Analyse the debates over Italian national identity and unification in the period circa 1830–1870.

**BASIC CORE: 1 point each to a total of 6 points**

1. **Provides an appropriate, explicitly stated thesis that directly addresses at least two aspects of the question.** The thesis must not simply restate the question.
2. **Discusses at least seven documents even if some of them are used incorrectly.** Note: Documents may not be bundled together to get credit for this point (e.g., “Docs 3, 7 and 9 all argue …”).
3. **May not misinterpret more than one document.** A student cannot earn this point if credit was not awarded for point 2 (discusses a majority of the documents).
4. **Documents support the thesis.** A student cannot earn this point if credit was not awarded for point 1 (appropriate thesis). A student cannot earn this point if credit was not awarded for point 2 (discusses a majority of the documents).
5. **Analyzes point of view or bias in at least three of the documents.** The student must make a reasonable effort to explain why a particular source expresses the stated view by
   - relating authorial point of view to author’s place in society (motive, position, status, etc.); OR
   - evaluating the reliability of the source; OR
   - recognizing that different kinds of documents serve different purposes; OR
   - analyzing the tone of the documents; must be well-developed.
6. **Analyzes documents by organizing them into at least THREE groups.** A group must have at least TWO documents. **Note:** If one document out of a group of two is incorrect, there no longer is a group.

**GROUPS**
- Republicanism and anti-monarchy: 1, 6, 9, 12
- Regionalism: 2, 3, 6, 7, 11
- Historical divisions: 2, 6
- Role of the pope: 3, 5, 8, 10
- Class divisions: 4, 12
- Democratic spirit: 4, 9, 12
- Monarchy: 4, 5, 8, 9, 12
- Foreign influence: 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
- Pro-unity: 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12
EXPANDED CORE: 0–3 points to a total of 9 points

Expands beyond the basic core of 1–6. The basic score of 6 must be achieved before a student can earn expanded core points. Credit awarded in the expanded core should be based on holistic assessment of the essay. Factors to consider in holistic assessment may include:

- Presents a clear, analytical and comprehensive thesis.
- Uses all or almost all of the documents (10–11 documents).
- Uses the documents persuasively as evidence.
- Shows understanding of nuances of the documents.
- Analyzes point of view or bias in at least four documents cited in the essay.
- Analyzes the documents in additional ways (e.g., develops more groupings).
- Recognizes and develops change over time.
- Brings in relevant outside information.
Question 1 — Document Summary

Document 1: Giuseppe Mazzini, attorney from Genoa, exiled from Piedmont in 1831, manifesto, 1831
Young Italy stands for the republic and unity. Italy should be a republic because it really has no basis for existing as a monarchy (pro-republic, anti-monarchy).

Document 2: Carlo Cattaneo, philosopher and political activist, Lombardy, 1836
Whoever ignores this love of the individual regions of Italy will always build on sand (pro-region, anti-unity).

That the pope is naturally, and should be effectively, the civil head of Italy is a truth forecast in the nature of things and confirmed by many centuries of history. Would increase the strength of the various princes (pro-pope, pro-unity).

Document 4: Count Camillo Benso di Cavour, politician from Piedmont-Sardinia, journal article, 1846
All true friends of the country must recognize that they cannot truly help their fatherland except by gathering in support of legitimate monarchs who have their roots in the national soil (anti-unity, pro-monarchy, pro-region).

Document 5: Pope Pius IX, published statement, 1848
The Italian people should abide in close attachment to their respective sovereigns, of whose goodwill they have already had experience, so as never to let themselves be torn away from the obedience they owe them (pro-monarchy, pro-region, anti-unity).

Document 6: Daniele Manin, politician from Venice, letter to a friend, 1848
Peoples who have different origins and customs should not be forced together, because otherwise civil war will follow the war of independence (pro-region, anti-unity, anti-independence).

Document 7: Marquis Massimo d’Azeglio, politician from Piedmont, secretly printed pamphlet, 1856
But ask any Italian, north or south, whether or not it is useful for Italy to free itself from foreign domination and influence, and no one, thank God, will reply other than in the affirmative, no one will refuse to give their minds or their hands to this end (pro-independence).

Document 8: Count Camillo Benso di Cavour, prime minister of Piedmont-Sardinia, letter to Victor Emmanuel, king of Piedmont-Sardinia, 1858
The Emperor [Napoleon III, emperor of the French] readily agreed that it was necessary to drive the Austrians out of Italy once and all. But how was Italy to be organized after that? (pro-independence, pro-region).
Question 1 — Document Summary (continued)

Every inch of ground won by Italians for Italy in 1848 and 1849 was won by republicans, and at the close of that year Italy would have been free from foreigners, would have been free, independent and united, had not monarchy stepped in and substituted the petty longings of dynastic ambition for the great national aim (pro-independence, pro-republican, anti-monarchy).

Document 10: Peace of Villafranca, treaty between France and Austria, 1859
The Emperors of Austria and France will favor the creation of an Italian Confederation and the honorary presidency of the pope (pro-pope, pro-region).

Document 11: Emperor Napoleon III of France, letter to an Italian friend, 1859
I do not wish to see Italy united. I want only independence (anti-unity, pro-independence).

Document 12: Giuseppe Garibaldi, representing Caprera in the Italian parliament, 1868
Although old republicans in principles and deeds, I and my friends accepted the monarchy in good faith, and asked of it nothing other than that it improve the conditions of our poor people (pro-monarchy).

A closer look at DBQ thesis and point-of-view statements

Examples of viable theses:
- For many Italians the debate was one not of national unification, but rather of national liberation.
- Underlying it all would be the debate of unification, whether Italy should emerge into the 20th century as a single unified nation, or simply as a confederation of individual constituents bound only by geographical destiny and religious conformity.
- National liberation and national identity were far more important to most Italians than national unification.

Examples of what would not count as a thesis:
- Italy was divided politically and culturally well into the 19th century.
- The pope was generally opposed to Italian unification.

Examples of attribution:
- Giuseppe Mazzini was an attorney from Genoa exiled from Piedmont in 1831.
- Napoleon III was the emperor of France.
- Vincenzo Gioberti was a priest from Piedmont who wrote On the Moral and Civil Primacy of the Italians in 1836.

Examples of point of view:
- As the context is in a letter to the New York Times appealing to American readers, such an audience might support such emotions of national unity and independence. Because of this, the letter was written probably more in an attempt to garnish audience support than in an effort to be politically accurate (Doc. 9).
- The fact that Mazzini penned these words when he was in exile shows that the unification of Italy was something he really believed in, making the document a reliable source in its intent (Doc. 1).
• *Caesar*: Napoleon III was the emperor of the Second Empire and primarily interested in the security of France, he obviously would be opposed to the creation of a new state that would disrupt the balance of power in Europe (Doc. 11).

• Because Vincenzo Gioberti was a prince of the Church and thus a loyal follower of the pope, Gioberti would naturally appeal to the Holy See as the means for Italian unification as opposed to a secular monarch (Doc. 3).
The 19th Century in Europe is characterized in its political and social institutions by the rise of Nationalism following the aftermath of the Napoleonic Era. The forces of Liberalism and republicanism of the French Revolution, which had seemingly been closed by Metternich’s Concert of Europe and the ineffectiveness of the 1848 revolutions to provide irrevocable political change, manifested itself again in the Italian kingdoms. Ever since the end of the Renaissance, the City-States of Italy had faded from the scene of international prominence, reduced to nothing more than pawns in the chessboard of political hegemony of other larger and more centralized powers. Yet as a byproduct of the times as well, to contest republicanism was a more hardened philosophy, critical of the inadequacies of democracy and based on the pragmatism of central authority, offered another solution to the question of Italy’s future, in the form of a unified state under a single monarch. Thus as all elements within Italy called for change, there would be three interlocking dimensions that would shape the creation of modern day Italy. There would be those that supported the ribbon of monarchs and a more centralized form of rule. Others would rally for republicanism and liberal representation as a form of government. Underlying it all would be the debate of unification, whether Italy should emerge
into the 19th Century as a single united nation, or simply
a confederation of individual constituents bound only by
a geographical destiny and religious conformity.

Often credited as the father of the Italian
state, Cavour was an adherent to the philosophes of pre-revolution
and restoration and supported the growth of Italy under a
single monarch. As Document 4 suggests, he viewed that
revolutionary ideals of democratic revolution would be incompatible
with Italy. In a prime demonstration of political pragmatism,
Cavour again demonstrates his support of the division of Italy
under the king of Piedmont, Victor Emmanuel. The decision to
acquire Savoy and Nice from France indicates his shrewdness
in securing his territorial goals which was crucial to the
Italian peninsula under Piedmont. In stark contrast to
political pragmatism, Document 5 appeals not a moral sympathy
but a flowering of some sort under the auspices of
the papacy. One must examine this document carefully, because
as an Italian first, the papacy may have been too firmly in the machinations of
the Vatican, clearly having forgotten the sadness of Rome
only centuries ago. Document 12, having been cited as
near the total political unity of Italy (minus the Vatican)
shows the triumph of Cavour and his attempts to unify a Italy
under Victor Emmanuel. Such sentiments are most
Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the exam.

greatly verified because the document attests the acceptance of
the monarchy by Giuseppe Garibaldi, who as leader of the
Red Shirts and staunch republican, ultimately capitulated and
aided Cavour by taking over the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies
and joining together with Piedmont.

Although republicanism never did ultimately win out
on the Peninsula, there were demands that did oppose
against a king. Document 4 dictates the manifesto of the Young
Italians, who were very much in favor of transforming Italy into
a republic. In Document 6, the same sentiment is shared, indicating
that states should be able to elect a republican form of
government should they so wish. Here one short note from
the politician advocating such a selection is a Venetian politician,
and Venice has demonstrated itself to be an Italian city-state
historically aligned with more democratic forms of government.

Document 6 and velocity attacks Cavour's monarchists,
stating that if not for 'dynastic ambitions', they
would have been free and independent. Yet as the content
is in a letter of the New York Times appealing to American
Readers, such an audience might support such emotions because
they themselves once were republicans
struggling for independence and unity. Thus the content
might appeal more for acknowledgment and agreement by
the audience rather than just political observation.
Finally, the overarching issue of Unity versus Independence was fiercely debated. Document 2 quite strongly states that the history of the city-states makes unification impossible. Document 5 supports this idea, stating that any form of unification under the pope would be disastrous, and instead people should follow their respective governments. Such a statement is particularly surprising since the person making such an argument is the pope himself, which clearly changes the claims of Document 2 that a city-state under the pope would be impossible—clearly he has forgotten the sad history of Rome in which the popes posed no such detriment. Document 7 on the other hand demands nationalization of some sort, so which was a sentiment shared by both republicans and monarchists alike. It would only be foreign influence that would predominately oppose unification. Napoleon 111 of France, though seemingly supporting Italy in Document 10 by defecting Austria even more to Piedmont, is careful not to want a united Italy at its door. As with the case case why Germany, a United Italy would be a threat to France. Each interest, especially if it was greed (Document 11).
Although the unification of Italy proceeded in 1870, the debate on Italian identity and form of governance would continue to rage on, finally culminating in the rise of Fascism and the decision which would change not only the face of Italy but the world as well.
From the 1830s, when movements for Italian unification first emerged, until 1870, leaders and politicians born in Italy and abroad were caught in a series of debates over the issue of Italian national identity and unification. Those aiming for Italian unification debated whether Italy was to be a republic or a monarchy and whether the Pope or a monarch were to rule, and then there were individuals completely against the unification of Italy, hoping for it to stay divided among its various kingdoms and territories.

A major debate that continued from 1830–1870 in Italy was whether unification would mean the establishment of a republic or Italy under the rule of a monarchy or single leader. Giuseppe Mazzini, a leading figure who contributed to Italian unification, sometimes deemed the “soul of unification,” founded Young Italy, a “brotherhood of Italians” who hoped for “the republic and unity.” Mazzini, in his manifesto for this brotherhood, unhesitatingly declared that “Italy should be a republic because it really has no basis for existing as a monarchy” (Doc. 4).

Jesse White Mario, a journalist who wrote to The New York Times, a newspaper in the established republic of America, wrote in agreement with Mazzini’s claims. Mario asserted that Italy could have been “free, independent, and united” after the republicans won in 1848–1849, and he denounced the monarchy for stepping in, criticizing it as having “petty longings of dynastic ambition” (Doc. 9).

On the other side of this debate, many argued against establishing an Italian republic, placing their faith instead in a monarchy. Cavour, another extremely significant leader in Italian unification, proclaimed that
"a democratic revolution has no chance of success in Italy," he praised. "Legitimate monarchy," with deep national roots, and urged all others to support behind their monarchs. Though some, especially religious figure, like Fenelli, supported unification of Italy under the pope (Doc. 3), Pope Pius IX, the leader of the Roman Catholic Church based in the Vatican during this time, severely criticized this "treacherous advice" and supported Cavour in asking the people of Italy to support the monarchs of the time (Doc. 5).

Despite their efforts by the Pope to avoid uniting Italy under his leadership, Cavour succeeded in establishing an agreement with Napoleon III of France and King Victor Emmanuel of Piedmont-Sardinia to organize Italy into four states, forming a confederation "given to the pope" (Doc. 8). Adhering with his support for a monarchy, Cavour established Victor Emmanuel as "legal sovereign" in practice dominate the whole peninsula (Doc. 8). In the peace of Villafranca in 1859, the Emperor of Austria in France declared their favor in the creation of this Italian confederation under the pope (Doc. 10). Thus, gradually, the unification of Italy was realized, putting an end to the debate over Italian national identity and unification.

Of course, Italian unification was not met without opposition and many debated against the unification of the peninsula. Cattaneo reviewed the continuation of "customary rites based on ancient and modern laws" and also the "love of the individual regions of Italy," effectively opposing unification. He argued that people "cannot easily be detached from their natural centers," perhaps reflecting the trends of nationalism that began to build in the 1850s (Doc. 2).
Manin also reflected upon the possibility of "civil war" in Italy if unification were not to be realized, because people of "different origins and customs should not be forced together" (Doc. 6). Lastly, despite agreements with Cavour and in the peace of Villafranca, opposition was put to an end by Emperor Napoleon III of France, who felt threatened by the prospect of having a strong, united nation to the south of his nation's border.

The debates over Italian national identity and unification regarding republic vs. monarch vs. pope and whether or not unification was even desirable raged on from 1850 - 1870. In 1870 these debates were finally put to rest as political unification of Italy was realized.
In the early nineteenth century, Italy was a collection of states ruled by monarchy and republic governments. The nineteenth century period between 1830 and 1870 in Italy were Italians were in a dispute about whether they wanted the kingdom of Piedmont and Sardinia to take over the pope and even by the Austrian Empire or Prussia. The main focus on taking over Italy was by the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia led by King Victor Emmanuel and Prime Minister Camillo Cavour and the other country focusing on Italy was Russia with Kaiser Wilhelm I with its as president and Otto von Bismarck as Chief Minister. Throughout Italy, some wanted a republic government, some a monarchy and some for the pope to rule them. The only big players in this game were the Prussians and King Victor. Both had the same aim, to increase the size of their country to achieve greatness.

The opposing opinions and desires of people e.g. the desire to have ruled by a republic govt. is show in Document 1. The Author’s point of view is “Young Italy stands for the republican and unity. Italy should be a republic because it has no basis for existing as monarchy.” Diff. Other people beg to differ e.g. Document 2, the author Carlo Cattaneo suggests the ruling of Italy with the old traditional way where as in Document 3, a priest from Piedmont wants to pope to act as head, but because the author of this document is a priest, this is biased. In Document, the main after Italy, writes how Italy had deep roots of a monarchy. This is also biased as Cavour himself supports and belongs to a monarchistic rule. In Document 6 suggests the states of Italy to have the choice of implementing a system, so as
to avoid revolution.

The big problem was the difference in people's views about how they wanted to be ruled and the neighbouring countries wanting to rule Italian states had their own vested self-interests. In Document 11, quotes, "I do not wish to see Italy united.... Unity would bring danger to me and France." Napoleon III clearly tells about his vulnerability if it is united, so he would do his best not to let that happen. An unbiased source, Document 5 suggesting the Pope says it would be better that if the Italian were to be left to their sovereign states and not to be modelled and that putting the pope on the throne would be a mistake. Document 7 shows another unbiased and differing view. Author, Piedmont Politician, suggests it no the Italians do not wish to be ruled by foreign powers at all.

All these opposing views make it difficult to answer what is the best solution. We know by the end of 1871, Victor Emmanuel was crowned King of Italy after having Bismarck fight three successive battles with Denmark in 1863, Austria in 1866 over Lombardy and Venice and finally with France in 1870, getting rid of all possible opponents and making their way to the throne. By 1871, Italy was unified with Germany/Prussia. Although, there were revolutions but the administration was successful in having a tight grip on the public there.

In Conclusion, it is still very difficult to suggest or implement the right systems and that is why we have to choose the best possible at Italy then was being ruled by a "seem to be democratic" empire under Bismarck and King Victor.
Question 1

Sample: 1A
Score: 9

The thesis of this essay is clearly stated in the final sentence of the introductory paragraph. The essay uses all 12 documents and there are no major errors, and it uses the documents to support the thesis. The essay analyzes point of view 10 times, and the point-of-view analysis is sophisticated, insightful and accurate. It also describes three major groups. In addition to meeting all six criteria for the basic core points, it demonstrates superior analytical ability.

Sample: 1B
Score: 5

The thesis of this essay is clearly stated in the last sentence of the introductory paragraph. The essay uses eight documents, there are no major errors, and it uses the documents to support the thesis. While the essay provides attribution for documents, it does not analyze point of view for any of the documents. For this reason, it did not earn the fifth point in the basic core for point of view from the scoring guidelines. Four major groups are indicated: republic, monarchy, foreign involvement, and anti-unification.

Sample: 1C
Score: 1

There is a major error in the thesis of this essay that makes the thesis impossible to prove. The essay earned 1 point for the use of seven documents. It makes major errors in interpreting the documents. Because of the erroneous thesis, it is impossible for the documents to support it. The essay does not analyze point of view for any of the documents, nor does it attempt to group the documents.