

Chapter 1 : The Near East in the World : The Near East and the Great Powers

Comment: Connecting readers with great books since Used books may not include companion materials, some shelf wear, may contain highlighting/notes, and may not include cd-rom or access codes.

During the period treated in the second half of the Old Testament course of study, Israel felt the powerful influences of several neighboring kingdoms and empires—especially the successive empires of Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, Greece, and Rome—each one pressing in, invading, conquering, exerting its own influence on the culture and institutions of Israel, affecting its political and social structure, testing its fortitude and obedience. Much of the fate of Israel was due to the position of its lands at the crossroads of the ancient world. Bordered on the west by the Great Sea the Mediterranean and on the east by the searing Arabian deserts, it lay directly on a virtual land bridge between Egypt and the lands of Mesopotamia and Asia Minor. Not always a target for invasion itself, the land and its people were often the victims of armies passing through, marching in pursuit of the riches of Egypt. Thus, with the waning of Egyptian and Hittite power in the early part of the twelfth century B. Babylonia and Assyria shared the region of Mesopotamia. The Elamites continued to exercise control over what is now southern Iran, while new peoples—notably the Medes and the Persians—were moving into the northern and central parts of that territory. The Assyrian Empire— B. By the middle of the ninth century B. Assyrian conquests in the west and south were delayed for a time by a confederation organized in the days of Shalmaneser III— B. But by B. During the years when the northern kingdom of Israel and the southern kingdom of Judah were overshadowed by Assyrian rule, there were many revolts. However, numerous Assyrian campaigns into the heart of the land crushed all but the later ones. Judah was virtually subdued in B. Assyria placed a pro-Assyrian king on the throne of Egypt. In the east, Elam was devastated by the Assyrian army in B. The Babylonian Empire— B. The end came at the battle of Carchemish in B. Nebuchadnezzar thought of himself as king of the world, controlling all of Mesopotamia and Syro-Palestine. But he was never fully accepted as such in the area controlled by the Medes or in Egypt. Indeed, the Egyptians tried to stir up some of their neighbors against Babylon; and one of the results of this action was a Babylonian invasion that brought about the destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of the Jews in B. The Persian Empire— B. Then, in B. It was Cyrus whose decree permitted the return of the exiles of Judah to their homeland to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem. His son Cambyses— B. The Greek Empire—63 B. During the years— B. The next years were to see Persians pitted against Greeks in such famous battles as those of Marathon, Thermopylae, and Salamis, to name but a few. Assassinated in B. Alexander conquered all of Anatolia, Syro-Palestine, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Persia proper, moving as far east as the border of India, part of Afghanistan, and central Asia. His empire exceeded even the Persian empire in geographical area. The Roman Empire in the east at the time of Christ. Consequently, warring armies criss-crossed the land, including Palestine, and the Maccabean rebellion arose—until, in 66—63 B. This set the stage for that which was to follow: Rome was to rule for more than five hundred years after Pompey. Into this period came the Messiah with the message of peace for all the world, and it was this world that shaped the rise and fall of the early Church.

Chapter 2 : Eastern Question - Wikipedia

The great powers and the Near East, Responsibility edited by M.S. Anderson. Imprint London, Edward Arnold, Physical description x, p. 20 cm. Series.

This essay aims to describe and analyze the causes of the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, its external and internal agents and various historical and ideological components which condensed in diplomacy and Western historiography later would be known as the "Eastern Question. Completing these processes with their disintegration and the formulation of the Republic of Turkey. But other systems and models, such as Chinese, Japanese, Russian, and, in particular, Ottoman Turkish have been lagging behind in research since the volume and dissemination of content in this respect is not proportional to that of European cases, perhaps because of difficulties in their study to be outside the academic and scientific sphere, for being considered exotic subjects and be analyzed as such or even by the very "coloniality" of knowledge and history that governs the parameters of research. The Turkish case is pertinent because of the immediate and tangent facts that affect its historical development today, the so-called "Arab Spring" 2 both have been praised in the West was developed in territories that were provinces of the Ottoman Empire for centuries, and today as yesterday, Western powers have intervened in this process. But this is not the only reason to study the Sublime Gate a name with which the Ottoman Empire was also known, especially its diplomatic sector and its colonial experience and disintegration related to the action of the European powers, but also to analyze briefly the own and completely different characteristics that had with respect to the European colonial metropolis. Clearly, the bibliography surpasses by far the set of books that are discussed here, but other important texts were left aside for the simple fact of not having access to them neither physically nor virtually beyond being found in other languages such as French, German, Russian, Turkish, Arabic, and Greek. The descendants of Osman and his Empire. The world in which the Ottoman Empire was forged in Anatolia from the Battle of Manzikert in through the weakening of the Byzantine Empire with the Fourth Crusade in until the capture of Constantinople in was deeply Turkish and timidly Muslim. And began to appear among the huge number of principalities that took advantage of the lack of a strong central authority in this region to emerge. Thereafter and until well into the eighteenth century, the Ottoman Empire will be the Mediterranean, Asian and African counterpart of Christianity. Dominator of the trade routes of east and master and lord of the Mediterranean until the opening of the Atlantic market and the victory of Don Juan of Austria, brother of Felipe II of Spain in Lepanto, in Unlike the other two great monotheistic religions, there is no priesthood in Islam. Thus, a nomad may disappear for weeks without his omnipotent and omniscient god abandoning him. In sum, the Ottoman Empire was multinational and was neither exclusively Islamic nor exclusively Turkish, it was a dynastic Empire in which the only loyalty demanded of its inhabitants was fidelity to the Sultan. Vergara Grupo Zeta, The main question revolved around whether it was necessary to preserve the integrity of the Empire or to divide it among the great powers. Curiously sharing with Spain the same characteristic, the Ottoman Empire before reaching its decline, lived its stage of more fruitful cultural development. Petersburg had grand plans for Eastern Europe thus agreeing on a mutual attack on the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans, but the Austro-Hungarian forces did not measure up and the peace of Belgrade was promptly signed for fear of an Ottoman counter-offensive. This victory gave rise to the traditionalist factions to stop the modernizing impulse throughout the eighteenth century. In ascends the throne of Russia Catherine the Great, the paradigm of enlightened despotism who had come with very clear ideas about the decadent neighboring colonies of Poland and the Roman Empire. Therefore, following the diplomatic "fashion" of the era in which the distribution of powers between the territories balanced powers, Russia and the Ottoman Empire went to war over the succession to the Polish throne in One of these bourgeois Greek merchants, John Kapodistrias, is known to have become the Russian minister of foreign affairs, and then at the beginning of the nineteenth century he would become president of the first independent Greek state so romantically supported by Europe. The Eastern Question, " A Study in International Relations. The Sublime Porte avoided the loss of its Balkan territories once again by the events that took place in France during , removing it from the international scene

while the other European crowns were leaping over revolutionary France. But the reluctance and lack of application to these reforms did not consist in a specific person or discourse but in ingrained interests and power schemes; The Empire was shaped in such a way that a vast section of the population was not interested in reforming the structures of Empire in the slightest. This paralysis over the years would become self-destructive. Relations between the four great powers and the Sublime Porte in the early nineteenth century radically changed thanks to the inconsistencies of the political actions of Napoleon. But in Istanbul already they knew that whoever they were their circumstantial allies, the danger of taking advantage of their position to seize portions of the Ottoman Empire was latent. The Ottoman Empire and its successors, Cambridge University Press, The first great revolt that triumphs was the Greek one, precisely because it renounced the social character of the revolution for a national character. Still, among the Greeks themselves and obviously among the other peoples subjugated to the Sultan, prevailed the idea of reforming the Empire without dividing it, because beyond emerging 23 nationalisms, its inhabitants recognized the common civilization represented by the Empire. The Greeks saw how the Ottoman Empire was rotting from the inside in the face of so many external threats, and thus, as it filled with the unfavorable impressions of the Sublime Gate in the rest of Europe, they converted the Greek rebellion of unlike The Serbian one of in an Insurrection clearly stained of political intentionality. Even so, by the Greeks did not achieve a national unity, where the continental ones fought with the Islanders and both against those of the Peloponnese, a conflict that lasted openly until Reforms, wars, and national problems. The Greeks wanted Greco-Turkish equality but did not wish to extend that equality to the rest of the Balkans, they wanted a Greco-Turkish Empire in which the Slavs were subjected. They had the idea that the various nations Greek, Turkish should join together in a confederation to preserve the cultural identity of the Aegean world. Once the confederation was realized the supranational state would be reached for the creation of an Eastern race. On June 15, the Janissaries rebelled against Sultan Mahmud II in Istanbul, unlike his predecessor Selim III, was prepared to confront the elite units of his army, assembled his trusted men and proclaimed throughout the city that this time the corrupt Janissaries did not count with the support of the ulemas. These intentions were highlighted by the famous provision of by which all officials should dress in the European way and use the fez instead of the turban, a garment that also consolidated as part of the military uniform of the new army, being the intention of the Sultan that this garment should be extended to all citizens regardless of religious affiliation or nationality, later becoming a symbol of the Empire and Turkey. Using the multinationality of the Ottoman Empire against St. Petersburg and against Istanbul itself. This work brought two novel concepts: The concern for a geopolitical vacuum in the region of the three continents that the dominions of the Empire occupied was very present in most of the diplomatic corps of Europe. Even with the tense calm that brought about the outcome of the Franco-Prussian war in did not prevent the amount of protagonists to the European political concert, where each one with its objectives and projects looked for to be accommodated within the tight map of the continent forming the zones that are geopolitically conflictive to this day and were part of the Ottoman Empire: This Conference consecrated the newly created Balkan states as aggressive nation-states of the imperialist era, scaled copies of the Western powers, sponsored by the triumphant industrial revolution. The Sultan and his bourgeoisie were gradually prey to nationalism, increasingly identified with the Turkish-Muslim slope, Extending this thought to all the confines of the Empire, closing the process with the Balkan wars of At the current juncture, Japan was emerging as an anti-imperialist option not only for the Ottomans but for the Filipino, Indian, Iranian and all those countries submitted during the second stage of colonization. Thus in the spring of the discontent of the army in Macedonia and the importance given to this fact by the Tsar of Russia and the King of England allowed the Young Ottomans the opportunity to overthrow the regime. The discontent and the support towards the insurgents made that in the end the Sultan gave his arm to twist and summoned to the formation of a Parliament, sealing thus the 23 of July of the triumph of the Revolution of the Young Turks. The loss of Libya, being its population almost all-Muslim, severely hit the morale of the sultan and his subjects. Therefore the way to follow was to replace the base of that civilization by another modern and European, conserving the Turkish culture. Academic relationship applied to politics used until practically today. Seen in perspective, it would be a suicide to confront Empires as large and strong as the Russian and the British, relying only on the

support of distant Germany; But the experience of the Boer war in South Africa and the Russo-Japanese war had been humiliating defeats for the Russian tsar and for the English king. Obviously, in London and in St. Petersburg the defeat in the Balkan wars, gave them arguments to think of an easy victory over the Ottoman forces. But the Sublime Gate was able to keep the Russians at bay and to inflict perhaps one of the most famous defeats of the Great War, establishing itself as an army with a better performance than that of the Austro-Hungarian troops throughout the conflict. The Gallipoli disaster at the beginning of , in which, as a good colonial power, the English although they suffered great and lamentable losses, thanks to the stubbornness of the first Lord of the Admiralty, Winston Churchill caused the troops of their colonies literally to sacrifice themselves in an impossible mission to take the impregnable Ottoman positions in the sheer peninsula of Gallipoli. Canadians, Australians and New Zealanders were annihilated without contemplation and for a long 9 months off the coast of the peninsula, this was a victory of great significance, as it was not only against the strongest navy in the world at the time, but also for being Gallipoli the first point in Europe from which the campaigns of the descendants of the Ottoman dynasty spread. The other great defeat inflicted on the "Redcoats" during World War I is less known but perhaps more humiliating. Imperial forces were sent from India and the Red Sea to take possession of Mesopotamia, but the desert, and the recovered bravery of the Ottoman army caused 25,000 losses to the English army and the surrender of Kut-al-Amara on April 29, 1916, of a garrison of 10,000 Indian and British soldiers with all the officiality and the major general Charles Townshend in the lead. The virtual elimination of Turkish Rumelia and the replacement of its dominion in the Balkan peninsula with the creation of the Yugoslav, Greek, Bulgarian and Albanian Republics of their own did not provide a solution to an insoluble question, as racial and religious problems still swarm in this area. The dominions of the Sublime Porte repeatedly suffered the intense pressure of the then new European imperialism. The decline and fall of the Ottoman Empire.

Chapter 3 : The great powers and the Near East, in SearchWorks catalog

The great powers and the Near East, by M. S. Anderson (Compiled by) starting at. The great powers and the Near East, has 0 available edition to buy at Alibris 48 Hours Only | Save \$

Eastern Question[edit] At the beginning of the 19th century the Ottoman Empire included all of the Balkan Peninsula south to the southern edge of the Hungarian Plain , but by had lost all of it except Constantinople and Eastern Thrace to the rise of Balkan nationalism , which saw the independence of Greece , Serbia , the Danubian Principalities and Bulgaria. Up until the Ottomans retained a band of territory including Albania , Macedonia and Southern Thrace , which were lost in the two Balkan Wars of 1912-13. The Ottoman Empire, believed to be about to collapse, was portrayed in the press as the " sick man of Europe ". The Balkan states, with the partial exception of Bosnia and Albania , were primarily Christian, as was the Arab zone of Lebanon. Starting in the Ottomans struck at the Armenians on the explicit grounds that they were a non-Muslim people and as such were a potential threat to the Muslim empire within which they resided[citation needed]. The Hamidian Massacres aroused the indignation of the entire Christian world. Relations of minorities within the Ottoman Empire and the disposition of former Ottoman lands became known as the " Eastern Question ", as the Ottomans were on the east of Europe. It now became relevant to define the east of the eastern question. In about the middle of the 19th century Near East came into use to describe that part of the east closest to Europe. Near East applied to what had been mainly known as the Levant , which was in the jurisdiction of the Ottoman Porte , or government. Those who used the term had little choice about its meaning. They could not set foot on most of the shores of the southern and central Mediterranean from the Gulf of Sidra to Albania without permits from the Ottoman Empire. Some regions beyond the Ottoman Porte were included. One was North Africa west of Egypt. It was occupied by piratical kingdoms of the Barbary Coast , de facto independent since the 18th century. Formerly part of the empire at its apogee. Iran was included because it could not easily be reached except through the Ottoman Empire or neighboring Russia. In the s the term tended to focus on the conflicts in the Balkan states and Armenia. The demise of the sick man of Europe left considerable confusion as to what was to be meant by "Near East". It is now generally used only in historical contexts, to describe the countries of Western Asia from the Mediterranean to or including Iran. Background[edit] Inhabitants of the Near East, late 19th century The geographical terms Near East and Far East referring to areas of the globe in or contiguous to the former British Empire and the neighboring colonies of the Dutch, Portuguese, Spanish and Germans, fit together as a pair based on the opposites of far and near, suggesting that they were innovated together. They appear together in the journals of the midth century. Both terms were used before then with local British and American meanings: Ideas of the east up to the Crimean War[edit] There was a linguistic predisposition to use such terms. Before them the Greeks had the habit, which appears in Linear B , the oldest known script of Europe, referring to the near province and the far province of the kingdom of Pylos. Usually these terms were given with reference to a geographic feature, such as a mountain range or a river. In the north is "Scythia this side of the Himalayas" and "Scythia beyond the Himalayas". Beyond the Ganges and Himalayas including the Tien Shan were Serica and Serae sections of China and some other identifiable far eastern locations known to the voyagers and geographers but not to the general European public. The world map of Jodocus Hondius of labels all of Asia from the Caspian to the Pacific as India Orientalis, [7] shortly to appear in translation as the East Indies. Ottoman Porte , , gateway to trade with the Levant. Painting by Antoine de Favray. Elizabeth I of England , primarily interested in trade with the east, collaborated with English merchants to form the first trading companies to the far-flung regions, using their own jargon. Their goals were to obtain trading concessions by treaty. The East India Company short for a much longer formal name was chartered in for trade to the East Indies. It has pleased western historians to write of a decline of the Ottoman Empire as though a stable and uncontested polity of that name once existed. The borders did expand and contract but they were always dynamic and always in "question" right from the beginning. The last Roman emperor died fighting hand-to-hand in the streets of his capital, Constantinople, overwhelmed by the Ottoman military, in May, The victors inherited his remaining territory in the Balkans. The populations of

those lands did not accept Turkish rule. The Turks to them were foreigners with completely different customs, way of life, and language. Intervals when there was no unrest were rare. The Hungarians had thrown off Turkish rule by Serbia was created by the Serbian Revolution, "The Greek War of Independence", created modern Greece, which recovered most of the lands of ancient Greece, but could not gain Constantinople. The Ottoman Porte was continuously under attack from some quarter in its empire, primarily the Balkans. Also, on a number of occasions in the early 19th century, American and British warships had to attack the Barbary pirates to stop their piracy and recover thousands of enslaved Europeans and Americans. In the Russian Empire on behalf of the Slavic Balkan states began to question the very existence of the Ottoman Empire. Eventually, the Ottoman Empire lost control of the Balkan region. Original diplomatic concept of near east[edit] British troops, Crimea, Until about the words near east and far east did not refer to any particular region. The Crimean War brought a change in vocabulary with the introduction of terms more familiar to the late 19th century. The Russian Empire had entered a more aggressive phase, becoming militarily active against the Ottoman Empire and also against China, with territorial aggrandizement explicitly in mind. Rethinking its policy the British government decided that the two polities under attack were necessary for the balance of power. It therefore undertook to oppose the Russians in both places, one result being the Crimean War. During that war the administration of the British Empire began promulgating a new vocabulary, giving specific regional meaning to "the Near East", the Ottoman Empire, and "the Far East", the East Indies. The two terms were now compound nouns often shown hyphenated. Toward the end of the letter he said: To support the "sick man" in the Near East is an arduous and costly affair; let England, France and America too, beware how they create a "sick giant" in the Far East, for they may rest assured that, if Turkey is [a] European necessity, China is a world necessity. Much of the colonial administration belonged to this club, which had been formed by the Duke of Wellington. If not the first use of the terms, the letter to the Times was certainly one of the earliest presentations of this vocabulary to the general public. They became immediately popular, supplanting "Levant" and "East Indies", which gradually receded to minor usages and then began to change meaning. Original archaeological concept of nearer east[edit] Rawlinson Near East remained popular in diplomatic, trade and journalistic circles, but a variation soon developed among the scholars and the men of the cloth and their associates: They undoubtedly saw a need to separate the biblical lands from the terrain of the Ottoman Empire. The Christians saw the country as the land of the Old and New Testaments, where Christianity had developed. The scholars in the field of studies that eventually became biblical archaeology attempted to define it on the basis of archaeology. For example, The London Review of Telford and Barber, unsigned in reviewing several works by Rawlinson, Layard and others, defined themselves as making: In defense of the Bible as history they said: Explicitly excluded is India. No mention is made of the Balkans. The British archaeologist D. Its area is generally understood to coincide with those classic lands, historically the most interesting on the surface of the globe, which lie about the eastern basin of the Mediterranean Sea; but few probably could say offhand where should be the limits and why. Hogarth then proceeds to say where and why in some detail, but no more mention is made of the classics. His analysis is geopolitical. His map delineates the Nearer East with regular lines as though surveyed. It differs from the Ottoman Empire of the times in including Greece and Iran. Hogarth gives no evidence of being familiar with the contemporaneous initial concept of the Middle East. The cause of the onus was the religiously motivated Hamidian Massacres of Christian Armenians, but it seemed to spill over into the protracted conflicts of the Balkans. For a time, "Near East" meant primarily the Balkans. Sir Henry Norman and his first wife[edit] The change is evident in the reports of influential British travelers to the Balkans. As the book was a big success, he was off to the Balkan states with his wife in to develop detail for a sequel, *The People and Politics of the Near East*, which Scribners planned to publish in Norman, a writer herself, wrote glowing letters of the home and person of Mme. Zakki, "the wife of a Turkish cabinet minister," who, she said, was a cultivated woman living in a country home full of books. As for the natives of the Balkans, they were "a semi-civilized people". The empire had descended from an enlightened civilization ruling over barbarians for their own good to something considerably less. The difference was the Hamidian Massacres, which were being conducted even as the couple traveled the Balkans. According to Norman now, the empire had been established by "the Moslem horde" from Asia,

which was stopped by "intrepid Hungary. The Russians were suddenly liberators of oppressed Balkan states. Having portrayed the Armenians as revolutionaries in the name of freedom with the expectation of being rescued by the intervention of Christian Europe, he states "but her hope was vain. Prince Nicolas of Montenegro wrote a letter thanking him for his article. The countries and regions mentioned are Greece , Bulgaria , Serbia , Bosnia-Herzegovina which was Muslim and needed, in his view, to be suppressed , Macedonia , Montenegro , Albania , Romania. The rest of the Ottoman domain is demoted to just "the east". William Miller[edit] If Norman was apparently attempting to change British policy, it was perhaps William Miller " , journalist and expert on the Near East, who did the most in that direction. In essence, he signed the death warrant, so to speak, of the Age of Empires. The fall of the Ottoman Empire ultimately enmeshed all the others as well. In the Travel and Politics in the Near East, , Miller claimed to have made four trips to the Balkans, , , and , and to be, in essence, an expert on "the Near East", by which he primarily meant the Balkans. He was in effect whatever his formal associations if any a point man of British near eastern intelligence. It is not so much the fault of the men as the fault of the system, which is thoroughly bad from top to bottom Turkish administration is synonymous with corruption, inefficiency, and sloth. These were fighting words to be coming from a country that once insisted Europe needed Turkey and was willing to spill blood over it. For his authority Miller invokes the people, citing the "collective wisdom" of Europe, and introducing a concept to arise many times in the decades to follow under chilling circumstances:

Chapter 4 : The Hellenistic World (B.C. - 31 B.C.)

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

It distracted Russia from further advances. Napoleon I himself invaded Egypt, but his army was trapped there when the British sank the French fleet. A peace interlude in allowed the army to return to France. Russia undertook to aid Napoleon in his war against Britain; in turn, the Emperor of Russia would receive the Ottoman territories of Moldavia and Wallachia. If the Sultan refused to surrender these territories, France and Russia were to attack the Empire, and the Ottoman domains in Europe were to be partitioned between the two allies. The alliance naturally proved accommodating to the Austrians, who hoped that a joint Franco-Russian attack, which would probably have utterly devastated the Ottoman Empire, could be prevented by diplomacy; but if diplomatic measures failed, the Austrian minister Klemens von Metternich decided that he would support the partition of the Ottoman Empire—a solution disadvantageous to Austria, but not as dangerous as a complete Russian takeover of Southeastern Europe. An attack on the Empire, however, did not come to pass, and the alliance concluded at Tilsit was dissolved by the French invasion of Russia in . This omission, together with the exclusion of the Sultan from the Holy Alliance , was interpreted by many as supportive of the position that the Eastern Question was a Russian domestic issue that did not concern any other European nations. Serbian revolution or Revolutionary Serbia refers to the national and social revolution of the Serbian people between and , during which Serbia managed to fully emancipate from the Ottoman Empire and exist as a sovereign European nation-state , and a latter period — , marked by intense negotiations between Belgrade and Ottoman Empire. The term was invented by a famous German historian Leopold von Ranke in his book *Die Serbische Revolution*, published in . It called for unity of the Serbian nation , emphasizing the importance of freedom of religion, Serbian history and formal, written rules of law, all of which it claimed the Ottoman Empire had failed to provide. It also called on Serbs to stop paying the jizya tax to the Porte. The Principality of Serbia was established, governed by its own Parliament, Government, Constitution and its own royal dynasty. Full independence of the Principality was internationally recognized during the second half of the 19th century. The Eastern Question once again became a major European issue when the Greeks declared independence from the Sultan in . It was at about this time that the phrase "Eastern Question" was coined. Ever since the defeat of Napoleon in , there had been rumours that the Emperor of Russia sought to invade the Ottoman Empire, and the Greek Revolt seemed to make an invasion even more likely. A desire for peaceful co-operation was also held by Alexander I, who had founded the Holy Alliance. Rather than immediately putting the Eastern Question to rest by aiding the Greeks and attacking the Ottomans, Alexander wavered, ultimately failing to take any decisive action. Deciding that he would no longer tolerate negotiations and conferences, he chose to intervene in Greece. Britain also soon became involved, interested in imposing its will on a newly formed Greek state in part to prevent it becoming a wholly Russian vassal. The spirit of Romanticism that then dominated Western European cultural life also made support for Greek independence politically viable. France too aligned itself with the Greeks, but Austria still worried about Russian expansion did not. An alarmed Austria sought to form an anti-Russian coalition, but its attempts were in vain. As the war continued into , Russia gained a firm advantage over the Ottoman Empire. By prolonging hostilities further, however, Russia would have invited Austria to enter the war against her and would have resulted in considerable suspicion in Britain. Therefore, for the Russians to continue with the war in hopes of destroying the Ottoman Empire would have been inexpedient. At this stage, the King of France, Charles X , proposed the partition of the Ottoman Empire among Austria, Russia and others, but his scheme was presented too belatedly to produce a result. Thus, Russia was able to secure neither a decisive defeat nor a partition of the Ottoman Empire. She chose, however, to adopt the policy of degrading the Ottoman Empire to a mere dependency. In , the Emperor of Russia concluded the Treaty of Adrianople with the Sultan; his empire was granted additional territory along the Black Sea, Russian commercial vessels were granted access to the

Dardanelles, and the commercial rights of Russians in the Ottoman Empire were enhanced. The Greek War of Independence was terminated shortly thereafter, as Greece was granted independence by the Treaty of Constantinople in 1830. The modern and well-trained Egyptians looked as though they could conquer the entire empire. The Tsar of Russia, in keeping with his policy of reducing the Ottoman Sultan to a petty vassal, offered to form an alliance with the Sultan. In 1821, the two rulers negotiated the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, in which Russia achieved the aim of securing complete dominance over the Ottomans. The Russians pledged to protect the Empire from external attacks; in turn, the Sultan pledged to close the Dardanelles to warships whenever Russia was at war. This provision of the Treaty raised a problem known as the "Straits Question". The agreement provided for the closure for all warships, but many European statesmen mistakenly believed that the clause allowed Russian vessels. Britain and France were angered by the misinterpreted clause; they also sought to contain Russian expansion. The two kingdoms, however, differed on how to achieve their objective; the British wished to uphold the Sultan, but the French preferred to make Muhammad Ali whom they saw as more competent the ruler of the entire Ottoman Empire. Russian intervention led the Sultan to negotiate a peace with Muhammad Ali in 1825, but war broke out once again in 1826. Another disaster followed when the entire Turkish fleet was seized by the Egyptian forces. Great Britain and Russia now intervened to prevent the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, but France still continued to support Muhammad Ali. In 1827, however, the Great Powers agreed to compromise; Muhammad Ali agreed to make a nominal act of submission to the Sultan, but was granted hereditary control of Egypt. The only unresolved issue of the period was the Straits Question. With the Straits Convention, the Russian Emperor Nicholas I abandoned the idea of reducing the Sultan to a state of dependence, and returned to the plan of partitioning Ottoman territories in Europe. Thus, after the resolution of the Egyptian struggle which had begun in 1825, the weak Ottoman Empire was no longer wholly dependent on Russia but was dependent on the Great Powers for protection. Attempts at internal reform failed to end the decline of the Empire. By the 1830s, the Ottoman Empire had become the "sick man of Europe", and its eventual dissolution appeared inevitable.

Revolutions of [edit] Main article: Revolutions of 1820-1821

After the Great Powers reached a compromise to end the revolt of Mehmet Ali, the Eastern Question lay dormant for about a decade until revived by the Revolutions of 1830-1831. Although Russia could have seized the opportunity to attack the Ottoman Empire—France and Austria were at the time occupied by their own insurrections—it chose not to. Instead, Emperor Nicholas committed his troops to the defence of Austria, hoping to establish goodwill to allow him to seize Ottoman possessions in Europe later. The Emperors of both Austria and Russia demanded that the Sultan return Austrian rebels who had sought asylum in the Empire, but he refused. The indignant monarchs withdrew their ambassadors to the Sublime Porte, threatening armed conflict. Almost immediately, however, Britain and France sent their fleets to protect the Ottoman Empire. The two Emperors, deeming military hostilities futile, withdrew their demands for the surrender of the fugitives. The short crisis created a closer relationship between Britain and France, which led to a joint war against Russia in the Crimean War of 1853-1856.

Crimean War A new conflict began during the 1850s with a religious dispute. Under treaties negotiated during the 18th century, France was the guardian of Roman Catholics in the Ottoman Empire, while Russia was the protector of Orthodox Christians. For several years, however, Catholic and Orthodox monks had disputed possession of the Church of the Nativity and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Palestine. During the early 1850s, the two sides made demands which the Sultan could not possibly satisfy simultaneously. In 1853, the Sultan adjudicated in favour of the French, despite the vehement protestations of the local Orthodox monks. Through skillful diplomacy, Lord Stratford convinced the Sultan to reject the treaty, which compromised the independence of the Ottomans. Nicholas believed that the European powers would not object strongly to the annexation of a few neighbouring Ottoman provinces, especially given Russian involvement in suppressing the Revolutions of 1830-1831. Britain, seeking to maintain the security of the Ottoman Empire, sent a fleet to the Dardanelles, where it was joined by another fleet sent by France. Yet the European powers hoped for a diplomatic compromise. The representatives of the four neutral Great Powers—Britain, France, Austria and Prussia—met in Vienna, where they drafted a note which they hoped would be acceptable to Russia and the Empire. Britain, France and Austria were united in proposing amendments to mollify the Sultan, but their suggestions were ignored in the Court of Saint Petersburg. Britain

and France set aside the idea of continuing negotiations, but Austria and Prussia held hope for diplomacy despite the rejection of the proposed amendments. The Sultan proceeded to war, his armies attacking the Russian army near the Danube. Nicholas responded by despatching warships, which destroyed the entire Ottoman fleet at Sinop on 30 November, allowing Russia to land and supply its forces on the Ottoman shores fairly easily. The destruction of the Ottoman fleet and the threat of Russian expansion alarmed both Britain and France, who stepped forth in defence of the Ottoman Empire. Emperor Nicholas I presumed that Austria, in return for the support rendered during the Revolutions of 1848, would side with him, or at the very least remain neutral. However, Austria felt threatened by the Russian troops in the nearby Danubian Principalities. When Britain and France demanded the withdrawal of Russian forces from the Principalities, Austria supported them; and, though it did not immediately declare war on Russia, it refused to guarantee its neutrality. When, in the summer of 1853, Austria made another demand for the withdrawal of troops, Russia fearing that Austria would enter the war complied. Though the original grounds for war were lost when Russia withdrew her troops from the Danubian Principalities, Britain and France continued hostilities. Determined to address the Eastern Question by ending the Russian threat to the Ottoman Empire, the allies posed several conditions for a ceasefire, including that Russia should give up its protectorate over the Danubian Principalities; that Russia should abandon any right to interfere in Ottoman affairs on the behalf of Orthodox Christians; that the Straits Convention of 1840 was to be revised; and finally, all nations were to be granted access to the river Danube. In addition, warships of all nations were perpetually excluded from the Black Sea, once the home to a Russian fleet which had been destroyed during the war. The Emperor of Russia and the Sultan agreed not to establish any naval or military arsenal on that sea coast. The Black Sea clauses came at a tremendous disadvantage to Russia, for it greatly diminished the naval threat it posed to the Ottomans. Moreover, all the Great Powers pledged to respect the independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Napoleon had opposed Russia over the Eastern Question in order to gain the support of Britain. But the new French Republic did not oppose Russian interference in the Ottoman Empire because that did not significantly threaten French interests. As Britain alone could not enforce the clauses, Russia once again established a fleet in the Black Sea.

Great Eastern Crisis 1877-78 [edit] See also: After many attempts, a diplomatic settlement was reached at the Congress of Berlin, and the new Treaty of Berlin revised the earlier treaty. The Great Powers believed they should intervene to prevent a bloody war in the Balkans. The Note, seeking to avoid a widespread conflagration in Southeastern Europe, urged the Sultan to institute various reforms, including granting religious liberty to Christians. A joint commission of Christians and Muslims was to be established to ensure the enactment of appropriate reforms. With the approval of Britain and France, the Note was submitted to the Sultan, and he agreed on 31 January. But the Herzegovinian leaders rejected the proposal, pointing out that the Sultan had already failed his promises of reforms. Representatives of the Three Emperors met again in Berlin, where they approved the Berlin Memorandum. To convince the Herzegovinians, the Memorandum suggested that international representatives be allowed to oversee the institution of reforms in the rebelling provinces. But before the Memorandum could be approved by the Porte, the Ottoman Empire was convulsed by internal strife, which led to the deposition of Sultan Abdul-Aziz. In the meantime, the hardships of the Ottomans had increased; their treasury was empty, and they faced insurrections not only in Herzegovina and Bulgaria, but also in Serbia and Montenegro. Still, the Ottoman Empire managed to crush the insurgents in August. The result incommoded Russia, which had planned to take possession of various Ottoman territories in Southeastern Europe in the course of the conflict.

Chapter 5 : Five Empires of the Ancient Near East: - ensign

Comment: A readable copy. All pages are intact, and the cover is intact. Pages can include considerable notes-in pen or highlighter-but the notes cannot obscure the text.

The Hellenistic World B. The Classical period of Greece was characterized by large numbers of city states of various sizes that were very jealous of their independence and found it hard to co-operate. At this time the Greek world in the East was restricted to the area of present-day Greece and the Aegean shore of Asia Minor. By the mid-fourth century Macedon under Philip II dominated the Greek city states, and his son Alexander led them in the conquest of the Persian empire. Greek colonies were set up throughout the Near East and the Greek language became the cultural lingua franca. These colonies became city states in their own right and established various relationships with the monarchies in whose territories they stood. The high period of the Hellenistic Kingdoms was the end of the 3rd century B. His successors the Seleucid dynasty had lost control of Asia Minor by , but Antiochus III gained the title "the Great" by re-establishing control over the vast areas east of Mesopotamia. His defeat by Rome in B. It had the difficult task of trying to maintain hegemony over the old Greek city states of the mainland. These city states continued to be as jealous of their autonomy as they had been in the Classical period. Macedon entered into variance alliances, but crucial to Macedonian control of Greece were their garrisons in three towns which kept open the invasion route from Macedon into southern Greece: These garrisons were known by the opponents of Macedon as the "three fetters" of Greece. Macedon was destroyed by Rome in a series of three wars in the early 2nd century B. In addition to these three major kingdoms, the kingdom of Pergamum arose in western Asia Minor in the mid-third century B. There a dynasty arose that was at first subordinate to the Seleucids but later gained its independence. It is called "Attalid" after the first member of the family to claim the title "king" and ruled from the city of Pergamum. In addition to Pergamem, other independent kingdoms flourished in Asia Minor during the 2nd century B. Cappadocia, Bithynia, Pontus, Galatia, and Armenia. In old Greece, certain of the Greek communities retained a precarious independence: The Aetolian League, north of Gulf of Corinth a federal grouping made up of the northern and central mainland States. Sparta, independent, challenged the Achaean League. Rhodes was to become the chief commercial centre in the Aegean, also controlling some territory in Asia Minor, and very rich. One by one, these Hellenistic kingdoms and cities fell under the sway of Rome. Rome engaged in three Macedonia Wars B. Following the destruction of Macedon in B. Their failure to understand clearly the new power arrangements led to the Achaean War and the destruction of Corinth in B. There it remained a secondary power, slowly desintegrating until it was finally abolished by Pompey the Great in 63 B. The other independent kingdoms of Asia Minor quickly become client states of Rome. Mithridates the Great of Pontus led the final resistance to Rome in the East, fighting a series of wars in the 1st century B. No significant power existed in the Mediterranean basin independent of Rome by the 1st century B.

Chapter 6 : Near East - Wikipedia

Sevaldsen, J. (). M. S. Anderson: The Great Powers and the Near East " Documents of Modern History, general editors: A. G. Dickens og Alan Davies.

Chapter 7 : The Near East and the Great Powers " Richard N. Frye | Harvard University Press

The Great Powers and the Near East, (New York: St. Martin's Press,); Alexander Macfie, The Eastern Question, (New York: Longman,). For.

Chapter 8 : The Near East and the Great Powers

c Turkish Foreign Policy, - Google Books Result The Eastern question, a study in international relations by Anderson, M.

S.. Overall Rating: The great powers and the Near East, ;. Book. The Eastern Question and British Imperialism, A. By Abdullah Dawam in The Powers and the Eastern Question.