antioch and ~~Jerusalem~~^{Edessa}. They also took the target, Jerusalem, with the city falling in five days due to some fortuitous circumstances. Their success in taking so much land is in stark contrast to the Second Crusade's failure to capture one city. Furthermore, although some leaders, such as Stephen of Blois, deserted the crusade, the other leaders remained despite desperate situations, such as the brutal siege of Antioch. This again contrasts the weak resolve of Louis and Conrad, who abandoned the Crusade after one failed siege.



This is an example of work at level 5. This response was awarded 18 marks. The bulk of this essay is focussed on analysing the differences between the leaderships of the First and Second Crusades. The candidate offers good detail and analysis on the differences in power and status of kings and princes; differences in preparation; and differences in terms of military success. The examiner is left in no doubt that this is a comprehensive analysis.



Again, this response underlines the importance of planning your work.

Question 2

Question 2 asked candidates to consider whether encouragement from the papacy provided the main motive for crusading in the years 1095-1192. Most candidates attempting this question were, once again, well prepared and some excellent answers were produced.

Most candidates followed a similar line of argument flowing from the obvious point that only the popes could call a crusade and justify it as a just and holy war. This tended to be followed up with an analysis that argued for a diminishing role for papal encouragement after the First Crusade, and the importance of defending the Holy Land and the development of chivalric values thereafter.

At the top end candidates were able to show knowledge of the whole time frame and give the appropriate amount of consideration to each crusade. This was often accompanied by a sustained focus on the concept of change and continuity.

At level 3 candidates struggled to maintain focus on the changing historical context and judgements tended to be only partially supported. Less successful candidates often spent too long describing the attractions of papal indulgences and twelfth century beliefs about hell and purgatory.

It can be argued that ~~Papacy~~ encouragement from the papacy played a role in crusading motivations, however this was more so in the first crusade as new motivations emerged in the 12th century, as ~~chivalry~~ chivalry, and ~~the religious idea~~ and most consistently and importantly, the idea of the plenary indulgence motivated crusaders to join.

It can be said that the Pope played the largest role in the motive of the first crusade; Urban II saw Alexius' request for help at Nicea as an opportunity to expand his papal kingdom in the East, as popes viewed themselves more like monarchs, unite the two churches of the East and West after the great schism and assert authority over the defiant kings of Europe, the excommunicated Philip II^{of France} that had openly defied the Pope and broken church law by having an affair and committing

adultery, and Henry ~~IV~~ VI, of ~~England~~ who had deposed the Pope by installing Clement III as antipope. Urban can be credited for creating motivation to crusade in his 1095 council of Clermont, in which he ~~we~~ claimed Jerusalem had been polluted by Muslims, which instilled ideas of heroism in Western crusaders. Urban was then responsible for a 2,000 mile tour of inspirational sermons, often arriving in towns across Europe on holy days such as St Giles. Urban also motivated crusaders by offering rewards such as $\frac{1}{7}$ penance of all sins at a feast to all that attended in Angers 1096. It can be argued that the papacy played less of a crucial role especially in the third crusade, and that although Gregory III did publish a papal bull, over motivation's took greater importance, ~~such as~~ especially the situation in Outremer in 1187 as Saladin captured

(Section A continued) Jerusalem. Desence was also a more important factor in motivating the second crusade too, as Edessa had been taken over by Zengi in 1144, slaughtering 15,000 Christians. However, papacy did play some role; ~~the~~ Eugenius did not go on a papal tour like Urban, but he did publish a bull, *Quantum Praecessores* and used Preachers like Bernard of Clairveux as a means to recruit powerful figures such as kings Conrad III and Louis VI, spreading the message that Jerusalem was at threat once again, by the polluting Muslim forces. Overall, papacy played a ~~consist~~ consistent role in motivating crusaders, however latter crusades illustrated that religious desence was a larger factor and the pope simply acted to spread the message a recruit.

It can be further argued that religious motivation was the most important motivation in all 3

(Section A continued) crusades, as the idea of plenary indulgence and religious penance for all sins only developed and remained consistent. In the first crusade, the idea of remissio Peccatorum was prevalent, ~~at~~ that a pilgrim and crusader would have all sin forgiven, popularised by the Cluniac reform movement that encouraged Imitatio Christi, that all should aim to imitate the life of Christ, and that meant participating in pilgrimages and crusading. This idea was developed in the second and third crusade into the plenary indulgence, that all further sin would be forgiven and the church would offer certain protections such as all debts would be paused from interest while crusading, all property and family protected by the church and all those accused of theft, rape or murder would not be tried; this motivated criminals, and the ~~id~~ indebted to join as

(Section A continued) well as wealthy lords and nobles who wanted to go to heaven.

Lastly, it can be argued that the growing role of chivalric values played a growing role in crusading motivations. In the first crusade, the idea of the knight was simply a soldier on horseback, however shame culture remained consistent in all crusades; the idea that breaking honour and oaths was worse than death. However, when *Quantum Processor* was published, Bernard made great mention to the knights' Templar and the more aristocratic chivalric values of a knight[^]; ^{showing the papacy encouraged chivalry} it was a knight's duty to act with honour and piety and the appearance of the knight had now changed to a more luxurious and colourful soldier. It can be said that ~~chivalry~~ Chivalry played the greatest motivation in the third crusade, with figures like Richard playing a crucial role of creating

(Section A continued) an image of a knight that was honest, stuck to oaths and a strong leader that motivated his vassals to join. This attitude to ~~honesty~~ honesty was illustrated ~~with~~ with Richard's massacre of 3,000 at Acre, although viewed as Brutal, was more an act of honesty and pious belief, sparing Saladin seen as a chivalric good deed. ★

To conclude, it can be argued that the papacy ~~did~~ did play a large role in encouraging crusaders to join especially in the first crusade with the papal tour of Urban. However, in later crusades, a greater emphasis was placed upon the religious motivations, and this can be seen in all crusades, with plenary indulgence only growing and evolving. For the average crusader, the social respectability promoted by ~~the~~ the Pope was not as desired as religious virtue and penance. Chivalry was

* The shift in crusading by the Third Crusade can ultimately be seen with the development of "crusengi", a ~~cruder~~ crusader, illustrating motivations ~~have~~ had changed to a military expedition and pilgrims were no longer welcome.

more an idea adopted by kings.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a good example of a level 4 response. There is a good range of mostly accurate evidence in a structured presentation. There are evaluations offered as summary points throughout the essay. The essay falls short of a sustained and justified analysis that would get it into level 5. Nevertheless, this is a good answer to the question.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

To turn a good level 4 essay into level 5, develop an analysis of the given factor - encouragement from the papacy - and offer a summary judgement. As you bring in other factors that motivated the crusades, weigh them against the analysis of the given factor, preferably with a sentence or two of discussion. This strengthens the overall analysis.

Question 3

Question 3 asked candidates to consider the extent to which lack of support from Byzantium and Europe was the most significant weakness in the defence of the crusader states in the years 1100-92. This was the more popular question in Section B. Only a minority of candidates could deal with both sides of the given defensive weakness of Byzantium and Europe. Nevertheless, candidates could still access level 4 by offering evidence and argument for the significance of one of them.

At the top end, candidates were able to offer convincing detail of the unreliability of Byzantine support and the often too-little-too-late support from Europe. This was weighed against the significance of the limited manpower of the military orders, dynastic disputes within the crusader states and the growth of Muslim power.

At level three candidates tended to provide a decent range of evidence but failed to evaluate its significance. Less successful candidates tended to offer a narrative of the period with weak links to the concept of significance.

Firstly, lack of support from Europe did play some role as when the crusader states were facing large threats from external forces, Europe was always only present when it was too late. This can be seen in the fall of Edessa in 1144, as the Jerusalem sent envoys to Europe, prior to the fall, and it was only after it had fallen that the second crusade was called. Had the crusade been called before the fall of Edessa, it

may have been more successful. However, the forces from Europe in the third crusade, in 1189, were far more successful as they retook many coastal cities, such as Tyre, therefore strengthening the crusader states. On the other hand though, the crusade third crusade was also too late as Jerusalem had fallen in 1187 and so had they managed to come to support the crusader states they may not have lost the battle of Hattin and subsequently Jerusalem. ~~Altho~~ Although that is true, ~~the~~ most of the knights of the holy orders were European and so without their expertise, Jerusalem may ~~had~~ have fallen even sooner.

Secondly, the lack of Byzantine support did play a sizable role in the weakness of the crusader states in 1100-92. This is because, after the death of Anatic, the Byzantines remained fairly distant from the crusaders. This meant that during the reigns of Baldwin IV, ~~Baldwin V~~ Baldwin V and Guy of Lusignan, the Byzantines did not help them to stop any external threats. Earlier on the life of the crusader states however, the Byzantines did help. This can be seen when they sent soldiers to help fight in the second crusade. On the other hand though, they were also hostile to the crusader states during the first

20 years of their existence as they still argued that they had a right to Antioch, due to Bohemond promising it to Alexius Comnenus and then breaking that oath. This meant they actually contributed to the external threats that weakened the crusader states.

Finally, although the lack of support from Europe and Byzantium did play a role in the crusader states' weakness, the most important factor was the large amount of internal struggle within the states. One instance of this is, after the death of ~~Baldwin III~~ Baldwin II, Fulk and Melisende had to co-rule Jerusalem. This caused factionalism within the kingdom, as some wanted Fulk to have full control and some wanted Melisende to have it. This made it much easier for Zengi to attack Edessa, as there wasn't a unified outcome to defend against him. This situation was further exacerbated when Fulk died in 1143 and ~~Baldwin~~ so Nuradin was easily able to take the city of Edessa in 1144, as half of Jerusalem were against Melisende. A similar situation also arose after the death of Amalric, as ~~Baldwin IV~~ he had had two wives and so two factions formed, each favouring one of the wives' offspring. This caused strife as it meant that Baldwin IV was not well liked by half his subjects and so was often not supported by some of his vassals during

(Section B continued)

time of, especially Raymond of Antioch. This situation was also extended due to Baldwin's leprosy, which caused him to need regents from time to time. This caused further upset between the sides as they both wanted someone from their side to be regent. This in the end was a major reason for the fall of Jerusalem, as Guy of Lusignan was not supported by Raymond of Antioch and was easily defeated at Hattin in 1187.

To conclude, the lack of support from Europe and the Byzantine Empire was not the most significant reason for weakness in the defense of Outremer between 1100 and 1192. This is because internal struggles were the most significant reason, as they caused Outremer to not be able to be cohesive enough to defend themselves. However, if Europe or the Byzantine had helped ~~they was~~ more, they may have been able to make up for the lack of internal support to Jerusalem.



This is an example of work towards the top of level 4. The candidate offers a decent amount of evidence related to lack of support from Europe and Byzantium and there is an analysis that makes a clear argument. In considering the factional disputes that weakened the crusader states most of the main points are there. There is some discussion and evaluation. This response was awarded 15 marks.



To get to level 5 this response needs a greater range of evidence. This could include the absence of natural boundaries, the role of the Military Orders, castle building and something on the assistance given by the Italian city states that were important for holding ports in the Levant. Considering a broad range of evidence strengthens the argument that the candidate wants to develop.

Despite this judgement, however, one interpretation is that the most significant weakness in the defence of the crusader states was the lack of support from Byzantium and Europe as it led to a lack of military resources. For example, in ~~the~~ ~~led~~ during to the Byzantium's desire to acquire Antioch the crusader states faced 6 Byzantium invasions through Cilicia between 1100-1149 which ~~weakened~~ weakened the defence of the states as Outremer was consequently a solitary entity in the East ~~as~~ as it was surrounded by threats and also meant that the states had to divert resources to ~~fighting~~ fight Byzantium instead of the Seljuk Turks. Similarly, later in

(Section B continued) the period the defence of the states was weakened to the lack of support from Byzantium and Europe as for instance ~~the~~ between it as after Andronicus ascended the throne in 1183 (due to the political instability in the ~~East~~ Byzantium) the crusader states could no longer rely on Byzantine military support as he signed a treaty with Saladin in 1185 and so actively worked to undermine the crusades. This significantly weakened the states defence as this policy continued under Isaac Angelos and Isaac tried to prevent the armies of Frederick Barbarossa ^{in 1190} reaching the Holy Land, which weakened the states as they were deprived of vital manpower. Despite this evidence, however, the argument that the lack of support from Byzantium and Europe was the most significant weakness in the states defence is limited. This is because ultimately this interpretation fails to acknowledge that there were period when the states had positive relationship with Byzantium such as in 1137 when John Comnenus allied with Raymond of Poitiers and in 1169 when Manuel lent ships to attack Damietta. Furthermore, the argument that a lack of European support weakened the states is severely limited as although European help was sporadic and although 7 crusade letters were authorized between 1157 to 1184 ultimately, ultimately it is arguable that European support was the key to the states survival. This is

(Section B continued) because it was European support ~~of such~~ that funded the Templars and Hospitallers (as for instance Pope Celestine II offered 'his indulgence to any individual that donated to the orders) and so arguably to Europe played strengthened, not weakened the defence of Outremer as the military orders were relied upon to garrison castles such as ~~Belvoir~~ ^{Platt} and in key battles such as ~~the~~ the defeat of Saladin at Montgisard in 1177. Overall, therefore, it is clear that lack of support from Byzantium and Europe cannot be seen as the most significant weakness as ultimately Europe did support the states and ~~there~~ there were periods of cooperation with Byzantium.

Another interpretation of events is that factionalism in Outremer's government ~~is~~ was the most significant weakness to the defence of the crusader states as it ~~enabled~~ provided instability Muslim forces could exploit. For example, ~~following~~ ^{following} the death of Fulk of Anjou in 1143 ~~then~~ Zengi was able to capture Edessa in 1144 as he recognized ~~that~~ that there would be no counter attack from the Franks as Melisende was unable to lead the army herself and Raymond of Poitiers (~~would refuse to inter~~ Prince of Antioch) would refuse to intervene due to his conflict with Joscelin II of Edessa. Similarly, factionalism and

(Section B continued) enabled Muslim armies to march freely into Outremer as for instance occurred in 1187 when Saladin marched 7,000 men to besiege Acre. Furthermore, the weakness of lacking a clearly defined boundary between ~~Fatimid~~ ~~Fatimid~~ ~~Fatimid~~ Muslim and crusader territory can be seen in 1103 as as a Fatimid raiding party was able to freely march into ~~Outremer~~ Jerusalem and attack Baldwin I. Despite this evidence, however, the argument that the lack of a natural boundary was the most significant weakness in the defence of the states is limited. This is because ultimately through intensive castle building and use of ~~the~~ the Templars and Hospitallers ~~the~~ during the 12th century the states largely overcame this issue. For example, building Belvoir in the ~~12th~~ 1160s significantly secured the ~~the~~ boundary east of Jerusalem as Belvoir ^{monitored} watched over the Bridge over the Jordan, ~~and~~ (which was the path from Gilead into Jerusalem) and so was able to ensure that ~~no~~ Nur al-Din did not attack Outremer from Damascus this way. As a result, therefore it is clear ~~that~~ although lacking a natural boundary ~~a~~ challenged the defence of the states ultimately the extent to which it ~~weakened~~ weakened the states defence is limited as ~~the~~ ~~the~~ clearly the states effectively overcame this issue with castles.



This is an example of work at the top of level 5. The candidate presents a good range of evidence that is subjected to analysis. For example, the given factor of a lack of support from Byzantium and Europe is carefully considered with evidence for both sides of the debate, and a well-considered judgement is given after a very helpful discussion. Other factors are added into the mix and weighed against a lack of external support for the crusader states. The examiner views a response like this to offer a sustained and justified argument. This response was awarded full marks.



Historical judgements have to be arrived at through a process of argument, with evidence for and against the proposition in the question.

Question 4

Question 4 asked candidates to consider the extent to which Muslim power was transformed in the years 1095-1144. This question was favoured by a minority of candidates but produced some of the best answers on the paper. The question did require some detail from the earliest period of growth in Muslim power, and this made it less accessible to candidates that were not well prepared.

At the top end there was almost unanimous agreement that Muslim power fell short of being 'transformed', but that a significant base for the further growth of Muslim power was laid. There were some very well-informed answers that explained that after the death of Malik Shah Muslim power could not regenerate without a considerable unifying force. This unifying force was provided by the leadership of Zengi, but it was not in itself transformative. And this case was well argued through the many successes of crusader armies in the field, and Zengi's own resort to waging ruthless war against those Muslims that refused to back him. Most successful candidates included the call to Jihad in their analysis of the changes in Muslim power.

Less successful candidates tended to lack the knowledge necessary to provide an analysis, with some choosing to extend the time frame to include Nar ad-Din and Saladin.

4) From 1095 to 1144, the power of the Muslims saw a dramatic transformation. ~~There was~~ The Islamic dynasty went from complete disunity to the emergence of leaders who united the people under the banner of Jihad. There were significant Muslim victories within these years as well as the expansion of Muslim warlords and their powerbases. Overall, the Muslim power was transformed by Zengi, ~~the~~ and the emergence of Jihad. However, this transformation was slowed due to the ~~area~~ strength of their Frankish enemies as well as the continuing disunity of the Muslim religion. Despite this, I believe it is moderately accurate to say that Muslim power ~~was~~ was transformed between 1095-1144.

Some historians argue the rise of Muslim warlord Zengi ~~was~~ largely transformed Islamic power. Zengi posed as the first leader to unite the Muslims against the

(Section B continued) Franks. This unification came through his 1127 conquest of Mosul and capture of Aleppo the following year. Zengi was a brutal and merciless warrior, whose secretary commented on his enjoyment of inflicting pain. By increasing his jurisdiction and expanding his empire, Zengi largely transformed Muslim power in 1095 - 1144. This culminated in the capture of Edessa in 1144 and subsequent slaughter of 15,000 of the city's Christian inhabitants. According to historian Jonathan Phillips, "this was the first major blow to Frankish power," which in turn proves the magnified power of the Muslims. However, this also proves that within the 49 years between 1095 and 1144, there was no other "major blow" to the Franks which diminishes the extent of the transformation of Muslim power. Consequently, I ~~moderately agree that~~ believe it is moderately accurate to say Muslim power was transformed 1095 - 1144.

In contrast, Muslim power was thwarted

(Section B continued) by the strength of their Frankish counterparts. In ~~the~~ 1101 and 1105 Baldwin I overcame an Egyptian force at the Battles of Ramla I and III (although it is important to note Ramla II was a Muslim victory in 1102.) The Franks were also victorious at Tell Danith in 1115 and ~~conquered~~ Azaz in 1125. Under King Baldwin I and Baldwin II, ~~the~~ Muslim power was inhibited by their consistent defence of Outremer against Muslim aggressors. Not only that, Baldwin II followed an aggressive expansionist policy and embarked on nineteen military campaigns throughout his reign. The Muslims were weaker in comparison to the Franks which undermines the ~~the~~ alleged transformation of Muslim power. However, the aforementioned Battle of Ramla II proves the increasing military abilities of the ~~Egyptians~~, as well as Muslims, as well as their victories in 1113 at Al-Sinabbar and 1119 at the Battle of the Field of Blood. As such, I find it moderately accurate to say that Muslim power was transformed

(Section B continued) in the years 1095 - 1144.

It is important to consider the degree of Muslim unity when assessing the extent of Muslim power. When comparing the situation in 1095, to that in 1144, it is evident that the power of the Muslims was in fact transformed due to their increased unity. In 1095, following the death of Malik Shah in 1092, the Muslim world was divided and the Sunni empire broken down by rival atabegs. In the Shi'a world there had been the Mustaali-Nizari schism which further fractured the Islamic religion. This led to Sunni-Shi'a infighting as well as a refusal to co-operate in order to fight the First Crusaders. At some points, Sunni Muslims did not even hinder the journey of the Crusaders in defiance against the Shi'a leaders. This demonstrates the significant diversity of the Muslims which affected their level of power. In comparison, with Zengi as leader, the Muslims were less divided, particularly as the Sunni and Shi'a factions worked to

(Section B continued) unite under the name of Jihad. Zengi had conquered Aleppo and Mosul and was working with various atabegs and caliphates to force the Franks out of Outremer. Thus, the power of Muslims was ~~brav~~ transformed between 1095-1144 but they ~~Franks~~ did not achieve their goal of defeating the Franks, aside from capturing Edessa. Therefore, ~~I find it moderate~~ continue to find it moderately accurate that Muslim power was transformed in the years 1095-1144.

Various historians argue there was a lack of transformation due to the constant attempts of the Muslims to fight the Franks. As early as 1097, Kilij Arslan had sent troops to fight the Crusade at Doryleum. This was followed by Kerbogha with 35,000 men outside Antioch in 1098. A Muslim attack on Ascalon in 1099 also attempted to defeat the Crusaders. Muslim power was not transformed as they oscillated between success and failure, as seen by the three battles of Ramla.

(Section B continued) Successes came with Il-Ghazi in 1119 at Ager Sanguinis but was followed by failure at Azaz in 1125, where the Seljuk Turks were defeated by Baldwin II. Hence, there was a continuous fight against the crusaders which did not culminate with Zengi. Bursug, Mawdud, Al-Sulami and Il-Ghazi were all significant Muslim leaders who came before. This reinforces the idea that Muslim power was not transformed, although the 1144 siege of Edessa was significant as it was the first successful retaliation to the Frankish invaders. As such, I find it moderately accurate to say Muslim power was transformed from 1095-1144.

In conclusion, the power of the Muslims witnessed a moderate transformation following the revival of Jihad and the emergence of Zengi. Various military defeats and strength of the Franks undermine this transformation, but the Muslims were clearly more united in 1144 than they were in 1095. There

(Section B continued) was a constant fight-back against the Franks by the Muslims but the pinnacle of this was Zengi's siege of Edessa in 1144. Therefore, I find it moderately accurate to say the Muslim power was transformed in the years 1095-1144.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is an example of work at the top of level 5. The full essay is included to show how this candidate focusses on evaluating whether Muslim power was transformed, or merely enhanced. The opening sentence in the introduction rather boldly agrees with the proposition, but quickly switches to a more nuanced approach. The main features of the work are a good range of relevant and detailed evidence, that is discussed and analysed to form a sustained conclusion. This response got full marks.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Try to make your judgements balanced and nuanced as this candidate does. It is usually the case that answers in history are not absolutely on one side of the argument. Demonstrate that you are carefully considering the question by having an informed discussion.

Question 5

Question 5 asked candidates to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the view that it is wrong to blame the Doge, Enrico Dandolo, for the failure of the Fourth Crusade. The extracts provided sufficiently contrasting interpretations for candidates to analyse them and deploy their arguments successfully. The vast majority of candidates were able to make the case for and against the role of Dandolo using the short comings of the crusader leaders as a counter.

At the top end candidates were able to establish an overview of the debate in the extracts and develop and critique the rival interpretations. Opinion was fairly evenly divided on the guilt or otherwise of Dandolo. Some of the best answers developed the case against a Venetian-centred conspiracy theory and brought in evidence and argument about the role of Innocent III to make their case.

At level three candidates tended to spend a little too long explaining what the extracts were saying, before adding in some own knowledge of their own to expand on the evidence in them. At this level judgement tended to be about the quality of the extract rather than the interpretations in them.

Less successful candidates tended to focus on the veracity of the extracts, picking out points in isolation and judging whether or not this was confirmed by own knowledge. At this level judgement tended to be asserted in favour of one extract over the other.

5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that it is wrong to blame the Doge, Enrico Dandolo, for the failure of the Fourth Crusade?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

Both extracts 1 and 2 disagree on whether the Doge, Enrico Dandolo, is to blame for the failure of the Fourth Crusade. Extract 1 argues that there is "no evidence" that Dandolo "deliberately [trapped]" the Crusaders in the Treaty of Venice. On the other hand, Extract 2 presents Dandolo as opportunistic and potentially manipulative as he knew the crusade could "make Venice a greater trading power" and "consolidate the Venetians' relations with Byzantium".

Extract 1 argues that Dandolo isn't to blame, as he was aware of the potential risks that the Crusaders could cause, and therefore wouldn't "expose Venice to these risks". The Treaty of Venice stated that the Crusaders would bring about 33,500 men, including 12,000 cavalry, but also pay the Venetians 85,000 ~~marks~~ ~~bezants~~ ~~gold~~ marks for the fleet/building expenses. However, out of those 33,500 promised, only 12,000 troops arrived. Due to the

Staggering terms of the treaty, it was very risky for Dandolo to agree to it, as, if anything failed, he would be left "holding an enormous fleet, a huge debt and no army". This shows that the potential risks of the terms would have a huge negative impact on Venice, so the Doge had to be sure the crusade would succeed in order to agree to such ~~terms~~ outstanding terms. This supports the view that it is wrong ~~to~~ blame Dandolo for the failure of the Fourth Crusade, as it's unlikely he would've done anything to negatively impact Venice, instead trying to do anything to ensure it was protected and not affected by the crusaders.

Another point Extract 1 makes is that there is no evidence that Dandolo knew that there would never be 33,500 crusaders. This contrasts with extract 2, where it's stated that Dandolo "had a much clearer understanding of the way the world worked than the crusaders had". This suggests that he knew the crusaders wouldn't be able to meet the terms of the treaty, and would be able to exploit this for his own advantage. 33,500

men was an outstanding and ~~very~~^{extremely} optimistic number of troops. This is especially true seeing as during the third Crusade, Frederick Barbarossa had a contingent of 15,000, which is still considered as one of the largest in crusading history. As the Fourth Crusaders had no monarchical power/resources, this was already incredibly ~~over~~ optimistic. As Dandolo had a "clearer understanding" of how the world worked, he potentially knew this was unrealistic, and manipulated the crusaders to his own advantage, to gain more power by receiving help from the crusaders. This demonstrates that Dandolo was in fact to blame for the failure of the Fourth Crusade, as he had set the crusaders up for failure (through the extreme terms of the Treaty of Venice) before the crusade even ~~ever~~ really began.

Extract 2 makes the point that Dandolo wanted to increase ~~the~~^{set up} the power of the Venetians through "securing for themselves a clear trading advantage" and "make Venice a greater trading power". As the crusaders couldn't fulfill the terms of the treaty, Dandolo suggested they ~~take~~^{take} Zara, which once belonged to Dandolo,

and return any booty found. They did this, however, only managed to pay back 51,000 marks, still leaving them in a 34,000 mark debt. Zara was an influential port, and by the crusaders taking it back for Dandolo, he could, as stated in the Extract 2, "make Venice a greater trading power". This suggests that Dandolo manipulated the crusaders, using the terms of the treaty as a potential trap, to get them to secure him more power through acquiring Zara. This contrast with Extract 1, which doesn't outwardly mention Dandolo wanting to use his power to divert the crusaders into taking Zara, but again suggests there's "no evidence for it and abundant evidence against it". It's possible that the thought of taking Zara wasn't a proactive plan Dandolo had been working on, but instead something reactive, as he could take the opportunity presented to him (this being the crusaders not being able to pay him the full 85,000 marks) and use it to his own advantage.

In conclusion, the view that it is wrong to blame the Doge, Enrico Dandolo, for the failure

of the Fourth Crusade is ~~greatly~~ convincing. partially convincing. It seems that Dandolo took a great risk agreeing to the terms of the Treaty of Venice, as the results could've went either way. In the end it ~~would~~ seems that he was ultimately trying to protect himself and Venice, and the failure of the Fourth Crusade would have a partial impact on him, showing he isn't entirely to blame. Additionally, it's the terms of the treaty that can be argued to have ultimately doomed the crusaders. This is because, from the start of the unrealistic ~~terms~~^{treaty}, the crusaders were doing things to fulfill the ~~treaty~~^{terms}, whether that be detouring to Zara, or making the mistake of asking Alexius Angelus for help. This shows that the ultimately, it was the terms of the treaty, which were grossly optimistic, that caused the failure of the Fourth Crusade. However, it is still wrong to ignore the possibility that Dandolo used the terms of the treaty to his advantage, knowing he could potentially manipulate the crusaders to get what he wanted, still ~~has~~ playing a sig being a significant contributor to the failure of the Fourth Crusade.



This is an example of a good level 4 response. The candidate offers an analytical critique of the views in the extracts. The main points are developed through the integration of evidence from the candidate's own knowledge. There is some discussion, and the candidate develops an argument that leads to an overall judgement. The range of analysis and development is good.



To get into level 5 this candidate would need to be a little more focussed on the key phrase in the question 'failure of the Fourth Crusade'. The Fourth Crusade came to halt at Constantinople. The diversion to Constantinople is very important.

5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that it is wrong to blame the Doge, Enrico Dandolo, for the failure of the Fourth Crusade?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

It could be argued that "it is wrong to blame Doge Dandolo for the failure of the Fourth Crusade". However, it could also be argued that "the Fourth Crusade was used to consolidate the Venetians' relations with Byzantium". To determine which view is more convincing, the journey away will be considered.

Firstly, Queller argues that "it is wrong to blame Doge Dandolo" as he could not have known that "there would never be 33,500 Crusaders" is somewhat valid. The Doge was responsible for the Treaty of Venice, and, therefore, it is unlikely that he would ~~launch a crusade~~ agree to the Treaty if he knew it would leave Venice ^{owed} a debt of 85,000 marks. The overestimation of troops was the fault of the ^{papal} legates who were highly ambitious about the number of Crusaders and failed to recruit secular leaders. This suggests the ~~interpretation~~ interpretation is accurate and thus ~~more~~ more convincing. ~~However, the limitations of this view~~ Furthermore, it can be argued that Dandolo's motives for helping the crusade were partly religious, as he was an ageing man who deserved indulgence. This makes ~~the~~ Queller's interpretation convincing. However, ~~the limitations~~ ~~are~~ ~~one~~ ~~of~~ ~~limitations~~ to this argument, as, arguably, Dandolo's motives were partially economic.

The differing aims of the Venetians and French the rest of the Crusaders can be seen in their differing reactions to the excommunication by Pope Innocentⁱⁱⁱ in 1213. The French begged for forgiveness and swore not to attack any more Christian cities, but the Venetians refused, which suggests that there may have been some desire for wealth in the decision to aid the Crusade. Also, the Doge cannot be completely absolved of blame for the "betrayal of Zara", as it was under his direction that the city was attacked. Therefore, the Queller's point on Dandolo's innocence leads him to overlook some of Dandolo's culpability, ^{which makes the argument less convincing}. However, the interpretation that "it is wrong to blame Doge Dandolo for the failure of the Fourth Crusade" remains a solid interpretation, as the Doge's offer arguably allowed the Crusade to continue, as otherwise, the Crusaders would have been prevented by debt. This means that Queller's interpretation is convincing and suggests Dandolo is not to blame for the Fourth Crusade.

On the other hand, Argold argues that "the Fourth Crusade" was used to "consolidate the Venetians' relations with Byzantium, and make Venice a greater trading power". This view is somewhat convincing, as, the main ^{driver} aim of the Venetians' desire for Zara was to have access to the port, improving access to Asia Minor, and, also, to profit from the oak trading market. This suggests that there was an economic motive to the diversion and supports the claim that the Venetians Dandolo aimed to make "Venice a greater trading power". This suggests that Argold ^{unlike} takes a ~~wide~~ ^{broader} view.

takes into account
Don Queller, as the economic motives of Dandolo's involvement
in the Fourth Crusade and makes Angold's interpretation convincing.
However, the argument that the Fourth Crusade was used to
consolidate the "Venetians' relations with Byzantium" is somewhat
less convincing, as Dandolo cannot have foreseen Alexius' promise.
The original plan laid out in the Treaty of Venice was to sail
from Venice to Alexandria and attack Egypt. This refutes the
claim that the aim of Dandolo was to improve relations with
Byzantium, as the Crusade was never supposed to travel through
Constantinople. This ^{suggests} makes the interpretation lack a way and
makes it less convincing. Furthermore, the claim that Dandolo "had
a much clearer understanding of the way the world worked than
the crusaders had" implies that Dandolo's ^{intent was always to} ~~not an orchestrated~~
direct the Crusade ~~figure in the direction~~ to Zara and Constantinople. This is less
convincing, ^{because, as} as mentioned by Queller, it is unlikely that Dandolo
would have agreed to the Treaty of Venice if he believed the
crusaders could not pay. The Treaty had been signed by papal legates,
and therefore, he could expect a large force. Therefore, it is perhaps
unreasonable to suggest that Dandolo's intention was always to
manipulate the Crusade. As mentioned earlier, he cannot have
foreseen the offer from Alexius or that this would lead to the
sacking of Constantinople. This makes Angold's interpretation that
Dandolo was to blame for the failure of the Fourth Crusade less
convincing.



This is an example of work at mid-level 5. The candidate recognises that the extracts provide rival interpretations and handles them with some confidence. The main arguments in the extracts are interrogated with informed reasoning that integrates the candidate's own knowledge with the evidence and argument in the extracts. Overall, the candidate presents a sustained argument that shows understanding of the historical debate.



When analysing the extracts always pick out the points that show an historical interpretation first. Some extracts will have been selected because they show a clear argument. These extracts might not have much evidence. It is up to you to select evidence from your own knowledge that can be used to critique and develop the interpretation. Avoid criticising the extract for the lack of evidence. Focus on the interpretation.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses:

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 reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Focus carefully on the second order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three questions 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 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
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- 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.

Grade boundaries

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

