

Why have historians disagreed about the success of the vienna settlement?



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The Vienna Settlement (1814-1815) was made up of not one but three sets of negotiations.

The First Treaty of Paris (May 1814), which was made just after the French Revolution, was convened to prevent Europe before French expansion. The Treaty forced Napoleon to abdication and he was sent to/on the Elba. The Congress of Vienna - which was a conference between ambassadors of the most powerful countries in Europe - went on November 1814 to June 1815. It was until the Napoleon had run off from Elba and interrupted the Congress with his '100days'. The Congress indeed did not make any decisions not related to borders and new order in Europe except banishing slave trade in France.

The main aim for Europe was prevent countries before France and preserving the peace. After Napoleon's '100 Days', when the battle of Waterloo was his great defeat, countries assembled once again on the Second Treaty of Paris (November 1815). Monarchs reduced France to its 1790 boundaries and ordered it to pay indemnity. As everything, the Vienna Settlement had its bad and good sides and this is what made a dispute between historians. The Settlement was hugely criticized by the historians, who had lived in the 19-th century.

According to the liberalism and nationalism, arrangements made in 1814-1815 were 'backward-looking' and not popular. Lord Greville, the member of the Cabinet in England was firmly against it and said that he must have been 'seduced by his vanity' to have agreed with such an arrangement. England was the country of liberalism, so it was nothing new that in 1817 in the Black

Dwarf you could read complains of the legitimacy, which went awry for the public opinion. tzn ta legitimacy nie byla po mysli) First of all, the most reasons for complaining had the France. The Bourbon monarch was restore, Napoleon was unduly punished and exiled, and also they blamed the Vienna Settlement for the next revolutions. Antonin Debidour, the Frenchman, wrote that the allies ' consulted only their own convenience and interest and took no account of the aspirations of the people' (such opinions can be found in the works of J.

Droz in the 1960s, 1970s). Normam Davies in the Europe - A history was still highly critical. In his opinion, the settlement was very conservative and it ' actually put the clock back'.