

A-LEVEL HISTORY

Unit HIS1A: The Crusading Movement and the Latin East, 1095-1204
Mark scheme

1041
June 2014

Version 1.0: Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which students meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a student with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

June 2014

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

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

Question 1

01 Explain why Emperor Alexius Comnenus appealed to the West for help in 1095.

[12 marks]

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised.

10-12

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the appeal was made by the Byzantine emperor at this time and to this audience.

Students might include some of the following long-term factors:

- Alexius hoped to recover the territory lost after the battle of Manzikert in 1071. He had achieved some victories since usurping the throne in 1081 and retained some territory while

fighting off many Turkish attacks but much had been lost during the civil war after Manzikert. Some Byzantine bases remained as did the fleet but he was seriously stretched in defence and lacked armed forces to make further progress, especially the recapture of Nicaea and Antioch

- the Empire had routinely turned to mercenaries for assistance and Western mercenaries in particular who were prized for their fighting skills. Scandinavians, English and Germans formed part of the Varangian guard and Alexius had hired knights as well as the Cumans to fight against the Pechenegs
- Pope Gregory VII had previously called upon the kings and emperors of Europe to organize their armies for aiding the Byzantine empire and healing the Great Schism. Alexius was aware of these previous efforts and had been working towards an understanding with Urban II. Alexius saw it as a good time to repair relations.

and some of the following short term/immediate factors:

- there were divisions in the Muslim world which were advantageous, including the divisions between Sunni and Shia Muslims and between the Seljuk Turks of Anatolia.
- the death of Malik Shah had resulted in a power vacuum in Syria, which gave a chance of major and lasting success.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might make the point that the timing was advantageous to regain territory due to Muslim divisions.

Question 1

- 02** How far was the desire for wealth the principal motive for participants in the First Crusade?
[24 marks]

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful' questions, the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting the desire for wealth might include:

- there was poverty in Western Europe among the peasants as a rising population put pressure on agricultural land which had not been helped by bad weather affecting harvests and causing famine and disease.
- luxuries were known to come from the east and travellers and pilgrims testified and it was believed that Jerusalem was the 'golden' city
- primogeniture had begun to bite in Western Europe among the nobility and there was a problem - particularly in France - relating to landless younger sons and subsequent internecine warfare. The attempt by the Church to control this through the Peace of God had not been successful. The point was made strongly in Urban II's call to arms and men like Baldwin and Bohemond were in this position. Bohemond, for example, went no further than Antioch and Baldwin was diverted to Edessa.

Factors suggesting an alternative view might include:

- there was a preponderance of popular piety at this time with people involving themselves directly in the means of their own salvation, shown by an increase in veneration of relics, pilgrimages, the cult of saints and religious patronage. Jerusalem was the major place of pilgrimage and the crusaders regarded the journey as a pilgrimage to free the Holy City and its relics from the hands of the infidels and restore the disrupted pilgrim route. This was underlined in the personification of the city as a theme for many popular preachers of the crusade
- personal piety and apocalyptic views meant that the offer of forgiveness of sins was eagerly taken up, especially by knights whose hands were stained with blood and were looking to resolve their 'knightly dilemma'. This links to the beginning of chivalry and the view of the knight as a 'holy warrior' as shown by Gregory VII's *milites Christi*
- people participated on the crusade because of kinship/family ties and the social pressures related to them. Tancred and Bohemond were nephew and uncle; Godfrey and Baldwin were brothers among many other examples. This kinship was not uncommon in the lower ranks as well as the leadership
- Urban II recruited powerful nobles and knights in service to them may have felt obliged to go on the crusade with their masters. Raymond of Toulouse took many of his household knights as did other crusader leaders. Some nobles, such as Fulk IV of Anjou, did not go but still put pressure on some of their knights to participate.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that evidence does not suggest that a desire for wealth was a major motive:

- material sacrifices were made on a major scale by many to finance their journey as crusader charters demonstrate
- most of the surviving combatants returned home rather than remaining to gain territory or status in the Holy Land.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why there was limited outside help for Outremer between the Second and Third Crusades. **[12 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Outremer and the kingdom of Jerusalem in particular sent a large number of representatives and appeals for help against growing Muslim power and incursions at this time and received no significant support from either the west or the Byzantine Empire.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the defeat of the Second Crusade and the subsequent shame and blame attached rather cooled the appetite of Western Europe for crusading in the east. The might of Christian Europe had been humbled and God's favour and support had, in the view of many, been lost.
- the papacy had not come of the situation well as the crusade to the Baltic had also failed and only limited progress made in the Iberian peninsula. By 1169 also, Alexander III was involved in war with the German Emperor Frederick Barbarossa and his anti-pope.

- Frederick Barbarossa was himself defeated at Legnano in 1176 and his military capability was compromised. The same was true of the Byzantine Emperor Manuel, who suffered a massive defeat against the Turks at Myriocephalum in 1176 and was forced to make peace with the Turks
- Baldwin III, Amalric I and Baldwin IV all tried to convince Henry II of England and Louis VII of France (later his son Philip II) to take the cross. They did not trust each other sufficiently to leave their lands at the mercy of the other. Henry was involved in the Becket crisis 1162-1172 and problems with his rebellious sons while Louis died in 1180 leaving a fourteen year old heir
- there was a belief in Western Europe that the threat to Outremer had been exaggerated and examples of success like the capture of Ascalon and Baldwin IV's victory at Montgisard fed this perception. There was also jealousy at the perceived wealth and luxury enjoyed by the Franks of Outremer and many in Western Europe felt that the Franks had the means and money to support themselves.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might make the point that the problem was that the size of the task was now such that it required the participation of at least one king to generate a movement of sufficient size to threaten the Muslims and they all had military and political problems of their own during this time.

Question 2

04 How important were castles to the defence of Outremer? **[24 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

L2: Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

L3: Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful' questions, the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting the importance of castles in the system of defence might include:

- they defended strategic routes and could check enemy movements, with castles such as Ibelin and Blanchegarde on the Egyptian border and Kerak inland. As the situation became more desperate during the 1160s, castles of increasing size and complexity such as Jacob's Ford and Durum were constructed showing how importantly they were regarded by the Franks
- they provided a base for garrisons, which helped to offset the manpower shortage and allow for raids into enemy-held territory. They also helped as supply dumps for armies in the field and provided protection for the local population in case of attacks and raids. Stripping the garrisons of the castles to join Guy's army prior to the battle of Hattin was a reason why the defeat was so decisive and the kingdom rapidly fell
- they were of symbolic importance in relation to the indestructibility of Outremer and the psychological effect of their destruction was shown by events such as Saladin's victory at Jacob' Ford.

Factors suggesting [*other factors/alternative view*] might include:

- additional manpower could be gained at certain periods. The use of the feudal system meant that men served for money fiefs and the Church and the towns both provided quotas of sergeants. Light cavalry were recruited from local Christians. The assistance of the Italian city-states of Pisa, Genoa and Venice as a navy when needed was also useful although this came at a cost. Pilgrims knights on minor crusades could also swell the ranks temporarily although these forces were hard to control
- the military orders, although never really numerous, provided armed contingents in the open field and served as commanders and garrisons of castles, like Krak des Chevaliers. Their growing wealth was used to build, hold and strengthen castles in Outremer. Their backgrounds and constant presence in Outremer gave them valuable experience and their existence as religious orders imbued them with discipline and zeal. The importance of the military orders is shown by Muslim attitudes towards them and the cull of them after Hattin shows how they were hated and feared
- defensive strategies such as the avoidance of pitched battle were employed particularly as the Muslim forces grew stronger. The purpose was to contain the enemy forces until their army began to dissolve due to the time taken, internal divisions and logistical problems. An example of this tactic, among many, was the shadowing of Saladin's forces at the Pools of Goliath in 1183
- the defence of Outremer relied on the divisions of their Muslim enemies and the Franks were active in both encouraging and exploiting these. Alliances were formed at various times between crusader states and individual Muslim rulers, such as that between the kingdom of Jerusalem and Damascus. Attempts were made, with variable success, to form alliances with groups such as the Ortoqids
- the individual actions of rulers of the crusader states were often vital to their defence, especially early on. There was a willingness to support each other at critical moments as shown by the actions of Baldwin II in assisting Antioch and the earlier support from Antioch for Edessa
- the establishment of an alliance with the Byzantine empire was important to the defence of Outremer between the 1150s and 1170s, especially in deterring attacks on Antioch. However, this was limited in time period as the Byzantines were hostile to the crusader states in the aftermath of the First Crusade and relatively powerless, and increasingly anti-Western, after the defeat at Myrioccephalum in 1176 and Emperor Manuel's death.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that although castles were important to the defence of Outremer, they could never hold back a determined enemy with the numbers to flood the land with troops so maintaining Muslim divisions was vital. Castles were only as good as their garrisons. The quality of the military orders and the external assistance may have contributed decisively.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why Saladin was able to unite the Muslim forces against the kingdom of Jerusalem by 1187. **[12 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the Muslim world was able and prepared to unite the rule of Saladin.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the work of Nurredin in sending troops to Egypt in 1169 and the success of Shirkuh's military campaigns and Saladin's subsequent political strategy in gradually suppressing the Fatimid caliphate that enabled him to become vizier with the support of the army. He was then able to harness Egypt's considerable economic resources
- the death of Nurredin in 1174 enabled him to move into Syria and successfully campaign against the Zengids in Aleppo and Mosul backed by Egyptian resources, as well as using such wealth to secure the support of Damascus. His marriage to Nurredin's widow also cemented his hold on Syria

- the death of Amalric I of Jerusalem weakened the kingdom as did the fighting and increase in faction over the succession during the reign of Baldwin IV. Saladin's victories at Jacob's Ford and the Springs of Cresson are examples of major psychological as well as military advantages
- Saladin legitimised his ascent to power through the use of propaganda by emphasising his role as the defender of Islam and Sunni orthodoxy. He used the idea of jihad to justify the need for Islamic unity under one leader, presenting the Franks as menacing and inimitable enemies
- the actions of Reynald of Chatillon in 1186 gave Saladin a cause for war while the killing of Muslim pilgrims intensified the idea of jihad and further united the Muslims under his command.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might consider the situation before 1186 as a long term factor and the actions after as the trigger to his actions as he was involved in a truce with the kingdom up to this period. Alternatively, it could be considered that it was down to either/or political and military factors or even lucky deaths.

Question 3

06 How important was Muslim unity in the failure of the Third Crusade? **[24 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

L2: Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

L3: Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful' questions, the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting that Muslim unity was a factor might include:

- Muslim unity under Saladin made his success over the kingdom of Jerusalem almost complete by 1190. The possession of Egypt in particular had brought wealth and supplies as well as naval support. His military reputation seemed secure
- Muslim unity achieved by Saladin enabled him to maintain control of his forces and largely avoid the pitched battles that the crusaders sought in order to achieve a decisive victory
- Saladin was mostly able to rely on the unity of his own forces whilst seeking to maximise the disunity of the crusaders. He negotiated separately with Conrad and Richard I. Saladin used Reynald of Sidon as an intermediary with Conrad and his brother Al-Adil as a negotiator with Richard I.

Factors suggesting that it was not a major factor might include:

- As Muslim unity was political rather than religious problems remained with Shi'a leaders and his life was threatened by the Assassins
- it is plausible to challenge the idea of failure and Muslim unity was not secure. Most of Saladin's victories of 1187-1188 were wiped away as the coastal cities were retaken by the Third Crusade, while crusader victories - especially at Arsuf and Jaffa - dented his reputation.

Other factors suggesting reasons for failure might include:

- the crusade was weakened at the start by important deaths. The death of William II meant the loss of the Sicilian fleet while the drowning of Frederick Barbarossa virtually ended the, previously very significant, German participation
- there were problems in relation to leadership. Rivalry between Richard and Philip, including that over candidates for the throne of Jerusalem, underlined a lack of cooperation. Philip's early departure as well as the German losses caused problems of manpower. Philip's plotting with John on his return to France distracted Richard and caused him to leave the Holy Land earlier than he might have done
- there were strategic and logistical problems. There was disagreement over strategy and purpose in relation to the target of the crusade - Jerusalem or Egypt - while the problems of supply and security relating to Jerusalem brought about compromise rather than victory.

Good answers are likely to show that Muslim unity only existed in a political sense, Saladin kept his army together through force of personality and did not have enough actual support to achieve ultimate victory. This meant that many of his strategies depended on exploitation of crusader divisions and the problems within the Third Crusade itself meant that final victory also eluded Richard. The result for both sides was compromise. Reference might also be made as to whether or not the crusade was a failure but links to the question need to remain clear.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion