

PART-II

QUESTION 3

Instructions

The Crimean War: A Turning Point in European Diplomacy

The Crimean war (1853-56) was not merely a localized conflict over the Eastern Question, it was the watershed of 19th

1. Give numbering to headings

century diplomacy. By shattering the concept of Europe, it destroyed the conservative solidarity that had suppressed

2. Do not write lengthy paragraphs. Write medium sized paragraphs with headings.

nationalism since 1815. The key held in Berlin refers to Prussia's strategic neutrality and subsequent leadership which

3. There should be around 15 headings for 20 marks question.

utilized this systematic breakdown to achieve German and Italian unification.

4. Draw figures/diagram/flowchart where needed

5. Start new question from fresh page.

The dismantling of the concert and the Eastern Question

6. Each answer should start with Introduction and end with Conclusion.

The Eastern Question, the fate of declining Ottoman Empire, served as a catalyst that pitted the Great Powers against

8. Change colour scheme for references to give them more visibility.

1) Death of the Holy Alliance

9. Manage time well.

For decades, the Russia-Austrian partnership was the pillar of European stability. During the war Austria's ingratitude (refusal to help Russia) turned Russia into the revisionist power, seeking to overturn the status quo.

10. Wide page borders are discouraged. Should be reasonable.

11. Avoid writing wrong references.

2) The Sick Man as a catalyst

The conflict proved that the Great Powers could no longer resolve Ottoman instability through consensus, leading

to a "free-for-all" in European politics of power.

The shift to Realpolitik: The "New Room"

The "new room" mentioned in the statement represents the era of "realpolitik" where cold national interests replaced the Balance of Power idealism of Metternich.

1) French Revanchism

Napoleon III sought to redraw the map of Europe to restore French prestige.

2) Russian withdrawal

Defeated and humiliated, Russia retreated into "Splendid Isolation" to focus on internal reforms, leaving central Europe without its traditional policeman.

Berlin as the Key: Prussia's strategic Ascent

Prussia under the leadership of Otto von Bismarck, held the key because it was the only power that emerged from the Crimean crisis with its options open and its military potential intact.

Exploiting Austrian isolation

Because Austria had alienated Russia during the Crimean War, it stood alone when Prussia challenged it for dominance in Germany (1866). Russia remained neutral, repaying Austria for its perceived betrayal in 1854.

The blueprint for unification

Bismarck realised that the shattered concert meant he could provoke localized wars (against Denmark, Austria, and France) without fearing a coalition of Great Powers intervening to stop him.

Impact on Italian and German Unification (1859-71)

Conflict	Role of Crimean Legacy	Outcome
Italian War (1859)	Cavour used Crimean participation to gain a seat at the peace table and secure French aid against an isolated Austria.	Northern/Central Italian unification.
Austro-Prussian War (1866)	Russia's refusal to help Austria (a direct result of Crimea) allowed Prussia to crush Austria and exclude it from German affairs.	Formation of the North-German confederation.
Franco-Prussian War (1870-71)	The lack of a concert no power intervened to save Napoleon III, the neutral "key" in Berlin finally locked the door on French hegemony.	Proclamation of the German Empire.

Critical analysis

While the key was indeed in Berlin, it is essential to note that Bismarck did not create the conditions; he merely mastered them. The Crimean war provided the

structural opportunity but it was Prussian military reforms and Bismarck's diplomatic genius that turned that opportunity into a unified Reich. Without the Crimean "door" opening, the conservative weight of Russia and Austria would likely have crushed any attempt at radical territorial change.

Question 4

The Fertile cause of War: Pre-War alliance and the road to 1914

Benjamin Disraeli's assertion that alliances are a "fertile cause of war" finds its most tragic validation in the outbreak of WWI. While intended to maintain the Balance of Power, the division of Europe into the "Triple Alliance" and "Triple Entente" transformed the regional Balkan crisis into a global catastrophe. These alliances functioned as a diplomatic "tripwire", replacing flexible diplomacy with a rigid "zero-sum" framework of mistrust.

The Genesis of Hostile Blocs

The transition from Bismarck's fluid system of alliances to rigid bipolarity of 1914 was the primary catalyst for instability.

~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ (e.g., the exact nature of French military aid to Russia), leading to worst-case scenario planning by General Staffs.

Colonial Friction

Localized colonial disputes (like the Moroccan Crises of 1905 and 1911) were amplified into existential tests of alliance loyalty rather than being resolved on their own merits.

The illusion of inevitability: The Blank Check.

By 1914, the alliance system had robbed statesmen of their agency, creating a fatalistic belief that war was inevitable.

Proxy pressure

To keep their alliance credible, the Great Powers felt compelled to support the reckless actions of their smaller "client" states. Germany's "blank check" to Austria-Hungary was a direct attempt to preserve its only reliable ally.

The Chain reaction

Because of the interlocking nature of treaties, no conflict would remain localized.

1) Austria attacked Serbia.

2) Russia mobilized to support its Slavic brother

- 3) Germany mobilized to support Austria and attacked France (Schlieffen Plan).
- 4) Britain entered to fulfil its (implicit) Entente obligations and protect Belgian neutrality.

Critical analysis

The central paradox of the pre-war alliances was that they were designed to prevent war through deterrence. However, they lacked the flexibility of the 19th century "Concert of Europe". Instead of acting as a "brake", the alliances acted as a "transmission belt", ensuring that the friction of a single spark in Sarajevo was immediately transmitted to the entire engine of European power.

Question 7 (I)

The Great Depression: The Catalyst of WWI

While the Treaty of Versailles provided the fuel for WWI, the Great Depression (1929) acted as the spark. It destroyed the fragile economic stability of 1920s, discredited liberal democracy, and provided the desperate conditions necessary for the rise of expansionist,

totalitarian regimes.

The economic collapse of Liberal democracy

The 1929 crash led the immediate withdrawal of American loans (the Dawes Plan) which had been the lifeblood of the German Weimar Republic.

Political polarization

High unemployment led the public to abandon moderate parties in favour of extremist movements - the Nazi and Communists - who promised radical economic solutions.

The rise of Hitler

The depression gave Hitler "the voter base of the desperate." His promise of "work and bread" transformed the NSDAP from a fringe group into the largest party.

The shift to "Autarky" and Aggression

Economic desperation forced nations to turn inward adopting protectionist policies that destroyed international cooperation.

Economic nationalism

Trade barriers led to "beggar thy neighbour" policies

Lebensraum (Living Space)

Fascist regimes in Germany, Italy, and Japan argued that because they lacked resources and markets they had a right to seize territory. Hence, aggression became an economic necessity for survival.

Paralysis of the League of Nations

The depression stripped the Great Powers of the will and resources to enforce collective security.

Appeasement as economy

Britain and France crippled by the debt and domestic social unrest, were unwilling to fund the military expenditures needed to challenge aggressors in Manchuria and Ethiopia.

Japan's precedent

The invasion on Manchuria was a direct response ~~to~~ to the Depression's impact on Japanese ~~exports~~ exports, proving that territorial conquest was a viable "fix" for the economic ruins.

Question 7 (II)

The Vienna Settlement (1815): A blueprint for peace or a reactionary triumph.

The Vienna Settlement was a dual-natured document.

While it was a blueprint for peace that established a century of relative stability, it was also a reactionary triumph that sought to turn back the clock by ignoring the burgeoning forces of liberalism and nationalism unleashed by the French revolution.

A blueprint for peace: The concert system

The settlement succeeded where others failed by focusing on stability rather than mere punishment.

Balance of power

By creating a pentarchy (Austria, UK, Prussia, Russia, and France), it ensured no single power could dominate.

Clemency to France

Unlike 1919, the 1815 ~~treaty~~ did not cripple the defeated power, ensuring France became a partner in the new order rather than a revisionist enemy.

Conflict resolution

It established the "Concert of Europe", a system of periodic congresses to resolve disputes through diplomacy rather than force.

A reactionary triumph: The suppression of progress

The settlement's fatal flaw was its "ostrich-like"

approach to social change, led by Prince Metternich

Principle of legitimacy

It restored "legitimate" (absolute) monarchs to thrones in Spain, Italy, and Germany, regardless of the wishes of the governed.

Disregard for nationalism

It treated nations as "blocks of wood", placing Italians under Austrian rule and Poles under Russian rule.

Interventionism

Through "Holy Alliance", the powers claimed to have the "right" to ~~militarily~~ militarily intervene in any state to crush internal liberal revolutions.

Critical assessment

Whether Vienna was a success depends on the metric used.

As a security framework

It was a masterpiece. There was ~~no~~ general war in Europe for 99 years (until 1914).

As a social framework

It was a failure. Its refusal to accommodate the middle class and national identities led directly to the violent revolutions of 1848.

Question 6

The Post 1989 reintegration: A critical evaluation

The fall of the Berlin wall signaled the end of the cold war and the promise of a peace dividend - the reallocation of military budgets to social prosperity. However, the reintegration of the East into the West was not a simple merger but a complex "Westernization" process. While it successfully expanded liberal democracy, it simultaneously birthed deep socio-economic fissures and renewed geopolitical tensions with Russia.

Success of the reintegration process

The eastward expansion of the Western institutions provided a framework of stability in a potentially chaotic vacuum.

Expansion of the EU "The Big Bang"

The 2004/2007 enlargements brought former Eastern Bloc states (Poland, Hungary, Czechia, etc) into the European fold, fostering unprecedented economic growth and legal standardization.

Institutional stability

NATO and EU membership provided a security anchor preventing the kind of ethnic fragmentation seen

in Yugoslavia from occurring in central Europe.

Democratic consolidation

The Copenhagen Criteria forced candidate states to adopt human rights protections, rule of law and market economies.

Internal fissure: The divided continent.

The East-West Economic Gap

The rise of liberalism

The "Two-Speed" Europe

Resurgent Political Rivalries: The Russian Factor

NATO expansion vs. Russian paranoia.

The end of the dividend.

Energy dependency

Critical analysis: Expansion or encroachment