

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY
2008 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)

Question 4

Analyze the similarities and differences in the methods used by Cavour and Bismarck to bring about the unification of Italy and Germany, respectively.

9–8 Points

- Thesis is clearly stated and addresses BOTH statesmen and compares and contrasts their methods of unification.
- Organization is clear, consistently followed, and effective in support of the argument.
- Essay is well balanced; the similarities and differences of both Cavour's and Bismarck's efforts are correctly described.
- Evenly compares and contrasts the methods of Cavour and Bismarck.
- Uses multiple examples to support the analysis of the similarities and differences.
- May contain some minor errors that do not detract from the argument (examples: calling the Seven Weeks' War the Seven Years' War; saying that Bismarck took over Denmark).

7–6 Points

- Thesis is clearly stated and addresses BOTH statesmen and compares and contrasts their methods of unification, although more attention may be paid to one aspect of the question.
- Organization is clear and effective in support of the argument, but not consistently followed.
- Essay is somewhat balanced, though the treatment of similarities and differences might be uneven.
- Contains at least two or three specific examples to support the analysis of the similarities and the differences.
- May contain several minor errors or one major error that detracts from the argument.

5–4 Points

- Thesis is clearly stated, but not fully responsive to the question; it might focus on either similarities or differences.
- Organization is clear and effective in support of the argument, but not consistently followed.
- Essay shows imbalance; the methods of either Cavour OR Bismarck may be discussed superficially.
- The analysis of the methods of either Cavour OR Bismarck might be supported with minimal examples and little factual support.
- May contain major errors or misleading overgeneralizations that detract from the argument.

3–2 Points

- The thesis is not clearly stated or just restates the question.
- Organization is unclear and ineffective.
- Essay shows serious imbalance; either just the similarities OR just the differences are discussed.
- Offers little factual support for analysis.
- May contain several major errors that detract from the argument.

1–0 Points

- No discernable attempt at a thesis.
- Poorly organized.
- One or none of the major topics suggested by the prompt is mentioned.
- Little or no supporting evidence is used.
- May contain numerous errors that detract from the argument.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2008 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)

Question 4 Historical Background

This question asks students to compare and contrast the methods used by Cavour and Bismarck. In order to answer this question, students need to know some specific facts about the unification process for each country. The stronger essays may generalize from these processes to some principles of state-building.

Textbook Material

Burns et al., *Western Civilizations* (9th edition, 1980)
Kishlansky, *Civilization in the West* (7th edition, 2008)
Merriman, *Modern Europe from the Renaissance to the Present* (2nd edition, 2004)
Noble et al., *Western Civilization: Beyond Boundaries* (4th edition, 2007)
Palmer et al., *A History of the Modern World* (12th edition, 2007)
Spielvogel, *Western Civilization Since 1300* (6th edition, 2006)

This is a mainstream question. All texts discuss this topic and give good detail about the process.

Kishlansky, Noble, and (to a lesser extent) Palmer explicitly compare the methods of Cavour and Bismarck, suggesting that both were opportunists as well as realists compelled by *Realpolitik*. Both used diplomacy, but Bismarck had greater access to military force while Cavour cunningly got others (France) to use their military for his ends. Burns and Spielvogel emphasize the similarities in their methods. Merriman is less concerned with the agency of Cavour and Bismarck and more interested in the forces at work and the situation in Europe at the time.

Cavour was an opportunist who achieved unification by manipulation of diplomacy and international events. He used his influence to achieve liberal administrative reforms in the government of Piedmont-Sardinia and entered the Crimean War (1853-56) in order to sit at the peace conference. An alliance with France and Napoleon III against Austria gained him Lombardy in 1850, and subsequent plebiscites enabled other central Italian states to join Piedmont-Sardinia. Cavour was a shrewd political tactician, supporting a liberal parliamentary government with an anticlerical policy. Other small Italian states sought annexation with Piedmont-Sardinia. In southern Italy Cavour's liberal goals persuaded the followers of Giuseppe Garibaldi in Sicily and Naples to join with Piedmont-Sardinia to create a unified state. After Cavour's death, Italy gained Venetia in 1866 through an alliance with Prussia, and in 1870, when Napoleon III was under attack from Prussia, took Rome.

Bismarck is described as a ruthless chess master, a Junker who joined with the liberals to gain a common end (Kishlansky). He did not just use wars to attain his goals; he provoked them. Palmer, in detail, describes Bismarck's technique. In 1864 Bismarck joined with Austria to challenge Denmark for Schleswig-Holstein with Russian support, since he had supported Russia the previous year during the Polish rebellion. He reformed the German Confederation with a parliament and universal suffrage and reinforced the *Zollverein* customs union, which was led by Prussia and excluded Austria. In 1866 he challenged Austria over Schleswig-Holstein, fighting the Seven Weeks' War to exclude Austria from a united Germany. In 1867 Bismarck annexed several German states to create the North German Confederation. Alsace and some of Lorraine were added as some of the spoils of the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71). The *Zollverein* and the military were the backbones of Bismarck's united Germany with its old military order and economic modernization. He undermined his opposition by using the masses against the private interests of the nobility and the Church and even negotiating with socialists and incorporating some of their policies.

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY
2008 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)

Question 4 Historical Background (continued)

Key Dates in Italian Unification

- 1848: Mazzini and “Young Italy.”
- 1849: France sends troops to Rome to protect the Pope.
- 1852: Cavour becomes prime minister of Piedmont-Sardinia.
- 1854: Crimean War begins (ends in 1856); Piedmont sides with France and Great Britain.
- 1856: Peace of Paris ends Crimean War.
- 1858: Treaty of Plombières (France and Piedmont-Sardinia).
- 1859: Austrian declaration of war against Piedmont-Sardinia.
- 1859: Battles of Magenta and Solferino.
- 1860: Treaty of Turin.
- 1860: Garibaldi campaigns in Sicily and southern Italy.
- 1861: All-Italian parliament with the exception of Rome and Venetia.
- 1866: Prussian–Italian military alliance.
- 1866: Italy annexes Venetia.
- 1870: France pulls out of Rome.

Key Dates in German Unification

- 1834: *Zollverein* (customs union of German states) formed, without Austria.
- 1848: Frankfurt parliament; “*Kleindeutsch*” versus “*Grossdeutsch*” debate; abortive liberal revolutions in the German states.
- 1848: First Schleswig–Holstein crisis.
- 1854: Crimean War begins (ends in 1856).
- 1856: Peace of Paris (ends the Crimean War).
- 1862: Bismarck becomes Prussian prime minister.
- 1863: Polish revolts against Russia.
- 1864: Second Schleswig–Holstein crisis.
- 1864: Prussian/Austrian–Danish War.
- 1864: Peace of Vienna.
- 1866: Prussian–Italian military alliance.
- 1866: Prussian–Austrian War (Brothers’ War or Seven Weeks’ War).
- 1866: Peace of Prague.
- 1867: Northern German Confederation, without Austria.
- 1869: Leopold, Spanish crisis.
- 1870: Ems Telegram; outbreak of Franco–Prussian War.
- 1870: Battle of Sedan; Siege of Paris.
- 1871: Treaty of Frankfurt.
- 1871: Establishment of the Second Reich, Hall of Mirrors, Versailles.
- 1873: Bismarck begins *Kulturkampf* against Roman Catholic influence.

The 1800's were a time of great change for Europe. The splintered and divided nations of previous centuries came under the controlled leadership of strong figureheads and diplomats such as Otto von Bismarck of Germany and Cavour of Italy. Nationalism was also a major backdrop of the mid-19th Century. The Congress of Vienna post-Napoleon had re-arranged boundaries according to previous monarchical boundaries rather than ethnicity or nationality. The Nationalist movement sought to unite peoples according to their ~~nation~~ ethnicity. ~~Bismarck~~ leaders also used diplomacy and alliances to their advantage and to achieve their nationalist policies. ~~For~~ ~~the~~ Cavour of Italy and Bismarck of Germany achieved unification of their countries in similar and different ways through their wars, diplomatic relations, and their policies for governing their nations internally.

Bismarck and Cavour showed similarities in their efforts to unify their respective countries through their wars and diplomatic moves. Bismarck's tenure in office produced three major wars, the 7 years war, the Danish war, and the Franco-Prussian war. These wars were an effort on the part of Bismarck to display German power and to unify territory to Germany held by other countries. His victories, especially in France, helped to unify Germany by expanding German territory and "liberating" Germans in other countries. Cavour also used war in an effort to unify ~~by~~ his nation. Garibaldi headed the Italian unification army as it swept from the south to the north in Italy bringing the divided areas of Italy to unification. Diplomatically, the policies of Cavour and Bismarck were also somewhat similar. Cavour used agreements with rival countries (such as ~~to~~ Austria) to bring peace in an effort to concentrate on the unification of his lands. The lack of a major external war was a major contributor to Italian unification. Bismarck also employed alliances and diplomatic relations in his efforts for unification (also with Austria as well as ^{France} ~~Prussia~~). Thus, Bismarck and Cavour's effects

at unification were similar in that they both employed war and intricate diplomatic agreements with outside nations to their advantage.

Bismarck and Cavour also differed in many of these same areas, and additionally, in their own internal policies (social and political) that helped them achieve unification. Cavour's goal was simply to achieve the unification of all ~~the~~ Italian people, however, Bismarck was forced to make a choice between "the small German plan" and the "large German plan." The large plan called for the additional unification of Austrian-German people while the small plan left Austria out of the picture. Also, diplomatically, Bismarck was much more cunning, deceitful, and Machiavellian in his diplomatic relations than Cavour. This is mostly seen in his deceit of France at the outset of the Franco-Prussian war.

Bismarck also differed from Cavour through his internal policies. Bismarck tried to inspire a sense of German pride through his policies such as his "Kulturkampf." These types of policies were somewhat absent from Cavour's regime. Thus, Bismarck and Cavour differed on many of the aforementioned fronts.

In conclusion, the similarities and differences between Cavour of Italy and Bismarck of Germany revolve around the war, diplomacy, and internal policies of both leaders. Despite the similarities and differences, though, both leaders were successful in their bids for nationally unified countries.

The methods used by Cavour and Bismarck to unify Italy and Germany, respectively, differed greatly but had the same basic principles. First of all, the unification of Italy came about before the unification of Germany in the 1860s. Cavour used many military tactics as did Bismarck. However, Cavour did not use religion very strongly where as Bismarck did.

The unification of Italy in the early middle 1800s was organized by Cavour. Cavour was the brains of the whole event but he did not work alone. He had the help of Garibaldi and Mazzini. Cavour unified Italy through mostly military tactics. First he gained the lands of North eastern Italy back by promising help to Prussia. He also conducted negotiations with France ^{through} ~~through~~ the Duchy of Piedmont-Savoy who fought to gain back North western Italy. The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies was easily overthrown and Italy was nearly a unified nation. Garibaldi and his red shirts fought battles after battle throughout Italy to gain the cooperation and commitment of multiple states. When all was said and done Cavour had militarily unified Italy and all of its city-states, including the Pope who had been given his own Vatican city.

The unification of Germany was much different in the aspect of its direct steps to unification. Bismarck, first of all, was the sole unifier of Germany. Bismarck applied his new ideas of religion, economics, and politics to work towards the unification of Germany, Kulturkampf was his idea that Catholicism needed to be eliminated. He was trying to unify the religion of Germany but was unsuccessful. He battled the many different states of Germany and negotiated with King Emmanuel. In the end Germany had become a highly militarized and united land. Germany's unification threatened the balance of power and scared many European

countries. Germany's unification was much more social than military surrounded.

The similarities between the two unifications were that they both involved military conquests, and both were aided by fellow European countries. Although they were years apart both had a strong impact on the history surrounding them. Both were made into unified Republic and this was a new development.

The unifications of Germany and Italy had many differences in their methods and some similarities. Italy was unified more militarily than Germany and Germany had a greater impact on the balance of power than Italy.

Cavour and Bismark unified Italy and Germany, respectively, with help from the nationalistic feeling that was growing, ~~in~~ in both Germany and Italy. Bismark use wars to bring Germany together, Cavour used an army but he never really had a war.

Bismark unified the northern part of Germany with the Franco-Prussia war. This was initiated by him, ~~so~~ by sending a telegram to the king of France, which insulted him. The Prussian army defeated the French army easily and this cause the people to feel like a nation which defeated a powerful country. This unified the northern part of Germany, but he still had to unite the southern part of Germany. To do this he provoke a war against Austria ~~and that was~~ ~~no~~. Again the Prussian army was able to defeat another powerful country and this fed the nationalistic feeling in the southern part making it easier to unite. Cavour, in the other hand, did not use ~~an~~ army as much as Bismark, he did it diplomatically.

Cavour saw that how of the emperors of the region, which is now Italy, would give up their

~~France~~ power easily, so he contacted the King of Sicily and offer him the throne of Italy. All of Italy except the Papal-State unify under the control of the King of Sicily.

This unifications were obtain with different methods but the thing that help both Cavour and Bismark was the nationalism which was raising in Italy and Germany.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY
2008 SCORING COMMENTARY (Form B)

Question 4

Sample: 4A

Score: 8

This essay's thesis lists three areas to be discussed (war, diplomacy, governing policies) and organizes the response accordingly. The discussion of similarities and differences is fairly balanced. The organization is clear and effective, and the general statements are supported by many details. However, the numerous minor errors in the second and third paragraphs ("the 7 years war," "the Danish War," the implications that Garibaldi was directed by Cavour and that Bismarck allied with France to achieve his goals, and the claim that Bismarck was forced to choose between *Kleindeutsch* and *Grossdeutsch*) prevented the essay from rising to a score of 9.

Sample: 4B

Score: 5

This essay has an acceptable thesis. The discussion of Cavour is more detailed and more accurate than the discussion of Bismarck, although it misunderstands the relationship among Cavour, Mazzini, and Garibaldi. The essay makes some significant mistakes, such as the assertions that the *Kulturkampf* predated unification, that Bismarck battled the German states and negotiated with King Emmanuel, and that both states became republics. The response received a score of 5 rather than 6 because it contains too many errors and the analysis of the differences between Cavour and Bismarck is simplistic.

Sample: 4C

Score: 2

This essay is unbalanced, giving significantly more attention to Germany than Italy. It contains many errors, beginning with the thesis (both men used nationalism; "Cavour . . . never really had a war"). These mistakes continue throughout the essay, as demonstrated by the confused chronology of German unification and the multiplicity of Italian emperors. This lack of correct factual detail kept the score below 3, but the essay was given a score of 2 because the organization is clear and some of the details are accurate (for example, on the events of German unification, although the chronology is reversed).