

Question 3: “Foreign nations were crucial for the unification of Italy”. Discuss this statement using these sources and your own knowledge.

What do you need to do?

The last question usually consists of a statement that must be evaluated with the help of all sources (three sources). When assessing this question, we use a matrix (see last page). **FOCUS** means that you have clearly answered the question / statement with the help of all sources (often a "Yes" or "No" and an explanation of how you arrived to this conclusion). **SOURCES** show how well you used the sources to answer the question/statement. **SOURCE CRITICISM** shows that you also evaluated the three sources (value and limitations according to the source-critical criteria) and used this knowledge when you discussed the answer to the question/statement. **OWN KNOWLEDGE** is the part that you read up on in the textbook and the material that was used when we studied this period. Note that this is not a repetition of the knowledge you gained through the three sources. It should add something more. Finally, it's important to point out that there must be a focused conclusion based on a discussion that comes from all parts - sources, source criticism and own knowledge. If this discussion is not included, several marks will be deducted.

SOURCE 1: Source 1 **supports** the statement “Foreign nations were crucial for the unification of Italy”. In the beginning of the extract it brings up an alliance with France “Cavour secured an alliance with France. The Franco-Austrian War of 1859 was the agent that began the physical process of Italian unification. The Austrians were defeated by the French and Piedmontese at Magenta and Solferino, and thus relinquished Lombardy”. At the end of the extract it talks about the alliance with Prussia 1866 that brought Venetia to Italy and later how the Franco-Prussian War 1870-71 became an advantage that secured Rome for the Kingdom of Italy. “In 1866 Italy joined Prussia in a campaign against Austria (the 1866 Austro-Prussian War) and thus won Venetia. In 1870, taking advantage of the fact that France (the country responsible at the time for guarding the Papal States) was distracted by involvement in the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71), the Italian army entered Rome”.

ORIGIN: Extract from <https://history.state.gov/countries/issues/italian-unification> from the US Office of the Historian. This is how this website presents itself “The Office of the Historian is staffed by professional historians who are experts in the history of U.S. foreign policy and the Department of State and possess unparalleled research experience in classified and unclassified government records”

(Visited December 1st, 2020 12:50)

Who wrote it = US Office of the Historian – under an official US State Department

When did the person write it = We don't know, but this was the information given December 1st, 2020 at 12:50

Where did the person write it = USA

What is the source = It's an official document from the State Government in the USA

This is the only information we have about the origin – so copy it and paste it in the answer.

PURPOSE:

Why did the person write it = To give an official US view of the unification of Italy (information/influence)?

For **whom** did the person write it = To the general public that's interested in the official US view of History

Authentic: We can check if it's authentic by checking the website-address. We can also send an e-mail and ask for a confirmation from the US Office of the Historian.

Time: It's written and published long after the event. This version is viewed in December 2020. So it's a non-contemporary source.

Dependence: This is a tertiary source (like an encyclopedia article). We don't know who wrote it and we have no references, so we don't know where the information used comes from. Since this source claims that it's published by the US Office of Historian we assume that a professional historian has made a professional selection of different sources that gives a balanced view of the Italian unification.

Tendency: It's a fairly neutral source, but a few expressions and slight tone of the article could be interpreted as little bit bias where the author shows his/her personal interpretation:

- then **the wealthiest** and **most liberal** of the Italian states
- orchestrated by Piedmont-Sardinia's Prime Minister, Count Camillo di Cavour. **A skilled diplomat...**

- Giuseppe Garibaldi, a native of Piedmont-Sardinia, **was instrumental** in bringing the southern Italian states into the unification process
- **Garibaldi and his men overthrew the Bourbon monarchy**

VALUE: It's an official State document from the US Office of the Historian. It tells us that it has been written by professional historians and is published by the US State as an official interpretation of history. Governmental papers will be read by many different nations as well as individuals including other professional historians. Therefore, it has to be carefully written and show an accepted view. The document was made long after the event(s) and has the advantage of hindsight.

LIMITATIONS: This is an official US view which might show an interpretation that benefits the USA. It's written long after the event(s) and therefore it can't be checked with anybody involved in the process. As a tertiary source certain selection of sources has been made. This process has been influenced by the traditions of historians trained in the US – working for the government. There is a slight tendency in the document...

SOURCE 2: Source 2 **supports** the statement “*Foreign nations were crucial for the unification of Italy*”. **to some extent.** At the beginning of the extract of Wikipedia the alliance with France and Napoleon III is mentioned “*The Second War of Italian Independence began in April 1859 when the Sardinian Prime Minister Count Cavour found an ally in Napoleon III. Napoleon III signed a secret alliance and Cavour provoked Austria with military maneuvers and eventually led to the war in April 1859*”. In these parts the significance of the Sardinian Army as well as the poor leadership of the Austrian Army is mentioned which downplays the role of France “*However, the Austrians' numerical strength was outweighed by an ineffectual leadership appointed by the Emperor on the basis of noble lineage, rather than military competency. Their army was slow to enter the capital of Sardinia, taking almost ten days to travel the 80 kilometers (50 mi)*” and “*France and Sardinia defeated Austria and forced negotiations; at the same time, in the northern part of Lombardy, the Italian volunteers known as the Hunters of the Alps, led by Giuseppe Garibaldi, defeated the Austrians at Varese and Como*”. The rest of the article goes on to mention the diplomacy of Sardinia and other circumstances “*Sardinia eventually won the Second War of Italian Unification through statesmanship rather than armies or popular election. The final arrangement was ironed out by "back-room" deals instead of in the battlefield. This was because neither France, Austria, nor Sardinia wanted to risk another battle and could not handle further fighting. All of the sides were eventually unhappy with the final outcome of the 2nd War of Italian Unification and expected another conflict in the future. Sardinia annexed Lombardy from Austria; it later occupied and annexed the United Provinces of Central Italy, consisting of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, the Duchy of Parma, the Duchy of Modena and Reggio and the Papal Legations on 22 March 1860*”

ORIGIN: Wikipedia https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Italian_unification (Visited December 1st, 2020 13:30)

Who wrote it = “Wikipedia” – unknown author(s)

When did the person write it = We don't know, but this was the information given December 1st, 2020 at 13:30

Where did the person write it = We don't know

What is the source = It's an article in a net-based encyclopedia (a tertiary source)?

PURPOSE: The purpose of this text in the digital encyclopedia Wikipedia is to inform the public about the unification of Italy. Wikipedia is an encyclopedia that is constantly changing because it is a so-called “**Open Source**”. This means that the article has several authors with an unknown background to us. Their purpose may be more than informing the public about the event itself. They may want to influence the information in a certain direction (political, religious, socio-economic, etc.). This may be worth mentioning, but the main purpose of this article in Wikipedia must be considered the same as for other encyclopedias - to inform the public about the unification of Italy from available sources.

For **whom** did the person write it = To the general public that's interested in the unification of Italy

Authentic: When it comes to Wikipedia, we can turn on the computer and search for the article using the web address. On the page – in the right corner we can find the publishing history of the article (“*View history*”). There we can look up the date that is closest to the date and time mentioned in the source (“*Visited December 1st 2020 at 13:30*”) and see if the text matches Wikipedia's text.

Time: This is a **non-contemporary source**. It was written many years after the unification of Italy, which is a limitation. Another problem with the time criterion in this article is that we do not know when it was written (Wikipedia started in 2001 so the article might be that old, but this is a popular topic of research so it is not very likely that the article is that old – but without dates we do not know). The advantage is that several works by professional historians have been written and the results of these works are often included in various encyclopedias (such as Wikipedia).

Dependence: This is a **tertiary source**. In other words, the source has been influenced by various works written about Italy's unification. The article has also been influenced by various authors who wrote the article. So, the dependency criterion is something that must be emphasized in this particular source. The fact that we do not know the authors, that there is only one reference (Robert Avery – footnote) and that it is only part of a larger text means that we find it difficult to control the dependence of other sources.

Tendency: The language is relatively neutral, and the authors do not clearly give any indications of supporting certain political, religious, etc... ideas. In other words, it is a fairly typical encyclopedia text, which gives the source a certain credibility.

VALUE: This is a tertiary source written long after the unification of Italy. This is an advantage because the authors have been able to study the reasons for Italy's unification in more detail as several sources have been published since the unification (advantage of hindsight). Wikipedia is a digital encyclopedia that is read by many. If there were major errors in the article, a warning text would appear stating that the article could be questioned. This is also an advantage.

LIMITATION: We know very little about the various authors (it only says "Wikipedia" as a source). There is only one source mentioned in the article (Robert Avery). This text is part of a larger article and we do not know what is said in the rest of the article. In addition, no date for the publication of this information is mentioned. All this - unknown author; only one referenced source; that it is only a small part of a larger article and that there is no publication date limits this source.

SOURCE 3: Source 3 does **not support** the statement “*Foreign nations were crucial for the unification of Italy*”. We see an image of Garibaldi sitting on his knees in the act of helping King Victor Emmanuel with the boot. There is no foreign nation in the image and there is no foreign nation mentioned in the text. The image has been interpreted the following way (Question 1b):

The picture shows a Garibaldi sitting on his knees in the act of helping King Victor Emmanuel with the boot. The boot is a symbolic image of Italy since the geographical contour of Italy resembles a boot. King Victor Emmanuel II has a tool (actually two) that helps the king and Garibaldi get on the boot, so-called boot hooks. Garibaldi advises the king to use more “**powder**” if the boot does not fit. Above this advice is the headline “**Right leg in the boot at last!**”. The text that follows the Source number – “*Unification of Italy: Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807-1882) helping Victor Emmanuel II (1820-78) put on the boot of Italy. John Tenniel cartoon from “Punch Magazine”, London, 17 November 1860. Wood engraving. Punch Magazine was a British weekly magazine of humor and satire*”. It’s also part of the interpretation!

Interpretation:

- Garibaldi helps King Victor Emmanuel II conquer Italy. Interpretation of the picture “*In the picture we see how Garibaldi stands on his knees and helps King Victor Emmanuel to put his leg in the boot which is marked with the text Italy.*”
- Another message is that Garibaldi wants King Victor Emmanuel II to unite all of Italy. Interpretation of the image “*Garibaldi advises the king to use more force (powder) if he does not succeed in getting his whole leg in the boot, which can be interpreted as him using force if it is necessary to unite the whole of Italy. That it is a question of the whole of Italy is symbolized by the boot - a famous image that geographically describes the whole country*”
- Garibaldi has done the “*job*”, uniting all of Italy for King Victor Emmanuel II, who can now take over. There is also a certain tension in the picture between the subordinate Garibaldi and the authority – King Victor Emmanuel II. Interpretation of the image “*Garibaldi who is dressed as “usual” when he was in the field has put the weapon aside. He helps the very well-dressed king with the boot. There is a certain arrogance in King Victor Emmanuel II's facial expression with closed eyes which marks his position in relation to his subordinate general who with the weapon lying on the ground reinforces the social*

difference and that Garibaldi does not intend to try to take over the conquered part on his own behalf. He capitulates before the king "

- The heading “*Right leg in the boot at last*” indicates that the unification has been going on for a long time. Interpretation of the image (caption) “*Both the words "at last" and "right" indicate that this is something that has been expected in Italy - that King Victor Emmanuel II will take over the whole country*”

ORIGIN: Unification of Italy: Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807-1882) helping Victor Emmanuel II (1820-78) put on the boot of Italy. John Tenniel cartoon from “*Punch Magazine*“, London, 17 November 1860. Wood engraving. *Punch Magazine* was a British weekly magazine of humor and satire.

PURPOSE: A cartoon is an exaggerated image for the purpose of portraying one or more people's characteristic features or attitudes through different stereotypes – a comical effect. Sometimes the purpose can be political. Sometimes it's social.

Authentic: By going to the archives of newspapers and magazines we can check for this special issue of *Punch Magazine* and see that it's a genuine copy of the image. The historic event can be checked with several other contemporary and non-contemporary sources.

Time: This is a contemporary source (a cartoon from the English satirical weekly "*Punch Magazine*" 1860). It has some value – it shows how an English weekly magazine perceives contemporary history...

Dependence: The drawing has hardly been influenced by a multitude of written sources because it is contemporary. However, it is affected by the debate of what is happening in Italy and Britain's relationship to these events. Although this is a contemporary source, it is not a primary source when it comes to the Unification of Italy. There is a dependency on the contemporary political debate, what "*Punch Magazine*" wants to publish and a possible assumption of the public opinion in the country.

Tendency: This is a cartoon which means that it reflects a contemporary exaggeration of the events in Italy. A cartoon often consists of different stereotypes. Italy drawn like a boot; Garibaldi's clothes, his weapon and a seemingly an arrogant king are examples of these stereotypes. It may be partly due to the political ideas of the magazine, partly due to the ideas of the British contemporaries and / or the cartoonist's personal opinion. Clearly, it does not reflect a neutral way of looking at Italy's unification.

VALUE: It is valuable that the drawing is contemporary. A contemporary cartoonist can provide a reference to public opinion in a country because cartoonists and satirical newspapers often tries to pinpoint the opinions and ideas of the general public. In this case, this could then be seen as the British view of Garibaldi, King Victor Emmanuel II and the Italian unification.

LIMITATIONS: There is no doubt that a cartoon is not neutral. It is always tendentious. A cartoonist uses stereotypes and exaggerates the appearance of people and events in order to create a reaction, usually a laugh-out-loud effect. The weekly *Punch* policies and ideas, Britain's ev. press laws as well as the artist's own personal opinions and ideas are other parts that can limit the source-critical value of this source.

OWN KNOWLEDGE: This part can include both knowledge that supports and knowledge that contradicts the sources above. It is important that the students show that they **have more knowledge** than the sources above (through the textbook, the lessons and the distributed (and published) papers). When it comes to the Unification of Italy, it is the foreign policy, the alliances, certain events and a couple of important people that lead to the Unification of Italy (Mazzini; Cavour; Garibaldi and to some extent Victor Emmanuel II). The most important thing is that the answer focuses on the question!

OWN KNOWLEDGE: This part should cover knowledge you received through the textbooks, the lessons and material published on the homepage about the Unification of Italy. Focus is the statement - “*Foreign nations were crucial for the unification of Italy*”. It's important that this part reveals more factual knowledge than the information we got through the three sources - like the foreign policy of the Kingdom of Italy, certain events and a couple of important individuals that were instrumental for the Unification of Italy (Mazzini;

Cavour; Garibaldi and to some extent Victor Emmanuel II). It should show that you have studied this topic – not just used the sources.

SOURCE CRITICAL DISCUSSION: In the very last part of the answer you will use the evaluation of each source as well as your own knowledge. You will also add a comparison of the value of the sources in connection to the question – do the sources support or refute the statement; which one is of more value and why is it that this one might be better than the other ones in connection with this question; to what extent does your own knowledge support or refute the statement, etc...

Here you can see a few things that could be brought up when you compare/contrast the value of the sources:

- The three sources are different. One source deals with the whole period 1859-1870 of Italian unification (Source 1 – US Office of Historian), one source focuses on the war 1859-60 (Source 2 – Wikipedia) and one source shows the views of Garibaldi, King Victor Emmanuel II and the Italian unification through a British satirical perspective (Source 3 – cartoon).
- Two sources highlight several causes that lead to the unification of Italy (Source 1 – US Office of Historians and Source 2 – Wikipedia)
- One source clearly mentions foreign nations (France and Prussia) and their impact on the Unification of Italy (Source 1 – US Office of Historian)
- Two sources are non-contemporary (Source 1 – US Office of Historian and Source 2 – Wikipedia). One source is contemporary (Source 3 – the cartoon from 1860)
- One source (Source 1 – US Office of Historian), is written by professional historians. One is constructed by a cartoonist - John Tenniel (Source 3 - the cartoon) and one we do not know who wrote (Source 2 – Wikipedia)
- One of the sources is clearly tendentious (Source 3 – the cartoon)
- Etc...

The discussion should also include the following:

- A clear answer to the question of whether the source supports the statement or not
- Own knowledge that addresses the discussion of the reasons for the Italian unification that is not mentioned in the various sources
- The outcome of the source-critical discussion to determine whether it further reinforces or questions the statement
- The discussion should be well structured and lead to various points which are later summarized in a shorter conclusion. This conclusion should clearly answer the question of Question 3!

QUESTION 3: This is an assignment that must include an evaluation of all sources in relation to the statement. Skilled students are expected to discuss the source value of the various sources. It is also important that your own knowledge - several details are included so that there is a good discussion. If you have gone through the previous questions (1a; 1b and 2) well, this assignment will be easier. If not, it will take time and the answer usually becomes weak. In the evaluation of this question, a matrix is used. On the next page is a copy of the matrix.

MARKSCHEME – QUESTION 3

Marks	Level descriptors			
	Focus	Sources	Source Criticism	Own knowledge
7-9	The response is focused on the question.	Clear references are made to the sources, and these references are used effectively as evidence to support the analysis.	A clear review of the different source-critical criteria and these are used effectively to support the analysis.	Accurate and relevant own knowledge is demonstrated. There is effective synthesis of own knowledge and source material.
4-6	The response is generally focused on the question.	References are made to the sources, and these references are used as evidence to support the analysis.	A review of the various source-critical criteria but they are only used as a reference in the main text.	Where own knowledge is demonstrated, this lacks relevance or accuracy. There is little or no attempt to synthesize own knowledge and source material.
1-3	The response lacks focus on the question.	References to the sources are made, but at this level these references are likely to consist of descriptions of the content of the sources rather than the sources being used as evidence to support the analysis.	Some source-critical criteria are mentioned but only as a more general description of the source.	No own knowledge is demonstrated or, where it is demonstrated, it is inaccurate or irrelevant.
0	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.