

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 Historians have different views about the reasons for the failure of the Fourth Crusade. Analyse and evaluate the extracts and use your knowledge of the issues to explain your answer to the following question.

How convincing do you find the view that the Fourth Crusade failed because Innocent III made 'the acquisition of wealth' (Extract 1 Line 13) a motive for crusading?

(20)

Plan → Innocent became Pope 1197.

Robert of Paris
- Flury of Nully

Failed → Poor leadership → Richard didn't want to be put down.

FOR against -

Philip II too busy.

rumour against him that he emboldened the Muslims.

→ Crusades = low no. → Preachers

The fourth crusade failed under many reasons under Pope Innocent III, when he became pope in 1197, some even said that the crusade failed before it even started due to the failure of leadership and the number of crusades that turned up because of the preachers not doing as well enough. However, the acquisition of wealth also played a main motive ~~why~~ encouraging the failure of the fourth crusade.

In Extract 1, it tells us that the "taxation of the clergy, local organisation of preaching and fund-raising and the clear intention to support warfare on behalf of the Church" were factors that Innocent included in helping the crusade to grow. We know that he wanted funding for the

Innocent had no set reason to take to take Jerusalem back



(Section C continued) from the muslim as Richard I's truce was in place and gave christians an open chance to visit the Holy Land when they desired. Jerusalem faced no major threat and the desire for it to be fought over had come to an end. However when P Innocent became Pope in 1197, he wanted to be the Pope that retook Jerusalem, purely for power and wealth.

We see this in extract 1. It states that Innocent took the "motivation for crusading away from an allowed religious duty to retake Jerusalem for Christendom, and made the acquisition of wealth decisive in the minds of crusaders." We know this to be true as the only part of religion he involved was the indulgence he used on the crusader - "redemption of sins for money". Innocent offered indulgence for anyone that funded the crusade. For example, he offered to take away sins of the crusaders who would pay for themselves and for non-crusaders who paid as much as they could in support for someone else to crusade. ~~this shows us that he~~ He also included "taxation of the clergy" and "fund-raising". Innocent made Bishops pay one thirtieth of their income to fund the crusade and also made the church pay ~~one~~ one fortieth of their income from the people. This clearly shows that Innocent had not thought out the crusade and it's funding enough, therefore having to take money from others. From this we can infer that he hadn't thought it out properly as he was power hungry and impatient - wanting to take Jerusalem as quickly as he could. This makes it extremely convincing that



(Section C continued)

he did ~~announcing~~ shift the ~~decision~~ motivation for crusading away from religion and focused it on acquiring wealth, due to the fact that Jerusalem did not need to be taken in the first place because Christian pilgrims were open to it.

However, extract 1 also tells us that he built existing practices but included local organisation of preaching". Innocent III's preachers that were appointed ~~played~~ played quite a large role in the failure of the crusade. For example, Pope Innocent III followed in Pope Eugenius's footsteps and wanted control of preachers. This was a mistake as the preachers chosen by Innocent failed to recruit crusaders. Guy of Naisy, for example, became unpopular due to rumours that he embezzled funds for himself, therefore the people did not want to listen to him. It could be interpreted that Innocent's need for a quick crusade - to gain power and wealth - encouraged him to appoint preachers that ~~he had not fully~~ were not ~~totally~~ totally experienced, therefore suggesting that the acquire of wealth did play a big part in the failure but also because Innocent had no experience of preparing a crusade.

In extract 2 we can see that the crusader leadership contributed to the failure of the fourth crusade. We can infer this from ~~"the eventual bloody conquest of Constantinople did not~~ "it is not to say that the eventual bloody conquest of Constantinople did not suit venetian interests or stem from the ambitions of some of the crusade leaders". We know that the crusade leaders wanted power and land - as most of them were family and



(Section C continued) wanted to expand their kingdoms. We also know this because when Innocent sent out a letter to the crusade leaders, telling them not to take Constantinople, it was ignored. This is also portrayed in extract 2, "the seizure of Constantinople was the crusaders' deliberate and intended goal". The crusaders had met up many times and discussed plans. Taking Constantinople may have been their main one however this was hard for them to fund. Therefore, they looked to prince Alexius to help them, alongside the Venetians. The Venetians promised to help the crusaders if they helped to take Zara. The Venetians offered land support, ~~the~~ troops (10,000) and transport for every single man. They also provided 4 months supplies of food, but the crusaders ~~were~~ had to pay 81,000 marks in return (£60,000 today).

This was hard for the crusaders to pay back so they looked to Prince Alexius, who offered 200,000 marks, and more troops if they helped to retake Isaac II's (his father's) throne. After this had been achieved, Alexius only paid the sum of 100,000 before he was murdered. Half went to the Venetians and the rest to anyone who helped take the throne.

This whole process delayed the crusade and made it a significant reason in why the fourth crusade failed.

~~the crusade~~ Although, the acquired wealth that Innocent III wanted helped start a crusade, it did also help to make it fail as he had not convinced enough people that it was for religious



(Section C continued) matters. So it is rightly convincing that it was a motive that helped it to fail as Richard's Truce had put an end to the need for Christians to own ~~Jesus~~ Jerusalem. However, the roles of crusader leadership and prince Alexis played a more significantly ~~so~~ convincing role in the failure due to money debt, empty promises and delayed time.

