

SOURCE A

Cavour, Prime Minister of Piedmont, considers what might happen now that Garibaldi has conquered Sicily in May 1860.

If Garibaldi captures Naples, just as he has taken Sicily, he will become master of the situation. King Victor Emmanuel would lose all his prestige in the eyes of the Italians, who would regard him as little more than the friend of Garibaldi. He would remain a dictator and refuse to join southern Italy to Piedmont. He would be stronger than we are. We would be forced to agree with his plans and help him fight Austria again. Therefore, the King must not receive the crown of Italy from Garibaldi's hands.

Cavour, a letter to King Victor Emmanuel's Ambassador in Paris, 1 August 1860

SOURCE B

Victor Emmanuel, King of Piedmont, advises Garibaldi what to do following the conquest of Sicily in a message delivered to Garibaldi by one of the King's courtiers.

When you reach Naples, you must do whatever circumstances suggest: you could occupy the central Papal States. Once in Naples you should proclaim union with the rest of Italy, just as you have done in Sicily. You must prevent disorder, for that would harm our cause. You should keep the Bourbon army in being and ready, for Austria might declare war on us shortly. You should let the King of Naples escape; or, if the King should be captured by the people, you should protect him and let him escape.

Count Trecchi, An Anthology of Letters, 5 August 1860

SOURCE C

The Prime Minister of Piedmont explains his thoughts about the position of the Papal States the day after two of them – the Marches and Umbria – were invaded by the Piedmontese army.

I note with gratitude that the French Emperor is increasing his garrison in Rome. By reassuring the Catholic world over the apparent danger to the Pope, France is doing us a big service. Moreover it will strengthen our position as regards Garibaldi, who I hope will now listen to reason. Once we have avoided being involved by his recklessness in a struggle simultaneously against France and Austria, we will try to regain the confidence of Europe. You must explain to the French government that our policy is always governed by the wish not to embarrass France by seizing Rome.

Cavour, letter to the Piedmontese Ambassador in Paris, September 1860

SOURCE D

Garibaldi clashes with Cavour in Parliament.

Garibaldi: Italy is not divided, she is whole; I and my friends will always champion Italy's cause. (Cheers) I must remind you of the glorious deeds of the Southern Army. My hopes for unity were ruined by the government when they sent forces against us. (Protests from the ministers' bench and violent exchanges within the Chamber)

Cavour: It is unforgivable to insult us in this way. Our intentions were always honourable. (Applause from the Deputies' benches and the galleries) Mr Chairman! See to it that the government of the nation is respected! Call people to order! (Interruptions)

An account of the session of the Chamber of Deputies in the Parliament of Italy, 18 April 1861

SOURCE E

A modern historian, studying the roles of leading Italian figures in the story of unification, assesses the impact of Garibaldi's expedition in southern Italy.

There was support in the south for liberation from an oppressive monarchy but not necessarily a wish for unity with the north. Most of Garibaldi's men came from the north and had little sympathy for the impoverished and backward south. As part of his law and order campaign Garibaldi introduced Piedmontese laws into the south. More might have been done for the peasants instead of, as in Sicily, abandoning them to the landlords. An opportunity was missed to win popular support through agrarian reform. If the relations between Garibaldi and Cavour had been different the outcome might have been better.

Andrina Stiles, The Unification of Italy, 1986

Examiner's Specific Advice

Students are required to compare two sources. To do so effectively students should identify individual points of similarity and difference in the content of the sources. It is wise to mark the question paper to identify the points you want to make before writing. Students should also comment on either the nature of the sources in terms of their quality and/or the provenance of the source, explaining how the authorship and time of writing might explain the similarities and differences between the sources. Notice, for example, that the sources have different views on how to deal with Garibaldi but similar concerns that a war with Austria might occur. Comment on the relative stance of the prime minister and king concerning Piedmont and the king's international standing. Both sources were intended for a restricted but quite different audience. How does this affect their reliability?

[Click Here For Sources Relating to this Question](#)

Exemplar Question

1 (a) Study Sources A and B.

Compare these Sources as evidence for the situation after Garibaldi's conquest of Sicily.

[30 marks]

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 1

Plan

Source A
Source B
Conclusion

Source B is an assessment of what Garibaldi must do when he reaches Naples. It was written by King Victor Emmanuel II of Piedmont. In this letter to Garibaldi the King is encouraging him "he must do whatever circumstances suggest". The king goes on to mention it would be alright for Garibaldi to advance on the Papal States "he could occupy the central Papal States" (1). Victor Emmanuel is telling Garibaldi what to do by saying he should give Naples over to the "rest of Italy", by this he

(1) This reference to the source merely repeats the point already made. This is done on subsequent occasions.
(2) The student is summarising the content of the source without making any point of comparison.
(3) The student is

Access to History – Online OCR AS European and World History Enquiries – The Unification of Italy, 1815–70

means Piedmont, “just as he has done in Sicily” as Garibaldi handed Sicily over to Piedmont once he had finished using it as a base to plan his attack on Naples and gathered men. The King wants Garibaldi to “prevent disorder” as it “would harm our cause” (2). If Garibaldi caused too much trouble in Naples foreign troops would be brought to attack Garibaldi and harm the cause which is to unify Italy. This could be because a united Italy would prove a threat to the countries around it such as “Austria and France” (3) so they might send in troops to prevent this from happening, “Austria might declare war”. Victor Emmanuel stresses that Garibaldi must protect the King of Naples. This could be because he is a king like Victor Emmanuel and if they overthrew the King of Naples there is no one to stop it happening to him (4).

Source A contradicts Source B (5). This source is a letter from Cavour, the Piedmont Prime Minister to Victor Emmanuel’s ambassador (6). Cavour fears Garibaldi if he captures Naples and is worried about the outcome. Cavour thinks if Victor Emmanuel supports Garibaldi then he “would lose all his prestige in the eyes of the Italians, who would see him as little more than the friend of Garibaldi”. This quote gives Cavour’s opinion that he feels the majority of the men from Italy only want a Northern Italy with no South involved. Cavour felt if Victor supported Garibaldi public opinion would turn against him. Cavour was worried Garibaldi would take over Southern Italy and be a ‘dictator’ and refuse to let it be joined with the North (Piedmont). He feared that Garibaldi’s South would be stronger than his North (7) due to Garibaldi’s bold, sharp style of leading troops and his admiration from the public (8). He was worried Garibaldi would persuade Italy to go to war with Austria so they could gain Venetia which Austria controlled but actually had Italians living there. Cavour did not want the King to gain Southern Italy from Garibaldi, maybe because he was jealous and felt using diplomacy he could join Italy himself (9).

Both sources contradict themselves. Source A is against Garibaldi and Source B is for Garibaldi. Source A is worried about what will happen if Garibaldi gains North Italy and Source B is encouraging Garibaldi to take South Italy (10).

Examiner’s Assessment

A01a – Level IV mark of 3: some unclear, disorganised sections, but a mostly satisfactory level of communication.
A01b – Level III mark of 5: a mixture of internal analysis and discussion of similarities and differences; judgement appears in the conclusion.
A02a – Level IV mark of 8: comparison attempted but

adding knowledge to inform the text, which is admissible and sometimes useful, but here the threat to Austria and France is not identified.

(4) This is speculative and does not really have any bearing on the issues at the heart of the comparison.

(5) This suggests awareness that there are differences but fails to make the points explicit.

(6) There is little to be gained by merely restating information provided. It would be better here, as with Source B, to comment on the provenance.

(7) To this point the treatment of Source A is a summary only.

(8) This adds knowledge but, as with note (4) above, little is gained from a speculative remark such as this.

(9) This implies that Cavour wanted to unite Italy, which is controversial and appears to be contradicted by Source C.

(10) At this point the student attempts to treat the sources together but the comments are

Access to History – Online OCR AS European and World History Enquiries – The Unification of Italy, 1815–70

comment is sequential with few points of internal analysis or provenance.
Total mark of 16 (Grade D).

restricted to very brief generalisations about the sources.

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 2

Plan

Difference: General response of each to Garibaldi
A wants to contain Garibaldi but B favours giving him a free hand.
The interests of Piedmont appear to be more of a concern to A than B.
Similarity: War with Austria (but for different reasons)
Evaluation: The king's motives may explain his message.
Cavour may be exaggerating to gain French support.

Both Sources A and B show assessments of the situation after Garibaldi's conquest of Sicily. The sources appear to differ in that Source A shows that Cavour is threatened by Garibaldi's actions which he fears will make him 'master of the situation'. In comparison, Victor Emmanuel has confidence in Garibaldi and the tone of Source B is positive (11). Cavour believes Garibaldi must be restrained otherwise he will 'remain a dictator and refuse to concede southern Italy to Piedmont'. The King thinks Garibaldi should have a free hand and 'do whatever circumstances suggest' and that he can be relied upon to hand over Naples (12). Cavour is clearly more concerned with the impact Garibaldi's expedition will have on Piedmont, afraid that Garibaldi 'will be stronger than we are' and the king 'would lose all his prestige in the eyes of Italians' (13). In Source B Victor Emmanuel does not appear to consider these dangers and seems to be more concerned with the broader interests of Italy. They both express fears about war with Austria although Cavour thinks this will be caused by Garibaldi himself whereas the King thinks that any war will be started by Austria (14).

However, although these sources may be contrasting at face value, they may in fact be similar when looked at more closely (15). The message in Source B may not reflect the true views of Victor Emmanuel. The source was probably intended as a device to manipulate Garibaldi. If Garibaldi was to think that the leaders of Piedmont were on his side then he would not misinterpret their impending invasion of the Papal States (16). He would merely see it as their contribution to unification. If the King had any fears about Garibaldi he would be unlikely to express them in a letter to him if only because the king realised that Garibaldi was the only one able to 'prevent disorder' in the South which the King saw as a priority (17). The information in Source A is more likely to reflect the actual

(11) This answer begins with a distinct point of comparison and indicates an awareness of the importance of providing an engaged response.
(12) A second point of comparison confirms the promise of the first lines.
(13) As above, this student selects a key phrase from the source to support the point identified.
(14) This final point is well expressed but would be more convincing if an explicit reference to the sources had been made as reinforcement.
(15) This comment hints at a degree of evaluation.
(16) This appears to be a fair attempt to explain the King's motives but it is unconvincing because at the time of writing Garibaldi was still in Sicily and the king was not considering any impending invasion of the Papal States.
(17) This is sound evaluation using the content of the source to assess the king's motives.

Access to History – Online OCR AS European and World History Enquiries – The Unification of Italy, 1815–70

views of Cavour because it is a letter sent to a fellow Piedmontese official and he would have no reason to disguise his fears (18). However, he may have exaggerated his views to ensure any French assistance was likely to be offered to Cavour and Piedmont rather than to Garibaldi.

(18) This is close to 'a stock response' where an assumption is made about the reliability of a view based on the relationship between the author and the recipient of the letter. In fact, as the next sentence concedes, the source may not have been entirely reliable.

Examiner's Assessment

AO1a – Level IA mark of 6: accurate use of historical terms, clearly structured and coherently written.

AO1b – Level IA mark of 8: consistently and relevantly analytical with developed comparisons and judgement.

AO2a – Level IB mark of 13: effective responses on content and provenance; further discussion of limitations of sources would have raised the mark.

Total mark of 27 (Grade A).

[Click here for a Mark Scheme that accompanies the exemplar answers provided above](#)

Mark Scheme

Examiners use Mark Schemes to determine how best to categorise a candidate's response and to ensure that the performances of thousands of candidates are marked to a high degree of consistency. Few answers fall neatly into the mark levels indicated below: some answers will provide good comparisons but offer little internal provenance; others may rely heavily on own knowledge. Examiners therefore try to find the 'best fit' when applying the scheme. Each answer has a final mark based on three Assessment Objectives (AO1a, AO1b and AO2a) worth $6 + 8 + 16 = 30$ marks. As the standard of the two answers lies between Level 1 and Level IV, only the descriptors and marks for these levels are tabulated below.

Marking Grid for Enquiries Question (a)

Access to History – Online OCR AS European and World History Enquiries – The Unification of Italy, 1815–70

Assessment Objectives	AO1a Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate clearly and effectively	AO1b Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis	AO2a Analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination
LEVEL IA	Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 6 marks	Consistently relevant and analytical answer; clear and accurate understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 8 marks	Provides a focused comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 16 marks
LEVEL IB	Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 6 marks	Judgements are supported by appropriate references to content and provenance; very good understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 7 marks	Provides an effective comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 13–15 marks
LEVEL II	Uses historical terms accurately; clearly and mostly coherently structured and clearly communicated answer. 5 marks	Good attempt at explanation/analysis but uneven overall judgements; mostly clear understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 6 marks	Provides a relevant comparison of both content and provenance; evaluation lacks completeness and may be confined to the conclusion or second half of the answer. 11–12 marks
LEVEL III	Uses relevant historical terms but not always accurately or extensively; mostly structured and clearly communicated answer. 4 marks	Mixture of internal analysis and discussion of similarities and/or differences; uneven understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 5 marks	Provides a comparison; makes limited links with the sources by focusing too much on content or provenance. 9–10 marks
LEVEL IV	Some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant; some unclear, under-developed or disorganised sections but satisfactorily written. 3 marks	Mostly satisfactory understanding of key concepts and significance of issues; some unlinked though relevant assertions, description/narrative but without a judgement. 4 marks	Attempts a comparison but comments are largely sequential; makes few points of comparative provenance or similarity/difference of content. 7–8 marks

OCR – AS GCE
European and World
History Enquiries
F 964

The Unification of Italy, 1815–70

QUESTION 1 PART (b)

Examiner's Specific Advice

This question requires you to pull together an answer which includes some of the analysis you have had to do for part (a) and then go further by considering all the sources. Make sure you allow half the time allocated for the whole paper (that makes 60 minutes for this question). Do a brief plan to remind yourself of agreement/disagreement with the proposition in the question. Identify themes which the sources pick up on; these should emerge in questions set by the examiners. For example, Sources A and C suggest divisiveness, whereas D offers conflicting views and B and E show there was potential for unity.

[Click Here For Sources Relating to this Question](#)

Exemplar Question

1 (b) Study all the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Garibaldi's expedition of 1860 revealed division rather than unity between Italians.

[70 marks]

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 1

Plan

Introduction

Sources A and C = division

Source D = division and unity

Source E = division and unity

Conclusion

Garibaldi's expedition in 1860 proved there were a lot of different ideas about how to unite Italy and what was the best way.

(1) This statement is correct but, crucially, no reference to the content of the sources is made to illustrate the basis of this statement.

(2) The different political views of Italians is an important factor but the basic difference

Access to History – Online OCR AS European and World History Enquiries – The Unification of Italy, 1815–70

The sources A, C and D show discontent in the way Garibaldi is going about uniting Italy. These sources are from Cavour and show he doesn't agree with the way Garibaldi is behaving (1). This could be because Cavour was a liberal and had different views (2) than Garibaldi who was a newly proclaimed royalist. Garibaldi used to support Mazzini and was a Nationalist but changed, Cavour was maybe worried that his support for Victor Emmanuel II was just an act. Both these sources prove not everyone was fully behind Garibaldi. Cavour and Garibaldi did differ a lot and had different views of a united Italy. Garibaldi believed a united Italy to be both the North and South of Italy joined together. But Cavour only wanted the North to be unified maybe because this was the rich part of Italy and the South was rather backward. Cavour as historians have said believed the only way to gain unification was with foreign help and diplomacy. Garibaldi preferred just to act on instinct and unite Italy by war, the invasion of Naples and Sicily in 1860 prove this (3).

But Source B shows people supported Garibaldi with his invasion of the south but were worried with what foreign countries think: "Austria might declare war". Italy wouldn't have been able to withstand an attack from Austria as it was too fragile so the king in Source B was asking Garibaldi to be careful (4).

Source E does mention the South wanted to escape from their "oppressive monarchy" but didn't necessarily want to be joined to the North instead. A. Stiles who wrote the book Unification in Italy in Source E mentions Garibaldi's men had little sympathy for the south as they didn't understand what happened there and how backward it was (5).

In the last line of Source E it mentions "if the relationship between Garibaldi and Cavour had been different the outcome might have been better". LCB Seaman rejects this view and feels that thanks to the bad relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi unity was achieved (6). Some historians have said Garibaldi only invaded Sicily because Cavour had given his home town Nice to France after a vote for union. Garibaldi felt it had been rigged and was going to invade when the revolutions in Sicily caught his attention. Maybe he thought if he gained control of Sicily it would get Cavour back for Nice, it's unknown (7).

But it's true that the expedition in 1860 revealed division rather than unity between Italians (8).

Examiner's Assessment

AO1a – Level IV mark of 5: mostly organised; some weak communication; relevant use of own knowledge.

AO1b – Level III mark of 7: attempts analysis but overall

between monarchists (like Cavour) and republicans (as Garibaldi once was) could be made more explicit. (3) This passage offers some valuable knowledge about the divisions between Cavour and Garibaldi. (4) Here the student is trying to link knowledge to the content of Source B but the treatment of the source and the extent of additional knowledge is very limited. (5) This is expressed awkwardly although the point is made. However, the backwardness of the south could be assessed if only by using the source more fully and explaining the reference to agrarian reform. (6) This indicates some wider reading and an awareness of the different views of historians but the basis of Seaman's view is not explained. (7) Garibaldi's motives are not strictly relevant to this question and the point about regaining Nice is very badly expressed and confused.

Access to History – Online OCR AS European and World History Enquiries – The Unification of Italy, 1815–70

judgement is incomplete.

AO2a – Level III mark of 17: sequential treatment of sources; refers to most but only partial assessment of limitations.

AO2b – Level III mark of 13: uneven balance between own knowledge and use of sources.

Total mark of 42 (Grade C).

(8) A judgement is needed to answer this question and although it should be brief this comment is far too short. Some assessment of the degree or extent of the division would be useful.

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 2

Plan

Intro. = there is a case for and against

Division: Sources A, C and D together then E

Knowledge:

different views of Cavour and Garibaldi

attitudes to and position of France

wider views of the people

Unity: Source B and possibly E

Knowledge:

Teano

land issue

Conclusion = division more than unity

(9) This is a good start. The student signals an intention to treat the sources as a group and to present an argument.

As a whole the sources support the view that Garibaldi's expedition of 1860 revealed division between Italians rather than unity. However, when viewed from a different perspective it could be seen to show unity towards the cause of Italian unification (9).

(10) A clear pairing of sources is indicated.

Division between Cavour and Garibaldi is made clear in Sources A and D (10). In A Cavour appears to be more concerned with Piedmontese interests and the prestige of the King and he is certainly wary of Garibaldi's intentions. Cavour worries that a unified south will affect his aims for Piedmont declaring "He will be stronger than we are". Cavour's priority was definitely to create a strong enlarged Piedmont in the north of Italy. The agreement made with Napoleon III at Plombieres in 1858 is proof of this (11).

(11) Knowledge used to substantiate the analysis of the source is relevant and linkage is direct.

The open disagreement between the two men is evident in the debate recorded in Source D. Garibaldi shows feelings of displeasure towards the actions of Piedmont by invading the Papal States. "My hopes for unity were ruined by the government when they sent forces against us" (12). Garibaldi saw this as an action against unification rather than a contribution towards it. Cavour's actions did prevent Garibaldi marching on Rome but Cavour felt this was necessary to prevent war with France which garrisoned Rome (13). This would explain why Cavour claims his aims were 'honourable' (14).

(12) An army from Piedmont marched from the north into Ancona, defeating Papal forces and occupying the Marches and Umbria.

(13) French troops had been stationed in Rome since 1849 to protect the Pope.

(14) Another good example of linking knowledge to the source.

Source E also shows deeper division between people rather

(15) This opens up the discussion to suggest that the

Access to History – Online OCR AS European and World History Enquiries – The Unification of Italy, 1815–70

than individuals (15). Those in the south appear to be more interested in liberation from an oppressive monarch, Ferdinand II (16), than unity with the north. Separatism (17) was strong in Italy and people were loyal to their state. Furthermore, Garibaldi's army of northerners are said to have had little sympathy for those in the south and little was done to deal with local problems. Many in the north feared that the south would be a drain on the finances of the north and lead to an increase in taxes (18).

However, it can be argued that the sources indicate a degree of unity. Source B seems to suggest common ground between the King and Garibaldi. In asking Garibaldi to preserve the Bourbon army and protect the King of Naples Victor Emmanuel seems to anticipate unity of effort for a possible war with Austria. He is certainly in favour of Garibaldi taking the central Papal States. The respect each had for the other was clear in the meeting between the two at Teano in October 1860 when Garibaldi handed over his conquests to Victor Emmanuel (19). Even in Source E the potential for unity is stressed as the support of the peasants could have been won if land had been redistributed from the landlords (20).

Overall, the sources as a set reveal great division between the Italians. They show that although the different Italian leaders wanted unification either of the entire peninsula or of the north only, they were not prepared to work together to achieve their aims. As Stiles states in Source E, 'If the relations between Garibaldi and Cavour had been different the outcome might have been better' (21).

Examiner's Assessment

AO1a – Level IA mark of 9: uses a wide range of accurate and relevant own knowledge; clearly organised and well written.

AO1b – Level IA mark of 11: clear and accurate understanding, consistently analytical and sound conclusion.

AO2a – Level IA mark of 26: excellent analysis and evaluation of all sources; aware of most limitations.

AO2b – Level IB mark of 19: focused balance of own knowledge and source evaluation.

Total mark of 65 (Grade A).

division was not just between Cavour and Garibaldi.

(16) A classic example of how knowledge can be linked to source content in a direct and simple fashion.

(17) Separatism, or particularism, was a feature of the peninsular.

Linguistic, cultural and traditional differences between the people of Italy were very strong.

(18) The attempt to balance references from the sources with knowledge is evident in this further example.

(19) Material from Source B is selected well, drawing out the relevant references only and, once again, knowledge is tied closely to the source analysis.

(20) Land ownership was the monopoly of a few and the vast majority of the peasants (the bulk of the population) were impoverished by high rents and limited legal rights.

(21) This is a clear judgement and a logical conclusion. The final comment focuses on the main theme running through these sources – the relationship

Click here for a Mark Scheme that accompanies the exemplar answers provided above

Mark Scheme

Examiners are told *not* to look for a set answer. The interpretation in the question may be agreed with or rejected – but it must be considered seriously, even if the claim is then rejected. Answers need to use *all five Sources*, evaluating them as to their strengths and limitations as evidence and testing them against contextual knowledge. This collection of Sources shows there are three pieces of evidence that suggest disunity (A, C and D), and two (Sources B and E) that imply a degree of unity existed. Indeed, this should prompt answers towards bringing in a range of wider knowledge to fully test and thus question the proposition.

Each answer has a final mark based on four Assessment Objectives (AO1a, AO1b AO2a and AO2b) worth 10 + 12 + 28 + 20 marks = 70 marks. As the standard of the two answers lies between Level I and Level IV, only the descriptors and marks for these levels have been tabulated below.

Marking Grid for Enquiries Question (b)

Access to History – Online OCR AS European and World History Enquiries – The Unification of Italy, 1815–70

Assessment Objectives	AO1a Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate clearly and effectively	AO1b Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis	AO2a Analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination	AO2b Analyse and evaluate how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented
Level IA	Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 9–10 marks	Consistently relevant and analytical answer; clear and accurate understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 11–12 marks	Provides a focused comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 26–28 marks	Excellent analysis and evaluation of the interpretation, using all sources and own knowledge to reach a conclusion. 20 marks
Level IB	Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 8 marks	Judgements supported by appropriate references to content and provenance; very good understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 9–10 marks	Provides an effective comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 23–25 marks	Focused analysis and evaluation of interpretation, using all sources and own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion. 17–19 marks
Level II	Uses historical terms accurately; clearly and mostly coherently structured and clearly communicated answer. 7 marks	Good attempt at explanation/ analysis but uneven overall judgements; mostly clear understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 8 marks	Provides a relevant comparison of both content and provenance; evaluation lacks completeness and may be confined to the conclusion or second half of the answer. 20–22 marks	Focused analysis and evaluation of interpretation, using all sources and own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion; some imbalance between use of own knowledge and sources. 14–16 marks
Level III	Uses relevant historical terms but not always accurately or extensively; mostly structured and clearly communicated answer. 6 marks	Mixture of internal analysis and discussion of similarities and differences; uneven understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 6–7 marks	Provides a comparison; makes limited links with the sources by focusing too much on content or provenance. 17–19 marks	Sound analysis and evaluation; there may be some description and unevenness between use of own knowledge and sources. 11–13 marks
Level IV	Some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant; some unclear, under-developed or disorganised sections but satisfactorily written. 4–5 marks	Mostly satisfactory understanding of key concepts; some unlinked though relevant assertions, description/ narrative but without a judgement. 4–5 marks	Attempts a comparison but comments are largely sequential; makes few points of comparative provenance or similarity/ difference of content. 14–16 marks	Some analysis and evaluation with increasing amounts of description; imbalanced use of own knowledge and sources. 8–10 marks

Chronology: Key Events in *The Unification of Italy, 1815–70*

1815		Congress of Vienna.
1820-1		Revolutions in part of the Austrian Empire.
1831		Mazzini founds 'Young Italy'. Charles Albert becomes King of Piedmont.
1848	January	Tobacco Riots in Milan.
	January	Revolution in Sicily.
	February	Constitutional government granted in Tuscany.
	March	<u>Constitutional government granted in Piedmont (the Statuto) (1).</u>
	March	Constitutional government granted in the Papal States.
	March	<u>The 5 Days of Milan (2).</u>
	March	Revolution in Venice.
	March	Charles Albert, King of Piedmont, declares war on Austria.
	May	Piedmont defeats Austria at Goito.
	July	Austria defeats Piedmont at Custoza.
	November	Revolution in Rome.
1849	February	A Republic is declared in Rome, with Mazzini as a leader.
	March	Austria defeats Piedmont at Novara.
	March	Charles Albert abdicates, to be succeeded by <u>Victor Emmanuel II (3).</u>
	May	Ferdinand II regains control in Sicily.
	July	Garibaldi defends Rome against French troops but is forced to retreat.
	August	Manin defeated in Venice and Austria regains control.
1850		<u>Church reform in Piedmont (4).</u>
1852		Cavour becomes Prime Minister of Piedmont.
1855	March	Piedmont joins England and France in the Crimean War.
1856	March	The Congress of Paris.
1857		The National Society is formed.
1858	July	Napoleon III and Cavour sign <u>the Pact of Plombières (5).</u>
1859	April	France and Piedmont declare war on Austria.
	May	Battle of Magenta: Milan is captured.
	May	Revolutions in the Central States and Romagna.
	June	<u>Battle of Solferino (6).</u>
	July	Treaty of Villafranca: Lombardy is transferred to Piedmont.
1860	January	Cavour returns to office having resigned after Villafranca.
	March	Plebiscites are held in the Central States and Romagna, which unites with Piedmont.
	April	Savoy and Nice conceded to France.
	May	Garibaldi and <u>the Red Shirts land at Marsala (7).</u>
	August	Garibaldi invades Naples.
	September	Piedmont invades Papal States and annexes The Marches and Umbria.

Access to History – Online OCR AS European and World History Enquiries – The Unification of Italy, 1815–70

October	Garibaldi formally concedes Sicily and Naples to Victor Emmanuel at Teano.
1861 March	The Kingdom of Italy is proclaimed, with a capital at Turin.
1862	Garibaldi's attempt to take Rome is foiled by the Italian army at Aspromonte.
1866 April	<u>Italy is allied with Prussia</u> (8).
June	Italy declares war on Austria.
July	Italy is defeated on land at Custoza, and on sea at Lissa.
August	Treaty of Prague: Venetia is conceded to Italy.
1867 November	Garibaldi's attempt to take Rome is foiled at Mentana.
1870 September	French troops evacuate Rome, and Italy annexes the Papal State of Rome.

- (1) The Statuto remained the basis of representative government in Piedmont throughout the period. Although a limited measure of constitutional reform, it established Piedmont as the only liberal Italian state.
- (2) Radetsky, the Austrian commander, was forced to evacuate the city and fall back on the defences of the Quadrilateral (four forts in Venetia).
- (3) Victor Emmanuel II was untainted by the reverses of 1848–49 and many nationalists were prepared to rally behind him as the leader of the only state in the peninsula ruled by an Italian king.
- (4) These reforms which reduced the power of the Church in Piedmont were part of a broad process of change undertaken in the 1850s which included economic and military reforms.
- (5) By the Pact of Plombières, Napoleon III agreed to support Piedmont in a defensive war against Austria for which she would be rewarded with Nice and Savoy. In the event of success it was agreed that a Kingdom of North Italy would be set up.
- (6) This battle was particularly bloody and helps explain why Napoleon III decided to sue for peace. He was also concerned about the Prussians mobilising on France's border.
- (7) This expedition started a series of events that exposed divisions within the ranks of Italian nationalists but also achieved the union of the north and the south.
- (8) Prussia played a key role in the completion of unification. Her defeat of Austria at Sadowa in 1866 resulted in Venetia going to Italy and her attack on France in 1870 forced the latter to withdraw her troops from Rome.

Teaching Activities

(1) As a way of focusing on *the provenance* of a source, comment on how the information provided in the introductions and the attributions of Sources D and E help inform an understanding of those sources.

(2) To practise the skills required for a comparison of the content of two sources, this question might be considered.

- Study Sources B and E.

Compare these sources as evidence for what Garibaldi's priorities were in Sicily and Naples.

[30 marks]

(3) Look at Exemplar Answers 1 and 2 in answering sub-question (b). Discuss the importance of clear expression in making a response effective.

(4) Study the Chronology and list those details that were of particular importance in the unification of Italy with a brief explanation of their significance.

Resources

- D. Beales, *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy* (Longman, 1982)
P. Browning, *Revolutions and Nationalities, Europe, 1825–1890* (CUP, 2000)
M. Clark, *The Italian Risorgimento* (Longman, 1998)
L. Cowie and R. Wolfson, *Years of Nationalism: European History 1815–1890* (Arnold, 1985)
J. Davies, *The Unification Of Italy* (Warwick History Video No 8)
M. Morrogh, *The Unification of Italy* (Palgrave, 2002)
R. Pearce and A. Stiles, *The Unification of Italy, 1815–1870*, 3rd edition (Hodder Murray, 2005)
J. Wilmot, *The Great Powers 1814–1914* (Nelson, 1992)

Weblinks

www.victorianweb.org/history/risorgimento/1.html

www.encyclopedia.com (then search for Italian Unification)