

# WAR AND RELIGION

An Encyclopedia of Faith and Conflict

VOLUME 1: A-G

Jeffrey M. Shaw and Timothy J. Demy

Editors



An Imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC

Santa Barbara, California • Denver, Colorado

2017

Britain, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States), war resistance came most conspicuously from the opposite end of the ecclesiastical spectrum, with Quakers, Mennonites, Jehovah's Witnesses, and other sectarian groups providing a small but conspicuous element of conscientious objectors, whose refusal to participate in the war was in many cases absolute. Among more liberal Protestants, the cataclysmic aberration of a global war served in the long run to promote internationalism and to reenergize the prewar peace movement, with Anglophone Protestants in particular placing huge faith in the nascent League of Nations and in the embryonic World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches.

Whether the First World War undermined the global influence and significance of religion or not is a contested point. Cherished in the Anglophone world as part of a master narrative of disillusionment with old beliefs and values, the war and its consequences certainly had negative repercussions for Sunni Islam, Russian Orthodoxy, and mainstream German Protestantism, with their close and historic ties to vanquished and fallen political orders. However, Catholicism emerged quite well from the war, enabled to take a more assertive stand in France, Italy, and Germany, and benefiting from the creation of some new and largely Catholic states in Central and Eastern Europe. Furthermore, the disruption of missionary work in sub-Saharan Africa did much to foster the autonomy of African Christians and the expansion of African-initiated churches—both of which were major features of the growth of global Christianity in the 20th century. Even in the Christian portions of the British Empire, the confidence of liberal churchmen may have been dented, but the power of Christianity to comfort and console was apparent in the impressive rituals and architecture of remembrance. Furthermore, the abiding capacity of Christianity to mobilize national energies in pursuit of more sanguinary goals was to be underlined a generation later in the even greater human catastrophe that was the Second World War.

MICHAEL SNAPE

#### See also

Balfour Declaration; First World War and Religious Art; Lawrence of Arabia; Zionism and War; *Primary Documents*: Issuance of Ottoman *Fetva* by Essad Effendi, Sheik-UI-Islam in the Name of Sultan Mehmed V (November 1914); Balfour

Declaration (1917); *Pacem, Dei Munus Pulcherrimum*, a Papal Encyclical Issued by Pope Benedict XV (May 23, 1920)

#### Further Reading

- Ebel, Jonathan H. *Faith in the Fight: Religion and the American Soldier in the Great War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Houlihan, Patrick J. *Catholicism and the Great War: Religion and Everyday Life in Germany and Austria-Hungary, 1914–1922*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Jenkins, Philip. *The Great and Holy War: How World War I Became a Religious Crusade*. New York: HarperCollins, 2015.
- McMillan, M. E. *From the First World War to the Arab Spring: What's Really Going On in the Middle East?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Petrone, Karen. *The Great War in Russian Memory*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2011.
- Snape, Michael. *God and the British Soldier: Religion and the British Army in the Era of the Two World Wars*. London: Routledge, 2005.

## Fourth Crusade (1202–1204)

Pope Innocent III, pope from 1198 through 1216, believed firmly that he had a divine vocation to retake the Holy Land and especially Jerusalem from the “enemies of Christ.” Crusades were pilgrimages that entailed sacramentalized violence attached to a plenary indulgence that theologically and historically differentiate a crusade from the much more common wars between Catholics and non-Catholics. During the pontificate of Innocent III this energy was released in new directions, such as against Albigensian heretics in southern France, reminding us that the crusades were far from confined to confrontations with Muslims. In this and other ventures, the scope of a crusade expanded to encompass any enemy of the Roman church.

Less than a year after ascending to the throne of St. Peter, Innocent III called for a new crusade to recapture Jerusalem. Dispatching preachers throughout Europe, noblemen from northern France were the first to respond favorably and were to form the core of this crusade's leadership.

Gathered in Soissons in 1200, these leaders made the decision to travel by sea to the Levant. They approached the preeminent maritime power of the day, Venice, with

their proposal. The leader, or doge, of Venice, Enrico Dandolo, already past 90 years of age and blind, accepted their offer. The entire industrial infrastructure of Venice was re-directed toward producing the large number of ships required for this expedition, which included nearly 30,000 troops and almost 5,000 horses. In addition to all of this, provisions would need to be supplied, and also 50 armed galleys would accompany the expedition. Presumably the Venetians would also receive favored status in governing the commerce of any territory that was captured, and they were especially desirous of achieving this position in Alexandria. The Venetians agreed to this contract, which was valued at 85,000 marks, or about twice the annual income of the English or French crown.

Technical advances were achieved. For instance, ships were designed with low doors that could open, allowing mounted knights to ride onto the beach, which is to say they were a predecessor to our landing crafts today. Crusaders started to arrive in Venice in the spring of 1202, but the promised numbers failed to materialize, and the disproportionately enormous scope of the building project became clear. All the finances available still fell short of the promised sum by some 34,000 marks. The entire economy of Venice had focused on this endeavor for a full year, and the crusaders had taken a solemn oath to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem—an oath that could not be broken. The doge proposed that the crusaders make up some of their debt to Venice by helping them to reestablish their rule over the Croatian city of Zara, which had recently thrown off Venetian rule—this even though Zara was under the king of Hungary—himself one of the crusaders. Nevertheless, the fleet departed. The pope threatened excommunication, but his legate, Peter of Capuano, did not prevent the crusaders' departure from Venice. This unseemly business led to a split among the crusaders, but in spite of this the assault was successful and Zara surrendered in late 1202. Innocent III wrote them a harsh letter and a group of them left for Rome to beg absolution. All in all, though, pragmatism had proved to be more powerful than the pope's spiritual influence.

During the winter of 1202 after the surrender of Zara, envoys from Prince Alexius, claimant to the throne of the Byzantine Empire, arrived. The promises made by the envoys were fantastic: if the crusaders helped reestablish

Alexius on the throne, from which he had been unjustly removed, he would give them 200,000 marks of silver, provisions for the army, and personally accompany them with 10,000 of his own men to take Alexandria—which was the next target of the crusade, prior to Jerusalem. Finally, he would have the Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople acknowledge papal supremacy—one of the key bones of contention between the Orthodox East and the Catholic West. The only drawback was the prospect of fighting their way into Constantinople to enthrone Alexius by force, but the great rewards promised outweighed this minor problem. With the exception of Simon de Montfort, who decided to take his knights directly to the Holy Land, all agreed to the plan.

On May 24, 1203, the crusaders set sail for Constantinople, a city far more populous than any place in Europe. But the people of Constantinople did not rise up to welcome Alexius as their ruler. Alexius III, the ruler of Byzantium, proved to be an incompetent leader and in spite of far superior numbers and a superbly fortified city, and in the face of a much smaller but disciplined force of crusaders, withdrew his men behind the city walls. The people were demoralized and on July 17 he fled the city with as much money as he could. The leaders of Constantinople appealed to their sightless former emperor, Isaac Angelos, who was enthroned again, and Alexius, his son, was named co-emperor. With relatively little violence the crusaders had succeeded in their mission. The emperor agreed to the terms, though he was aghast at his son's pledge, and the crusaders were given provisions.

The authority of Alexius IV, as he was now known, had been overestimated. His attempt to pay his debt was met with hostility, nor was it clear that he could order the Orthodox clergy to acknowledge Roman supremacy, or that if he did they would obey. Alexius IV and some of the crusade's leaders set out on a tour to consolidate his authority and raise money, but relations between the crusaders and the locals soured. Alexius stopped paying the crusaders, nor could they depart for Alexandria at that time of the year. Dandolo made one last personal appeal to Alexius IV but was rebuffed. And so, on the first day of 1204 the Byzantines launched a naval offensive on the crusader fleet, sending burning ships with the wind behind them toward the crusader fleet, but the crusaders were quick to respond

and sent out boats with grappling hooks to redirect the 17 burning ships away from their fleet and succeeded.

Byzantine anger at Alexius's feeble position resulted in a coup. He was imprisoned and the leader of the coup was crowned emperor, taking the name Alexius V. He withdrew provisions from the crusaders, and war was inevitable.

On April 8, 1204, the crusaders boarded their ships and set out across the Bosphorus to the Golden Horn, but hindered by a contrary wind, they were not able to engage the enemy closely and withdrew. Four days later they had better fortune and were able to breach and scale the city walls. Within the day parts of Golden Horn were in crusader control and Alexius IV, like his predecessor, fled the city. The palaces were secured by the crusader noblemen in a relatively orderly manner, but outside the sack of the city, the rapes, the looting, and the desecration of holy places, which have become so well known, took place. The Venetians were finally paid off for their immense industrial mobilization; Count Baldwin of Flanders was named emperor of the Latin Empire of Constantinople; Dandolo requested that the pope lift his vow to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, which Innocent III did not do, and Dandolo died in 1205. Urban III regarded the conquest as a miracle, but when his legate released the crusaders from their vow to reach Jerusalem—very reasonable given the fragility of the new Latin Empire—and when he learned of the sordid details of how the conquest was carried out, his happiness at the conquest vanished.

DUANE ALEXANDER MILLER

#### See also

Constantinople, Arab Sieges of; Crusades (Overview); Innocent III, Pope

#### Further Reading

Madden, Thomas. *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1997.

Philips, Jonathan. *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople*. New York: Viking, 2004.

## Frederick II and the Papacy, Conflict of

The life of Frederick II (1194–1250) illustrates the close, but also contentious relationship between political power

in the Latin West and a powerful medieval papacy that both legitimated and challenged that power.

While the Roman Empire had at times persecuted the early Christians, its fourth-century adoption of Christianity as the official religion forced Christians to reevaluate their relationship with the empire. Particularly in the East, the emperor was viewed as the primary leader and defender of the Christian community; this “caesaropapism” placed Caesar’s political power—the *imperium*—above the spiritual authority of the clergy—the *sacerdotium* (Eusebius of Caesarea). In the Western empire, others promoted a hierocratic vision of society, which might be termed “papocaesarism”; the bishops, rather than the emperor, remain the ultimate leaders of the Christian community on earth, even of the emperor himself (Ambrose).

The Roman Empire loomed large in the imagination of Western Europe long after its 476 collapse. The desire to restore the *imperium* took root when the pope crowned Charlemagne in 800, ultimately resulting in the formation of the Holy Roman Empire, a collection of territories spanning Northern Italy and Germany bound together by the vassals’ personal pledge of loyalty (fealty) to their ruler. Frequently, bishops were invested with their office by political rulers in a manner that recalled the fealty oath. Zealous reformers in the reign of Pope Gregory VII (reigned 1073–1085) objected to the caesaropapist implications of this practice; instead, Gregory VII claimed full jurisdiction over Christendom, including the power to depose not only any bishop, but any secular ruler whatsoever. This papocaesarist claim that *sacerdotium* generally, and the papacy in particular, was (in the words of Bernard of Clairvaux) the ultimate “fountainhead of justice” led to a serious controversy with Emperor Henry IV. Henry, who had denied the pope’s right to judge prince and emperor alike, was forced to dramatic repentance, famously kneeling in the snow at Canossa. The king was now—at least in canon law—vassal of the pope.

Frederick II was made king of Sicily at the age of two and orphaned at the age of four. At the encouragement of Pope Innocent III (ca. 1160–1216; reigned from 1198), his legal guardian, Frederick was crowned king of the Germans while only 17. Innocent, who had quarreled seriously with Emperor Otto IV, believed Frederick would respect the papacy’s territorial rule of central Italy, deemed