

**THE CRUSADES, THEIR INFLUENCE AND THEIR
RELEVANCE FOR TODAY**

by

MYOUNG – WOON CHA

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of

MAGISTER ARTIUM

in the Department of Church History Studies

Faculty of Theology

University of Pretoria

Pretoria

Promoter: Prof. J W Hofmeyr

2006

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Above all, I am grateful to God, who gave me the wonderful opportunity of coming to South Africa to study. His love and grace assisted me in the completion of this thesis.

I must also express my deep gratitude to Professor J. W Hofmeyr, who challenged me to work critically and discerningly over the past 2 years. Furthermore, he provided me with tireless care and kind consideration. It was a great honour to study under him.

I would also like to give special thanks to the Rev. Y.H. Hong, the members of Gwangju Woorideul Presbyterian Church. I am greatly indebted to Professor J.S. Park, and Professor S-B Choi, who is the president of the KwangShin University.

My language in this thesis was corrected, improved and polished by Mr. Ernest Jones. His painstaking endeavours presented my thesis in a clearer and more logical form.

Most importantly, I wish to give deep thanks to my beloved wife, Y.M. Mo, for her endless love, sacrificial support, and constant encouragement. Thanks also to my son whom I love dearly. I dedicate, with thanks, this dissertation to my parents and my parents-in-law, whose prayers for me during the course of this study were an inspirational support.

SUMMARY

Title: The Crusades, Their Influence and Their Relevance for Today

Researcher: Myoung-Woon Cha

Promoter: Prof. J.W. Hofmeyr

Degree: Magister Artium

On Tuesday, 27 November 1095, at the Council of Clermont, Pope Urban II made an appeal for a military expedition to fight for brethren in the Byzantine Empire and to liberate Jerusalem. The appeal, which was taken up was very successful. The result of the First Crusade was that the Latin States of the East were born: the county of Antioch, the county of Edessa, the county of Tripoli and the kingdom of Jerusalem.

As time went by, the Crusades to the Holy Land became weakened. Finally, on 28th, May 1291, the remainder of the Holy Land (Acre) fell into Mamluk hands. In the period of the Crusades, the Crusade affected two great effects to the outside Western world. First, in April 1204, the Fourth Crusaders occupied Constantinople, which was the heart of the Byzantine Empire. It was the greatest sacking of Byzantine. Second, Saladin the most famous of Muslim heroes appeared on the scene. He recaptured Jerusalem (2 October 1187) and roused the spirit of jihad. At the present time, many leaders of Islam countries and terrorists groups regard themselves as successors of Saladin.

On September 11, 2001, a group of 19 Muslim Arab terrorists hijacked four passenger planes en route across the United States. The immediate death toll was estimated at about three thousand civilians.

After the attack of September 11, President Bush labelled the attacks as

'acts of war' and declared war on terrorism. On 29 January 2002, President Bush said that America would act against an 'Axis of Evil' formed by Iran, Iraq and North Korea. He accused these countries of developing weapons of mass destruction.

On 20 March 2003, U.S. troops and allied troops launched an invasion on Iraq without the sanction of the UN Security Council. Finally, on May 1, 2003, Bush declared his victory and announced the end of a "major combat operation" in Iraq.

Bush adduced three reasons for attacking Iraq. First, Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction. Second, the Iraqi government had persistently violated human rights, and routinely used torture and carried out summary executions. Third, the regime of Saddam Hussein was implicated in transnational terrorism and, specifically, in the attacks of September 11. I tentatively conclude that Bush lacked the necessary evidence, but he, nevertheless, attacked Iraq.

In the period of the Crusades or even nowadays, it is difficult to keep the peace between Islam and Christianity. Our duty is not to conquer Islam by war but to preach the Gospel in peaceful ways, and then it is necessary for us to learn peaceful coexistence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
SUMMARY	ii
Table of Contents	iv
Chapter one: Introduction	1
1.1 The Research Problem	1
1.2 The Research Question	2
1.3 Overview of Chapters	4
1.4 Introduction of Crusades	5
Chapter Two: Describes background and progress of Crusades	9
2.1 The Major Crusades	9
2.1.1 The First Crusade	9
2.1.2 The Second Crusade	15
2.1.3 The Third Crusade	18
2.1.4 The Fourth Crusade	23
2.1.5 The Fifth Crusade	26
2.1.6 The Crusade of Frederick II	29

2.1.7 The Crusade of St. Louis	31
2.1.7.1 The First Crusade of St. Louis	31
2.1.7.2 The Second Crusade of St Louis	34
2.2 The Minor Crusades	36
2.2.1 The Children’s Crusade	36
2.2.2 The Crusade against heretics and pagans	39
2.2.3 The Political Crusade	41
2.3 The End of Latin State in the Holy Land	43
2.4 Conclusion	45
Chapter Three: Discusses the influence of the Crusades on Christianity and Islam	47
3.1 The influence of Crusades in The West	47
3.1.1 Political and Military	48
3.1.2 Social and Economic	52
3.1.2.1 Social	52
3.1.2.2 Economic	55
3.1.3 Ecclesiastically	59
3.2 The influence of Crusades in the Byzantium Empire	62
3.2.1 Political and Military	62
3.2.2 Social and Economic	64

3.2.3 Ecclesiastically	66
3.3 The influence of the Crusades in the Near East	68
3.3.1 Political and Military	68
3.3.2 Social and Economic	71
3.3.3 Christianity in the Islam Lands	74
3.4 Conclusion	78
Chapter Four: The Relevance of the Crusades for today	79
4.1 The war on Iraq	79
4.2 Justification of war on Iraq	94
4.2.1 Background of the attacks on September 11	94
4.2.2 The motive of the war on Iraq	97
4.2.3 The pros and cons of the war on Iraq	105
4.3 The current confrontation between Christianity and Islam	108
Chapter Five: Conclusion	115
5.1 Summary	115
5.2 Final Statement	120
Bibliography	124

Chapter one: Introduction

1.1 The Research Problem

Nowadays we see a crisis emerging in the confrontation between Western Christianity and Islam. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, the conflict between the Western powers, Israel, and the Islamic world has begun to draw the concern of the world. In the summer of 1993, Professor Samuel Huntington's book, *"Foreign Affairs,"* has had a great impact on the western world.

After the events of September 11, the United States has continued the war against terrorism and the war on Iraq. We have been faced with difficult problems in the confrontation between the United States and Islam. This confrontation seems to concern the antagonism between Christianity and Islam. Bush revealed religious intentions in the war against terrorism and especially the war on Iraq. Many of the Christians in the United States have supported this war.

Generally, we regard the terrorists who attack the western world and especially the United States as devils, but the western world attacks the Islam world to protect their human rights. This standpoint has existed since the Crusade era.

Gregory VII had made a casual suggestion about going to Jerusalem to war against Islam, but Urban II called out for a holy war for the recovery of

the holy city. In 1098, the Crusader leaders from Antioch, asked the pope to come over and finish the war, “which is your very own,” but Urban said that it was “God’s work,” and that “Christ was the leader.”¹ The Crusaders had several reasons to go to the Holy Land but, essentially, were highly motivated by the Christian faith. The current crisis between the United States and Islam also has religious motivations.

The U.S. foreign policy seeks to extend and protect the freedom of the Islamic people to choose their own government and to “worship the Almighty God the way they see fit.” Freedom, Bush said, is not “America’s gift to the world. It is God’s gift to humanity.”² The United States asserts to give freedom to the Islamic, but most of the Islamic people feel convinced that the United States is taking on the contrary, their freedom by force.

1.2 The Research Question

The image of the Crusades is usually good in Christianity. Some Christians use the word, “Crusade,” with the meaning of fighting evil things. Some missionaries describe the work of converting infidels to Christianity, as a Crusade. However, the Islamic people consider a Crusade as something evil.

It cannot be denied that both Christians and the Jewish people have

¹ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), A History of the Crusades, 6 vols: Marshall W. Baldwin (ed), ‘The First Hundred Years,’ Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania press, 1958, vol. 1, p.221

² Tony Carnes, “The Bush Doctrine,” Christianity Today, 05. 2003, p.40

occupied Jerusalem, which the Muslims consider the third Holy Place of Islam. The Muslims regard the most occupation of Jerusalem by others beside themselves as a violation of Muslim Land. This causes strong anti-imperialist, anti-western and anti-Christian attitudes, which date from the period of the Crusades.

Islam terrorist Groups such as the Hamas and the Hizbullah were set up under a religious banner to fight for the liberation of Palestine and against western “Crusader” intervention and support for Israel.³ The Muslims interpret the Crusades as the first acts of western imperialism. They also regard the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and the state of Israel, as such, because the Western Christian Countries founded both the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and the State of Israel in Muslim territory.

Arab political leaders, such as Nasser and Sadat in Egypt and Saddam Hussein in Iraq, aspired to become the successor of Saladin, who recaptured Jerusalem from the Crusaders in 1187. Despite Saladin’s Kurdish origins, his mantle has been donned by Arab and wider Islamic militant groups eager to fight the “crusaders,” the *Salibiyyen*(cross bearers), the West and specifically the United States.⁴ In 1996-98, Osama bin Laden issued serious fatwa⁵

³ Thomas E, Madden, Crusades: The Illustrated History, London: Duncan Baird Publishers Ltd, 2004, p.209

⁴ *ibid*, p.209

⁵ Fatwa is a formal religious opinion. Fatwa usually requires knowledge of the Quran and Ḥadith (narratives concerning the Prophet's life and sayings), as well as knowledge of exegesis and collected precedents, and might be a pronouncement on some problematic legal matter. (Encyclopedia Britannica Deluxe Edition 2004 CD-ROM)

(Arabic: “religious opinions), declaring the jihad. Finally, on the 23rd of February 1998, he declared a fatwa, this time in the name of the international Islamic front for the jihad against the Jews and the Crusaders.⁶

However, the U.S. endeavors not to connect the current struggle between the West and Islam with religious motives. The U.S. insists that their military action is a legal defense against terror.

Great attention has been given to the question of the justification of the war on Iraq. In addition, the question we have to ask here is whether the Crusades influence the relation between Western Christianity and Islam.

1.3 Overview of Chapters

In 1095, Pope Urban II preached to help the Eastern Christians, who were threatened by an Islamic invasion, to recover the Holy Land. It was the starting point of the Crusade. Many people of the West took the Cross, and many people underwent all sorts of hardships in the Near East, not only Muslims but also native Christian. After the fall of Acre, 1291, the conquest of the Near East by the Westerns was ended, but the Crusades still continued for a long time.

I will take up the progress of the Crusades in the chapter two. The

⁶ Kimberley A. McCloud, "Al-Qaeda and the Reach of Terror," History behind the Headlines: The Origins of Conflicts Worldwide, Volume 5. Gale Group, 2002. Reproduced in History Resource Center. Farmington Hills, MI: Gale Group. <http://0-galenet.galegroup.com.innopac.up.ac.za:80/servlet/History/>

Crusades were carried on by the masses for a long time throughout Western Europe. Therefore, it is very difficult to consider all of them, and I will only touch on some of the Crusades.

We will classify the crusades into two parts. The first part, we will call “Major Crusades.” I will treat them beginning with the Council of Clermont in 1095 and ending with the Fall of Acre in 1291. The second part, we will call “Minor Crusades.” Here I will consider the “Children’s Crusade,” and the Crusades against the enemies of the Faith and Papacy.

Islam attended less to the influence of the Crusades than what Christianity did, but recently, the Crusades have received more attention in Muslim circles. In Chapter three, we will consider, the influence of the Crusades as viewed by both Christians and Muslims.

In the first part of Chapter Four, I will describe the war against terrorism and the war on Iraq. Now we bring up a very important question: Does the U.S. have a just cause? So, to answer this question, we should discuss the justification of the war on Iraq. After this, we will discuss the current confrontation between Christianity and Islam,

Finally, in Chapter Five, I will draw a conclusion from this study.

1.4 Introduction of Crusades⁷

⁷ more information; Jonathan Riley-Smith (ed), *The Oxford History of The Crusades*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, pp.1-14; Thomas F. Madden (ed), *The Crusades; The*

Medieval western Christians had a positive attitude towards the Crusades. However, in the sixteenth century, Europeans utterly lost interest in the Crusades. There were many reasons for this. As secular authority in Europe increased, religious unity crumbled, Europeans began dividing themselves along political lines, and there was a strong desire in the west for church reform. Protestants usually criticized the fact that the corrupt papacy had abused its authority as a tool for her purposes. Catholics defended themselves, saying that this was done in order to necessarily defend the Faith.

In the eighteenth century, the historical view of the crusades changed dramatically. The Ottoman Empire no longer had the power to menace Western Europe. The Enlightenment's historians viewed the Middle Ages as a foul pool of ignorance, superstition, and fanaticism. They also described the crusades as a bizarre manifestation of medieval barbarism. In the nineteenth century, there were various attitudes toward the medieval crusades, but most of them like Romanticism, Nationalism, Colonialism and Racism, dealt positively with the crusades. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the romantic image of the chivalric crusader was displayed.

The foundations of modern scholarship were laid in the second half of the nineteenth century. The multi-volume histories of Steven Runciman and the American team of scholars led by Kenneth Setton, had begun to appear by the middle 1950s and the last volume was published 1980s. Since the 1960s,

essential Readings, Oxford; Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002, pp.1-12; Norman Housley, The Later Crusades, 1274-1580: from Lyons to Alcazar, New York: Oxford University Press, 1992, pp.1-6

the renewed vigour came in the study of the Latin East. The Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East has at present more than 480 members in a professional organization of crusade scholars, in 30 countries. The result is that we now know more about the crusades and the crusaders than we have ever known before. Since then, many scholars have argued about a very important question. It is that “What were the Crusades?”

Traditionalists put emphasis on the crusader’s destination. They regard crusades only as those expeditions, which were launched with the intention of defending or recovering the Holy Land. Pluralists disagree with the opinion regarding the Traditionalist’s definition. These scholars put emphasis on where it originated and how it was organized. They look for papal validation, the granting of crusade status, preaching, and the evidence of recruitment.

Erdmann argued that the conquest of the Holy Land was not the primary purpose of the Crusade, but H.E.J. Cowdrey was concluding that Jerusalem was the goal right from the start. John France has further defined this conclusion, noting that western Christians were largely unconcerned with the city of Jerusalem before Urban II bound together in their minds the heavenly Jerusalem with the terrestrial one.⁸ Erdman also argued that the eleventh-century Reform Movement gave birth to the Crusades. However, Jonathan Riley-Smith argued Popes and Crusade preachers depicted crusading as an act of selfless love and charity. The Crusader demonstrated his love for God by following Christ, just as the Jesus Christ had demanded to do. Erdmann

⁸ Thomas F. Madden (ed), 2002, p.7

argued that the Spanish Reconquest was for the establishment of the crusading tradition. R. A. Fletcher argued that the Spanish Reconquest redefined itself by the very success of the Crusades. The shifting relationships between Muslim and Christians had brought back the roll of the Muslim Conquest of the Iberian Peninsula.

Traditionalists like Hans Mayer and Jean Richard see the crusades as beginning with the Council of Clermont in 1095 and ending with the Fall of Acre in 1291. The Revisionist's view is that a Crusade was any papally sanctioned war against the enemies of the Faith. Long after 1291, many popes continued to call for Crusades to recapture the lost Holy land or to defend the Church. They argue that the crusades had continued up through at least the sixteenth century.

Chapter Two: Describes background and progress of Crusades

2.1 The Major Crusades

2.1.1 The First Crusade

During the battle on Manzikert, on the 26 August 1071, the Byzantine Empire sustained a serious defeat and Romanus, the Byzantine Emperor, at the time, was captured by Turkish troops. After Manzikert, the Turkish invasion of Asia Minor went well and Turks threatened Constantinople. The Byzantine army would not have been able to undertake a war of re-conquest on its own, and it also did not have the power to prevent the Turkish invasion. For these reasons, they asked Christianity in the West for help.

On Tuesday, 27 November 1095, at the Council of Clermont, Pope Urban II made an appeal for a military expedition to proclaim the Truce of God⁹, to fight for brethren in the East, and to liberate Jerusalem. The appeal, which was taken up by numerous preachers was very successful, including Peter the Hermit, and resulted in a total of almost 60,000¹⁰ men, women and children setting out for the Holy Land.

⁹ To cease their fratricidal wars, and thus promote peace in the west.

¹⁰ Jonathan Phillips, "Who were the First Crusaders?," History Today, 03. 1997, p.17

Pope Urban II put great emphasis on two canons. The first was the Truce of God, which, he claimed, would stop brethren in Christianity from fighting each other. The second was the promise of forgiveness of sins for all, who would go to recapture the Holy Sepulchre. In this 'new religion' the business of fighting and killing was highly meritorious, equal to the traditional 'good works', prayer, fasting and charity to the poor.¹¹

Two groups, differing vastly in character, set out for the Holy Land. Almost all elements of society were represented in this crusade. The most notable exception, however, was the absence of all the kings.¹²

The first group was known as Peasants' or People's Crusaders. The task of this group was to recruit new Crusaders. One member of the group, Peter the Hermit, went eastwards, proclaiming that they had to recover the Holy Sepulchre. Many people made themselves available and joined Peter's troop, which consisted mostly of pilgrims. This band departed from Cologne in April 1096, marched through Hungary, crossed the Sava River into Bulgaria and reached Nish on July 2nd, and Sofia on the 12th of July 1096. On August 1st the band arrived in Constantinople. They had been travelling for three months and eleven days.¹³ Peter's Crusaders, consisting of a few knights and thousands of ragged pilgrims, crossed the Bosphorus and were then escorted by the Byzantine Army. They camped in Civitot and unsuccessfully tried to

¹¹ John France, "The Capture of Jerusalem," *History Today*, 04. 1997, p.38

¹² Jonathan Phillips, p.18

¹³ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. 1, pp.258-262

recover Nicaea. They were defeated by the troops of Kilij Arslan¹⁴ on about August 10th, 1096.

Another section of the People's Crusaders, led by Folkmar, Gottschalk and Emicho, also set out for the Holy Sepulchre. Unfortunately, however, because of weak leadership and a serious lack of funds for the long journey, only a small number of these people actually reached Constantinople.

The first victims of the Crusades were the Jews of Germany. Some of the Crusaders could not understand why it was right to kill the enemies of Christ abroad and leave untouched His enemies at home.¹⁵ This slaughter of the Jews was carried out by Emicho's band.

The second group of Crusaders was known as the Knight's Crusaders. The five armies set out for the Holy Land. The first army led by Hugh of Vermandois departed from France about the middle of August 1096. His army travelled through southern Italy, crossed the Adriatic and arrived at Constantinople in November 1096. However, he arrived with "a scant army" because most of his followers had been lost in a storm.¹⁶ The second army was led by Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lorraine, and his brother, Baldwin of Boulogne. They departed from the West about the same time as Hugh. He followed the northern route, which the People's Crusade had used the previous year. The third army led by Bohemond of Taranto and his nephew Tancred left with the Normans of southern Italy. They crossed the sea

¹⁴ His rule covered much of Asia Minor.

¹⁵ Terry Jones and Alan Ereira, *Crusades, Facts on File*, 1995, p.31

¹⁶ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. 1, p.266

fifteen days after Hugh and arrived at Constantinople on April 10. The fourth army led by Duke Robert of Normandy, his cousin Robert, Count of Flanders, and his brother-in-law Count Stephen of Blois. They set out for the Holy Land in the autumn of 1096 and arrived at Constantinople about May 14th, 1097.

The last army led by Count Raymond IV of Toulouse probably left in December 1096. Adhemar, Bishop of Le Puy, the papal legate, accompanied Raymond's Crusaders. His army, numerically the largest, crossed Italy, passed down the Dalmatian coast and reached Constantinople April 21st, 1097.

At Constantinople, Alexius I, the Emperor of the Byzantine, insisted that the Crusade leaders promise to restore any former lands of the Byzantine Empire that they would conquer. Some leaders refused to accept the request of Alexius but eventually agreed to the proposal. In return, Alexius promised to give military and logistical support.

In May 1097, the First Crusaders crossed the Bosphorus with Alexius' kind assistance. The first objective of the Crusaders was Nicaea, which was a gateway to Turkish territory. Byzantine Imperial troops marched with the Crusaders. On the night of 18-19 June, the Crusaders entered Nicaea by means of boats that slipped silently across the Ascanian Lake; the garrison capitulated without a fight. By the first glimmerings of dawn, the banners of the Emperor were already fluttering over the city walls.¹⁷ In accordance with the promise, the city was handed over to the Emperor.

¹⁷ Amin Maalouf, *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, trans. Jon Rothschild, New York: Schocken Books, 1984, p.13

Four months later, the Crusaders reached the Iron Bridge of Yagi-Siyan's territory, three hours' distance from Antioch, the chief city of Syria. After pitching their camp around the city, they blocked the supply route and despoiled throughout the district. Yagi-Siyan had sent his son to transmit the news to the various Muslim leaders of Syria. Ibn al-Qalanisi tells us that in Damascus Yaghi-Siyan's son spoke of a holy war(jihad). However, in Syria, in the eleventh century, the jihad was no more than a slogan brandished by princes in distress.¹⁸ The Crusaders had pressed on with the long siege, but in the end had recovered the city on June 3rd, 1098. However, two great problems lay ahead. First, the moment the city was invaded, the indefatigable Shams al-Dawla, the son of Yaghi-Siyan, had barricaded himself in the citadel with a small group of fighters. Second, three days later a Turkish army, under the Emir of Mosul, came to relieve Antioch and besieged the Crusaders.

Fortunately, for the Crusaders, this Muslim army was in no way similar to the previous one, but on the contrary, it was an easygoing company. Then, an extraordinary event occurred. A monk, in the following of Raymond declared that if they could find a staff of the Messiah, they would be victorious. After the Crusaders fasted and did penance for three days, they discovered it in Antioch. Eventually, on June 28th, 1098, the Crusaders beat the Turkish army and won an apparently miraculous victory.

The Emperor Alexius had advised leaders of Crusaders to ally with the Fatimid of Egypt against the Seljuk Turks, but the Crusaders were ignorant of

¹⁸ ibid, p.21

the fact that the two caliphates were hostile to each other. The Fatimids had established a Shiite caliphate in Cairo in opposition to the Sunni caliphate in Baghdad. In the second half of the eleventh century, they had been waging a war against the Seljuks and other Turkish soldiers of fortune for control of Palestine and Syria.¹⁹

After a long rest, the Crusaders went southward to Jerusalem and attacked Maarrat an-Numan. On May 19th, 1099, they crossed the Dog River, just north of Beirut, and entered the Fatimid territory. Thereafter the Crusaders reached the city of Jerusalem before June 7th, 1099 without any trouble.

The Crusaders had faced difficult problems for they experienced a lack of food and water. Because they approached the Egyptian army, the Christian army became demoralized, but as at Antioch, a vision came to its support.²⁰ On the morning of 6 July, Peter Desiderius declared that he had seen Bishop Adhemar of Le Puy, who presided over the papal legate and died after regaining Antioch. He commanded the whole army to walk barefooted around the walls of the Holy City and to repent of their sins, as was done in the days of Joshua before the walls of Jericho fell, if they wanted to recover the Holy Sepulchre. Once more, the Crusaders were burning with the passion of religion.

After one week, the Christian army attacked the infidel army in Jerusalem. At long last the Crusaders recovered the Holy Sepulchre on July 15th, 1099 (the twenty-second day of the month of Sha'ban, in the year of the Hegira

¹⁹ Robert Irwin, "Muslim responses to the Crusades," *History Today*, 04. 1997, p.44

²⁰ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. 1, p. 335

492), after a forty-day siege. They massacred the Muslims and burned the Temple of Hope and all the corpses as well.

The result of the First Crusade was that the Latin States of the East were born: the county of Antioch, the county of Edessa, the county of Tripoli and the kingdom of Jerusalem.

2.1.2 The Second Crusade

Like the First Crusade, the Second received stimulation from the East. As early as the summer of 1145, pilgrims and travellers, on their return from Jerusalem, had spread the sad news of the fall of Edessa to Islam during the preceding December.²¹ This news gave to the Pope Eugenius the impetus to follow the example of Urban.

Zengi has been hailed as the First great combatant of the jihad²² against the Crusaders. He imposed the strictest discipline on his troops, unlike other armies against previous Crusaders. He devoted far more time and energy to warfare with Muslim rivals more than with the Franks of Palestine. He took over Mosul in September 1127 and the next year his army occupied Aleppo. Zengi had begun taking control of Syria, systematically challenging the Latin States.²³ On Christmas Eve of 1144, Zengi's army recaptured Edessa, the

²¹ *ibid*, p.466

²² Amin Maalouf, p.113

²³ Matti Moosa, "The Crusades: An Eastern perspective, with emphasis on Syriac sources," *Muslim World*, Issue 93. No.2, April. 2003, p.263

first of the four Christian states born out of the First Crusade, and thus, achieved their obligations in the Holy war. It was not until Zengi recaptured Edessa that the Muslims began to reconquer lands taken by the Crusaders. With the recapture the spirit of the Holy War (jihad) shifted to the Muslim camp. It sparked a dormant pan-Islamic spirit, which materialized in counter-crusades that continued until the last Crusader was thrown out of the land.²⁴

The horrible news of the fall of Edessa had spread throughout the West by pilgrimages. Pope Eugenius III immediately called for a second Crusade on 1st, December, 1145. St. Bernard, the papal legate, preached Crusade sermons to the French and the Germans.

The second Crusade would be a better-organized expedition than the previous one, because it was led by the two chief Western monarchs, the king of France, Louis VII and the Emperor of Germany, Conrad who took up the cross themselves.

At the end of May 1146, Conrad, the king of Germany, started his journey to the East. The German Crusaders reached Constantinople on about September 10th. King Louis and the French army having arrived in June.

The German army crossed the Bosphorus into Asia Minor, where it split in two. Conrad III's half-brother, Bishop Otto of Friesing, led the non-combatant pilgrims toward the Holy Sepulchre, while Conrad's army went into battle with the Turks near Dorylaeum in October, where it was heavily defeated. He then

²⁴ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), A History of The Crusades, 6 vols: Norman P. Zacour and Harry W. Hazard (ed), 'The Impact of The Crusades on The Near East,' Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, vol. 5, 1985, p.35

fell ill and returned to Constantinople. Conrad's health recovered as soon as he sailed directly to Acre in the middle of March 1148.

At a council in Acre on 24 June, the Crusaders and the nobles of the Kingdom of Jerusalem agreed to attack Damascus²⁵, a unique Moslem ally. The attack was launched late in July. The combined Crusader army captured the orchards and laid siege to the city. The citizens were in desperate straits, but then the situation changed. Reinforcements began to pour into Damascus from the north and the attackers were held at bay for several days²⁶ and suffered the pains of thirst. Such being the case, they decided upon withdrawal, but this was a disastrous mistake. The Turkish troops harassed the crusaders, who lost their fighting spirit.

The Second Crusade broadened to encompass the conflicts in Spain and the Baltic. Scottish and English Crusaders set sail for the Holy Land in April 1147. After suffering stormy weather, they arrived at Oporto in the Iberian Peninsula on June 16th. The Pope had authorized King Alfonso VII of Castile to equate his campaign against the Moors in the Iberian Peninsula with the Crusade to the Holy Land. Scottish and English Crusaders joined the Portuguese army in the occupation of Lisbon. They began attacking Lisbon on July 1st. After a long siege, the Crusaders conquered the city. This was one of the few permanent results of that great effort known as the Second Crusade²⁷.

²⁵ Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The atlas of the Crusades*, London: Times Books, 1991, p.50

²⁶ Terry Jones and Alan Ereira, p.122

²⁷ Richard Ager Newhall, *The Crusades*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Inc, 1969, p.59

Most of the Crusaders decided to remain as settlers, and some left for the Holy Land.

In October, St. Bernard, the papal legate, gave permission to leaders in Saxony to regard their attack on the pagan Wends in Pomerania as part of the crusading enterprise.

The Second Crusaders went east for the purpose of assisting Crusaders that had settled in the Palestine. There were expeditions against the Moors in the Iberian Peninsula and against the Wends in Pomerania, all in all a grandiose conception far surpassing the aims of the First Crusade and pointing to later adaptations of the crusading idea.²⁸ The consequences of the Second Crusade were the mutual recriminations that ensued on soured relations between the West and the Crusader States for an entire generation²⁹. Thereafter, the friction between French and Germans, Crusaders and Greeks, Crusaders and Syrian native Christians, and newly arrived Crusaders and inhabitants of the Latin State made cooperation on a grand scale impossible for a long time to come.

2.1.3 The Third Crusade

As a consequence of amazing luck, Saladin became the ruler of Syria and Egypt. His first stroke of luck happened in Egypt. Egypt was thrown into

²⁸ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. 1, p.465

²⁹ Jonathan Riley-Smith, 1991, p.50

confusion by the misgovernment of Shawar, the vizier of the Egyptians, therefore Nur al-din, the ruler of Syria, ordered Asad al-din Shirkuh who was Saladin's uncle to regain Egypt. Saladin up to that time had played a subordinate role. On January 8, 1169, Shirkuh finally and triumphantly entered Cairo together with Saladin. But he died nine weeks later, and Saladin succeeded to the office.

After Saladin took over Egypt, the relations with Nur al-din deteriorated. Saladin was less forthcoming about actually providing his master with the money and military assistance which he was repeatedly asked for.³⁰ Finally, Nur al-din tried to invade Egypt, to conduct an audit on Saladin's financial disbursements in the newly acquired province. However, before the auditor could make his report to Damascus, on 15 May 1174, Nur al-din also died. Saladin's luck was infallible.³¹

The ruler of Aleppo, al Salif, who was Nur al-din's heir, declared himself regent. But on October 28th Saladin became the ruler of Damascus, and so a struggle ensued for political power in Syria. This was Saladin's first step toward encircling the crusader states.

Saladin was not really very active in the struggle against the Christians until 1183, after Zangid Aleppo had recognized his supremacy.³² In fact, he spent most of his time warring with Muslim rivals. Saladin commenced recovering

³⁰ Robert Irwin, "Islam and the Crusades 1096-1699," in Jonathan Riley-Smith (ed), *The Oxford Illustrated history of the Crusades*, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, p.231

³¹ Terry Jones and Alan Ereira, p.139

³² Robert Irwin, p.232

Palestine from the West, and for the first time he gained the supremacy in Syria.

The men of Jerusalem had experienced a series of misfortunes. It is true that Kings Baldwin IV (1174–1185) and Baldwin V (1185–1186) died at an early age of a fatal disease, and their followers split into two factions to take over the regency. There is no simple explanation for the characteristics of these two groups. Broadly speaking they were, the “native barons” and the “newcomers.”³³ The former had already settled in Jerusalem and the latter group was likely to be the warlike adventurers from the West.

On Wednesday, 1st July 1187, Saladin led a huge force over the Jordan River into Tiberias. Both armies met at Hattin, and the King of Jerusalem, Guy, was captured and his troops were slaughtered. After the victory at Hattin, Saladin attacked Galilee, Samaria, and the southern part of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. These operations were very successful. Finally, the Muslim army besieged Jerusalem. Balian of Ibelin defended the city, but after a fortnight's siege, he capitulated in order to save the people's lives. Friday, the 2nd October 1187 (27 Rajab 583 by the Muslim calendar) was a memorable day on which the Muslim flags were hoisted over the walls of Jerusalem.³⁴

Saladin's advance in Palestine continued unabated. Eventually, he had recovered most of Palestine before the Third Crusaders showed up in October 1192. Only Tyre among the cities of the Kingdom of Jerusalem now

³³ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. 1, p.592

³⁴ Francesco Gabrieli, Arab Historians of the Crusades, trans. E.J. Costello, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London: Melbourne and Henley, 1984, p.142

remained.

After the horrible failure of the Second Crusade, Europe had enough of Crusades for a while. However, the bad news about the fall of the Jerusalem changed their minds. Pope Gregory VIII initiated a new Crusade.

On 11 May 1189, the Holy Roman Emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, was the first to get his army on the move for the Holy Land. It was undoubtedly one of the largest crusading armies ever to leave Europe.³⁵ Frederick's Crusaders had many troubles on their expedition. Because Isaac Angelos, the Byzantine Emperor, had allied with Saladin he did not help the progress of Frederick's Crusade in the territories of his Empire. The Crusaders suffered badly from hunger, thirst and ambushes. As a last straw, on June, 10th, Frederick drowned as he crossed the River Selef (Cöksu) near Antioch. His son the Duke of Swabia was put in charge of the army, but many of the Crusaders deserted.

Richard, the King of England, met Phillip, the King of France, at Vézelay and decided to go to the Holy Land by sea. Philip marched his army to Genoa and Richard marched to Marseilles. The two kings' fleets joined at Messina in Sicily. The relations between the two kings became very frosty. On March 30, 1191, Philip sailed on his way and reached Acre on April 20th. On April 10th, Richard sailed to Cyprus.

The siege of Acre had lasted for almost two years. Philip joined the siege but did not prove to be an inspirational leader. After Richard's arrival on June

³⁵ Hans Eberhard Mayer, *The Crusades*, trans. John Gillingham, London: Oxford University Press, 1972, p.138.

8th, the siege was pressed more vigorously. Finally, the Turkish garrison surrendered on July 12th, 1191.

Richard was anxious to get to Jerusalem and then sent his troops on the march south towards Jaffa on August 22nd. After a forced march, Richard's army reached Arsuf, only about fifteen miles distant,³⁶ on September 7th. Saladin launched a full-scale attack, but the Muslims were beaten. As a result, Richard took Jaffa. After the battle of Arsuf, they maintained a truce for a little while.

Richard had a strong ambition to be the conqueror of the Holy City. Nevertheless, whether he liked it or not, he had to go home. His brother, John, was creating trouble in England, and Philip was threatening Normandy. So he moved to Acre for his departure.

Just then, Saladin suddenly attacked Jaffa on July 27th, 1192. The news reached Richard at Acre. He immediately dispatched a squadron of galleys to Jaffa with his small troop. When he arrived at Jaffa, the garrisons were yet to give up a citadel. His troop, perhaps fifty knights and a few hundred crossbowmen,³⁷ camped outside the walls. After the dark on August 4th, Saladin attacked the Crusaders' camp. After a fierce battle, Richard's troop found safety in Jaffa.

In the end, King Richard made a truce with Saladin and on October 9th,

³⁶ Terry Jones and Alan Ereira, p.186

³⁷ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), *A History of the Crusades*, 6 vols: Robert Lee Wolff and Harry W. Hazard (ed), 'The Later Crusades 1189-1311,' Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, vol. 2, 1962, p.84

1192, sailed home to curb his ambitious brother, Count John. The Third Crusade was ended. The Third Crusaders had recovered most of the coastal region and had re-established the Kingdom of Jerusalem.

2.1.4 The Fourth Crusade

Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) issued a crusading bull on 15 August 1198, but he was unable to enlist any kings, because political conditions in the West were not favorable for a crusade.³⁸ England and France were at war. The powerful Count Baldwin of Flanders was also at loggerheads with his French suzerain. Germany was in a situation because of two rivals, Philip of Swabia, who was allied with France, and Otto of Brunswick, who was allied with England. Genoa and Pisa, two of the great maritime powers, were also at war.

After more than a year, the call was answered by the Counts of Northern France and the Low Countries. This also included Count Baldwin of Flanders, his brother-in-law Count Thibaut of Champagne, Count Hugh of St. Pol and Count Louis of Blois and the Northern Italian, Marquis Bouiface of Montferrat.

There were many purely personal motives: it had become part of a family tradition to go on a Crusade. For some the shame of the failure of the Third Crusade needed to be erased. For many it had been the forceful preaching of Fulk of Neuilly's that had inspired them. Others felt the need to respond to

³⁸ Donald E. Queller, *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople 1201-1204*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977, p.1

their lord's decision to go on a Crusade.³⁹

The Crusaders decided that the best way to repossess Jerusalem was through a conquest of Egypt, because Egypt had supplied the Holy Land with financial and strategic strength. However, this plan required a huge naval force. At last, in April 1201, the Pope decided on a treaty with Venice. The Venetians had wanted to first open the most lucrative markets and then take up the Cross. In terms of the contract, the Pope granted them permission to continue trading with Egypt in non-strategic goods.

The invitation at exactly this time from Innocent III, to supply the shipping for the Crusade he was planning, seemed heaven-sent.⁴⁰ However, in the summer of 1202, the Crusaders faced terrible problems as a result of the lack of money and men. Without delay Enrico Dandolo, Doge of Venice since 1193, suggested an attack on the port of Zara, once a Venetian dependency, but now in the hands of the King of Hungary. The leaders had no stomach for such a thing, but they had no other option.

The Crusaders sailed near to the coast and arrived at Zara on November 10th. In the end, the Crusaders took the city on November 24th, 1202, and the Venetians once again controlled Zara. The Pope, Innocent III, was furious because the city was a Catholic city.

In early 1203, envoys that were sent from Alexius Angelus⁴¹ arrived in the

³⁹ Michael Angold, *The Fourth Crusade: Event and Contest*, Harlow; New York: Longman, 2003, pp.81-2

⁴⁰ *ibid*, p.76

⁴¹ Alexius Angelus was a nephew of Alexius III. His father, the emperor Isaac II Angelus, had been blinded and deposed by his own brother, Alexius III, in 1195.

Crusaders' camp at Zara. He suggested that he would supply money and men, if the Crusaders helped to reinstate him on the throne of the Byzantine Empire. Once again, the fourth Crusaders used their weapons against Christian brothers. The leaders prevailed in persuading Pope Innocent III to allow them to launch an attack against Constantinople. They reasoned that the heretics were the enemies of God.

In July 1203, the Crusaders marched on Constantinople. The Franks attacked from the land and the Venetians from the sea. Alexius III, the Byzantine Emperor, first pretended to protect, but after a very fierce day's fighting, he suddenly and disgracefully fled during the night.

As a result, Alexius Angelus occupied the throne as Alexius IV, but he landed in a difficult situation, because of the citizens' mutiny against his authority. Eventually, Alexius IV was strangled on 27 January 1204.

At the same time, Mourzouphos, assisted by some of the nobles, performed a coronation ceremony in St. Sophia. The new Emperor, Alexius V, neglected to fulfil the promise of Alexius IV. Consequently, the crusaders decided to attack Constantinople. In March 1204, they camped outside the city.

On Friday morning, April 9th, the Crusaders launched a full-scale assault. The Venetians' fleet approached the sea walls along the Golden Horn and troops landed. They took the city after four days of direct assault. Many of the inhabitants were slaughtered and women of all ages were raped. The amount of 50,000 silver marks was paid to the Doge of Venice. The leaders of the Crusade had spoils to the value of about 400,000 silver marks. On May 16th, Baldwin, Count of Flanders, was crowned the first Latin Emperor of

Constantinople in the Hagia Sophia. Byzantine was divided between the Latin Emperor, the Venetians, and the other leaders.

It was plunder, above all else, in which the Crusaders were interested, for whatever might have been their original motives in taking the Cross. They were now venal self-seekers.⁴² The Pope, Innocent III hailed the news of the conquest of Constantinople as a miraculous vindication of the papal claims to supremacy over the Byzantine Church.⁴³ However, the Crusaders understood their success as a manifestation of God's will.

Unfortunately, Greek resistance did not emerge as a single united effort against the Latin conqueror. Theodore Lascaris, the son-in-law of Emperor Alexius III, in Asia Minor, established the kingdom of Nicaea and concentrated in keeping their region. Another of Angeli-Comnenian ancestry set himself up in Epirus in western Greece as Michael Angelus Comnenus Ducas. There was acute rivalry between these two Greek kingdoms. The Balkan principality was bent on establishing itself as heir of the Greek imperial ruler just before the Fourth Crusade commenced.

2.1.5 The Fifth Crusade

Pope Innocent III had an unsatisfied feeling about the debacle of the

⁴² John Godfrey, 1204 The Unholy Crusade, New York: Oxford University Press, 1980, p.127

⁴³ Michael Angold, The Byzantine Empire 1025-1204: A Political History, London; New York: Longman, 1984, p.284

Fourth Crusade. In April 1213, he announced that the Fourth Lateran Council would be held in November 1215, to deal with the reform of the church and the planned Crusade. He dispatched a legate to preach recruiting, and he especially sent James of Vitry, who had preached in the third Crusade and against the Albigensians, to preach about the new Crusade in the Latin settlements of Syria.

In May 1216, the Pope offered transport for the Crusaders by the Genoese and Pisan, both who agreed to do this. Nevertheless, the Pope died on 16 July 1216, in the midst of his preparations for his last Crusade. His successor, Honorius III lead the Crusade, but his political strength was inferior to his predecessor. Therefore, he postponed the departure of the Crusaders until the following year.

At the beginning of July 1217, the Fifth Crusaders marched to the Holy Land. They were combined Germans, Hungarians and Austrians. Their leaders were King Andrew of Hungary, Duke Leopold of Austria and Otto of Meran. Only a few Frenchmen joined because most French nobles disliked Hungarians. They spent time without outcome in Palestine. After the arrival of the new Crusaders from Germany, Frisia and Portugal, the Crusaders decided to attack Egypt. On 24 May 1218, the crusading army embarked at Acre and sailed towards Damietta.

On May 27th, the Crusaders arrived in the harbour of Damietta. They camped out on the west bank of the Nile. On August 25th, 1218, they had succeeded in taking a strategic tower. Saladin's brother, Sayf al-Din al-Adil, ruler of Egypt, died of grief. His son al-Kamil became the overall Sultan. Al-

Kamil's army began to fight against the Crusaders. But his effort was not worth the trouble, because more troops were arriving continuously, especially Italians with Pelagius of Albano, who was the cardinal legate sent by the Pope, during the autumn of 1218. Once again, the Crusaders joined the Italian merchants because Pelagius joined the crusaders of Pisa and Genoa.

Then al-Kamil offered a long-term truce and the restoration of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, excluding Transjordan, in March 1219. However, Pelagius rejected this offer. The Crusaders eventually took Damietta in November and the siege carried on in 1221. A great many Crusaders were confused. But from the Italian merchants' perspective, Jerusalem was irrelevant. It was economically useless. The whole point of this war was to take over Egypt and gain control of Alexandria, one of the greatest ports of the Mediterranean, as Venice had taken Constantinople.⁴⁴

After Saladin's death, his Ayyubid empire was divided among hostile kinsmen, between Egypt and Syria. But Al-Mansur, al-Kamil's kinsmen in Syria, sent contingents of troops to the assistance of Egypt.

The Crusaders marched towards Cairo, moving up the east bank of the Nile. However, al-Kamil had opened the sluice gate, it being high water on the Nile at that time of year and the countryside was completely flooded.⁴⁵ Pelagius found a boat to escape from the waters but it was difficult. The Crusaders were bogged down. In the end Pelagius proposed terms of peace that would leave the Crusaders free to leave. On 8 September 1221 al-Kamil entered

⁴⁴ Terry Jones and Alan Ereira, p.220

⁴⁵ Hans Eberhard Mayer, 2ed, p.227

Damietta in triumph.

The Fifth Crusade that was launched had probably killed more people than all earlier Crusades combined. Nevertheless, not a single one of the Crusaders of Pelagius had entered Moslem territory. Their victims had all been Christians.⁴⁶

2.1.6 The Crusade of Frederick II

Frederick II, the Holy Roman Emperor and ruler of southern Italy, had wanted to take the Cross, even since his coronation in 1215. With all his heart, he wanted to have independence from the papacy for his Crusade. He was the first person to try to bring a Crusade to a successful conclusion by using political, rather than military, means.⁴⁷ He did not have any ideas about everlasting war and the destruction of Islam. He only wanted to rule in Jerusalem because he was the Emperor, the leader of Christendom.⁴⁸ His ambition was quite possible because he had enough power and money.

Pope Innocent III had completely ignored the Crusading vow of Frederick II in 1215, at the Fourth Lateran Council. After that, Frederick did not repeatedly receive a demand from the Pope to fulfill his vow. In the meantime, the Fifth Crusade had failed. Finally, Pope Gregory IX threatened him with

⁴⁶ Terry Jones and Alan Ereira, p.219

⁴⁷ Hans Eberhard Mayer, 2ed, p.231

⁴⁸ Terry Jones and Alan Ereira, p.221

excommunication, if he did not fulfil his vow.

Frederick prepared his own Crusade. Meanwhile, the empress Constance died in June 1222. At the same time he made a new arrangement for his marriage to Isabel, daughter of John of Brienne and heiress to the kingdom of Jerusalem.

On 15 August 1227, Frederick fulfilled his vow to take the Cross and departed for the Holy Land having in the meantime, married the Queen of Jerusalem. But after a few days he returned to Italy owing to serious illness. Therefore, on 29 September, Pope Gregory IX excommunicated him for not fulfilling his vow.

During his stay in Italy, al-Kamil dispatched an envoy to him and offered to help him against his brother al-Mu'azzam, governor of Damascus. Frederick accepted. When Frederick arrived at Acre on 7th September 1228, the situation had changed. Al-Mu'azzam had suddenly died. After al-Mu'azzam's death, an-Nasir, his son and heir, made constant efforts for peace with his uncle al-Kamil. So it was no use holding on to this alliance. But Frederick was not in a position to seek a victory through the force of arms. His army was small. He was already committed to diplomatic rather than military action in his relations with al-Kamil.⁴⁹

In November 1228, Frederick's army marched down the coast to Jaffa. This action was a means to an end to press al-Kamil. Al-Kamil was busy besieging Damascus, so he conducted negotiations with Frederick for reuniting the

⁴⁹ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. 2, p.452

Ayubid Empire. Finally, on the 18th February, 1229, Jerusalem was restored to the Franks, but with a ten years alliance, open for negotiations. On the 17th March, 1229, Frederick entered Jerusalem with a glorious ceremony. The Pope was furious, so he excommunicated Frederick for making peace rather than pushing for military victory. In addition, the Pope called a new Crusade against the Emperor Frederick II, the political enemy of the Papacy.

The Crusade of Frederick II is unique in the history of the Middle Ages, reflecting not so much the spirit of the age as the complex Character and cosmopolitan attitude of the emperor.⁵⁰ He was opposed at every step by the papacy and had been excommunicated several times. But he had achieved his poetical ambition.

2.1.7 The Crusade of St. Louis

2.1.7.1 The First Crusade of St. Louis

The Khwarismian conquest of Jerusalem made no significant impression on Europe. In 1245 Pope Innocent IV held a Council and preached a new Crusade, which had little success.

The pious Louis IX, king of France, fell desperately ill. In December 1244, he swore a vow to take the Cross if he recovered from the illness. As soon as his health recovered, he fulfilled his vow. Louis's devotion to the crusading

⁵⁰ *ibid*, p.461

ideal was evident even to the sceptical Frederick II. Neither the pressure of public opinion nor the emotional exhortations of the clergy were responsible for his taking the Cross.⁵¹ It was a manifestation of passion for Christ.

He hoped to lead a large international expedition to destroy Islam and prepared his crusade to begin in 1245. Unfortunately for Louis, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, above all, the crusade was a permanent factor in the religious thinking of the men on whom it fell to participate. It was seen both as a duty owed to God, comparable to the duty owed by a vassal to his lord.⁵²

The Pope was involved in the great struggle between the two universal powers. Italy was in a state of disorder because of the war of Guelf against Ghibelline. The battleground was for the final showdown for supremacy between the papacy and the emperor after Pope Innocent IV had deposed Emperor Frederick II at the Council of Lyons(1245). The result was that only a handful of Germans and Italians joined the Crusade.⁵³ Henry III of England was kept far too busy by his unruly barons, so it was almost impossible to focus his attention on this Crusade.

But in France Crusade recruitment was more successful. It was true that the appeal of the papal legate, Odo of Châteauroux, of the local preachers, and the king's own influence had got good results for recruitment of Crusaders.

He meticulously prepared for his expedition and decided to attack Egypt

⁵¹ *ibid*, p.488

⁵² Jean Richard, *Saint Louis: Crusader King of France*, tran. Jean Birrell, Cambridge; New York; Port Chester; Melbourne; Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1983, p.87

⁵³ Simon Lloyd, "The Crusades of St Louis," *History Today*, May. 1997, p.38

which controlled Syria. This was sensible and in accordance with a general change in strategy since the time of the Third Crusade.⁵⁴ So he embarked on the 25th August, 1248. On 17 September, he landed at Cyprus, and decided to wait there until the end of May 1249.

After thorough preparation, the army of mostly French Crusaders sailed to the Egyptian city of Damietta, and on 6 June, they captured it without any resistance. Louis well knew that it was impossible to attack Cairo because the annual Nile flood was impending. So he decided to spend the summer and waited for his brother Alphonse and his troops. In late October, Alphonse's army arrived. On 20th November, 1249 the Louis' Crusaders marched along the east bank of the Nile towards Cairo. A few days later, the Crusaders had good luck when the sultan died. This caused a political and military crisis among the Egyptians, because the heir was far away in Syria. However, the regent, the sultan's widow, Shajar-ad-Durr, had control over the situation. In addition, the army completely obeyed the new commander.

Louis' Crusaders were forced to halt on the north bank of the al-Bahr al-Saghir, opposite Mansurah, where the bulk of the Egyptian forces were positioned. On 8th February, 1250 the vanguard, led by Robert of Artois, started to cross the river. Louis had instructed his army that once they had crossed the river they had to join the vanguard. The vanguards then attacked an Egyptian camp and were victorious. Although, they were intoxicated with this small victory, Robert could not be restrained. They pressed on to

⁵⁴ *ibid*, p.39

Mansourah where they were slaughtered in the narrow streets of the town.⁵⁵ It was the critical turning point, for Louis had lost too many men to advance any further.⁵⁶

The Louis' Crusaders suffered due to the bad situation; disease took its toll and they were cut off from supplies coming upstream from Damietta. Eventually, these Crusaders were beaten and retreated from the front. Louis's forces were then surrounded and he himself was taken prisoner. His great Crusade had foundered completely, and there can be no doubt that it was Robert of Artois' behavior at Mansurah that was fundamentally to blame for the failure.⁵⁷ Louis was ransomed for a huge sum in gold and gave up the city of Damietta.

After the ransom was paid, Louis went to the Holy Land and stayed there for almost four years until April 1254. During his stay in the Holy Land, he rebuilt many Christian fortresses.

2.1.7.2 The Second Crusade of St Louis

By dint of his status and personal authority, Louis acted as virtual ruler of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and these were therefore peaceful years in a country whose problems normally included internal dissension on a crippling scale. After Louis's departure Latin Syria collapsed into a state of anarchy.

⁵⁵ Hans Eberhard Mayer, 2ed, p.263

⁵⁶ Simon Lloyd, p.40

⁵⁷ *ibid*, p.40

The situation was worsened by the rivalry between the Military Orders, which pursued semi-autonomous policies towards the Muslims, and the conflict between the Italian trading republics of Genoa, Venice, and Pisa, which conducted their quarrels within the ports of Latin Syria.⁵⁸

The Mamluks struck the Ayubid Empire and repulsed the Mongols in Syria. They had controlled Egypt until it was destroyed by the Ottomans in the early sixteenth century.

The great Sultan Baibars I of the Mamluks, the ruler of the Egypt, took and dismantled Caesarea. Then Haifa and Arsuf were taken in 1265. The next year he took the Templar fortress Saphet in Galilee. Jaffa and Antioch were captured in 1268. His last big gain was the capture of the Hospitaler Fortress of Crac des Chevaliers in 1271.

Louis again took the Cross. He appealed to the French nobles at an assembly on 24 March 1267, to take the Cross, but there was very little enthusiasm for the new crusade. A happy feature of a misfortune, the great lords were accompanying Prince Edward of England. King James I of Aragon also joined the expedition. In view of the general lack of enthusiasm, it seems likely that Louis had to bear even more of the expenses than he had on his previous Crusade.⁵⁹ Louis once again had planned very carefully. Most of the proceeds went towards shipping contracts, beginning with Genoa and Marseille. On 2 July 1270, Louis embarked for Tunis.

The Crusaders landed on the Coast of Tunis without serious opposition. But

⁵⁸ Norman Housley, p.8

⁵⁹ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. 2, p.510

they suffered badly heat, lack of sanitation and scarcity of fresh food brought the usual diseases. Typhus and dysentery, spread through the Crusader camp. Unfortunately, on 25 August Louis died in the camp outside Tunis. Louis' death led to the rapid disintegration of the army, and his brother Charles negotiated a treaty. Prince Edward arrived too late in Tunis, so he and the other leaders sailed on to Acre with a small troop in 1271. They soon abandoned the cause, however. Edward remained in the Holy Land until September 1272. He only succeeded in arranging an eleven years' truce with Baibars.

Saint Louis' death in some sense marks the end of an era in the history of the crusading movement, for Louis' expedition to Tunis proved to be the last of the great international Crusades, led by a European monarch, whose overt goal was the recovery of the Holy Land.⁶⁰ The failure of Louis contributed to the loss of confidence, the hesitation, and even the cynicism, which weakened all later Crusades.⁶¹

2.2 The Minor Crusades

2.2.1 The Children's Crusade

The Children's Crusade in Germany began between Easter and

⁶⁰ Simon Lloyd, p.37

⁶¹ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. 2, p.488

Whitsuntide (25 March-13 May) 1212, while in France, Stephen's Crusade began in June of that year.

In Germany, large crowds of teens began heading south toward the Holy Land. Their leader was Nicholas, a boy from Cologne. Johannes Codagnellus relates that Nicholas had had a vision in which an angel had told him that he and his followers were to liberate the Holy Sepulchre from the heathen Saracens.⁶² There was no evidence that anyone else had, in fact, urged such a movement. When they were asked who had urged them, they answered only "To God."

On 25 July 1212, the Children's Crusaders left Speyer and then crossed the Alps into Italy. They had undergone many hardships in the course of their journey. That year was famous for its hot summer. Many of them died of heat and thirst, some died of hunger, even before they crossed the Alps. They crossed the Alps, arrived in Piacenza on 20 August, and reached Genoa on Saturday, 25 August. Many left the next day, probably deeply disappointed, and certainly so if they had trusted Nicholas' words that God would hasten to aid them and would transport them with dry feet to the Holy Land.⁶³ What happened next is unknown. A chronicler in northern France said that one group of children went to Pisa, where they were given two ships and sailed away, never to be seen again.⁶⁴ A few went to Rome to seek the Pope's

⁶² Johannis Codagnelli Annales Placentini Guelfi, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH Scr. Rer. Germ. 23: p.426, quoted from Peter Raedts, "The Children's Crusade of 1212," *Journal of Medieval History*, 3. 1997, p.290

⁶³ Peter Raedts, p.291

⁶⁴ Douglas Thorburn, *The Children's Crusade*, Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall Ltd, 1985, p.13

release from the vow. A German chronicler said that another group boarded boats, but they were captured by pirates and sold as slaves to the Saracens. According to Alberic of Troisfontaines, some of them went to Marseilles, but he confuses them with the group led by Stephen.⁶⁵ It is certain that of the many thousands who went to Italy, only a tiny number returned home.

In France, during the month of June, a twelve-year-old shepherd boy named Stephen appeared in the village of Cloyes near Vendôme and preached about the vision, which he had received from the Lord. The boy claimed that he had seen Christ in the guise of a poor pilgrim. The Lord had given him a letter from heaven to deliver to the King of France. People congregated around the shepherd from all parts of France. Finally, their numbers mounted to about 30,000. Stephen met the king, who ordered them to return home. It is not certain whether they achieved their ambition of reaching Jerusalem.

According to Alberic, the Children's Crusade, led by Stephen,⁶⁶ went to Marseilles. They met merchants, Hugo Ferreus and Porcus of Marseilles. These wicked merchants offered to take them to the Holy Land without charge, for the glory of God. They took the children on seven large ships. When they were two days on the way, they were struck by a storm. Two of the ships were lost and all the children were drowned. The other five ships arrived in a port in North Africa. The evil merchants sold all the children to Moslem princes and local merchants, and the children became slaves. Saracen princes in

⁶⁵ Hans Eberhard Mayer, p.216

⁶⁶ Peter Raedts has treated as Germans. See p.294

Baghdad had taken eighteen children and compelled them to convert to Islam. The greater part of those who had refused the conversion were martyred in various ways.

We cannot conclude that the crusade of 1212 was really a 'children's' Crusade. But on the whole it is true that the spirit of the age induced innocent people to devote themselves to the wrong passion.

2.2.2 The Crusade against heretics and pagans

Crusaders always harboured enmity toward heretics and pagans. At the first, Crusaders accidentally attacked Jews, heretics, and pagans, but soon the papacy labelled the Crusade against heretic and pagan as a Crusade against the Muslim.

Popular heresy did present a serious challenge. Its manifestations ranged all the way from an effort to return to the simplicity of early Christianity (in a healthy reaction against the temporal power and the presumptions of the ecclesiastical hierarchy), to the setting up what amounted to a rival religion under "Neo-Mani-chaeon" or Catharist leaders.⁶⁷ This heresy was most firmly entrenched in northern Italy and Languedoc. The local clergy, in the late twelfth century, recognized the heresy as the most dangerous of all.

Paganism had lingered until the time of the Crusades, despite the pressure to convert in the Wends, who were neighbours of the converted Saxons and

⁶⁷ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol.2, p.279

Danes. Bernard of Clairvaux in Germany, preaching the Second Crusade, advocated a Crusade against pagan Wends and persuaded north German and Danish nobles to take Cross, in 1147. In that year the Crusaders, consisting of Germans, Danes, Saxons and Czechs, attacked pagan Wends. The Wends converted to Christianity to save their lives, but it did not help. The Crusade against the Wends set a precedent for other pagan and heretic Crusades.

At the council of Rheims (1148), the church excommunicated all protectors “of the heretics of Gascony and Provence,” and the council of Tours (1163) decreed that the Albigensians should be imprisoned and stripped of their property. The third Lateran council (1179) called on secular rulers to use force against the heretics.⁶⁸ In the years immediately following the Council of Verona (1184), where Pope and Emperor agreed that the secular powers should be employed in the service of the Church for the extirpation of heresy, there was developed (in addition to ecclesiastical legislation), a growing body of secular law in the matter of heresy. This indicates that the suppression of heresy was moving from the occasional and the improvised to a conscious policy on the part of Church and State looking toward its eradication.⁶⁹

In 1171 Pope Alexander III declared all wars against the pagans of the Baltic equal to crusades to the Holy Land. Conrad of Masovia, Poland’s most powerful Duke, approached several military orders, the Templars, Hospitallers, the Spanish Order of Calatrava and the Teutonic Order, to fight the pagans in

⁶⁸ Thomas F. Madden (ed), 2002, p.132

⁶⁹ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol.2, p.282

the Eastern Baltic. This cooperation ended because crusaders had not unified. But the Poles continued the Crusade against the Lithuanians. As a result, at the end of the fourteenth century, Lithuania underwent conversion.

In Languedoc, all ranks of society were involved, either as heretics themselves or as defenders of the heretics. So Pope Innocent III was anxious to convert the Albigensian. The Pope requested Philip Augustus, the French king, to take up arms to eradicate heresy in Languedoc. In March 1208, Innocent III called a crusade against the Albigensians. The same indulgences were promised to the new Crusaders as to the Crusaders to the Holy Land. It was the murder at St. Gilles of Peter of Castelnau (who was a papal legate) that was the immediate cause of the Albigensian crusade. Through this murder the papacy was given an excellent excuse to call the Crusade against the Albigensian.

In 1227, Pope Gregory IX pressed for final settlement in Languedoc. Cardinal Romanus was retained as legate with instructions to negotiate peace. To that end he bent all his energies, the result being the Peace of Paris of April 12, 1229. On the same date Raymond was absolved from long-standing excommunication and reconciled with the Church.⁷⁰

2.2.3 The Political Crusade

What is a political Crusade? In one sense, every Crusade is political, for

⁷⁰ *ibid*, p.319

every Crusade aims at conquest, at replacing the rule of unbelievers by that of Christians.⁷¹ But there is an evident difference between a Crusade against Islam or heresy, and a Crusade against secular opponents of the papacy in Western Europe. The one is waged to protect the Christendom, and the other to protect the political authority of the papacy.

In 1135, Pope Innocent II presided over a council at Pisa, which decreed that those who fought against the Pope's enemies (in this case, the South Italian Normans) should enjoy the Indulgence granted to the first Crusaders.⁷² Even before the Crusades, Popes had blessed armies that purported to be serving the Church. Still, there were no Crusades against Christian rulers until 1199, when Pope Innocent III called a Crusade against a minor German noble in order to recover church lands in Italy.⁷³ After this event, the other Popes, Innocent's successors, declared a Crusade against their political enemies in the Christian World.

In 1239 Gregory IX called a Crusade against Frederick II, because he presumed Frederick to be atheistic and heretical, but mostly because the Pope wanted to have a strong position against the Emperor Frederick II that Italy was acquiring at the time. For a long time the papacy continued the Crusade against the Emperor.

Pope Clement V raised the use of the Crusade as a political weapon in his conflict with Venice. As the escalating disorder in Italy required him to seek

⁷¹ *ibid*, p.343

⁷² Jonathan R. Smith, *What were the Crusades?*, 2nd ed, London: Macmillan, 1992, p.20

⁷³ Thomas F. Madden (ed), 2002, p.138

safety in Avignon, the Pope found himself reliant on French protection.

In 1314 Pope John XXII (1316–34), who lived in exile in Avignon, hoping to reassert papal leadership in Italy, refused to recognize the election of Louis IV of Bavaria as Holy Roman Emperor. In 1324 John excommunicated Louis, had himself crowned Emperor by the people of Rome, and briefly established a rival Pope, Nicholas V. The Pope, in Avignon, countered in 1328 by declaring a crusade against Louis. The dispute only ended in 1346, when Clement VI persuaded the electors to depose Louis and elect Charles IV of Luxemburg as his successor. In the Golden Bull (1356), Charles IV carefully defined the imperial election process in such a way that future papal interference was impossible.⁷⁴

2.3 The End of Latin State in the Holy Land

The settlers in the Holy Land had felt greatly relieved, for the news came of the death of Baibars who had menaced them. Baraqa, Baibars' heir, had succeeded to the throne, but Qalawun, the Emir of the Syrian and Mameluk, revolted and took over Egypt.

Qalawun, the ruler of Egypt, began to attack the Franks. His first aim was Tripoli. His troops marched to Tripoli in April 1285, and he captured the city at the end of May. The news of the fall of Tripoli produced a shock wave in the West. Since 1286 Edward I had acted as intermediary between the Papal-

⁷⁴ *ibid*, p. 139

Angevin party and the Aragonese, and he had taken the Cross in Gascony in 1287. Pope Nicholas IV took immediate steps to protect Acre. Nicholas also ordered crusade preaching. However, it was completely unsatisfactory, for no barons responded to the Call of the Pope. The only people to respond were Italian merchants. This was a grave error. A large force of Italian Crusaders arrived in Acre in August of 1290. But lacking leadership and finding no military activity in hand, they attacked and killed peaceful Muslim peasants and merchants.⁷⁵ On the 5th, April 1291 a massive Mamluk army under al-Ashraf marched to Acre, the last city of the Crusaders. On May 4th King Henry of Cyprus arrived with valuable reinforcements, but the city's defenders were still comparatively few in number. King Henry, the Master of the Hospitallers, Odo of Grandson and John of Grailly were able to escape, but low water prevented many vessels from entering the harbour and most of the defenders, clergy, and remaining civilians were either killed or taken prisoner. By nightfall al-Ashraf's troops held all Acre except for the Templars' stronghold, which resisted until 28 May. The remainder of the Holy Land fell easily into Mamluk hands.

The pontiffs in the fifteenth century once again sought to revive crusading passion against the Turks, but the papacy had been too badly discredited and had lost much of its authority. It was not able to rekindle the religious zeal of 1095 that recognized the danger of the Turks in Europe.

⁷⁵ Norman Housley, p.16.

2.4 Conclusion

The Papacy and the Crusaders, on the surface, had recognized the principal objectives, which had presented themselves. The first was the restoration of the Holy Places to Christian rule. The second was the defense of the Byzantine Empire against the danger of Turkish conquest, and the necessity of driving them out of Asia Minor. The third was that the Papacy wanted to reunite Christianity between the Eastern and Western churches and exact control over them. The Crusaders, however, had a good motive, but as time went by, the minds of Crusaders were changed and expanded.

The Crusaders had to leave their families, wealth and lands in order to recover the Holy Land from the Muslims. Everyone who took the Cross had received the indulgence. The indulgence consisted of: the Crusader's release from the burden of sin. If they should die on the road to the Holy Land, they would immediately enter the Kingdom of Heaven, and their families, wealth and lands would be protected by the Papacy. But the issuance of indulgences suffered the same discrediting misuse as the Crusade itself, for the Crusade began to be dissipated into all kinds of other enterprises. There were Crusaders fighting in Spain against the Moors, in the south of France against the Albigensians, in Prussia against the northern pagans, in England against John Lackland, and in Germany against Frederick II.⁷⁶ The Crusade had become an expedition not for the protection of Christendom, but for the

⁷⁶ Louis Brehier, 'The Crusades: The Victory of Idealism', in James A. Brundage(ed), *Motives and Achievements*, Boston: Heath and Company, 1965, p.86

establishment of the supremacy of the Pope.

The mind of the Crusader was expanded, but behavior towards crusading was weakened. There were several reasons for this state of affairs. Firstly, crusading was used for the political purposes, especially by the Papacy, so the people did not find a just cause to Crusade. Secondly, there was increasing doubt among the people about the validity of the indulgence. Thirdly, the political influence of the papal curia toward secular rulers was weakening.

The Crusades brought about two bad results. First, the political and religious dissensions of East and West were definitely aggravated, and the power of the Byzantine Empire was weakened, especially, by the Fourth Crusade. Second, Islam's hatred for Christianity was more intense than the little bit of harassment the Crusaders caused Islam. Islam regarded the Crusade as an invasion, and it was the loss of Jerusalem that robbed the Muslims of a third of their best provinces.

Chapter Three: The influence of the Crusades on Christianity and Islam

3.1 The influence of the Crusades in The West

The Crusades were the turning point for Europe, pushing the continent out of an isolated Dark Age and into the modern world.⁷⁷ This occurred during the period of the Crusades, which greatly changed most of the ways of living and thinking. In regard to the social and political influence of the Crusades, it is necessary to be cautious, lest too many of the changes, which took place in Europe during the period of the Crusades, be ascribed to their influence.

There is no doubt about it that the feudal society was in a process of slow transformation – national monarchies were gradually beginning to form, and the Papacy was showing signs of decay. However, we should not assume that the crusades themselves were anything more than contributory factors to the transformations of the later Middle Ages.

Prior to the Crusades, the Western World had suffered pain from internal struggles. The early Crusades gave many Western people a sense of adventure and excitement. Stories of bravery and daring were told by returning Crusaders, stories like the capture of Jerusalem and Richard's

⁷⁷ Andrew Curry, "The First Holy War", *Mysteries of Faith*, 2003, p69,

victory at Arsuf in 1192. In addition, the Italian towns (Pisa, Venice, and Genoa) increased their trade with the East, and many princes and nobles gained estates in the East. In the long-term, Western Europe learnt much from the Moslems: in mathematics, medicine and geography, the building of castles, and so forth.

However, as time went on the crusades became more and more unpopular in Europe. The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the other Principalities were short-lived, and many brutal acts were committed in the name of God. The later Crusades lost sight of the original idea of crusading, and were little more than raiding expeditions. Many of Crusaders lost their lives fighting in the Holy Land.

3.1.1 Political and Military

Before the Crusades, a reasonable amount of cultural exchange existed between Western Europe and the Islamic World, and the Europeans enjoyed Islamic civilizations. In Spain, Christian and Muslim had been living side by side since the eighth century. At the worst, this warfare did not prevent the continuation of cultural exchange between the two worlds. In the period of the Crusades, cultural exchange was greater than before, but after the Fall of Acre in 1291, however, it ceased altogether.

The Crusaders had two ways in which to reach the Holy Land – by land, and by sea. The one more difficult than the other, because the way by land

took a long time and crossed several national borders. As time went by, pilgrims and Crusaders made more use of the sea route to the Holy Land.

The Italian maritime cities (especially Pisa, Genoa, and Venice) took the opportunity of increasing their maritime power. In the period of the Crusades, these cities accumulated the profits of trading with the Muslims, and of transporting pilgrims and Crusaders. In addition, the Italian maritime cities had powerful fleets, so they assisted in the conquest of Muslim lands. In compensation for their assistance, they acquired commercial and political privileges.

Pisans assisted the First Crusaders. They sent out the larger fleet, for it was carrying Archbishop Daimbert, the papal legate. Daimbert was shortly to become Patriarch of Jerusalem, and the Pisans, in return, received many more economic concessions. In the Crusader States, for example, they occupied a special quarter in Jaffa. The Genoese also assisted the First Crusaders and profited greatly from plundering. They also obtained certain commercial privileges in Antioch. The Venetians, under the Doge Ordelafo Falier, sent a fleet to Palestine in 1110. They supported Baldwin of Jerusalem in his attack on the town of Sidon. The Venetian fleet dispersed the Fatimid fleet and Sidon fell to the Christians in December of that year. In return, the Venetians obtained the new trading concessions in Acre. Early in 1124, the Crusaders urged the Venetians to attack the city of Tyre. The Venetians agreed – on condition that they were exempted from all taxes and dues in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The Crusaders marched on Tyre and the Venetians sailed to a point north of the city. The siege of Tyre began in February 1124,

and in July its Muslim garrison surrendered. Italian city-republics, which provided naval help to the Crusaders in this way, were always interested in securing commercial advantages in return.⁷⁸ As a necessary consequence, the Italian maritime cities secured many colonies in the Mediterranean and the Near East. It was through the increase in political and military power that the influence of these cities was enhanced in the Western World.

The Religious Order had been organized by the knights and was being implemented by Templar and Hospitaller. Their general aim was to protect pilgrims to Jerusalem and the Latin State. In 1190, German Knights organized the Teutonic Order and made constant efforts to convert pagan Prussia and Lithuania to Christianity. In Spain, the Spanish Order was established to drive out the Moor from that country.

The Crusaders and settlers in the Holy Land were armed with new weapons, and had a new technique of war. The 'concentric' castle concept was developed in the West, and carried by the Crusaders to the East. The crossbow is said to have been an import from the Orient. The use of mail for the knight and his horse is ascribed to the influence of the Crusaders. The wearing of cotton quilts or pads under the armour is attributed to the same origin.⁷⁹ The Crusades gave rise to the development of military

⁷⁸ John Godfrey, p8; Sir Steven Runciman, A History of the Crusades, 3 vols: 'The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East 1100-1187,' vol.2, 1952, pp. 143-52; Donale M. Nicol, Byzantium and Venice, Cambridge. New York; New Rochelle; Melbourne; Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 71-9; David Abulafia (ed), The Mediterranean in History, London: Thames & Hudson Ltd, 2003, pp.187-92

⁷⁹ Sir Thomas Arnold, Influence & Impression of Islam, Delhi: Rightway Publications, 2001,

establishments and armed strength.

It is in military architecture that the influence of Islam upon the West is most evident. The elaborate defenses of Syrian cities, such as Antioch, were novelties to the Western World. The Western people learned the style of architecture such as 'how to build the elaborate defenses'. After the fall of the Roman Empire, the boom in architecture was suspended, but continued to be presented and developed by the Byzantines. The Crusaders who conquered Syria insured their hold on the Levant by building concentric castles, with towers strategically placed to command all approaches and all the parts of the wall. The Crusaders returning to Europe proceeded to copy these structures when they reached home. The design of the castles, which Edward I built in the Welsh Marshes, owed a great deal to the configuration of castles built by the crusaders in the Holy Land.

The Crusades undoubtedly helped the rise of monarchical power in the West, to the ultimate detriment of the Papacy. The Crusaders always needed the blessing of the Pope, but the Crusade leaders overrode the Papal plan on the battlefield. In the Fourth Crusade, for example, Pope Innocent III proclaimed his plan, but the Venetian merchants and Crusade leaders themselves went against the Pope's will and launched an attack on Constantinople.

3.1.2 Social and Economic

3.1.2.1 Social

The mutual influence between Christian Europe and Islamic Egypt was very much at work in Mediterranean trade during the century preceding the Crusades. Nevertheless, the Crusades had an effect on the development of Western European society. There was a sudden broadening of Western cultural horizons because of the movement of a large number of people from Western Europe to the Holy Land (which was in close proximity to Islamic land) and who, in many cases, returned home when the Crusades ended.

The damage caused by the crusading war fell most heavily upon the feudal nobility, especially in France. The Crusade leaders had to pay the crusading expenses themselves. The financial requirements of the Crusade sometimes led to the sale or mortgage of part of their lands, often effecting change in the permanent ownership. The heirs to these estates died on the road to the Holy Land, or settled permanently in the Holy Land, or were in a state of war with the Muslims. In this case, the noblemen as a whole were losers in both the Western world and in the Holy Land,

The influence of the Crusades had a general affect on the European culture. At the beginning of the twelfth century, it was impossible to become a fully-fledged mathematician or astronomer without a good knowledge of Arabic.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ George Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science, 11-1, Baltimore. 1931, p.249, quoted from Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. V, p.21

The study of the ancient languages grew in extent and fertility. Historiography and geography acquired a new vigour. Gothic architecture succeeded Romanesque, and a finer taste appeared in sculpture and painting.⁸¹ During the period of the Crusades, many of the European philosophers made contact with both Arabic and Ancient Greek philosophies. It is needless to say that there was a revival in Western Philosophy.

Before the Crusades, the relations between Byzantine and Western Christianity were sparse and infrequent for many centuries. After the start of the Crusades, the Byzantine and Western Worlds met each other in all spheres and at all levels more closely than ever before. The East-West meeting-grounds covered a wide area. The traditional Byzantine-Western meeting-grounds were in Southern Italy and Venice, and the Crusades created new fields, from Hungary in the north to Mount Sinai in the south. Moreover, after the Fourth Crusaders conquered Constantinople in 1204, Byzantine scholars, who had the full wealth of the Greek inheritance, emigrated with Italian merchants to Italy.

To what extent the new contact between East and West (resulting directly from the Crusades) influenced Western civilization is somewhat obscure. It seems possible that the first Western knowledge of Aristotle, in the original Greek, was one of the consequences of the Latin capture of Constantinople in 1204.⁸² Greek culture was reintroduced into Southern Italy by the Byzantines.

⁸¹ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. V , p.51

⁸² R.A. Newhall, p.185

It was a long, slow process.⁸³ Byzantine scholars provided the Italian Renaissance with its material. As a result, the Italian Renaissance in the twelfth-century gave to Europe the first Gothic cathedral, the music of Perotinus, and scholastic philosophy.⁸⁴

Manuscripts may well have been part of the booty, which found its way to France after the sacking of the city, although relics and precious metals were the articles of particular interest to the Crusaders on that occasion. At any rate, shortly after this date, Latin scholars gave evidence of knowing some non-Arabic writings of the great philosopher. When in 1438 the hopeless Greek Emperor came to the Council of Ferrara to negotiate with the Pope on military aid to resist the Turks, Greek scholars accompanied him. Some of them remained in Italy contributing to the already awakened interest in the Greek classics and language, which played such an important part in the Renaissance revival of learning.

Hitherto trade had flowed mostly from east to west, but now there was a strong reverse current, while the east-west stream was improved and accelerated. The textile industry, as old as Phoenicia, the trade in spices, which went back to Sabaeen-Roman days, the export of pottery and glassware from Sidon and Tyre, of drugs and perfume from Damascus, wines from Gaza, and sugar from the maritime plain—all these activities received fresh impetus as a result of the opening of new markets and the widening of

⁸³ Kenneth M. Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance", Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol.100, No. 1, 24. 02. 1956, p.3

⁸⁴ John Godfrey, p.127

old ones.

Asia was truly discovered in the thirteenth century by the missionaries and the Italian merchants. Sometimes the Westerners dispatched the Diplomatic Corps to the Mongols and the Mongol Khans invited Western people. Around the Black Sea, on the fringes of the Mongol world, as entrepôt trade routes leading directly to China, the Genoese founded trading posts and colonies. Edward I of England sent his envoy, Geoffrey de Langley, to the court of the Ilkhan of Persia, in one of those improbable diplomatic exchanges that marked the second half of the thirteenth century. At Trebizond the English envoy purchased a horse from 'Benedict, merchant of Genoa', while the ambassador stored his baggage in the house of Nicholas Doria.⁸⁵ The Crusaders themselves were fired by the spirit of the Crusade and, they never abandoned the idea of finding possible allies against the Saracens or of working at the task of propagating Christianity.⁸⁶ Nevertheless, the Europeans had many opportunities of meeting with Asian peoples. What seems to us even more important is the increase in geographical knowledge and, at the same time, the extension of European civilization, which resulted from these expeditions and journeys into the East.

3.1.2.2 Economic

⁸⁵ Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe; Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950-1350*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, p.187

⁸⁶ Louis Brehier, , "The Crusades: The Victory of Idealism," in James A. Brundage (ed), p.87

Christian-European merchants were active in significant numbers in Egypt and Tunisia⁸⁷ before the Crusades. When the First Crusaders settled in Syria, they and their successors had to depend upon Europe for certain necessary supplies, horses, armour, cloth, and the like, which gave occasion for a trade that grew with great rapidity.⁸⁸

Crusaders, pilgrims, business people, and sailors returning from the East brought back knowledge of new products, which they had learned to enjoy during their stay. In this way, new demands and new markets were created in the West of which enterprising merchants sought to avail themselves. The introduction into Europe of new articles of commerce, new natural products, and new commercial practices by way of this Muslim trade is clearly marked by the words borrowed from the Arabic, which appeared during the crusading epoch. Goldwork, ironwork, the manufacture of swords, silk, and soap, and the weaving of rugs flourished as never before. Fabrics such as muslin (from Mosul), baldachin (from Baghdad), damask (from Damascus), sarsenet (from Saracen), and atlas (alias) were increasingly in demand. New vegetables and fruits, known among the Muslim peoples, appeared, such as rice, sugar, lemons, apricots (sometimes called Damascus plums), and garlic (shalot, that is, little onions of Ascalon), and products of India and Arabia, had to be satisfied on behalf of returning Crusaders through commercial channels.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ M. A. Cook (ed), *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the rise of Islam to the present day*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1970, p.7

⁸⁸ R.A. Newhall, pp.101-2

⁸⁹ *ibid*, p.102; Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. V, p.38; Joshua Prawer, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: European Colonialism in the Middle Ages*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson,

Venetians in Syria exchanged Western for Eastern glassware; Genoese and Florentines carried on the same kind of trade.⁹⁰ Besides wool, linen was a desired commodity.

In 1154, Pisa concluded a trade treaty with Egypt, which the Fatimid Caliph al-Zahir ruled. In 1173, the Pisans obtained a new grant of privilege from the new ruler of Egypt, Saladin, and this became the basis of their subsequent position in Egypt.⁹¹ The Italians and Crusaders wanted to reach the Red Sea area because they wished to secure the commercial riches of the Orient. Italians with Egyptians established emporiums, in which European products such as timber, arms, slaves, and munitions of war were traded.

The Italians, moreover, had banking and credit facilities to offer; and from the start of the Crusades the nimble-witted Italian merchants realized that a door had been opened to new sources of wealth. English sailors played some part in the Crusades, but generally it was the Italians who dominated the maritime scene. The Italians thus quickly gained commercial benefits from the success of the Crusaders.⁹² The Italian maritime cities, particularly Venice, Genoa, and Pisa, staged two passages a year, the March (or Easter) voyage, and the autumn voyage.⁹³ Originally, these terms meant no more than the convoys of merchant ships; but these, of course, also offered the best chance of making the pilgrimage. The Easter voyage appears to have been the more

1971, pp.393-6

⁹⁰ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. V, p39

⁹¹ Subhi Labib, 'Egyptian Commercial Policy in the Middle Ages,' in M. A. Cook (ed), p.66

⁹² John Godfrey, p.8

⁹³ Hans Eberhard Mayer, 2nd, p.229

popular and the conditions of payment attached to it were more favourable.

Whether the Easter date always had religious associations is very much open to doubt, but it is incontestable that pilgrim traffic flourished greatly in the thirteenth century.

The trade with the East had become active. Traders did business, but Europe got the profits. First, the social position of the class of merchant was going up and this then brought about the growth of cities. The commercial activities of Italian cities were greatly stimulated, and the east-west trade between the ports of Syria and those of Italy enjoyed a great revival.

Second, resulting from the crusading movement, the economy became active, systems of international banking developed and gold coins were minted. It speedily brought to an end the period of barter and substituted a period of money and credit that brought about the rapid growth of the Levantine trade and the movement of thousands of travellers. In 1252 the first florins (that is, coins of Florence) appeared, the Venetian sequin came a generation later, and similar coins in the rest of Europe soon followed.⁹⁴ As liquidity increased in the twelfth century, the "cash nexus" became ever more important. Professional soldiers did emerge, but commanders dismissed them as soon as possible because of the enormous drain on resources. The Templars began to issue letters of credit, and to perform other banking functions. In fact, all three military orders – Templars, Hospitallers, and Teutonic Knights – which had started as charitable religious organizations,

⁹⁴ R.A. Newhall, p.103

and had evolved into military institutions, gradually became to a certain extent commercial companies.⁹⁵

3.1.3 Ecclesiastically

Pope Urban II had launched the Crusade as an international Christian movement under his leadership. The first Crusaders got great results. They captured two important cities, Antioch and Jerusalem, for Christianity. The Crusade's initial success greatly enhanced the Pope's power and prestige. The Crusaders all belonged to the Pope's flock, and their successes were *his* successes, as one by one the ancient patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and finally, Constantinople fell under the Papacy's dominion. It seemed as though the Pope had become the Head of the whole of Christendom. Congregations in every part of the Christian world acknowledged his spiritual supremacy. His missionaries travelled as far as Ethiopia and China.⁹⁶ Nevertheless, the Papacy overreached itself.

The issuing of indulgences was increased and was abused by the papacy. The Papacy gave plenary indulgences, the remission of all penances, to the Crusaders, in compensation for duties carried out in the face of the difficulties and dangers of the Holy War against the Muslims. Moreover, the indulgence of the Vow of Crusade was expanded. The Papacy also issued indulgences to

⁹⁵ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. V, p. 40.

⁹⁶ Sir Steven Runciman, "The Crusades: A Moral Failure", in James A. Brundage (ed), p76

the other Crusades, those against the Moors in Spain, against the Pagans, against heretics and schismatic and even against lay powers in Western Europe. It is clear that to the Papacy the other Crusades were to be regarded as belonging to the same species as crusades to the Holy Land.

The First Crusade gave the Papacy an opportunity to gain supremacy in the Near East. Moreover, the Papacy established its supremacy in the Byzantine after the Fourth Crusaders had captured Constantinople. For a short time, the Roman Church reunified the whole Christian world.

Actually, after the twelfth century an antagonism developed between the Pope's generous actions on behalf of Palestine and the temporal politics of the nations, which were eager for tangible results.⁹⁷ For the Papacy, however, the loss was severe as each fresh Crusade had been an opportunity for an impressive display of its powers. Moreover, as advocate of the movement, the Papacy had to bear a share of the loss, which came from its failure, and that failure was final, as the popes of the fifteenth century were to discover.⁹⁸ The Muslim victories were regarded as the judgment of God upon the Christians, and the blame was laid upon the popes.

Pilgrims, who went to the Holy Land, believed that special spiritual advantages had been conferred on them. Pilgrimage increased before the Crusades, but it became more and more difficult. Following the success of the First Crusade, pilgrims freely visited Jerusalem. Pilgrims made donations to

⁹⁷ Louis Brehier, pp.85-6

⁹⁸ L. Elliott Binns, *The History of The Decline and Fall Medieval Papacy*, Hamden; Conn: Archon Bools, 1967, p.103

abbeys and churches en route as well as at the final destination. In Europe, many Christians were interested in the holy relics. It was an easy job for the Latin Church to gain quality relics. The cathedral, which was equipped with high-quality relic collections, was a key not only to contributions to the church but also to the economic development of entire towns.

There was a marked increase in heresy coming from the East. The pontiffs themselves came to regard the suppression of heretics in Europe as more important than combating the infidels. The Byzantine was regarded as heretical by the Crusaders; the Fourth Crusade demonstrated that even Innocent III could not control the Crusaders. It was a misuse of crusading, for selfish political purposes, that seriously discredited the papacy.

In conclusion, we can say that the Crusades were indeed a turning point for Europe, pushing the continent out of an isolated Dark Age and into the modern world. Western people felt a strong interest in the things of the East; new products, culture, religion. The Crusaders, who did not settle in the Holy Land but returned home, and merchants (especially Italian), brought new things (Eastern and Muslim culture, religion, products and especially Greek philosophy) with them. The crusades were the factor that produced in the New Europe the Age of the Renaissance, the Age of Discovery, and the Age of the Reformation. Actually, they were only one factor among many.⁹⁹

⁹⁹ Sir Thomas Arnold, p.51

3.2 The influence of the Crusades in the Byzantium Empire

3.2.1 Political and Military

In the course of the eleventh century, the Byzantine Empire was threatened by new enemies; in the west the Normans, in the east the Seljuk. Before the first Crusade, the Byzantine Empire lost a huge amount of territory. The Normans captured the last remaining land in southern Italy and displayed their hostility towards the Byzantine Empire. In 1071, the Seljuk army defeated the Byzantine at Manzikert and dominated in the whole of Asia Minor. As a result, large areas of Europe were soon to be opened to successive waves of Islamic invasion. The Crusaders largely responded to protect the weak Byzantine Empire.

The continued occupation of Byzantine was threatened by external aggression of not only Seljuk Turks but also Latin Christianity. The Normans had shown their hostility more than once. The German Emperors had boasted of their plans to conquer Constantinople. Then, in April 1204, the Fourth Crusaders occupied Constantinople, which was the heart of the Byzantine Empire. It was the greatest sacking of Byzantine. In Western eyes no one was to blame for the diversion of the Fourth Crusade. It was more a matter for congratulation, once the dust of plunder had settled and Byzantium came

under Latin control.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, the Byzantine Empire suffered an internal struggle between rival Orthodox claimants to the imperial succession, such as the Greek rulers of Trebizond, Epirus, and Nicaea, as well as the rising Serbian and Bulgarian princes.¹⁰¹

In the twelfth century and then again in the second half of the thirteenth and the fourteenth century, the Byzantines not only had political and ceremonial relations with the Muslim rulers of Egypt, but also considered themselves, and were considered by others, as having a special role to play in the protection of the Christian populations of the Egyptian state.¹⁰² With the exception of a short period following the conquest of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusaders, Byzantine and Egypt had continuing trade and political relations.

The Crusades, in the end, made the relations between the Christian East and West worse than before, and did more damage to Byzantine than to Islam. In 1261, the news of the loss of Constantinople was brought to the West. Some plan was being laid for its recovery and for a reunification of Eastern and Western Christianity. The Byzantine Empire had to fight for survival not only against Islam but also against the Christians of the West.

As a result, the Muslims ultimately triumphed with the conquest of Asia Minor, of the Balkans, and of Constantinople in the fifteenth century.

¹⁰⁰ Donald M. Nicol, p.412

¹⁰¹ *ibid*, pp.412-3

¹⁰² Angeliki E. Laiou, 'Byzantine Trade with Christians and Muslims and the Crusades,' in Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (ed), *The Crusades from the perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001, p.187

3.2.2 Social and Economic

The Byzantine Empire was faced with the huge problem of provisioning the very large crusading armies. The First Crusaders, about 60,000 men spent less than two months on Byzantine soil, and others, in the army of Raymond of Toulouse and Bohemond, stayed less than five months. The Second Crusaders stayed two and a half to three months, and the Crusaders of Frederick Barbarossa, numbering almost 100,000 men,¹⁰³ spent about nine months on Byzantine soil. The Crusaders, especially the First, certainly expected that the Byzantine authorities would provide them with provisions, and they brought with them money and marks of silver, which they could exchange for food. The Crusaders demanded special markets where they could buy food at reduced prices. When their demands were rejected and they had trouble in obtaining food, the Crusaders found their food through plunder, which must have been very painful for the Byzantines.

The Crusaders and the Italian maritime cities seized the Empire's wealth. The Crusaders required that the Byzantine Empire should supply food and something for the defensive war. Italian maritime cities created, rather than supplanted, commercial wealth. In May, 1082, hard pressed by the Normans and with other enemies on the horizon, Alexius I Communes had rewarded

¹⁰³ John France, *Victory in the East: A military History of the First Crusade*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, p.136

his Venetian allies with a well-known grant of trading privileges, with free access to a long list of specified Byzantine ports and trading centers. The Venetians received similar concessions, or rather renewals of the grant of 1082, in 1126, 1147, and 1148; the Pisans received grants in 1111, 1136, and 1155, the thriving period of the great Pisan quarter, where the famous disputation of 1136 was held. The Genoese received grants in 1155 and 1169.¹⁰⁴ Before the Crusade, the Byzantine Empire was wrecked by Seljuk's invasion. In addition, in the Crusade period, they suffered greater damage by the Italian merchants and the Crusaders.

The Fourth Crusaders captured Constantinople in 1204. The provinces in Greece, the Greek islands and Asia Minor were to be parcelled out among the Venetians, the new Emperor and the other Crusade leaders. It seems quite probable, however, that a large mass of irreplaceable classical Greek literature perished at this time in the wanton destruction attendant upon the city's capture.

The Venetians seized the most strategic economic ports, Modon and Coron in the south Peloponnesus, useful ports of call en route to Crete, as well as many of the Aegean islands. Venice and Venetian families, wise from the long experience of their merchants in the eastern Mediterranean, appropriated most of the red meat of the carcass of the Empire.¹⁰⁵ Venice had special terms designed to exempt her from feudal duty, to preserve the privileges,

¹⁰⁴ Kenneth M. Setton, 1956, p.29

¹⁰⁵ Donald M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261-1453*, London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1972, p.11

which she already enjoyed under Byzantine rule, and to disallow her rivals, such as Genoa and Pisa, from participation in the profits to come. The privilege became better before they obtained it by agreement.

The Crusades, and the existence of the Crusader states played a much greater role, not only in the general patterns of trade in the eastern Mediterranean, but also in the conditions and mechanisms of trade between the Byzantines and the Muslims, and especially between the Byzantines and the Western Christians.¹⁰⁶ However, the Byzantines lost their wealth in trade with the Western merchants.

3.2.3 Ecclesiastically

Pope Urban II may have purposed, by way of the First Crusade the bringing about of a union between the Byzantine and Latin Churches. The effect of the movement was exactly the opposite. The rude manners and ineffective discipline of the Crusaders led to the retaliatory measures of the Greeks. Pope Innocent III was eager to unite the Byzantine Church under the Papacy, so he tolerated the attack on Constantinople and gave official approval to the establishment of the Latin Empire by the Fourth Crusade in 1204. The establishment of the Latin Empire and principalities obviously introduced radical changes not only in the territorial extent of Byzantium but

¹⁰⁶ Angeliki E. Laiou, 'Byzantine Trade with Christians and Muslims and the Crusades,' in Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (ed), p.192

also in the ecclesiastical organization of the former Byzantine provinces. Pope Innocent III claimed that bishops who wanted to remain in their positions must swear obedience to the papacy. Most left their sees and either went to Byzantine centres such as the principalities of Nicaea and Epirus. The Greeks could not prevent the wholesale plundering of ecclesiastical property. This led to Orthodox resistance to the new Roman Catholic presence. It was agreed by the Crusaders that some compensation should be made for the wholesale seizure in the first days of victory.

In these circumstances, Orthodoxy became more and more synonymous with Byzantine nationalism. Orthodox bishops in exile fanned the flames of anti-Latin prejudice in the hearts of their flocks.¹⁰⁷

The ecclesiastical significance of the Latin Empire lasted from 1204 to 1261. The Frankish and Venetian settlers needed their own Latin clergy and had to be provided for. On the other hand, the Greek clergy functioning within the conquered territories were restricted in their authority. This event helped to make the decisive separation of the Greek and Latin Churches more hostile and significant.

Theodore Lascaris, ruler of the kingdom of Nicaea, needed to establish his position, his patriarchal coronation, and the support of the Orthodox Church. The old patriarch, John X Camaterus, refused to support Nicaea. But he soon died, and the Latins refused to allow the election of a new Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople. Theodore took advantage of this opportunity. He held a

¹⁰⁷ *ibid*, p.20

synod in Nicaea in the third week of Lent 1208 to elect a new patriarch.

Michael IV Aulianus was duly elected on 20 March, three years after he had been acclaimed Emperor.¹⁰⁸ As a result, Theodore obtained the support of the head of the Orthodox Church, and the new Patriarch worked for the Nicaean imperial claims.

The rituals of the Western Church had spread to the Byzantium church. The Papacy placed Latin bishops in the conquered provinces of Syria and Palestine in accordance with the existing system before the schism between the West and East Churches. Besides, many temples, monasteries, and abbeys, which performed the Latin rituals, had been established. In the Latin States of the East, the Latin Church, the Byzantium Church, the Armenian Church, and so on, co-existed. In spite of the fall of the Latin Empire, the rituals of the West had had an effect on the Church of the East through the priest who devoted himself to the Papacy.

3.3 The influence of the Crusades in the Near East

3.3.1 Political and Military

The constant warfare was disruptive, not only politically, but also socially and economically.

At the time, that Pope Urban II was launching the Crusading movement,

¹⁰⁸ J. M. Hussey, p.207

the religious unity of Islam had already been shattered and its political state was split into several factions. After the capture of Jerusalem by the First Crusade, the local Muslims requested help from Damascus and Baghdad, but there was no response. After the loss of Jerusalem, which is the third most Holy Place of Islam, the Spirit of the Jihad shifted to the Moslem Lands, but the remarkable Counter-Crusade did not begin until almost a century later. Its immediate cause was the action of freebooting Crusaders who launched a series of raids against Muslim caravans and commerce in the adjoining regions. In the late twelfth century, the Crusaders launched a buccaneering expedition in the Red Sea area, involving attacks on Muslim shipping and on the Hijaz ports, which served Mecca and Medina.¹⁰⁹ It sparked a dormant pan-Islamic spirit, which materialized in counter-crusades.¹¹⁰ It is fair to say that terrorism (Islamic terrorist attacks on Western countries) originated with these counter-crusades.

Islam, which had no priesthood and no monasticism, forged the counterparts to these two entities in self-perpetuating corporations organized by prominent Sūfīs. The first fraternal order to be established on a permanent basis was the Qādirīyah order, so named after its founder 'Abd-al-Qādir al-Gīlanī (1077-1166); the second was the Rāifī order, named after its founder, Ahmad ar-Rāifī (d. 1183) of Baghdad. Both orders still exist and claim

¹⁰⁹ Bernard Lewis, *The Crisis of Islam: Holy War and Unholy Terror*, London: Phoenix, 2003, p.42

¹¹⁰ Philip Hjuri Hitti, 'The Impact of the Crusades on Moslem Lands', in Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. V, p.35

followers in all parts of the Moslem world.¹¹¹ They were inspired partly by Christian monasticism and by the two great military religious orders of the crusades.

In the event, the Crusader's neglect of the natural frontier offered by the elbow of the Euphrates was to deliver them into the hands of a rejuvenated Sunni Muslim power, which the challenge of the Crusades had called into existence.¹¹²

Before the invasion of the Crusaders, the native Christians of the Near East and North Africa (territories under Moslem rule) were permitted to attend worship meetings. After the First Crusade, however, the rulers and inhabitants of Islamic nations suspected native Christians of collaborating with the enemy. Islamic rulers regarded these people (Gregorian Armenians, Syrian Jacobites, Nestorians, Lebanese Maronites, and Egyptian Copts) as simply being Christians who believed a different doctrine to that of the Western Christians. Christians in Muslim countries lived under very difficult circumstances. The greater part of the twelfth century witnessed very little increase in hostility toward native non-Muslims, but this changed late of the twelfth century, for example, in 1184 when an-Nasir ordered all non-Muslim employees to be dismissed from their employment and forbade any future reemployment¹¹³. As a result, the faith of native Christians weakened drastically.

"The impact of the Crusades created a historical memory which is with us

¹¹¹ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. V , p.21

¹¹² Arnold J. Toynbee, "The Crusades: A Military Failure," in James A. Brundage (ed), p.70

¹¹³ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. V , p.15

today - the memory of a long European onslaught," says Akbar Ahmed, chair of Islamic studies at American University in Washington, D.C. Its legacy was profound. For Muslims, then probably the strongest and most vibrant civilization on the globe, the Crusader victories and the destruction that followed were a confidence-shaking blow.¹¹⁴

3.3.2 Social and Economic

Before the Crusader's appearance in the Arab world, there were disruptions to trade routes and commercial enterprise was strangled, primarily because of the prevailing internal unrest. Therefore, Arab trade with the Far East had already come to a standstill. In the eleventh century, too, trade with Russia and the North had gradually diminished.

Because the crusaders destroyed both agriculture and urban life, they had a detrimental effect on the economy of Muslim Lands. However, the Crusaders and the Western merchants arrived in the Holy Land at the same time. In the venture, their coming encouraged trade between the West and the East. In the eleventh century, before the Crusades, Muslim naval forces controlled the seafaring and maritime affairs of Mediterranean, but this dominance was transferred to Christian-European control by the Crusades in the twelfth century. The political and economic initiative of the Mediterranean had also shifted from the southern and south eastern shores to the north and

¹¹⁴ Andrew Curry, p.69,

north-west. However, the Crusades revived commerce in the Mediterranean. Many of the Western merchants in Italy, Egypt, Syria, and the Crusader states engaged in trade with the Muslims. Syrian and Egyptian ports were gateways into Mesopotamia, Persia, and even Central Asia. One scholar goes so far as to say that the occupation of Syria revolutionized the entire economy of commerce in the Mediterranean, helped to raise the country to the international level, and bestowed on it a prosperity previously enjoyed only under the Romans.¹¹⁵ Moslem merchants earned huge fortunes through brisk trading, and the revived Mediterranean commerce partially compensated the Arab area for commercial profits lost elsewhere.

The Aiyubid dynasty concluded a series of trade treaties with the Italian maritime cities. Al-'Adil (1199-1218), younger brother and successor of Saladin, allowed the Venetians to establish markets with inns in Alexandria. Moreover, he allowed the Pisans to establish consulates there. Al-Kamil (1218-1238) followed the example of his father and signed a commercial treaty with Venice.¹¹⁶ It was clear that occasional military conflicts did not inhibit the stream of increasing trade between the West and the Muslims. This trade had given a variety change to the Muslims. The revival of trade led to a revival of industry. As commerce expanded, agriculture and industry shared the benefits.

The new economic circumstance, which was brought about by the

¹¹⁵ Henri Lammens, *La Surie: Précis Historique* 2 vols., Beirut, 1921, vol. 1, p. 235, quoted from Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. V, pp. 39-40.

¹¹⁶ Kenneth M. Setton (ed), vol. V p.40

Crusades, essentially needed a larger supply, and a more rapid circulation of money. The gold coin struck by the Latins, was minted in the Holy Land and bore an Arabic inscription. As already mentioned, the Templars began to issue letters of credit and to perform other banking functions. In fact, all three military Orders —Templars, Hospitallers, and Teutonic Knights —gradually became, to a certain extent, commercial companies, because, many Christians, in Europe, made contributions to the military Orders, to protect the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The military Orders, of necessity, required banking services.

In spite of the disruptive effects of war and political instability, the area retained a measure of prosperity. How widespread this was is difficult to determine with any degree of certainty, since sources for the most part ignore rural areas and concentrate their attention on urban centers.¹¹⁷ The major cities of Iraq-Basra, Baghdad, and Mosul —continued to excel in weaving. Syria produced, in addition to woven fabrics, stained glass, sugar, and paper, while Egypt's leading products were cotton, woollen, and silk fabrics, silk brocades, mattress beds, rugs, tents, sails, saddles, metalwork, gold and silver jewelry, pottery, glassware, and wood-carvings. The exigencies of war also gave impetus to shipbuilding and the manufacture of weapons.¹¹⁸ The scarcity of documentation led some scholars to assume a fixed pattern of commerce between West and East.¹¹⁹ The Europeans exported precious

¹¹⁷ *ibid*, pp.10-11

¹¹⁸ *ibid*, p.10

¹¹⁹ Joshua Praver, pp.398-9

metals to Syria, and then to Egypt. Export to Egypt was largely classified as contraband, which offended the Papacy, as all materials could be used in weapon manufacture and shipbuilding. Crusader Syria was in a different position. The Latin States needed European metals to protect the Holy Land.

It is equally important to recall that the twelfth century, and especially its second half, witnessed an extraordinary set of quantitative and qualitative changes in Islamic art. Hundreds of new buildings, for the most part Madrasahs¹²⁰ and other social functions of pious architecture, and also caravanserais and bazaars, were sponsored in every city from Central Asia to the Mediterranean coast in order to meet a set of newly developed ideological and economic purposes.¹²¹

3.3.3 Christianity in the Islam Lands

In the eleventh century, the Seljuk extended their control over Persia, Iraq, Armenia and Asia Minor. In 1055, they established a sultanate in Baghdad, in 1070 they conquered Jerusalem, and finally in 1071 they defeated the army of the Byzantine Empire and captured Emperor Romanus. After the conquest of the Near East, the Seljuk Turks assumed a firm attitude against the native Christian community. Many Christians lost their positions simply because they

¹²⁰ The madrasah functioned until the 20th century as a theological seminary and law school, with a curriculum centred on the Koran. (Encyclopedia Britannica Deluxe Edition 2004 CD-ROM)

¹²¹ Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (ed), p.236

were Christians.

Conversely, the Shi'ite dynasty of the Fatimid adopted a mild attitude toward native Christianity. This was the case, for example, of the Fatimid caliph, Nizar al-'Aziz (975-996) who married a Christian woman whose two brothers he himself had appointed as patriarchs of Jerusalem and Alexandria.¹²² Unfortunately, the Fatimid territory fell into the hands of the Crusaders and, as a necessary consequence, this situation had a harmful influence on the relation between the Fatimid and native Christians.

The Eastern Christian eventually thought that the Crusades proved to be one of the greatest calamities that befell the communities of Eastern Christians. Before the Crusades, they had adapted themselves to the conditions of Islamic rule without the loss of their faith or their lives. After the Crusades, both Islam and Crusaders hated the Eastern Christians. Islamics displayed their hostility towards all Christians, whether Latin, Greek, Coptic, or Jacobite. The relations between the Eastern Christians and Crusaders were usually friendly and, officially, the Jacobite and Armenian bishops of Jerusalem were suffragans of the Latin patriarch.¹²³ On the other hand, the Papacy looked upon the Eastern Christians as outcasts, schematics, and heretics. Following this, the position of the Eastern churches and communities greatly deteriorated.

The Eastern Christians took an ambivalent attitude to the crusades. Many

¹²² Antonie Wessels, *Arab and Christian: Christians in the Middle East*, Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1995, p.26

¹²³ Joshua Praver, p.229

of the Syrian Jacobites had fled to Egypt in the face of the approaching Crusaders, because they were regarded as heretics by the European Christians. The Copts, in Egypt, were also regarded as heretics. They were weakened by the onset of the crusades. A Sumerian named Ibrāhīm, misled the Caliph into believing that the Copts collected the Church income and sent it to aid the Franks.¹²⁴ As a result, the Caliph ordered the confiscation of all Coptic funds. Saladin released the Copts from civil service. He demolished the cathedral of St. Mark in Alexandria.

Armenians were prepared to assist the effort against the Turks. The Maronites joined with Raymond of Toulouse who was one of the most important leaders of the first crusade against the Seljuk Turks. They continued to assist the Crusaders in the Holy Land for the duration of the Crusaders' stay. William of Tyre, a contemporary, wrote in 1182 that 40,000 Maronites joined the Crusaders and gave up their monotheletism,¹²⁵ but some Maronites were quite hostile to the Maronite-Crusader alliance. However, Armenians rejected the Western insistence on the Chalcedonian Doctrine.

The Greek Orthodox and Syrian Christians there originally welcomed the Crusaders as friends, but the Crusaders and the Papacy instituted a Latin hierarchy in both the Latin states and the Byzantine. When Frederick II entered Jerusalem, he found that the native Christians held themselves aloof

¹²⁴ Rufaila, *History of the Coptic Nation*, Cairo, 1964, pp.158-9; Aziz S. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, London: Methuen & Co Ltd·11 New Fetter Lane·London EC4, 1968, p.93

¹²⁵ Ken Parry, David J. Melling, Dimitri Brady, Sidney H. Griffith and John F. Healey (ed), *The Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity*, Blackwell Publishers, 1999, p.306

fearing the restoration of Latin rule.¹²⁶ Native Christians gradually began to see the Crusaders as conquering oppressors.

Even before the commencement of the Crusades, the Armenians had sent a bishop to Gregory VII (1073-85) to court his sympathy for the holy war and to secure his support for the Armenians and their Church.¹²⁷ The Armenian state remained under the influence of the Latins and their Church. In King Leo II's reign, especially, the Armenian Church was at risk of a schism. After the King's coronation in 1199, he had his nominees supported by the local Cilician bishops, whereas the Eastern Divines elected an anti-Catholic in defiance of the state. The movement of union with Roman Catholicism was continuing in the Armenian state and church.

The Maronites were brought into direct contact with Westerns and with the Roman Catholics. Like the Armenians, they had welcomed the Crusade and became valuable guides to the first Crusaders in a strange land. As a result, many native Maronites freely attended the Latin churches in the Latin states. The Maronites, more than any other form of Christianity in the Near East, adopted the rites of Roman Catholicism and were delighted to be Romanized. But the Latin states were finally defeated by the Mamluk troops in 1291. The relations between Rome and the Maronites were severed and the Maronites suffered hardship under Islam.

¹²⁶ Sir Steven Runciman, A History of the Crusades, 3 vols: 'The Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades, vol.3, 1954, p.188

¹²⁷ Sir Steven Runciman, vol. 1, pp.202-3

3.4 Conclusion

In previously discussing the influence of the Crusades, I pointed out that some of these influences already revealed themselves before the Crusades started. Not every historical event and change comes under the influence of any single important factor, but the influence of a variety of factors. As the product of ecclesiastical reform, growing Papal authority, devout relic veneration, knightly chivalry, turbulent relations with the Christian East, feudalism, and a host of other factors, the crusades were a fundamental component of medieval Europe.¹²⁸

Westerners had settled in the Near East for two centuries, and after the fall of the Jerusalem Empire, the Crusades continued for a long time. The Crusades had multifarious effects on both Medieval Europe and the Islamic world. Moreover, even today, the Crusades still influence the relations between Christianity and Islam.

¹²⁸ Thomas F. Madden (ed), 2002, p.2

Chapter Four: The Relevance of the Crusades for today

4.1 The war on Iraq

After the Gulf War in 1991, when Iraqi troops were defeated by the U.S. army, Saddam Hussein, the former President of Iraq, refused to give up his dictatorship and criticized the U.S. foreign policy which threatened Arab countries. On the other hand, the United States denounced Iraq as a wicked nation and one which supported terrorism. Furthermore, the United States had targeted Saddam Hussein as a person to be eliminated. The U.S. State Department's Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000 (April 2001) lists Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Cuba, North Korea and Sudan as state sponsors of international terrorism.

On September 11, 2001, a group of 19 Muslim Arab terrorists hijacked four passenger planes en route across the United States. Two of the planes under the hijackers' control crashed into the World Trade Centre twin towers in New York City. The third plane crashed into the Pentagon building near Washington, DC. The fourth plane crashed in rural Pennsylvania after passengers attempted to retake control of the plane. The immediate death toll was estimated at about three thousand civilians, including the lives of nineteen hijackers.

The attack of September 11, instantly outlined the essence of the American response. President Bush labelled the attacks as ‘acts of war’ and declared the USA to be at war. He also declared that no distinction would be made between those who conducted terrorists acts and those who sheltered the perpetrators.

World leaders immediately condemned the attacks and announced their solidarity and sympathy for the suffering of the American people. Although almost every government in the world advocated assembling, a military coalition to respond to the events (thus expressing unconditional outrage over the terrorist attacks of September 11) the actual response was a supreme challenge for the United States government. Every Middle Eastern leader officially also expressed sincere condolences with the American people. Iraqi President Saddam Hussein also expressed his regret to the American people, but argued that the terrorist attacks on American soil had been the inevitable outcome of America’s own foreign policy.

On 14 September, Colin Powell, US Secretary of State, pronounced bin Laden to be the chief suspect and a day later Bush repeated this statement. Within one week, the American military was prepared to go to war against the Taliban¹²⁹ for the capture of bin Laden and his top associates. U.S. authorities

¹²⁹ The Taliban emerged as a force for social order in 1994 in the southern Afghan province of Kandahār and quickly subdued the local warlords who controlled the south of the country. By late 1996 popular support for the Taliban among Afghanistan's southern Pashtun ethnic group, as well as assistance from conservative Islamic elements abroad, enabled the faction to seize the capital, Kabul, and gain effective control of the country. (Encyclopedia Britannica Deluxe Edition 2004 CD-ROM)

believed that Afghanistan had become a "safe harbour" for terrorist groups, especially al-Qaeda.

On 20 September, the U.S. government demanded that the Taliban surrender al-Qaeda leaders and all terrorists to US authorities. Moreover, the U.S. requested the permanent closure of terrorist camps, and to allow American verification of such action. However, the Afghanistan government, the Taliban, rejected demands by the international community to expel bin Laden and to drive out al-Qaeda, which had several terrorist base training camps.

As a result, the US military response to "drain the swamp" began. The U.S. administration, with British participation, launched attacks against terrorist camps in Afghanistan on 7 October 2001. Bush announced on television that 'None of these demands were met, and that the Taliban would now pay the price.' The President said the decision was made 'only after the greatest care and a lot of prayer' and 'We did not ask for this mission, but we will fulfill it.' In terms of the emerging fight, Bush concluded that 'The battle is now joined on many fronts' and warned 'We will not falter. And we will not fail.'¹³⁰ The Northern Alliance, which had opposed the Taliban regime, led the offensive army and assisted the U.S. Other nations, in the region of Afghanistan, also agreed to allow US troops to utilize their airspace or use their air bases for

¹³⁰ Bush's speech was widely reported. The official website is: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011007-8.htm/>; quoted from Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn (ed), *Global Responses to Terrorism: 9/11, Afghanistan and beyond*, London; New York: Routledge, 2003, p.15

humanitarian relief operations.

On the other hand, there was resistance against this attack. On 27 October thousands of Pakistani fighters gathered to fight a jihad against the US army. Moreover, Islamic supporters of al-Qaeda, shot dead fifteen Christian worshipers and a police officer at St. Dominic's Church in Bahawalpur, central Pakistan on 28 October.

The mustering of a multinational force continued. The German government agreed on 6 November to an American request for almost 4,000 German soldiers. A day later, the Italian parliament accepted a similar request, assigning 2,700 troops, and on 8 November Jordan's King Abdullah gave verbal backing to the war.

In a major military breakthrough in Afghanistan, the Northern Alliance troops conquered the key northern city of Mazar-e Sharif on 9 November. During the night of November 12/13, Alliance troops entered the Taliban abandoned capital of Kabul, and the next day the city was occupied.

While fighting continued in Afghanistan, the UN conference to determine Afghanistan's postwar order began in Bonn on 27 November 2001. By 2 December, a draft agreement was circulated which indicated that former King Zahir Shah, who had already returned to Kabul with a triumphant parade, would not stand as an interim president. Thereafter, former Afghan President Burhanudi Rabbani who forced from office by the Taliban in the middle of November publicly consented to other candidates to head the provisional

government. On 5 December, the peace agreement was signed.¹³¹ Finally, on 6 December, Alliance troops occupied Qandahar, the geographical heart of the Taliban movement, and Taliban forces in the city agreed to surrender to Karzai's new government. By December 22 a new, interim administration had been installed in the capital.

The attack of 9/11 had enormous strategic consequences for both the U.S.A and the international community. The scale of the loss of life caused in the World Trade Centre attacks, unprecedented in the history of sub-state terrorism, led the U.S President, the government, and the vast majority of U.S citizens to view the attacks as an act of war rather than as crimes of terrorism.¹³² President Bush and U.S. authorities declared a global war on terrorism, against not only the perpetrators of 9/11 but also against other terrorist groups, which threaten the security of US citizens and the safety of the world.

US authorities put greater pressure on Iraqi President Saddam Hussein than they did before the terrorist attacks of 9/11. On 20 September 2001, President George W. Bush advanced the war on terrorism.

Our war on terror begins with al-Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated.

Americans are asking, why do they hate us? They hate what we see right here in this chamber-a democratically elected government. Their

¹³¹ Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn (ed), pp.18-20

¹³² *ibid*, p.32

leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms . . .

We will starve terrorists of funding, turn them one against another, drive them from place to place, until there is no refuge or no rest. And we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism. Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbour or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.¹³³

Subsequently, President Bush's spokesperson set up the challenge that 'this is the time for nations to choose whether they are with the United States and the free world against terrorism or whether they are not,'¹³⁴ Bush established two groups – those with the Americans, and those with the terrorists.

In a series of addresses, hints were given about the use of force against countries that support Islamic terrorist groups. It had a particular salience and urgency for Iraq, because Saddam Hussein had attributed the origin of the 9/11 attacks to US foreign policy.

President Bush stressed the necessity of war on terrorism, because some countries continued to support and shelter the terrorists, and some countries possessed weapons of mass destruction. U.S. administration especially gave attention to Saddam Hussein.

Above all, our principles and our security are challenged today by outlaw groups and regimes that accept no law of morality and have no

¹³³ <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>

¹³⁴ Press Briefings by Ari Fleischer, 26, Sept. 2001, in www.whitehouse.gov/news/briefings

limit to their violent intentions. In the attacks on America a year ago, we saw the destructive intentions of our enemies . . . Iraq continues to shelter and support terrorist organizations . . . and al-Qaeda terrorists escaped from Afghanistan and are known to be in Iraq. (Bush's address in the UN General Assembly on September 12, 2002)¹³⁵

Imagine those 19 hijackers with other weapons and other plans – this time armed by Saddam Hussein . . . It would take one vial, one canister, one crate slipped into this country to bring a day of horror like none we have ever known. (Bush address in State of the Union on January 28, 2003)¹³⁶

On 29 January 2002, President Bush declared that America would act against an 'Axis of Evil' formed by Iran, Iraq and North Korea. He accused these countries of having developed weapons of mass destruction and, in the case of Iraq and Iran, of harbouring and supporting international terrorists. It was to extend the 'war on terrorism'.

What we have found in Afghanistan confirms that, far from ending there, our war against terror is only beginning. . .

Our nation will continue to be steadfast and patient and persistent in the pursuit of two great objectives. First, we will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans, and bring terrorists to justice. And, second, we must prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world. . .

Our second goal is to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from

¹³⁵ Derek Gregory, *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan • Palestine • Iraq*, Malden; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004, p.185

¹³⁶ *ibid*, p.188

threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of mass destruction. . . North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens. Iran aggressively pursues these weapons and export terror, while an unelected few repress the Iranian people's hopes of freedom. Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax, and nerve gas, and nuclear weapons for over a decade. . . This is a regime that agreed to international inspections – then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world. (George W. Bush, 'President's State of the Union Address', 29 Jan. 2002)¹³⁷

The various groups in opposition to the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein quite strongly supported the US anti-terrorist campaign. The Iraqi National Congress (INC) went to considerable lengths to demonstrate to the US administration that there was a direct link between Iraq and the 9/11 attacks. The INC leadership provided evidence that senior Iraqi intelligence officers had been in contact with al-Qaeda.¹³⁸ The Kurdish parties which have a substantial degree of autonomy in Northern Iraq, sought to demonstrate their commitment to the anti-terror coalition by engaging in a confrontation with a small splinter Islamist Kurdish group, the Jund al-Islam, which it was claimed included al-Qaeda fighters and was working with the Iraqi.¹³⁹ The various

¹³⁷ www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html. quoted from Joanne Meyerowitz (ed), *History and September 11th*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003, pp. 251-2

¹³⁸ David Nissmann, 'INC Claim Saddam Linked to Bin Laden Network', *Iraq Report*, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, 5 Oct. 2001, quoted from Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn (ed), p.130

¹³⁹ *Kurdistan Newslines*, 19 Sept. 2001, quoted from Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn (ed), p.130

groups (the U.S. Intelligence, the allied countries' intelligences and groups in opposition to Saddam Hussein's regime) sought to find justifications for why the US administration should extend the campaign to target directly the regime of Saddam Hussein. However, U.S. administration failed to find the 'smoking gun' which directly connected Iraq with 9/11 attacks. US administration of pressure and focus on Iraq was changed from a direct link between the 9/11 attacks to supporting al-Qaeda and a possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Iraq came to be viewed as the new strategy's first test,¹⁴⁰ even though another member of the "Axis of Evil" implied regime change as a goal.

The exposure of Saddam's twin evils became one of the main targets of the war planners, and many efforts were made before, during, and especially after the war to provide the "smoking gun" that America could not come up with convincingly enough prior to the war.¹⁴¹ The evidence was based not only on the data collected by the teams of inspectors over the years, but principally on intelligence services, the CIA. The American authorities believed that this intelligence was enough of a smoking gun to proceed.

The U.S. government rejected a UN-sponsored resolution, but many countries supported the resolution. On 5 February, Powell addressed the UN Security Council and argued that the Iraqis play a game of deception and

¹⁴⁰ Joseph S. Nye, Jr, "U.S. Power and strategy After Iraq," *Foreign Affairs*, July/August. 2003, p.61

¹⁴¹ Raphael Israeli, *The Iraq War: Hidden Agendas and Babylonian Intrigue*, Brighton; Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2004, p.139

cover-up that frustrates the work of inspectors. Intercepted conversations between Iraqi officers were particularly damning. The day before the inspectors arrived in November, a colonel and a brigadier talked about evacuating a “modified vehicle (WMD).” In January, two republican Guard officers cleared out “forbidden ammo.” The next day, President Bush effectively abandoned U.S. support for the inspectors, saying, “The game is over.”¹⁴²

The time was not quite right for taking action in the war against Iraq. However, the U.S. administration would act without UN legitimacy. Though the UN Security Council did not actively support the use of military force, Bush did not despair. At that stage, the war preparations were so advanced, with troops pouring into the Gulf region, and President Bush so committed, on the record, to Saddam’s removal, that war became inevitable.

In his State of the Union address in January 2003, Bush argued passionately for war, claiming that he possessed evidence of a link between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda. However, Bush’s steadfast ally in Britain, Tony Blair, was enduring more vociferous opposition to war from within his own Labour Party, prompting further debate about stability and tension in the US-British relationship. Blair also pressed Bush to give weapons inspectors in Iraq more time to complete their work. But Bush’s message remained blunt: ‘Saddam Hussein is not disarming. He is a danger to the world.’¹⁴³ Thus,

¹⁴² Richard Wolffe and Daniel Klaidman, “Judging The Case,” *Newsweek*, February 17, 2003, pp.18-9

¹⁴³ *The Guardian*, 1 Feb. 2003, p.1, quoted from Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn (ed), p.9

Bush advocated a preemptive war.

The Iraqi government accepted the inspection of the UN, but Bush argued that it was a trick to gain time for covering up the facts. In February 2003, the U.S. introduced a resolution authorizing an attack on Iraq. Finally, on 20 March 2003, US troops and allied troops (Britain, Spain, Australia etc) launched an invasion on Iraq without the sanction of the UN Security Council.

On 19 March 2003 (Washington Hour 7:12 pm), US President Bush ordered the attack on Iraq. This attack was part of the “shock and awe” policy of the war, calculated not only to stun the enemy but also specifically to decapitate their leadership by targeting Saddam, his sons and their cronies. The bombing offensive began when three dozen Tomahawk cruise missiles were launched against Iraqi targets from four Navy ships and two submarines operating in the Gulf and in the adjoining Red Sea. At the same time, two F-117A stealth bombers were dispatched to bust the bunkers belonging to the leadership. After two hours, around 9: 30 (Baghdad Hour 5:30 am 20 March), Iraqi troops set fire to the oil wells in southern Iraq. The U.S. administration advanced the date by one day to begin the attack by ground forces.

On 20 March, the British troops marched toward Basra and Umm Qasr, Iraq’s only port, while Allied planes were bombing Iraqi missile and artillery sites. The next day, the 600 Iraqi soldiers, located in the Fao Peninsula, surrendered. At the same time, the H2 and H3 air bases in Western Iraq were seized and the war on all fronts was intensified. On 22 March, the rate of bombings diminished; “only” 1,500 bombs were dropped, attacking 500 targets. Three days after the start of the offensive, the 3rd Infantry Division

reached the plateau north of Najaf and positioned itself for the onslaught on Baghdad.

On 4 April, a brigade of the 3rd infantry captured the Saddam International Airport, southwest of Baghdad, a mere 20 Km from its centre. The next day, a start was made to gradually surround Baghdad from the south by the 3rd Infantry, and from the south and the east by the 1st Marines. On 5 April, the American troops entered Karbala¹⁴⁴ and found a considerable number of tanks abandoned by the withdrawing Iraqi forces. The occupation of Karbala, brought the American advance within reach of the capital.

On another front, U.S. troops, with the assistance of Kurdish allies, altered the war plans and dictated a slower pace in the rush northward to Baghdad. The importance of the Kurdish allies, who were originally to be kept out of the combat zone in the north, began to be realised. Thus from the onset of the war the Kurds became vital partners in the opening up of the northern front, in tandem with the airborne brigade and the Special Forces that U.S. transports had landed in the north on airfields previously secured by the Kurds.¹⁴⁵ On 23 March, American cargo planes ferried Special Forces and equipment into northern Iraq at the same time that combat jets were bombing Iraqi positions in and around Kirkuk and Mosul, the third largest city in Iraq.

By the beginning of April the result of the constant American bombings and

¹⁴⁴ Iraq's two holy cities are Karbala and Najaf. Karbala's religious importance derives from the Battle of Karbala (AD 680) between the Sunnite and Shi'ite sects of Islam. Ḥusayn ibn Ali, the Shi'ite leader and grandson of Muhammad, was killed, and his tomb remains one of the greatest Shi'ite shrines and pilgrimage centres.

¹⁴⁵ Raphael Israeli, p.84

pressure by the infantry, on the one hand, depressed the morale of the Iraqi troops in and around Baghdad and, on the other hand, engendered retreats by Iraqi forces, first around the important northern cities, then Kirkuk and then Mosul, without any threatening battles being fought. On 9 April the alliance troops, American and Kurdish, took over the Maqlub Mountain Ridge, a strategic point which dominates Mosul from the northeast. From that point, only 30 km distant, U.S. troops would quickly have punctured the city's defenses, had the strategy gone according to plan.

On 10 April, swiftly and suddenly, the alliance troops captured Kirkuk. The light American-Kurdish attack was merely intended to tighten the grip on the city by occupying its major intersection. In this area, there are many oil fields, so the Americans quickly took control of the oil fields before they could be destroyed. After Kirkuk had fallen, Iraqi troops defending in Mosul also began to show signs of surrender. The process seemed more orderly than in Kirkuk, amidst continued American bombings of the Iraqi garrison and the attempt to destroy a building occupied by Barazan Ibrahim al-Tikriti, Saddam's half-brother. After Iraqi troops deserted Mosul, a convoy of a dozen Special Forces, with several hundred Kurdish fighters, drove into the city, once again raising suspicions as to the existence of some master plan for a strategic withdrawal. On 12 April, the paratroops of the 173rd Brigade made their way into the city, after which the Americans began to make a show of force and tighten their grip.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁶ *ibid*, pp.83-99

On 9 April, the Americans entered into the heart of Baghdad unopposed, with Iraqis cheering. This was essentially the day that Baghdad fell. There was a culmination of the war against Iraq. On 15 April, when U.S. troops captured Saddam's hometown, Tikrit, it was the clearest possible sign that the war, and the Saddam regime, had ended.

Bush declared his victory and announced of the end of the “major combat operation” in Iraq on May 1, 2003.

It may make for grand theater to describe Saddam Hussein as an ally of al-Qaeda or to characterize the fall of Baghdad as a victory in the war on terror, but stirring rhetoric does not necessarily reflect sobering reality. Not one of the 19 September 11th hijackers was an Iraqi. In fact, there is not a shred of evidence to link the September 11 attacks on the United States to Iraq. . . . The United States has made great progress in its efforts to disrupt and destroy the al-Qaeda terror network. . . . We should not risk tarnishing these very real accomplishments by trumpeting victory in Iraq as a victory over Osama bin Laden.¹⁴⁷

At the same time, insurgent attacks began with bombings of the US-led coalition's military convoys and vehicles. However, this did not end the fighting or the suffering of the civilian population. The insurgents are a group of Iraqi civilians opposed to the coalition attack.

On August 19, a massive truck bomb exploded outside of Baghdad, devastating the building and a nearby hospital. At least 23 people were killed, including the UN special representative in Iraq, Sergio Vieira de Mello, and

¹⁴⁷ Derek Gregory (ed), p.189

more than 100 injured, many of them seriously. By the time Bush declared the end of major combat operations in Iraq on May 1, 131 American and 8 British troops had been killed in action; but between May 1 and August 24 2003, another 64 American and 10 British troops were killed by hostile action from insurgents.¹⁴⁸

Insurgent's attacks were launched against the nations that were part of the coalition – killing officials and diplomats from Spain, Japan and Italy – in the hope of driving a wedge between these countries and the United States, and ultimately forcing them out of Iraq.¹⁴⁹ So far, Spain, Japan and the Philippines have withdrawn their forces.

While the American forces were successful in Afghanistan and in Iraq, there is a growing tension between the United States and the wider Islamic world. This condition includes not only the founding hub in the Middle East, but other Islamic countries and movements in Africa, Europe, Central Asia, South Asia, and Southeast Asia as well.

In October 2003, the London-based International Institute for Security Studies reported that “war in Iraq had probably inflamed radical passions among Muslims and thus increased al-Qaeda’s recruiting power and morale [and], at least marginally, its operational capability.”¹⁵⁰ In 2003 terrorist attacks, which were inspired by al-Qaeda, broke out in the Philippines, Saudi Arabia

¹⁴⁸ *ibid*, p.232-3

¹⁴⁹ Ahmed S. Hashim, “Iraq: From Insurgency to Civil War?,” *Current History*, January. 2005, p.10

¹⁵⁰ Augustus Richard Norton, “Making War, Making Peace: The Middle East Entangles America,” *Current History*, January. 2004, p.5

(twice), Morocco, Indonesia, Iraq, and Turkey (twice), taking nearly 250 lives.

4.2 Justification of war on Iraq

4.2.1 Background of the attacks on September 11

The attacks of September 11 caused a shock, such as no one in the world ever expected. On September 20, 2001, President George W. Bush addressed to a Joint session of Congress and posed the question 'Why do the terrorists hate us', and gave the answer himself.

Americans are asking, why do they hate us? They hate what we see right here in this chamber – a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms – our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other. . .¹⁵¹

However, We also question 'Why do the terrorists hate Americans?' I have several answers to this question, which I will briefly detail.

One of the answers, principally given by the anti-globalization movement and more generally by anti-Americanism, is that they (especially Muslims) look for causes within, and fault U.S. foreign policies, because of the overwhelming American power intruding into their societies. There are many

¹⁵¹ <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>.

people, particularly outside of the United States, who claim that America to a large degree brought this calamity upon itself. After the U.S. victory in the Cold War, there was an increase in U.S. influential power. Additionally, the U.S. administration intervened in the disputes in Haiti, Somalia, Bosnia, and Kosovo. Some countries regarded this as unwarranted intervention in the affairs of another country. Along these lines, the attacks of September 11 are a kind of acute response to the process of globalization over the last decade. In the minds of many people this has increasingly meant "Americanization," since the United States has become the sole remaining superpower.

Al-Qaeda has a universalistic ideology aimed at not only ousting Western influence and evicting foreign armies from Arab Land (the heart of Islam), but also terminating the support Americans give to Israel. Moreover, they also pursue the objective of toppling the governments of Arab and other Muslim states that collaborate with the U.S.A and its allies. Finally, they pursue their ultimate aim, which is the establishment of a pan-Islamic Caliphate. Al-Qaeda does not depend upon any single regime or government for its survival and financial resources. It has a presence in at least fifty countries. Its activists are drawn from a wide range of Muslim countries, and some originate from the Muslim Diasporas within Western societies.¹⁵² Osama bin Laden, the founder and leader of the al-Qaeda terrorist network, gave a speech in celebration of the attacks of September 11; he clearly announced the aim of this event.

¹⁵² Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn (ed), p.33

I say that the situation is clear and obvious. After this event, after the senior officials have spoken in America, starting with the head of infidels worldwide, Bush, and those with him, they have come out in force with their men and have turned even the countries that belong to Islam to this treachery, and they want to wag their tail at God, to fight Islam, to suppress people in the name of terrorism. (October 7, 2001)¹⁵³

For a second possible answer, we will state the point of view of America and her allies. They attribute the attacks of September 11 to 'radical Islam.' The investigation after the attacks revealed that the nineteen hijackers were Muslims with ties to Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda terrorist group. The al-Qaeda members come from quite a variety of backgrounds and they are dedicated radical militant Muslims. They are committed to an anti-Western (especially anti-American) campaign. All al-Qaeda members share the belief that the West (especially the United States) is responsible for the power grip of illegitimate and oppressive governments in their homelands. The ultimate goal of al-Qaeda is the eradication of American influence and control over Muslim countries, especially the oil-rich Middle East.

It is very difficult to answer why terrorists attack Americans, just as it is difficult to answer the question of which came first, the chicken or the egg, as can be seen in the following quotation;

In the minds of the anti-globalization movement and the anti-American left, and perhaps in the minds of Islamic terrorists themselves, the growth of the American Empire had caused the growth of Islamic

¹⁵³ Joanne Meyerowitz (ed), pp.244-5

terrorism. But in the minds of the American political and economic elite, and certainly in the minds of the officials of the Bush administration, the growth of Islamic terrorism had become the cause of the growth of the American Empire. As it happens, both causal theories are probably correct.¹⁵⁴

4.2.2 The motive of the war on Iraq

On September 12, 2002, President George W. Bush addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations; he offered three main reasons for a military attack on Iraq.¹⁵⁵ The first was that Iraq had persistently defied Security Council resolutions. Bush asserted that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction: nuclear, chemical, and biological. He represented this as a “defining moment” for the integrity of the United Nations. The second reason was that the Iraqi government had persistently violated human rights, and routinely used torture and carried out summary executions. The third reason was that the regime of Saddam Hussein was implicated in transnational terrorism and, specifically, in the attacks on America on September 11.

It is necessary that we should consider the three main reasons that Bush used to justify a military attack on Iraq. First, Bush argued that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction.

¹⁵⁴ James Kurth, “Confronting the Unipolar Moment: The American Empire and Islamic Terrorism,” *Current History*, December. 2002, p.404

¹⁵⁵ President’s remarks at the United Nations General Assembly, September 12, 2002 at <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912-1.html>>.; Derek Gregory, pp.180-1

When the crisis between the U.S. and Iraq was building up toward war, the main accusation levelled against Saddam was that he was manufacturing weapons of mass destruction. The U.S. administration regarded Saddam Hussein as a warlike dictator, who threatened his neighbours and American interests in Arab countries. Nonetheless, the administration won public support for invading Iraq by stressing the alleged threat of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

That the Bush administration intended attacking Iraq on the pretext of weapon of mass destruction, can be seen in the following quotation:¹⁵⁶

‘Right now, Iraq is expanding and improving facilities that were used for the production of biological weapons.’ (United Nation address, 12 September 2002)

‘Iraq has stockpiled biological and chemical weapons, and is rebuilding the facilities used to make more of those weapons.’

‘We have sources that tell us that Saddam Hussein recently authorized Iraqi field commanders to use chemical weapons – the very weapons the dictator tells us he does not have. (Radio address 5 October 2002)

‘Our intelligence officials estimate that Saddam Hussein had the materials to produce as much as 500 tons of sarin, mustard and VX nerve agent.’ (State of the Union address, 28 January 2003)

‘Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt

¹⁵⁶ Tariq Ali, *Bush in Babylon: The Recolonisation of Iraq*, London; New York: Verso, 2003, pp.147-9

that the Iraqi regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised.’ (Address to the nation, 17 March 2003)

The U.S. wanted to go to war regardless of the discovery of WMDs. The Bush administration and its London sidekick regarded Saddam, alone, as being sufficient reason for going to war. Iraq persistently obstructed the work of the U.N. weapons inspection teams. The U.S. administration regarded this as an act of the suppression of the truth and the possession of weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, President George W. Bush and leading U.S. administration officials exaggerated the intelligence estimates and drew unsupported conclusions about the dangers posed by Iraq, and al-Qaeda to America.

On February 14, 2003, the inspectors,¹⁵⁷ who had searched in Iraq for nuclear weapons and for chemical and biological weapons, reported that, after 11 weeks of investigation, they had discovered no evidence of WMDs and affirmed that a substantial degree of compliance had already been achieved. They also testified that they would be able to complete their work within eight months. On the other hand, U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell presented to members of the Security Council on February 5, 2003, evidence that Saddam Hussein had concealed the existence of WMD programs from the U.N. inspectors. However, Powell’s speech failed to persuade many of the members of the Security Council to agree to a second resolution against Iraq.

¹⁵⁷ leading the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC)

As a second reason for a military attack, Bush argued that the Iraqi government had persistently violated human rights. The war was ostensibly intended to stop the regime of Saddam Hussein from developing WMDs. But the invasion was not just about weapons. The plan was to put in place a democratic regime in Baghdad that would become an exemplar to the remaining authoritarian states of the Middle East.¹⁵⁸

After September 11, U.S policy makers began to talk about the need to pay more attention to the absence of democracy in the Arab world.¹⁵⁹ U.S. officials have increasingly come to believe that there is most definitely a lack of democracy in many of the Islamic countries. As a result, the radical Islam movement has become spirited and people (especially Iraqis) are trampling upon human rights. Bush summarized his broad global vision and America's preeminent role, as follows;¹⁶⁰

“People everywhere want to be able to speak freely, choose who will govern them, worship as they please, educate their children- male and female, own property, and enjoy the benefits of their labor. These values of freedom are right and true for every person, in every society.”

The Ba'athist regime in Iraq was, without question, savage and brutal, and identifying other regimes contemptuous of human rights does not exempt the

¹⁵⁸ Augustus Richard Norton and Farhad Kazemi, p.3

¹⁵⁹ Thomas Carothers, “Democracy: Terrorism’s Uncertain Antidote,” *Current History*, December. 2003, p.403

¹⁶⁰ Tony Carnes, “The Bush Doctrine,” *Christianity Today*, May. 2003, p.39

Iraqi government from international sanction.¹⁶¹

Ken Roth pointed out that it is not just cause to declare war on Iraq for violations of human rights.

. . . the Iraq war and the effort to justify it in humanitarian terms risk giving humanitarian intervention a bad name. If that breeds cynicism about the use of military force for humanitarian purposes, it could be devastating for people in need of future rescue.¹⁶²

Bush believes that promoting democracy in the Islamic World will bring peace to the entire world. He also believes that the U.S. set Iraqi people at liberty through the war.

“We believe that when all Middle Eastern peoples are finally allowed to live and think and work and worship as free men and women they will reclaim the greatness of their own heritage. In addition, when that day comes the bitterness and burning hatreds that feed terrorism will fade and die away. America and the entire world will be safer when hope has returned to the Middle East.” (At the Army War College in May 2004)¹⁶³

“We will defend the peace by fighting terrorists and tyrants. We will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers. We will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent.” (the National Security Strategy of the United States, Bush released the strategy on September 20, 2002)¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ Derek Gregory (ed), p.183

¹⁶² Ken Roth, “War in Iraq: not a humanitarian intervention,” in Human Rights Watch, World Report 2004 “Human rights and armed conflict,” at <<http://hrw.org/wr2k4/>>, January. 2004

¹⁶³ Augustus Richard Norton and Farhad Kazemi, p.3

¹⁶⁴ The full text is available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/20/polities>.

The U.S. administration is concerned about the agony suffered by the Iraqi people during Saddam Hussein's regime. Then, the U.S had attempted to topple Saddam Hussein by sanctions of military, political, economic, and diplomatic nature. However, the effects of sanctions were such that the civilians suffered more agony. Many Iraqi people lived on the verge of starvation. Because of starvation and a lack of medical supplies, mortality had increased, especially amongst infants and children (table 4.1). Moreover, many innocent Iraqi people died during the war.

Table 4.1 Infant and child mortality in Iraq, 1984-1999¹⁶⁵

province	Infant mortality per 1,000		Under 5 mortality per 1,000	
	1984-1989	1994-1999	1984-1989	1994-1999
North	64	59	80	72
South/Centre	47	108	56	131

Source: based on data in Mohamed Ali and Iqbal Shah, "Sanctions and childhood mortality in Iraq," *The Lancet* 335 92000, pp. 1851-7

The third reason given by Bush was that the regime of Saddam Hussein supported Islamic terrorist groups, especially al-Qaeda, and was implicated in the attacks on America on September 11.

In the weeks following September 11, Donald Rumsfeld, U.S. Secretary of Defense, asked the CIA on ten separate occasions to find evidence linking

¹⁶⁵ Derek Gregory (ed), p.178

Iraq to the attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon, and each time the agency drew a blank. Britain's Joint Intelligence Committee reached the same conclusion. Still, from the summer of 2002, as the administration started to agitate for a "regime change" in Iraq, both the President and his Secretary of Defense made increasingly sweeping claims about connections between al-Qaeda and Saddam Hussein's regime until, by September, Bush was insisting that the two were "already virtually indistinguishable." There is no credible evidence that Iraq was involved in the attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon on 11 September 2001.

I tentatively conclude that Bush had a lack of evidence, but he, nevertheless, attacked the Iraq. Then, I will question 'Why did President Bush attack the Iraq?' I suggest two answers to this question.

One of the answers is that many people, who oppose the U.S. invasion of Iraq, believe that a major element in the hidden aim of the US attack on Iraq is the oil issue, because the U.S. wants to take the leadership in the world oil market since she is the major consumer.

U.S. officials have not mentioned anything about oil and have chosen to downplay the role of oil in the war on Iraq. Therefore, to the extent that oil was mentioned in the war aims, it was always in the context of "saving the oil fields" from arson, "keeping the oilfields for the Iraqi people," or "averting major environmental disasters" by wresting the oil fields from the "evil regime of Saddam."¹⁶⁶ It was obvious, that oil was always in the background and that

¹⁶⁶ Raphael Israeli, p.140

they hid themselves behind slogans that were acceptable, such as promoting democracy, terrorism and human rights in the Gulf War.

As much as is possible the United States continues to increase its reliance upon imported crude oil. The U.S. has been seeking numerous ways to diversify its oil supplies away from its reliance on Saudi Arabia and has been wooing other countries such as Nigeria and Russia in this context.

Unfortunately, many people living in oil-producing areas (especially the Arabian Peninsula) have an anti-American view. The control of Iraqi oil would therefore not only fill a strategic gap but would act as an alternative to an erratic and volatile Islamic regime, which maintains friendly relations with the United States.

The second answer, George W, Bush was motivated by religious passion. According to him, "we're fighting evil," and there are no shades of grey. Many Christians in the United States support his passion. In January's (2003) State of the Union address and February's (2003) speech to the National Religious Broadcasters convention, Bush argued that U.S. foreign policy is designed to extend and protect freedom. He said, "people are born to freedom in the image of God." America's advocacy of freedom is not just one of America's special interests, he told the nation, because freedom is not "America's gift to the world. It is God's gift to humanity."¹⁶⁷ It is not easy to know how to be a Christian in wartime. In this case, especially, the attacker is a Christian and he believes that God wills it. But the defenders are Muslims and they are usually

¹⁶⁷ Tony Carnes, p.40

regarded with hostility.

Phillip Jensen, Dean of Saint Andrew's Anglican Cathedral in Sidney, Australia, came up with five different attitudes to this war.¹⁶⁸ First there are the doves, the pacifists who are opposed to all war and all violence. They are opposed to the war in Iraq because they oppose any use of force to resolve any issue. The second attitude is the opposite of the dove: the hawk. They are always looking for a fight, for controversy and the use of force to get their own way.

The third and fourth attitudes agree to the use of force. But in the third, they say it is "not yet" time for war. Maybe if the United Nations did more, maybe if Iraq invaded a neighbouring country, or if clearer evidence of a terrorist connection could be established – but not now. The fourth attitude is that of our government's – "at last" we have had to act. Those who hold this position must remember that this war cannot be fought in the name of God. This is not a religious war. The fifth attitude: the fence-sitters. They think that we are unable to decide right or wrong. They do not want to go to war. But neither do they want Saddam Hussein's regime (tyranny) to continue. Those in this category may not know what to do politically, but they can always pray.

4.2.3 The pros and cons of the war on Iraq

On 15 February 2003, over eight million people in major cities all over the

¹⁶⁸ See Christianity Today, May. 2003, pp.33-5

world took to the streets. They, who came from many different political and social backgrounds, were united only by the desire to prevent the imperialist invasion of an oil-rich Iraq. They participated in this march not only against the war on Iraq, but also against the United States and the countries participation in the war.

Britain was one of over eighty countries to suffer casualties from the attacks of September 11. British casualties were roughly estimated at fewer than a hundred deaths. Britain is always a loyal ally of the United States and was involved in the war in Afghanistan and the war in Iraq.

After the U.N. Security Council (February 14), the United States, the United Kingdom, and Spain introduced a resolution that would have had the council simply declare, under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter, that “Iraq had failed to take the final opportunity afforded to it in Resolution 1441.”¹⁶⁹ However, France, Germany, Russia, and China argued that they would block any subsequent resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq and proposed giving the Inspectors still more time.

On 18 March 2003, Blair announced ‘We are asked to accept Saddam’s decision to destroy those weapons’.¹⁷⁰ On the same day, Australian Prime Minister John Howard agreed to attack Iraq:

The action that might be taken as a result of this decision [to commit

¹⁶⁹ Michael J. Glennon, “Why the Security Council Failed,” *Foreign Affairs*, May/June. 2003, p.18

¹⁷⁰ Tariq Ali, p.149

Australian troops] has a sound legal basis in the resolutions of the Security Council that have already been passed.¹⁷¹

The UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, regretfully said that it was a 'sad day for the United Nations and the international community.'¹⁷² President Putin condemned the war as 'a big political mistake,' and worldwide from Sydney to Moscow and San Francisco, demonstrators took to the streets in protest.¹⁷³

When Gerhard Schröder used his opposition to a war in Iraq to squeeze out a re-election victory in Germany, Bush refused to place the customary congratulatory phone call.

Foreign opinion about America increasingly soured in the weeks leading up to the Iraqi war. Among the eight largest European countries polled in March 2003, only in Poland did even 50 percent hold a favorable view of the United States. Britain came in a close second, with 48 percent holding a favorable view. In Italy and France, only a third did; in Germany and Russia only a quarter did; and in Spain and Turkey barely 10 percent did. The antagonism is especially pronounced in the Arab and Islamic world. In Jordan, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan, and among the Palestinians, near majorities polled earlier this year (2003) believed that bin Laden would do the right thing in world

¹⁷¹ Transcript available ABC News Online, "Howard confirms Australian military commitment to Iraq war", URL<<http://www.abc.net.au/public/s809462.htm>>; quoted from Alex Conte, Security in the 21st century: The United Nations, Afghanistan and Iraq, Ashgate, 2005, p.141

¹⁷² The Independent, 6 March 2003, p.6; quoted from Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn (ed), p.9

¹⁷³ Newslines, Vol. 7, No. 51, Part 1, 18 March 2003, p.1, quoted from Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn (ed), p.9

affairs. By contrast, overwhelming majorities said they had no confidence in Bush's leadership.¹⁷⁴

There is as much in a war against terrorists as against conventional enemies. Unlike a conventional military campaign, a war on terrorism has no enemy capital to seize and industrial base to destroy. In spite of this the U.S administration attacked Baghdad, which they looked upon as the capital of terrorism.

4.3 The current confrontation between Christianity and Islam

The United States is confronting Islamic terrorism because of its bitterness over the violence, especially following the attacks of September 11. In order to understand the roots of the present conflict, it is important to look at the historical evolution in the relationship between the West and Islam in general, and between Christianity and Islam in particular.

The Crusades were always on the minds of Europeans in the age of imperialism. Politicians, soldiers, and scholars all drew upon the Crusades for inspiration and justification. The European Christians always desired to conquer the Holy Land.¹⁷⁵ In 1862 the Prince of Wales, future English king

¹⁷⁴ Ivo H. Daalder and James M. Lindsay, "Bush's Revolution," *Current History*, November 2003, p.374

¹⁷⁵ There are many examples to support this point; Carl Hill, "The Crusades and Modern

Edward VII, visited the Holy Land and stayed on the very spot where Godfrey of Bouillon supposedly camped while outside the walls of Jerusalem. When German emperor Wilhelm II visited Jerusalem in 1898, he did so on horseback dressed as a Teutonic Knight and entered the city by the Jaffa Gate in the style of a triumphant Crusader lord. The most marked use of the Crusade image in relation to contemporary warfare was to be found during the First World War, English clergymen proclaimed this war to be a Holy War, similar to a Crusade.

Finally, I will say that imperialism and colonialism was a continuation of the Crusades. This concept spread to the Arab World and confirmed the concept of the jihad. However, modern Western leaders have abstained from linking the current crisis with a Crusade.

Many Arab Muslims experienced more than ten centuries of tremendous cultural achievement by Western invaders. The current struggle between Islam and the West began neither in 1990, when the United States launched Operation Desert Storm, nor in 1948, with the creation of the State of Israel. It began more than 900 years ago in a field in France when Pope Urban II called for a Crusade against the Seljuk Turks.¹⁷⁶ Muslims suffered great

East-West Relations." History in Dispute, Vol. 10:

<http://www.galenet.galegroup.com.innopac.up.ac.za:80/servlet/History/>; Elizabeth Siberry, *The New Crusaders: Images of The Crusades In The 19th and Early 20th Centuries*, Aldershot; Burlington USA; Singapore; Sydney: Ashgate, 2000; Albert Marrin, *The Last Crusade: The Church of England in The First World War*, Durham North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1974

¹⁷⁶ Paul L. Williams, *Al Qaeda: Brotherhood of Terror*, Alpha – A Pearson Education Inc., 2002, p.52

hardships: the invasion of the Crusades in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, and Western colonialism that began in the early 1800s.

Although the West has long since repudiated the idea of religious warfare, especially the crusades, Arab nationalists and Islamic radical terrorists retain a worldview of this type of conflict.¹⁷⁷ Modern Muslims (especially terrorists) have rediscovered and reinterpreted the crusades. According to such thinking, the crusader states were “proto-colonies,” since then, Western Christianity has continually tried to conquer Islamic Land: Napoleon’s Egyptian expedition, in the 20th century Britain and France’s occupation of Arab territories of the former Ottoman Empire under League of Nations mandates, and the creation of the State of Israel in 1948.¹⁷⁸ Moreover, Arab nationalists and terrorists argued that Americans are New Crusaders, because the U.S administration intervenes in the internal affairs of Arab countries, sometimes allowing U.S troops to invade them, in support of Israel.

For figures such as Sayyid Qutb, who spoke of “international crusaderism,” the crusades never ended; the struggle between Christianity and Islam is ongoing. Mehmet Ali Agca, the Turk who attempted to kill the Pope in 1981, wrote in a letter. “I have decided to kill Pope John Paul II, supreme commander of the Crusades.”¹⁷⁹ Saddam Hussein advocated a jihad against Western Christianity. After his invasion of Kuwait in 1990, he announced the need for steadfastness against the “New Crusaders,” who were scheming

¹⁷⁷ Thomas F. Madden (ed), 2002, p.2

¹⁷⁸ Thomas E, Madden, 2004, pp.207-8

¹⁷⁹ *ibid*, p.208

against the Arab homeland and the Islamic Holy Shrines of Mecca and Medina.

Osama bin Laden and other terrorist leaders declared a jihad, or holy war, against the “American Crusaders” who, they believed, were intent on conquering the Muslim world for Christianity. On February 23, 1998, Al-Qaeda officials, along with the Egyptian Jihad Group, Al-Jihad, the Jihad Movement of Bangladesh, and the Pakistan Scholars Society, endorsed a Fatwa under the heading “International Islamic Front for Jihad on the Jews and Crusaders.”¹⁸⁰

In compliance with God’s order, we issue the following fatwa to all Muslims: The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies – civilians and military – is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it, in order to liberate the Al Aqsa Mosque and the holy mosque [Mecca] from their grip, and in order for their armies to move out of all the lands of Islam, defeated and unable to threaten any Muslim. This is in accordance with the words of Almighty God, ‘and fight the pagans all together as they fight you all together,’ and ‘fight them until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in God,’”

Dr Nasser al-Zahrani, whose sermon was broadcast live on national television, called upon all Muslims to join the war against America.

Oh our people! Why are you sitting cross-handed? The fighting is a duty, for the Crusaders have returned once again . . . Their war against

¹⁸⁰ Paul L. Williams, p.51

Islam has its motive . . . Are they humane motives? Let us examine the non-Muslim creeds – the Jewish and the Christian . . . What lay behind their wars? Is it justice or freedom as they claim?

President Bush and his administration are pushed by their Judaic-Christian-Zionist faith to fight and kill.¹⁸¹

He accused the medieval Crusaders of having entered the Al- Aqsa Mosque and having slaughtered 70,000 Muslims, and knowing no pity for children and the aged. Because of these Crusades, the cleric claimed, all the land is burning with terrorism, despite the huge demonstration across the world against what is happening in Iraq and Palestine.¹⁸²

A Palestinian preacher, Sheikh Ibrahim Mdeiras, repeated the same ideas on Palestinian Authority Television.¹⁸³

Oh Muslims! Wake up from your slumber! It is your faith that is under attack! Iraq is also attacked for economic and strategic reasons, and as a personal vendetta, but there are also historical and religious reasons . . .

This is a religious war . . . The Iraqis who defend justice are martyrs. Iraq is sacred because there is a golden mountain there, as the Prophet has said. The Crusaders know about that golden mountain, for which they came to Iraq, but that mountain will turn Iraq into a cemetery for the invaders and the Infidels. (March 21, 2003)

Al-Qaeda argued that the war on Iraq is a Crusade. On their Web site and

¹⁸¹ Qatar Television, March 21, 2003. Cited by MEMRI, quoted from Raphael Israeli, pp.214-5

¹⁸² Raphael Israeli, p.222

¹⁸³ Al-Hayat al-Jadida, The Palestinian Authority, March 24, 2003; and al-Quds, also the PA, March 30, 2003. Both cited by MEMRI, quoted from Raphael Israeli, p.215

under the heading of “The Crusader War against Iraq,” al-Qaeda publishes its summary of the war and in a series of 35 articles, based on so many questions that were raised in the first article and answered.¹⁸⁴

What happened today in Baghdad, with the entrance of the Crusader forces there without battle, was not surprising for those who scrutinize things from a military point of view, because their entrance to the Capital had been expected sooner or later, and the terrain did not allow the Iraqi defense to stand fast, as long as it operated as a regular army . . .

John Esposito noted, "despite their common monotheistic roots, the history of Christianity and Islam has more often than not been marked by confrontation rather than peaceful coexistence and dialogue. For the Christian West, Islam is the religion of the sword (jihad), the opposite for Muslims; the Christian West is epitomized by the armies of the Crusades. The United States was not in existence at the time, as a symbol of Western power today the United States has inherited the legacy of these historical encounters, which were characterized by cycles of confrontation and collaboration.

What about the use of terrorism in the name of religious causes? It is true that militant religious fundamentalists often throughout history have waged holy terror as part of a holy war. The major reason why moderate Muslim leaders of Islamic countries, and particular radical Islamic terrorist groups, are such a threat is precisely because their revolutionary Islamic agenda aims not merely at the purifying of religious practice, but at the overthrow of existing

¹⁸⁴ ibid, p.228

governments and their replacement by fundamentalist theocracies. Hence, these movements are inherently religious and political.¹⁸⁵ The modern fanatical Islamic terrorists groups such as Hizbollah, Hamas, al-Gama's Al-Islamiyya, and al-Qaeda emphasize such a religious cause.

¹⁸⁵ Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn (ed), p.28

Chapter Five: Conclusion

5.1 Summary

On Tuesday, 27 November 1095, at the Council of Clermont, Pope Urban II made an appeal for a military expedition to liberate Jerusalem. The appeal, which was taken up was very successful. The five armies (the First Crusaders) set out for the Holy Land. The first army led by Hugh of Vermandois departed from France about the middle of August 1096. The second army was led by Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lorraine, and his brother, Baldwin of Boulogne. The third army led by Bohemond of Taranto and his nephew Tancred left with the Normans of southern Italy. The fourth army led by Duke Robert of Normandy, his cousin Robert, Count of Flanders, and his brother-in-law Count Stephen of Blois. The last army led by Count Raymond IV of Toulouse probably left in December 1096. Adhemar, Bishop of Le Puy, the papal legate, accompanied Raymond's Crusaders. The result of the First Crusade was that the Latin States of the East were born: the county of Antioch, the county of Edessa, the county of Tripoli and the kingdom of Jerusalem

Zengi has been hailed as the First great combatant of the jihad against the Crusaders. He imposed the strictest discipline on his troops, unlike other armies against previous Crusaders. On Christmas Eve of 1144, Zengi's army

recaptured Edessa , the first of the four Christian states born out of the First Crusade. With the recapture the spirit of the Holy War (jihad) shifted to the Muslim camp.

The horrible news of the fall of Edessa had spread throughout the West by returning pilgrims. Pope Eugenius III immediately called for a second Crusade on 1st, December, 1145. St. Bernard, the papal legate, preached Crusade sermons to the French and the Germans.

The Second Crusaders went east for the purpose of assisting Crusaders that had settled in the Holy Land. They failed to realize the anticipated result in the Holy Land and, on the contrary, brought about the mutual recriminations that ensued in soured relations between the West and the Crusader States for an entire generation.

Friday, 2nd October 1187 was a memorable day on which Saladin's troops recaptured Jerusalem. Saladin's advance in Palestine continued unabated. Eventually, he had recovered most of Palestine. Only Tyre among the cities of the Kingdom of Jerusalem still remained.

The bad news about the fall of Jerusalem changed Western minds. Pope Gregory VIII initiated a new Crusade. On 11 May 1189, the Holy Roman Emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, was the first to get his army on the move for the Holy Land. It was undoubtedly one of the largest crusading armies ever to leave Europe. However, he failed to step on Holy Land soil because he died en route to Jerusalem.

Richard I , the King of England, met Phillip, the King of France, at Vézelay and decided to go to the Holy Land by sea. The siege of Acre had lasted for

almost two years. After Richard's arrival on June 8th 1191, the siege was pressed more vigorously. Finally, the Turkish garrison surrendered on July 12th, 1192. After a series of fierce battles, King Richard made a truce with Saladin on October 9th, 1192, and then sailed home to curb his ambitious brother, Count John. The Third Crusade was ended. The Third Crusaders had recovered most of the coastal region and had re-established the Kingdom of Jerusalem.

Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) issued a crusading bull on 15 August 1198. However, in the summer of 1202, the Crusaders faced terrible problems as a result of the lack of money and men. The Venetians treaty with the Fourth Crusaders suggested an attack on the port of Zara. The leaders had no stomach for such a thing, but they had no other option. The Fourth Crusaders took the city on November 24th, 1202.

Moreover, on Friday morning, April 9th, 1204, the Fourth Crusaders with the Venetians launched a full-scale attack to Constantinople. They took the city after four days' of direct assault. On May 16th, Baldwin, Count of Flanders, was crowned the first Latin Emperor of Constantinople in Hagia Sophia. Byzantine was divided between the Latin Emperor, the Venetians, and the other leaders. The Pope, Innocent III hailed the news of the conquest of Constantinople as a miraculous vindication of the papal claims to supremacy over the Byzantine church. Moreover, the Crusaders understood their success as a manifestation of God's will.

Everyone who 'took the Cross' had received the indulgence. The indulgence consisted of the Crusader's release from the burden of sin. But the

issuance of indulgences suffered the same discrediting misuse as the Crusade itself, for the Crusade began to be dissipated into all kinds of other enterprises. There were Crusaders fighting heretics, pagans and papacy political enemies.

As time went by, the Crusades to the Holy Land became weakened. Finally, on 28th, May 1291, the remainder of the Holy Land (Acre) fell into Mamluk hands. The pontiffs in the fifteenth century once again sought to revive crusading passion against the Turks, but the papacy had been too badly discredited and had lost much of its authority.

In chapter three, we looked at the influence of the Crusades.

The Crusades were the turning point for Europe, pushing the continent out of an isolated Dark Age and into the modern world. In considering the social and political influence of the Crusades, it is necessary to be cautious, lest too many of the changes, which took place in Europe during the period of the Crusades, be ascribed to their influence.

The Italian maritime cities (especially Pisa, Genoa, and Venice) took the advantage of increasing their maritime power. They had powerful fleets, so they assisted in the conquest of Muslim lands. In most cases, Greek and Islam culture was introduced into Europe by the Italian maritime cities.

We are able to summarize three points about the influence of Crusades in the Byzantine Empire. First, in April 1204, the Fourth Crusaders occupied Constantinople, which was the heart of the Byzantine Empire. It was the greatest sacking of Byzantine. Second, The Crusades made the relations between the Christian East and West worse than before, and did more

damage to Byzantine than to Islam. Third, the event of the fall of Constantinople helped to make the decisive separation of the Greek and Latin Churches more hostile and significant.

The most important influence of the Crusades that affected Islam was that it roused the spirit of jihad. Therefore, leaders of terrorists groups profess to be successors of Saladin.

In chapter four, I have attempted to judge the war on Iraq and have treated confrontation between Christianity and Islam.

On September 11, 2001, a group of 19 Muslim Arab terrorists hijacked four passenger planes en route across the United States. Two of them crashed into the World Trade Centre twin towers. The third plane crashed into the Pentagon building. The immediate death toll was estimated about three thousand civilians.

After the attack of September 11, President Bush labelled the attacks as 'acts of war' and declared the U.S. to be at war. As a result, the US military, with British participation, launched attacks against terrorist camps in Afghanistan on 7 October 2001. Finally, on 6 December, Alliance troops occupied Qandahar, the geographical heart of the Taliban movement, and Taliban forces in the city agreed to surrender to Karzai's new government.

On 29 January 2002, President Bush declared that America would act against an 'Axis of Evil' formed by Iran, Iraq and North Korea. He accused these countries of developing weapons of mass destruction.

In January 2003, the Iraqi government accepted the inspection of UN, but Bush argued that it was a trick to gain time for a cover up of the facts. In

February 2003, the U.S. administration introduced a resolution authorizing an attack on Iraq. On 20 March 2003, US troops and allied troops launched an invasion on Iraq without the sanction of the UN Security Council. Finally, on May 1, 2003, Bush declared his victory and announced the end of a “major combat operation” in Iraq.

Bush adduced three reasons for attacking Iraq. First, Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction. Second, the Iraqi government had persistently violated human rights, and routinely used torture and carried out summary executions. Third, the regime of Saddam Hussein was implicated in transnational terrorism and, specifically, in the attacks of September 11. I tentatively conclude that Bush lacked the necessary evidence, but he, nevertheless, attacked Iraq.

The Crusades were always on the minds of Europeans in the age of imperialism. The European Christians always desired to re-conquer the Holy Land. Modern Muslims think that the crusader states were “proto-colonies,” and that since then, Western Christianity has continually tried to conquer Islamic Land. Moreover, Arab nationalists and terrorists argued that Americans are New Crusaders, because the U.S administration intervenes in the internal affairs of Arab countries, sometimes allowing U.S troops invade them in support of Israel.

5.2 Final Statement

Up to now, I have looked at the history of the Crusades, the influence of the Crusades, the war on Iraq, and the current crisis between Islam and Western Christianity. Proceeding from what has been said above, it should be concluded that the current crisis has, indeed, reflected images of the Crusades.

I have earlier alluded to the fact that the leaders of modern Islamic terrorist groups have spoken as the successors of Saladin. They also argued that the Westerners (especially Americans) who support Israel and intervene in the internal affairs of the Muslim countries are the 'new Crusaders.'

Westerners have two different views of the Crusades. On the one hand is the American/British view that the Kingdom of Jerusalem and the State of Israel is the recovering of the inheritance of Jewish people. After September 11, President Bush used the term 'crusade' to describe the U.S. mission against the forces of evil. He has been more open about his Christian convictions in private. Bush had distinguished between those who are "evil" and those who are "good," between those who are "for us" and those who are "against us," between those who "love freedom" and those who "hate the freedom we love." The war on terrorism is a "crusade."¹⁸⁶ Bush also argued that his aim was to give freedom to Muslims, especially the Iraqis. For this cause, he attacked not only Saddam Hussein but also the innocent Iraqi people.

On the other hand, the other Westerners (especially the French) argued

¹⁸⁶ Ivo H. Daalder and James M. Lindsay, p.373

that the Crusader was the first colonialist. On October 8, 2002, the Prime Minister of France, Jean-Pierre Raffarin, in a speech to the French National Assembly, told how Saladin was able “to defeat the Crusaders in Galilee and liberate Jerusalem.” This is an interesting use of the word ‘liberate’ by a French Prime Minister. It is a reflection of present-day realignments or, alternatively, a case of extreme political correctness.¹⁸⁷

In the period of the Crusades (or even nowadays), it was difficult to keep the peace between Islam and Christianity. Richard, the Lion Heart, was suspected of collaboration with Muslims, because of his negotiations with al-Adil; in this connection, even his friends reported that ‘it was a common saying that a friendship with the Gentiles was a heinous offence.’¹⁸⁸ Emperor Frederick concluded a peace treaty with al-Kamil and on the 17th March, 1229, he entered Jerusalem with a glorious ceremony. However, the Pope excommunicated Frederick for making peace, and called a new Crusade against the Emperor.

Jesus presented to His disciples ‘The Parable of the Tares.’ There were tares among the wheat in the field. The slaves of the landowner said to the landowner ‘Sir, do you want us, then, to go and gather them up?’ But he said, ‘No; for while you are gathering up the tares, you may uproot the wheat with them. Allow both to grow together until the harvest.’¹⁸⁹ There were infidels

¹⁸⁷ Bernard Lewis, *The Crisis of Islam: Holy War and Unholy Terror*, London: Phoenix, 2003, p.42

¹⁸⁸ Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1958, p.114

¹⁸⁹ Reference, Matthew 13: 24-43: All biblical references are to the New American Standard

among the Christians. We do not gather them because Jesus will send forth his angels, and they will gather the tares at the end of the age. Our duty is not to conquer by war but to preach the Gospel with peaceful ways, and then it is necessary for us to learn peaceful coexistence.

Results of this study leave more to be investigated and answered, and any deficiencies in this treatise are, of course, due entirely to me.

Bibliography

- A.J. Arberry (ed), *Religion in The Middle East*, 2 vols, London: Cambridge University Press, 1969
- AL. J. Venter, *The Iraqi War Debrief: Why Saddam Hussein was Toppled*, South Africa: Earthbound Publications, 2004
- Alan O'Day (ed), *War on Terrorism*, Aldershot; Hants; Burlington: Ashgate, 2004
- Alan Sorensen, "The Reluctant Nation Builders," *Current History*, December. 2003, pp.407-10
- Albert Marrin, *The Last Crusade: The Church of England in The First World War*, Durham North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1974
- Alex Conte, *Security in the 21st century: The United Nations, Afghanistan and Iraq*, Aldershot; Hants; Burlington: Ashgate, 2005
- Amin Maalouf, *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes*, trans. Jon Rothschild, New York: Schocken Books, 1984
- Andrew curry, "The First Holy War," *Mysteries of Faith*, 2003, pp.68-75
- Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (ed), *The Crusades from the perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001
- Antonie Wessels, *Arab and Christian: Christians in the Middle East*, Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1995
- Archibald R. Lewis, *Naval Power and Trade in the Mediterranean A.D. 500-*

1100, Princeton. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951

Augustus Richard Norton and Farhad Kazemi, "The Limits of Shock and Awe: America in the Middle East," *Current History*, January. 2005, pp.3-9

Augustus Richard Norton, "Making War, Making Peace: The Middle East Entangles America," *Current History*. January. 2004, pp.3-7

Aziz S. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity*, London: Methuen & Co Ltd · 11 New Fetter Lane · London EC4, 1968

— — —, *Crusade, Commerce and Culture*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962

Bernard Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, London: Variorum Publications Ltd, 1980

Bernard Lewis, *The Crisis of Islam: Holy War and Unholy Terror*, London: Phoenix, 2003

Bob Woodward, *Plan of Attack*, London; Sydney; New York; Toronto: Pocket Books, 2004

Bruce L. Shelley, "How Could Christians Do This?" *Christian History*, Issue 40, vol. 12, no. 4, 1993, pp.16-9

Bruce Lawrence (ed), *Messages to The World: The Statements of Osama Bin Laden*, trans. James Howarth, London · New York: Verso, 2005

Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of The Idea of Crusade*, trans. Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart, Princeton; New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977

Carl Hill, "The Crusades and Modern East-West Relations," *History in Dispute*, Vol. 10: <http://0->

galenet.galegroup.com.innopac.up.ac.za:80/servlet/History/

Christopher Tyerman, *England in the Crusades 1095-1588*, Chicago;
London: The University of Chicago Press, 1988

Daniel Benjamin and Steven Simon, *The Age of Sacred Terror: Radical
Islam's War Against America*, New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks,
2003

Dennis Piskiewicz, *Terrorism's War with America: A History*, Westport;
London: Praeger, 2003

Derek Baker (ed), *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*,
Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973,

Derek Gregory, *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan • Palestine • Iraq*,
Malden; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004

Donald E. Queller, *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople
1201 – 1204*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977

Donald M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261-1453*, London:
Rupert Hart-Davis, 1972

— — —, *Byzantium and Venice*, Cambridge; New York; New Rochelle;
Melbourne; Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1988

Douglas Thorburn, *The Children's Crusade*, Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall
Ltd, 1985

E.O. Blake and C. Morris, "A Hermit Goes to war: Pert and Origins of the
First Crusade", *Studies in Church History*, Issue 22. 1985, pp.79-107

Elizabeth Siberry, *The New Crusaders: Images of The Crusades in The
19th and Early 20th Centuries*, Aldershot; Burlington USA; Singapore;

Sydney: Ashgate, 2000

Encyclopedia Britannica Deluxe Edition 2004 CD-ROM, Computer Software,
Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 2004

Francesco Gabrieli, Arab Historians of the Crusades, trans. E.J. Costello,
Routledge & Kegan Paul, London: Melbourne and Henley, 1984

Frederick H. Russel, The Just War in The Middle Ages, Cambridge;
London; New York; Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1975

Gary M. Anderson, Robert B. Ekelund Jr, Robert F. Hebert and Robert D.
Tollison, "An Economic Interpretation of the Medieval Crusades," pp.339-363

Gary Rosen (ed), The Right War?: The Conservative Debate on Iraq,
Cambridge; New York; Melbourne; Madrid; Cape Town; Singapore; Sao
Paulo: Cambridge University Press, 2005

Gregory Miller, "From Crusades to Homeland Defense," Christian History,
Issue 74, vol. 21, no. 2, 2002, pp.31-4

Hadia Dajani-Shakeel, "The Muslim Defense," Christian History, Issue 40,
vol. 12, no. 4, 1993, pp.32-5

Hans Blix, Disarming Iraq: The Search for Weapons of Mass Destruction,
London: Bloomsbury, 2005

Hans Eberhard Mayer, The Crusades, trans. John Gillingham, London:
Oxford University Press, 1972

The Crusades, 2nd ed. trans. John Gillingham, New York: Oxford University
Press, 1982

Irwin Abrams and Wang Gungwu, The Iraq War and its Consequences,
New Jersey; London; Singapore; Shanghai; Hong Kong; Taipei; Bangalore:

World Scientific, 2003

Ivo H. Daalder and James M. Lindsay, "Bush's Revolution," *Current History*, November. 2003, pp.367-76

— — —, James M. Lindsay, and James B. Steinberg, "Hard Choice: National Security and the War on Terrorism," *Current History*, December. 2002, pp.409-13

J. M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in The Byzantine Empire*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986

James A. Brundage, "Adhemar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critic," *Mediaeval Academy of America*, Issue X X X IV. 1959, pp.201-12

James Kurth, "Confronting the Unipolar Moment: The American Empire and Islamic Terrorism," *Current History*, December. 2002, pp.403-8

Jean Richard, *Saint Louis: Crusader King of France*, trans. Jean Birrell, Cambridge; New York; Port Chester; Melbourne; Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1983

— — —, Jean Richard, *The Latin kingdom of Jerusalem*, trans. Janet Shirley, New York; Oxford: North-Holland Publishing, Inc., 1979

Jennifer D. Kibbe, "The Rise of the Shadow Warriors," *Foreign Affairs* March/April 2004, pp.102-115

Joanne Meyerowitz (ed), *History and September 11th*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003

John France, *Victory in the East: A military History of the First Crusade*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994

— — —, "The Capture of Jerusalem," *History today*, April. 1997, pp.37-42

John Godfrey, 1204 The Unholy Crusade, New York: Oxford University Press, 1980

Jonathan Phillips, "Who were The First Crusades," History Today, May. 1997, pp.16-22

— — —, "The Fourth Crusade and The Sack of Constantinople," History Today, May. 2004, pp.21-8

Jonathan Riley-Smith (ed), The Oxford History of The Crusades, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999

— — —, The Oxford Illustrated History of The Crusades, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997

— — —, The atlas of the Crusades, London: Times Books, 1991

— — —, What were The Crusades?, 2nd ed, London: Macmillan, 1992

Jorge G. Castaneda, "The Forgotten Relationship," Foreign Affairs, May/June. 2003, pp.67-81

Joseph S. Nye, Jr, "U.S. Power and strategy After Iraq," Foreign Affairs, July/August. 2003, p.61

Joshua Prawer, The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: European Colonialism in the Middle Ages, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972

Judith S. Yaphe, "Iraq Before and After Saddam," Current History, January. 2003, pp.7-12

Karen Armstrong, Holy War, London: Macmillan, 1998.

Ken Parry, David J. Melling, Dimitri Brady, Sidney H. Griffith and John F. Healey (ed), The Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity, Oxford; Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 1999

Kenneth M. Pollack, *The Threatening Storm: The Case for Invading Iraq*,
New York: Random House, 2002

Kenneth M. Setton (ed), *A History of the Crusades*, 6 vols: Marshall W.
Baldwin (ed), 'The First Hundred Years,' Philadelphia: University of
Pennsylvania press, vol.1, 1958

— — —, *A History of the Crusades*, 6 vols: Robert Lee Wolff and Harry W.
Hazard (ed), 'The Later Crusades 1189-1311,' Philadelphia: University of
Pennsylvania Press, vol. 2, 1962

— — —, *A History of The Crusades*, 6 vols, Harry W. Hazard (ed), 'The
Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,' Wisconsin · London: The University of
Wisconsin Press, vol. 3, 1975

— — —, *A History of The Crusades*, 6 vols, Norman P. Zacour and Harry W.
Hazard (ed), 'The Impact of The Crusades on The Near East,' Wisconsin: The
University of Wisconsin Press, vol. 5, 1985

— — —, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance,"
Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol.100, No. 1, 24. 02.
1956, p.3

Kevin Phillips, "Crusader: Bush's religious Passion," *Christian Century*, July
13. 2004, pp.8-9

Kimberley A. McCloud, "Al-Qaeda and the Reach of Terror," *History behind
the Headlines: The Origins of Conflicts Worldwide*, Volume 5. Gale Group,
2002. Reproduced in History Resource Center. Farmington Hills, MI: Gale
Group. <http://0-galenet.galegroup.com.innopac.up.ac.za:80/servlet/History/>

L. Elliott Binns, *The History of The Decline and Fall Medieval Papacy*,

Hamden · Conn: Archon Books, 1967

Louis Brehier, "The Crusades: The Victory of Idealism," in James A. Brundage (ed), *The Crusades, Motives and Achievements*, Boston: Heath and Company, 1965

M. A. Cook (ed), *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the rise of Islam to the present day*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1970

Malcolm Barber, "How The West Saw Medieval Islam," *History Today*, May. 1997, pp.44-50

Marcus Bull, "The Pilgrimage Origins of The First Crusade," *History Today*, March. 1997, pp.10-5

Mark Danner, *Torture and Truth: America, Abu Garaib, and The War on Terror*, New York: New York Review Books, 2004

Mark Galli, "Bloody Pilgrimage," *Christian History*, Issue 40, vol. 12, no. 4, 1993, pp.8-15

Mary Buckley and Rick Fawn (ed), *Global Responses to Terrorism: 9/11, Afghanistan and beyond*, London · New York: Routledge, 2003

Matti Moosa, "The Crusades: An Eastern perspective, with emphasis on Syriac sources," *Muslim World*, Issue 93, No.2, April. 2003, pp.249-89

Michael Angold, *The Byzantine Empire 1025-1204: A Political History*, London; New York: Longman, 1984

— — —, *The Fourth Crusade: Event and Contest*, Harlow; New York: Longman, 2003

Michael Gervers, "The Fighting Monks," *Christian History*, Issue 40, vol. 12, no. 4, 1993, pp.39-41

- Michael J. Glennon, "Why the Security Council Failed," *Foreign Affairs*.
May/June. 2003, pp.16-35
- Nigel Saul, "Late Medieval Crusading," *History Today*, June. 1997, pp.23-8
- Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*, Edinburgh:
Edinburgh University Press, 1958
- Norman Housley, *The Later Crusades 1274 – 1580: From Lyons to Alcazar*,
New York: Oxford University Press, 1992
- Paul Crawford, "A Deadly Give and Take," *Christian History*, Issue 74, vol.21,
no.2, 2002, pp.19-24
- Paul L. Williams, *Al Qaeda: Brotherhood of Terror*, Alpha Books and
Pearson Education, Inc., 2002
- Penny J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095 –
1270*, Cambridge; Massachusetts: The Medieval Academy of America, 1991
- Peter Raedts, "The Children's Crusade of 1212," *Journal of Medieval
History*, 3. 1977, pp.279-324
- Philip Jensen, "Apocalypse Again and Again," *Christianity Today*, May. 2003,
pp.33-5
- Raphael Israeli, *The Iraq War: Hidden Agendas and Babylonian Intrigue*,
Brighton; Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2004
- Richard Ager Newhall, *The Crusades*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and
Winston. Inc., 1969
- Richard Wolffe and Daniel Klaidman, "Judging The Case," *Newsweek*,
February 17, 2003, pp.16-21
- Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural*

Change 950 -1350, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1996

Robert Irwin, "Muslim responses to the Crusades", *History Today*, 04, 1997

— — —, 'Islam and the Crusades 1096-1699,' in Jonathan Riley-Smith (ed)

The Oxford Illustrated history of the Crusades, Oxford University Press, 1995

Robert Fossier (ed), *The Cambridge Illustrated History of The Middle Ages: volume 2, 950 – 1250*, trans. Stuart Airlie and Robyn Marsack, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997

— — —, *The Cambridge Illustrated History of The Middle Ages: volume 3, 1250 – 1520*, trans. Sarah Hanbury Tenison, Cambridge; New York; New Rochelle; Melbourne; Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1986

S. D. Goitein, 'Mediterranean Trade in the Eleventh Century: Some Facts and Problems,' in M. A. Cook (ed), *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the rise of Islam to the present day*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1970

Simon Lloyd, "The Crusades of St Louis," *History Today*, May. 1997, pp.37-43

Sir Thomas Arnold, *Influence & Impression of Islam*, Delhi: Rightway Publicationns, 2001

Sir Steven Runciman, 'The Crusades: A Moral Failure,' in James A. Brundage (ed), *Motives and Achievements*, Boston: Heath and Company, 1965

— — —, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols: 'The First Crusade and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, vol. 1, 1951

— — —, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols: 'The Kingdom of Jerusalem and

the Frankish East 1100-1187, vol.2, 1952

— — —, A History of the Crusades, 3 vols: 'The Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades, vol.3, 1954

— — —, The First Crusade, Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005

— — —, "The Children's Crusade," Christian History, Issue 40, vol.12, no.4, 1993, pp.30-1

Steven Gertz, "Spiritual Warriors," Christian History, Issue 74, vol. 21, no. 2, 2002, pp.28-30

Tariq Ali, Bush in Babylon: The Recolonisation of Iraq, London; New York: Verso, 2003

Terry Jones and Alan Ereira, Crusades, New York: Facts on File, 1995

Thomas Carothers, "Democracy: Terrorism's Uncertain Antidote," Current History, December. 2003, pp.403-6

Thomas E, Madden, Crusades: The Illustrated History, London: Duncan Baird Publishers Ltd, 2004,

— — — (ed), The Crusades; The essential Readings, Oxford; Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002

Timothy George, "Is the God of Muhammad the Father of Jesus?," Christianity Today, February 4. 2002, pp.28-35

Tony Carnes, "The Bush Doctrine," Christianity Today, May. 2003, pp.38-40