



MASTERS MODEL UN

MASMUNC III

A Letter from the Secretariat

Dear Delegates, Advisors, Staff, and Friends of MASMUNC II I,

Greetings from Dobbs Ferry, New York! As this year's Secretaries General, we are honored to share the second iteration of the Masters School Model United Nations Conference with you at the beautiful Masters School campus on December 7, 2024. After a successful MASMUNC III, we hope to grow the conference even more. Throughout MASMUNC, we aim to cultivate thoughtful and meaningful debate and compromise in committees spanning current UN bodies to fictional crises.

We've spent our spring and summer preparing and planning for you, and we hope you enjoy the committees our delegates have to offer! As a team, we've been inspired by the many conferences we've attended, and hope you will grow, learn, and have fun at MASMUNC II I. This conference is truly the work of our entire team, whether that be brainstorming, writing background guides, or serving as pages and crisis staffers. We look forward to seeing everyone represent world powers, Shakespearean characters, and even spies in our 'Spy School' committee!

Our dedicated staff of students spanning from grades 8-12 and our devoted faculty advisors are eager to welcome you with open arms to ensure the best experience possible. We hope that you will leave MASMUNC II I with lasting skills to use in more conferences in the future and throughout everyday life.

Thank you.

Jesse Gelman
Secretary General

Sophie Moussapour
Secretary General

A Note on Cultural Sensitivity

While at MASMUNC, we encourage delegates to bear full participation, tackle their topics with full force, and embrace the dynamics within the international community; it is vital to recognize that the topics and issues being debated influence real places and people. This recognition is crucial to developing a culturally aware mindset that will contribute to an impactful committee. Delegates representing countries, leaders, and governmental figures must acknowledge the cultural aspects that determine the nature of their position.

In addition to maintaining cultural sensitivity, we recognize that we live in a world that is filled with bias. While it may be impossible to completely separate ourselves from our worldview and the many factors that influence us on a daily basis, we can make a concerted effort to minimize the way our personal biases impact the way that we interact with each other within this activity. To that end, please remember that:

- Accents do not reflect intelligence;
- Race does not indicate socioeconomic status;
- Gender is fluid;
- Positions that delegates take while competing don't necessarily equate to their personal beliefs;
- Words do not exist in a vacuum. Avoid using charged language toward delegates.

Thank you all for abiding by these guidelines. We look forward to seeing you all on conference day!

Jesse Gelman
Secretary General

Sophie Moussapour
Secretary General

MASMUNC III Crisis Procedure

Structure of Committee

Crisis committees use three primary tools for discussion about the topic at hand:
Moderated Caucuses, Unmoderated Caucuses, and Round Robins:

Moderated Caucuses

- Most crisis committees conduct debate through a series of rolling moderated caucuses.
- The Dais will call on delegates to give brief speeches about the topic proposed.
- The delegate proposing a moderated caucus should specify a topic of discussion, the duration, and speaking time per delegate.
 - *SAY: "Motion for a six-minute moderated caucus with a 30-second speaking time to discuss the latest crisis update."*

Unmoderated Caucuses

- Delegates may leave their seats and discuss the topic freely in groups of their selection
- Topics/goals of the unmod can be suggested by both Dais and delegates, but are not necessary
 - *SAY: "Motion for a ten-minute unmoderated caucus to merge directives on the table."*

Round Robins

- A round robin is a variation of the moderated caucus, where every delegate in the committee gives a speech in order of chairs around the room.
- The delegate proposing a round-robin also specifies the speaking time per delegate, which is usually not more than one minute.
- Round robins are especially useful at the very beginning of a committee since it allows each delegate to lay out their position and discuss what issues they believe to be most worthy of further discussion.
- They can also be useful after a major crisis update to allow all delegates to give their opinion on how to resolve the latest crisis.

- *SAY: “Motion for a 30-second round robin about [topic].”*

Directives

- Directives are similar to resolutions in traditional committees, with the notable exception that they do not include preambulatory clauses and are much shorter and more concise.
- Directives are generally written in response to a specific crisis update and can be as short as two or three clauses.
- Once a directive has collected the required number of signatories, it is sent to the Dias. A delegate can then motion to introduce all directives on the table. Some Chairs may elect to set a cap on the maximum number of directives, and in which case an unmoderated caucus will often be necessary for delegates to compare similar directives and merge them.
- Once a directive has been introduced, a delegate may motion to enter into voting procedure. It is also possible to combine the two if the directives have broad support: a delegate may motion to introduce each directive and immediately enter into voting procedure after introduction.
- If a directive faces no opposition, it automatically passes (in for and against)
- During the for and against speeches, or if a moderated caucus occurs after a directive is introduced, a delegate may raise an objection that the sponsoring delegate may wish to address with an amendment.
- Amendments are similar to how they operate in traditional committees, but are more loosely structured — verbal agreement from all the sponsors is enough for it to be considered a friendly amendment.

- *SAY: Motion to introduce directive [Name].*

- Occasionally, the crisis staff may introduce a “timed crisis,” where delegates have a limited amount of time to address a problem. In those cases, the Chair may further relax parliamentary procedure rules and skip parts of the formal voting procedure or allow a directive to be presented verbally without first being written.

Arcs and Backroom

Crisis arcs are essentially the storyline for your character in Model UN crisis committees. Most importantly, they should detail a vital end goal for your personality and the various methods and steps you will take to get there. Strong crisis arcs will consider the committee's topics, period, character's persona, and portfolio powers. The most important part of having a good crisis arc is fluidity from one action to the next.

The two most significant pieces of arc development that delegates often forget about are:

- **Protection:** You should always establish security within one of your first few correspondences with crisis staff.
- **Money:** Money is one of the essential resources in crisis committees.

Crisis notes are the tools used to act “behind the scenes” during committees. Crisis notes are written as letters to a real or fictional character we imagine to be outside the committee in the setting of the committee’s universe. Crisis notes must address the who, what, where, when, why, and how of each action you plan. Make your notes clear and easily understood so crisis staff knows what to do and has no room to mess up your plans or reveal them to the rest of the committee. When writing crisis notes, ensure you’re working with the backroom instead of against it. Crisis staffers will then respond to your notes as the character you’re writing to with a response, usually confirming or denying that the action was completed.

Introduction

The Eastern Mediterranean in the year 1204 was a place of chaos. The revered Byzantine Empire had fallen, leaving behind a massive power vacuum. In this gap, the Western European crusader armies were rapidly consolidating their power over the former Byzantine lands. The Crusaders were dealing with both the Byzantine collapse and the threat posed by one another as varying factions vied for further influence and territory. All of this only came at further cost to the multiple Byzantine rump states on the periphery of the Aegean, hastily established after Constantinople's fall.

This committee is composed of the temporal leaders and those of great influence in the region, many of whom bore personal responsibility for the events in years prior that directly led to the current state of affairs and many of whom are in apt positions to dictate the course of history and of their valuable legacies. Political, geographic, cultural, and religious divisions had all their part in inflaming and exacerbating pre-existing conflict: bureaucratic and feudal; east and west; Hellenic and Italic; Orthodox and Catholic.

Historical Background

Constantinople and the Byzantine Empire, 330–1453 C.E.

In 330 CE, the Roman Emperor Constantine I moved the capital of the empire east to the Greek city of Byzantium, greatly expanding the city and renaming it to Constantinople.

In 395 CE, emperor Theodosius finally divided the empire in two upon his death because the large empire was so challenging to administer and keep together. Theodosius' firstborn son, Arcadius, became the emperor of the Eastern Roman Empire (also known as the Byzantine Empire), ruling from Constantinople, while Theodosius' secondborn son, Honorius, became the emperor of the Western Roman Empire, ruling from the Italian city of Ravenna.

In 476 CE, the Western Roman Empire, after being in an almost constant state of shrinking and weakening since the division of the two empires, fell, leaving the Eastern Roman Empire as the sole Roman Empire.

In the mid-7th century, many of the lands of the East Roman Empire were conquered by the Arab armies of the Rashidun Caliphate, including Egypt, Libya, the Levant, and Syria.

The direct successor to the Roman Empire. Its capital, Constantinople—often called 'the queen of cities'—was considered a second Rome. This legacy brought with it

a level of legitimacy and reverence that was both jealousy desired and intensely guarded.

Christianity in the East and Christianity in the West

The East-West Schism, also known as the Great Schism of 1054, was the break of communion between the Western Roman Catholic Church, and the Eastern Orthodox Church. The main reason for the split was Church governance, which led to major theological disagreements as well. The crux of the arguments were about the supremacy of the Pope as compared to the 4 other patriarchs. The patriarchs are the highest-ranking Bishops in Christianity, and they belong to the 5 major cities of Christianity (Antioch, Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Rome).

Pre-Schism, all five patriarchs had equal authority on Christian doctrine. The main contention which led to the Schism was the Pope (patriarch of Rome) claiming that his authority superseded that of the other patriarchs. Simply, in Catholicism the Pope has ultimate authority over Christianity, while in Eastern Orthodoxy all five patriarchs share ultimate authority over Christianity. As it relates to the 4th Crusade, the Byzantine Empire was the stronghold of Orthodoxy, while the Crusaders were on an order to crusade from the Pope. While the Patriarch of Constantinople did eventually submit under the Pope, as he was held prisoner by the Latins, the Crusade was truly

a battle of Catholicism vs. Eastern Orthodoxy.

The First Three Crusades, 1095–1192 C.E.

In 1096 CE, the Pope called the First Crusade to help to defend the Byzantine Empire from invading Turks and then to retake the holy city of Jerusalem for Christendom. The Crusaders, after fighting towards their goal, went south and brought Christian rulership back to the swath of land from Alexandretta (modern Iskenderun) to Gaza. Though centuries before, the last Christian rulers of those areas were under the Byzantine Empire while the Crusader states were composed of Western European Italic and Frankish Catholics.

The second crusade was called in 1147 CE to come to the military aid of the fledgling crusader states. The Crusaders lost lots of land in the conflict against the Muslim regional power, the Ayyubid Sultanate such that the Crusaders were reduced to a couple cities.

In 1187 CE, the Pope called the Third Crusade to attempt to reconquer the land lost before and during the Second Crusade. The Third Crusade was a success. All of the lands conquered in the First Crusade and more was brought under Christian rule.

In the subsequent decades, many of these Crusader lands were again lost to the Ayyubids in a series of wars, including Jerusalem, reducing the Crusader presence to a fragile one only thinly along the Levantine coast.

The Start of the Fourth Crusade, 1198-1203 C.E.

By the time the Fourth Crusade was called by Pope Innocent III in 1198, the Byzantine Empire had been in a period of decline since the end of the reign of Emperor Manuel I Komnenos in 1180. The empire was less large, powerful, and revered than it was only two decades prior. The Frankish, Latin, and Germanic Christian powers to the empire's west, having for centuries desired Byzantine power, wealth, and prestige, saw opportunity at such weakness.¹ This occurred at the same time that the Byzantine Empire was suffering a series of coups and internal instability.

Wary of sending the Crusade over land through often hostile territory, Innocent III decided to have the army sail to the holy land. Emissaries were dispatched to the various Italian maritime republics, including Genoa and Venice, to negotiate the transport of the massive Crusader army. Eventually, the Republic of Venice won the contract in 1201. It then took over a year for Venice to build all the ships. However, per the nature of the crusade and the contract with Venice, all of the Crusaders were not bound to exclusively travel by the Venetians so a not insignificant number of the Crusaders ended up sailing from other cities. Thus, the Venetians built a much larger fleet and charged much more than what would be reasonable for the number of Crusaders that actually showed up there. Naturally, the Crusaders in Venice could not afford the price Venice was charging for passage. A compromise was reached where the

¹ See the Frankish rulers Charlemagne and Robert Guiscard for specific examples of those desiring Byzantine power and legitimacy.

Crusaders could pay the rest of their debt in service to the Venetians by reconquering the formerly Venetian Adriatic city of Zara (modern-day Zadar, Croatia), then a politically independent city under the protection of the king of Hungary and Croatia since Zara rebelled against Venice in 1181. A number of Crusaders were opposed to making war upon other Christians, especially other Catholics, so they either left the Crusade entirely or found other means to Jerusalem. The Papal representative to the Crusader host, though, endorsed the Venetian collaboration. On the contrary, Pope Innocent III himself, hearing of this development, issued a decree forbidding the Crusaders from harming fellow Christians but it is likely that the Crusaders did not learn of this until too late.

The Crusader-Venetian army landed at Zara in November 1202. They had conquered the city before the month's end and then set themselves to the pillaging of the city and surrounding area. Pope Innocent was furious at this and sent a letter excommunicating all those involved in the siege of Zara and commanded the Crusaders to go straight to Jerusalem. While many in Rome now knew of this substantial excommunication, those in Zara themselves were generally unaware as the Crusader leaders elected to not notify their army of this development. In February, after a few months, the Pope changed his mind and revoked the excommunications on the Crusaders but maintained those on the Venetians, holding them as responsible for the bloodletting.

The State of the Byzantine Empire, 1185-1203 C.E.

After a prolonged period of instability since 1180, the empire was in a weaker state come 1203. By 1185, the reign of the great and prestigious Komnenos dynasty over the empire had ended. The final Komnenian emperor, Andronikos I (r. 1183-1185 CE) had an unpopular and chaotic reign, a far cry from the success of former emperors of his family like Manuel I (r. 1143-1180 CE), the memory of whom was still present in many minds.

Andronikos' unpopularity sparked a popular revolt where Andronikos was seized and lynched as the general Isaac Angelos was brought to the throne, becoming emperor Isaac II, the first of the emperors of the Angelos family.

In 1195, after the ascension of Isaac II, a coup was staged in which Isaac II's older brother, Alexios, was brought to the throne, becoming emperor Alexios III, and Isaac II was not just deposed, but blinded and imprisoned. Alexios III was a notably incapable ruler, leading the empire into the extremely consequential years of 1203 and 1204.

The Crusaders to Constantinople, 1182-1204 C.E.

The Crusaders came to Constantinople as a consequence of the festering animosity between the Byzantines, and the Franks and Italians.

One of these animosities was the Veneto-Byzantine commercial and political rivalry. Hundreds of years before 1204, Venice was a vassal to Constantinople. Over the centuries, as result of various treaties and

and agreements, the Venetians gradually acquired more independence while at the same time, along with other Italian mercantile republics including Pisa, Genoa, and Amalfi, secured broad trade privileges from the Byzantines in treaties and a large 'Latin' presence in Constantinople became apparent, especially in the areas of Constantinople where these republics were allowed to make use of their trade privileges. These 'quarters' of Constantinople, the Venetian, Genoese, Amalfitan, and Pisan, featured a combined 'Latin' population of sixty thousand who possessed outsize influence in shipping and finance. In 1182, after years of brewing tensions between the Byzantine and Italian populations, a great massacre ensued where the majority of the Italian population of the city was either killed or forced to flee in what was known as 'the massacre of the Latins,' which greatly inflamed tensions between Constantinople and the Italians.

After emperor Isaac II was deposed, his son, Alexios, who was formerly junior emperor, fled, holding on to their desire to regain the throne. Boniface of Montferrat, elected as one of the leaders of the 4th Crusade, left Venice before the host departed for Zara. At the court of his cousin, who also happened to be the brother-in-law of the exiled prince Alexios, Boniface met with the prince, who presented him and his blind former emperor with a father's plight of exile. Prince Alexios proposed that if Boniface and the Crusaders would support him in acquiring the throne, he would grant Boniface the silver to pay off the entire Crusader debt to the Venetians, thousands of Byzantine soldiers to fight in the Crusade,

and more. The majority of the Crusaders learned of the proposal by January 1203. Enrico Dandolo, the Doge of Venice, was strongly in favor of this idea as he harbored a strong resentment for the Romans. The other Crusaders leaders were convinced and after waiting for winter to end, they sailed from Zara in April. Again hearing of this next scheme, Pope Innocent leveraged his most-of-used weapon, the pen, to again make his will known. Save if they posed an obstacle to the goals of the Crusade, he forbade any further attacks on other Christians. However, it is noteworthy that he did not explicitly forbid the acceleration of Prince Alexios' scheme.

The Latins came to Constantinople suddenly and without prior declaration in July 1203, catching the imperial city relatively unprepared where in more precedented occasions the emperor would have had the time to recall many more soldiers from the border provinces for the defense of the city and quickly set siege to the capital. Soon after, the Crusaders started their full assault. Alexios III, already disgraced from a lost battle outside the walls of the city days earlier, fled into exile, after which, the noble and common Romans of the city again proclaimed Isaac II emperor while Prince Alexios was proclaimed co-emperor, becoming Alexios IV

Alexios IV's reign was marked by tensions coming to a breaking point and the marginal impact of his father, Isaac II, who by this time was not only blind but also infirm. Alexios III had taken a sizable proportion of the wealth of the imperial treasury with him when he fled so he was forced to take Orthodox Christian religious

icons and melt them down for their precious metals in order to pay his substantial debt to the Crusaders. Though, even after this he only managed to pay half of the debt while the citizens of his empire were horrified at this act of religious desecration for monetary purposes. Between this, and the sizable number of heavily armed Latins indefinitely encamped outside the city walls, intense rioting broke out in the city. The unrest was sometimes put down by those same Crusaders, as their services had been hired by Alexios IV for six months once he became emperor, in rightful need of further protection.

By January 1204, the current imperial family was only enduring further disfavor, and the anti-crusader faction of the city's commons and nobility grew, with a popular general and nobleman known as Alexios Doukas as the leader. Doukas had earned much popularity valiantly leading the Byzantine forces against the Crusaders the previous year. In late January, the people of Constantinople initiated a mass rebellion against Alexios IV and Isaac II in which Doukas became emperor, being known as

Alexios V. Alexios IV was strangled to death and Isaac II died of natural causes, though the death was likely hastened by the shock of being violently deposed a second time. The armed Westerners wished for the remaining substantial debt of Alexios IV to be taken up by his successor, which Alexios V, having championed the anti-westerner cause, refused. The crusaders, furious, and inflamed by their clergy and leaders against the Romans, began another assault on the city on April 9th, 1204. Alexios V and his soldiers, the most effective of which were those of the renowned Varangian Guard, fared much better in this than Alexios III did. On April 12th, wind conditions strongly favored Venetian naval attacks on Constantinople's coastal walls, and some Crusaders managed to enter the city and burn a portion. In the dead of night, Alexios V, his family, and followers fled the city. They found refuge in the Thracian city that was under the control of the still-alive and in-exile, Alexios III. Come the end of April 13th, the entirety of the storied Roman capital was in foreign hands.

Topic A: To the Victors Go the Spoils

Regional Stability and Partition of the Roman Empire

Despite these crusader victories, there was still active change in the crusader holders of the formerly Greek lands, all while the fleeing Greek nobles and generals held on to their hope of banishing the Frankish and Italic interlopers. The former crusaders still had the task ahead of them to assert control of their territory over the Greek defenders, assuming an agreeable partition is made.

Surely, without a defined agreement among the crusaders on how to allocate the Greek lands, exemplified by an agreement made between Boniface and Baldwin months earlier, the crusaders would turn on each other. Historically, the western forces arranged such a partition, the *Partitio terrarum imperii Romaniae*, in the wake of the sacking.

The widespread and monthslong unrest brought upon by the crusaders has

done great damage to both the economics and populace of the region. Historically, Constantinople never recovered its pre-1204 glory. This is all before even considering the lack of political stability in the region in the years prior. In the interest of furthering peace and development, compromise will be necessary between the powers.

Proper domains must be put onto paper. Occupations are not enough to establish legitimate realms. In the mind of the western crusader, it is up to them to stabilize the realm and create pious kingdoms of the true faith in Greek territory. In the mind of the Greek, it is a matter of self-preservation to avoid this outcome. The results of this partition could spell the end of a Greek state, and the dominance of what they believe to be a heresy in their homeland if they play their cards wrong.

Questions to Consider

- Can the various alliances and beliefs present in the greater Aegean region reconcile their differences and cooperate for peace?
- What might potential conciliation mean for the involved historical legacies and hopes?
- What desired intangibles might be possible concessions?

Topic B: Barbarians at the Gates

Threats from Beyond the Empire

One of the few constants in Byzantine history is its empire being surrounded by persistent enemies. The territorially intact empire had the means to defend against these powers but, as of the middle of 1204, the fractured petty Aegean states had much less capacity to defend against these foreign interlopers, especially considering how much they were investing into fighting each other.

Most notably, the empires that attempted to take advantage of this situation were the Second Bulgarian Empire, with its bellicose ruler Tsar Kaloyan ‘the Romanslayer’ to the north, and the Turkic Sultanate of Rûm to the East (under the expansionist Sultan Suleiman II).

The Second Bulgarian Empire, a rising Balkan state now spanning from Moesia to Kosovo, looks beyond their southern border into Roman territory with eager anticipation. For the second time in Byzantium’s long and painful history, a Bulgarian revolt has taken root. And for the second time, it has displaced them from the security of a Danube border, endangering their core lands in Thessalonica, Macedonia, and Thessaly, exposing even Thrace, and thereby putting the City of the World’s

Desire -- already broken from Latin conquest -- within a moment of Bulgarian invasion.

The Sultanate of Rûm, the primary offshoot of the Seljuk Empire, was now the primary power in the Anatolian peninsula. The origins of the sultanate date back to the 1030s, with migratory Turks settling within the Anatolian areas of the Byzantine Empire. Around the 1070s, Suleiman ibn Qutalmish established the sultanate as a vassal state of the Byzantine Empire, on top of his overlord’s former territory. The sultanate had come a long way since the 1000s, and by the time of the Fourth Crusade, the sultanate was at the height of its power. The primary claims of the sultanate lie in the Byzantine ports of both the Black and Mediterranean seas. They will use the collapse and chaos within the Aegean to secure such claims.

With the looming chance that the bastions of civilization in the storied Aegean fall to detestable hordes, it might be that the post-Sack of Constantinople powers have to resist their peoples’ impulse to defeat their present enemies, and instead cooperate and negotiate with each other to safeguard their existences for the long term.

Questions to Consider

- What measures could be taken to protect the Danube border and prevent Bulgarian intrusion?
- What strategies could be used to counter the growing power of the Sultanate of Rum?
- What possible avenues are there for cooperation amongst the Aegean powers?

Current Overview

April 16, 1204: It has been a series of eventful days since the four-day sacking of Constantinople, and chaos still reigns in the broader Eastern Mediterranean.

The Franks, emboldened by their conquests, seek to consolidate their gains, assume the crowns of local lands, and establish a new Latin Catholic empire in Constantinople to end the Schism once and for all. Meanwhile, the meddling Venetians, financiers of the crusade, support the Franks only insofar as their new fiefdoms are agreeable to the bottom lines of Venice's merchants: where the Franks see in their newly-conquered lands the allure of kingship and the glory of conquest, the Serene Republic sees an opportunity for special trade privileges and new ports free of excise tax. The defeated Greeks attempt to prevent a total apocalypse for their prestige, their religion, and their sovereignty: as the empire in Constantinople comes crashing down, three Byzantine noble houses scatter

across the Balkans and Anatolia and give rise to three separate splinter states, all claiming successorship of the Empire: the Angelids in Epirus, the Laskarids in Nicaea, and the Komnenids in Trebizond. Finally, of course, the Muslim states of the Near East await the moment that the Crusaders' feuding becomes an opening of instability for them to reconquer their lands once and for all -- the Ayyubids in Egypt and Syria eye a reconquest of the Crusader states in the Levant, and the Sultanate of Rum in Anatolia seeks exploitation of the Christians' disorder and infighting to exert hegemony over the peninsula for themselves.

As post-battle frenzy subsides and Crusaders count their stolen riches while Romans mourn their proud city, monumental decisions loom. What is next for the Crusade? How shall the formerly proud empire be divided? And what is to be done to meet threats from beyond its former borders?

Positions

Boniface Aleramici, Marquis of Montferrat

Boniface was the ninth ruler of the Marquisate of Montferrat, a Holy Roman Empire state in Piedmont, Italy, and the prominent leader of the Crusade under the patronage of the doge of Venice. As Latin forces march into the conquered Constantinople, Boniface is one of the presumed candidates to be the new Emperor due to his popularity among the Crusaders. Historically, however, Boniface's emperorship was vetoed by the Venetians to preserve their own interests since he was perceived as being too closely connected to the Byzantine Greeks (his brother being married into the Angelos imperial family which took power after the revolt that overthrew Andronikos Komnenos), and Baldwin, Count of Flanders, was chosen instead, with Boniface instead carving out his own kingdom under Baldwin's empire in neighboring Thessalonica. Will Baldwin's bid for the throne of Constantinople succeed, or will the Venetians get their way and do away with him?

Eudokia Angelina, Basilissa of the Romans

Byzantine nobility, Eudokia is the daughter of the former Byzantine emperor Alexios III Angelos -- deposed in favor of his nephew prior to the Crusader attack -- and empress Euphrosyne Doukaina. Eudokia had returned to Constantinople following a messy separation from her first husband, the Grand Prince Stefan Nemanjić, which resulted in her being banished from Serbia; when the Crusaders struck, she fled the city for Mosynopolis (nearby in Thrace) with her lover and final pre-sack emperor Alexios V (Doukas). In Mosynopolis the two were married, ever so briefly making Angelina the rightful Empress-in-exile of Byzantium, before her father ordered his new son-in-law be arrested and blinded, then sent back to Constantinople and killed. Will the empress denied the chance to rule and return from her hiding to Constantinople in triumph to assume the throne she is owed, or will she live the rest of her days in this self-imposed exile?

Marie de Champagne, Empress of Constantinople

Marie is the soon-to-be-Empress of The Latin Empire due to her marriage with Baldwin I of Constantinople, should he be chosen as the emperor. Historically, she is to be coronated on the 9th of May, 1204. However, after being crowned in the Holy Land on the 9th of May, she fell ill and died on her voyage to Constantinople exactly three months later. As Countess of Flanders, she took an active role in the court, even issuing charters in her own name. If she is to make it to Constantinople, it is assumed that she will take a similar role in governance, if she can work out the patriarchal bureaucracy of Constantinople.

William de Champlitte

William of Champlitte is a prominent crusader and the son of the Viscount of Dijon. Historically, after the conquest of Constantinople, William would continue to join Boniface of Montferrat in his campaign into Greece which established the Kingdom of Thessalonica and was subsequently chosen by Boniface to rule the Peloponnese peninsula under him, fighting a campaign against the Greeks (including the splinter Despotate of Epirus under Michael Komnenodoukas) which ultimately saw him conquer the region and be crowned Prince of Achaea.

Enrico Dandolo, Doge of Venice

The aging Enrico, of the influential Venetian family of Dandolo, has been the Doge of Venice for the past twelve years. He historically was instrumental in leading the Republic of Venice to its golden age. Dandolo is known for his poor sight, which some sources even mention as blindness caused by a previous Byzantine Emperor.

Gualfredotto Grasselli, Podestà of the Free Municipality of the City of Genoa

Originally a Milanese bureaucrat, Grasselli came to power in Genoa as a part of their system in which they elected leaders from other Italian states. As leading Genoa, he enforced that their participation in the Fourth Crusade was too limited, but that they were certainly to be involved. This is partly due to the fact that they did not want their eternal rival Venice to gain too much influence originally in the Holy Land, then eventually in the Aegean. He is a known military and diplomatic expert, who eventually went on to lead Florence in 1207.

Baldwin de Hainaut, Emperor of Constantinople

Ruling an area comprising most of modern-day Belgium, Baldwin became a leading member of the Crusader army that went to Constantinople. His candidacy was supported by the Venetians, Baldwin was elected ruler of the conquered lands by the army. Historically, Baldwin would additionally be coronated Roman Emperor in the weeks after the city's sack. Baldwin's reign would be marked by negotiations with his crusader vassals over land and territorial authority as well as by almost constant war with the various non-Latins on the borders of the Latin Empire.

John X Katameros, Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople

As the Patriarch of Constantinople, John was the foremost leader of Eastern Christianity and held an important position in the empire. John as well as Eastern Christianity as a whole had many disagreements with the Pope and Western Christianity, John was especially notable in contesting absolute Papal authority, asserting instead that the Patriarch of Rome ought to return to the status quo of antiquity and acknowledge his equal position to the Patriarchs of the other four holy cities. By 1204 though, under imminent threat of a Latin attack on Constantinople, he was forced to acknowledge Papal supremacy. Thankfully, the wise old Patriarch was able to

escape the fall of the city, heading to a small town in Thrace. Though John is now a Patriarch without a true Patriarchate, many still acknowledge his authority and the symbolism of his office—and its storied ancient legacy.

Michael Komnenodoukas, Strategos of Epirus

Michael Angelos, or to use the family name its members used, Komnenodoukas, to emphasize their relations to the more prestigious Komnenos and Doukas families, managed to establish a Greek domain in exile centered around the city of Arta, in the region of Epirus.

Theodoros Laskaris, Strategos of Opsikion

Theodoros is remembered as a heroic figure among the Greeks. He was the chosen heir to the anti-crusader Emperor Alexios III. He successfully evaded the crusaders and managed to secure a domain centered on the city of Prusa and after military successes against the Latins, the center would move to Nicaea. Despite Theodoros' meager position in mid-1204, he would lead Greek reconquests of vast tracts of land and eventually would declare himself the rightful emperor in Nicaea.

Alexios Megas Komnenos, Basileus of the Romans

Alexios Komnenos, eventually the first claimant Roman emperor in Trebizond, is one of two living descendants of the last Constantinopolitan Komnenid Emperor (the disastrous Andronikos I Komnenos, hanged by his people in the Hippodrome in 1185) along with his brother David, with the two historically becoming the founders of the Trapezuntine splinter state of Byzantium. If formed, this Roman Empire-in-Exile will claim the Komnenid legacy and compete with its peers in Nicaea and Epirus to retake Constantinople from the Latins and rebuild Rome in the East.

Stefan Nemanjić, Grand Prince of Serbia

After using the chaos caused by the Venetian attack on Zara to regain the throne of Serbia from his catholic brother Vukan, Stefan became subordinate to the patriarch of Constantinople. As he was dedicated to orthodoxy, Stefan was acutely aware of the new Latin treat cornering in on all sides. However, the main threat to Serbia remains Bulgaria and Hungary. Stefan's primary goal is to retain his titles and protect Serbia from the two aforementioned threats. He can not turn to his weakened "overlords" in Constantinople, but his bridge with the Pope has been burned after the succession crisis with his Catholic brother. It would be ideal if Serbia could simply remain untouched by the conflict in the Aegean, but they must not isolate themselves from their allies for fear of invasion.

Otto de la Roche

A Burgundian nobleman, Otto de la Roche enlisted in the Crusader army where he became an influential figure, leading the Burgundian Crusaders. Historically, in the time of internal crusader tension over the distribution of conquered lands, Otto served as an advisor and supporter of Boniface of Montferrat, who in turn granted Otto the land of Attica, which became the Duchy of Athens with him as ruler.

Leo I Roupen, King of Armenian Cilicia

As the 10th Lord and First King of Armenian Cilicia, Leo I was truly one of the most notable Anatolian Armenian leaders. He was a staunch supporter of the Crusades, even involving his Kingdom directly in the 3rd Crusade. He oversaw a union of churches between the Armenian church of his kingdom, with the Latin Church of the Pope. Though his main ambition lies in Antioch, the success of the Crusaders is important as strong Latin allies in the Aegean would be great protection from the unfriendly Greeks and the hostile Muslims.

Innocent III Segni, Pope of Rome

The product of a noble family of the city of Rome, Innocent made it his effort to expand the pontificate into a temporal power over a large swath of land. These changes in the nature of the office would endure for hundreds of years and would come to define it. Innocent did not desire nor intend for his crusade to play out as it did, specifically demanding of many crusader leaders that their forces stay their hand from all Christians -- including, crucially, the Byzantines. Horrified at the result, he excommunicated all those who strayed from the path to Jerusalem. Innocent historically acknowledged the unfortunate outcome, and in the early years of the Frankokratia, was even hopeful that it would enable the two churches to be reunited.

Sources and Helpful Resources

- Brundage, J., et al. "Fourth Crusade." *Wikipedia*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fourth_Crusade. Accessed 25 October 2024.
- "A Calculated Crusade: Venice, Commerce, and the Fourth Crusade." *Scholar Commons*, <https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1117&context=historical-perspectives>. Accessed 25 October 2024.
- Cartwright, Mark. "Byzantine Empire." *World History Encyclopedia*, 19 September 2018, https://www.worldhistory.org/Byzantine_Empire/. Accessed 25 October 2024.
- Cartwright, Mark. "Crusades." *World History Encyclopedia*, 12 October 2018, <https://www.worldhistory.org/Crusades/>. Accessed 25 October 2024.
- Cartwright, Mark. "Enrico Dandolo (Illustration)." *World History Encyclopedia*, 31 January 2018, <https://www.worldhistory.org/image/8051/enrico-dandolo/>. Accessed 25 October 2024.
- Cartwright, Mark. "Fourth Crusade." *World History Encyclopedia*, 3 September 2018, https://www.worldhistory.org/Fourth_Crusade/. Accessed 25 October 2024.
- "Crusades - Holy Wars, Jerusalem, Europe." *Britannica*, 21 October 2024, <https://www.britannica.com/event/Crusades/Crusades-of-the-13th-century>. Accessed 25 October 2024.
- di Paoli, Ottaviano, and Pope Clement. "Pope Innocent III." *Wikipedia*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pope_Innocent_III. Accessed 25 October 2024.
- "GRASSELLIGualfredotto - Enciclopedia - Treccani." *Treccani, il portale del sapere - Treccani*, 2023, <https://www.treccani.it>. Accessed 25 October 2024.
- Madden, Thomas F. "Outside and Inside the Fourth Crusade." *The International History Review*, vol. 17, no. 4, 1995, pp. 726–43. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40107441>. Accessed 24 10 2024.
- Schmitt, John. *The Chronicle of Morea = to Chronikon Tou Moreos: A History in Political Verse, Relating to the Establishment of Feudalism in Greece by the Franks in the Thirteenth Century*. Creative Media Partners, LLC, 2017.
- Williams, Esther. "East–West Schism." *Wikipedia*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/East%E2%80%93West_Schism. Accessed 25 October 2024.