



**General Certificate of Education
January 2011**

AS History 1041

HIS2G

Unit 2G

The Forging of the Italian Nation, 1848–1871

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2011

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2G: The Forging of the Italian Nation, 1848–1871

Question 1

01 Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to Charles Albert's leadership in 1848. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

	Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
L1:	Answers will either briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources or identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	1-2
L2:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed.	3-6
L3:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	7-9
L4:	Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication.	10-12

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the levels scheme.

Candidates will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Charles Albert claims the 'throbs of my heart are always for Italian independence'; but Mack Smith believes his motive was to 'avoid the proclamation of a republic there' and that he wanted to 'discourage the kind of popular war Garibaldi was now beginning'
- Charles Albert claims he could do nothing to save Milan ('its resistance could not be sustained') but Source B says flatly there were 'good chances' of defending Milan if a real effort had been made but Charles Albert did nothing to exploit them

- the tone of Charles Albert in Source A implies he was a gallant leader up against impossible odds; the view in Source B is that '17 years as an absolute monarch had left Charles Albert unequipped to fight a revolutionary war'.

Candidates will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, refer to:

- the provenance of the sources. The view in Source A is that of Charles Albert himself – the whole tone of the source is one of self-justification, whereas the view in Source B is a powerful critique of Charles Albert by a modern historian
- knowledge of the military situation could be used to argue that the King was indeed a wretched military leader and that Mack Smith's denunciation of him is fully justified; or to point out that it is true Charles Albert was up against terrible handicaps and that Mack Smith is unfair in condemning his leadership so sweepingly.

To address 'how far', candidates should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- both agree that there were early victories before Custoza
- both agree that the decision to withdraw to Milan was a turning point, even though they disagree about the motives for the move.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may show the ability to differentiate:

- both sources agree that defending Milan was very difficult
- even Mack Smith says only that there were 'fairly good chances' of defending Milan, which is hardly a complete contradiction of Source A.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How far was the failure of the 1848–49 revolutions due to the political and military strength of Austria? (24 marks)

*Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)***Levels Mark Scheme**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

This is a broad question, involving the extent to which the strength of Austria was the decisive factor in the failure of the 1848–49 revolutions. Candidates should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. Many good answers may conclude that, despite some early revolutionary successes, Austrian control remained a decisive issue in the long term. Other answers may argue that, prior to 1848, Austria's control of northern and central Italy was firm but events in that year caused difficulties both in the peninsula and at home – thus they were weak in the face of the revolutions. The only reason that Austrian forces regrouped in the Quadrilateral under Radetzky and were able to re-establish control was that the revolutionaries let them off the hook.

Candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer. Relevant material from the sources could include:

- **Source A:** points to the 'increased strength' of the Austrians; it also refers to Piedmont being 'almost alone', implying lack of unity; and mentions 'lack of provisions', implying military unpreparedness
- **Source B:** gives no support to the idea of Austrian strength and ascribes the defeat at Custoza to 'tactical mistakes'. The main causes of defeat according to Mack Smith are poor leadership by Charles Albert; and divisions between the king and those such as Garibaldi who wanted 'popular war'
- **Source C:** points to the Austrians 'recovering and consolidating their position – but only after the armistice, not before. Beales implies that the Austrians were too strong because the revolutions were doomed to fail unless supported by foreign powers – the main cause of defeat of the revolutions is foreign intervention by the Catholic powers. Source C also implies there were divisions between the Roman Republic and the Pope.

From candidates' own knowledge of Austrian strengths:

- Austria controlled Lombardy and Venetia in the north
- the 4 fortresses of the Quadrilateral gave Austria a military footing in Italy
- Pius IX ultimately would not move against Catholic Austria
- Austrian influence and support for rulers in central states
- previous Austrian intervention to assist Bourbon rulers in Naples.

Points/factors/evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- Austria was weakened by problems at home – Metternich had resigned
- the economic problems in Italy during 1846–1847, leading to food riots, showed Austrian weakness
- some of the revolts were initially successful (Piedmont declared war due to political vacuum in Lombardy, which showed Austrian weakness)
- Austrian forces suffered early setbacks in Milan and Venice; they withdrew to the forts of the Quadrilateral because they were weak, not because they were strong.

From own knowledge of other factors:

- absence of foreign allies
- the lack of co-ordinated action between the revolutionaries in different states
- no overall leadership and unified objectives among the nationalists
- lack of revolutionary support from the peasantry
- Charles Albert's uncertainty over Piedmont's involvement and his errors after the invasion began

- the decision of Pope Pius IX to refuse to let Austrian troops cross Papal states in Jan 1848 (and the reluctance with which he issued a liberal constitution in March 1848) followed by his decision to issue his Allocution and side with reaction.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, such as how the Austrians were given time to recover by the lack of unity in the early stages.

Question 2

03 Explain why Cavour wanted to bring about the modernisation of Piedmont. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Cavour believed so strongly in the need for Piedmont to modernise.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- he was a political liberal who believed that constitutional monarchy was the best way forward and wanted Piedmont to take the lead in the cause of unification in order to forestall republicanism. He had no interest in the 'backward' South
- he was an economic liberal who got much of his support from businessmen who wanted economic progress and were pleased by his trade reforms and railway building
- he was influenced by Britain and very anxious to gain British support by showing how Piedmont was developing in accordance with the 'British model'
- he wanted to attract supporters from other parts of Italy and bring them under his leadership – strengthening Piedmont would help this.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might make links between the economic motives and Cavour's political aims; or differentiate between Cavour's aims for his own political power: his aim to serve the interests of Piedmont and the King; and idealistic aims to advance the cause of Italian unification.

Question 2

- 04** 'During the years 1849 to 1858, supporters of the cause of Italian unification had no hope of achieving success.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not. It could be argued that 'succeeding' did not necessarily mean full unification – perhaps there was significant progress towards a distant goal. Good answers should also show awareness of a range of 'supporters'.

Evidence which supports the idea there was 'no hope' of success might include:

- continuing divisions between Italians, including regional differences between North and South and the different objectives of democrats and republicans, such as Garibaldi and Mazzini, against the pragmatists – Mazzini's ideas alienated some groups such as the peasantry, nobility and Church. Many Mazzinians changed allegiance to Piedmont or Garibaldi after the failure of the 1848–9 revolutions. Mazzini's rejection of foreign assistance in expelling the Austrians from Italy also counted against him
- the hostility of the Pope weakened the Risorgimento badly
- Cavour had little interest in achieving complete Italian unification; he was working for the interests of Piedmont and King Victor Emmanuel II
- the French troops stationed in Rome from 1848 prevented any move against the Pope
- the attitude of foreign powers was mostly negative and it was obvious at Paris in 1856 that they would not support Italian unification – and it was also obvious Austria could not be defeated without foreign intervention
- unification only mattered to a minority – the Italian National Society was merely an ineffective talking shop.

Evidence to support the view that supporters of the cause of unification *did* learn lessons for the future after the defeats of 1848–49 and *did* have hopes of advancing their cause might include:

- Mazzini helped to lay the foundations to an extent with his establishment of an Italian identity, republican ideas and attempted uprisings. He encouraged patriotism in his efforts to create a free and equal united Italy. Mazzini's earlier revolutionary attempts with Young Italy continued to inspire nationalists in the 1850s
- Garibaldi was steadily gaining support in the 1850s and laying the foundations for his triumphs in 1860
- the Italian National Society in 1857 proved the emergence of a national identity
- the rise of Piedmont as the only independent Italian state and the policies of Cavour did represent genuine progress in the 1850s. Cavour was a skilled politician who exploited opportunities such as Piedmont's involvement in the Crimean War and the Paris peace conference.

Question 3

05 Explain why Garibaldi's invasion of Naples and Sicily in 1860 was successful. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Garibaldi achieved such success in his military campaigns.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the extent to which the absolutist monarchy of the Two Sicilies had been weakened and discredited by the events of 1848–49
- Garibaldi's charismatic leadership and the enthusiasm he engendered among the Redshirt volunteers
- Garibaldi led a well-planned military campaign
- the presence of the British Navy assisted his crossing of the Straits of Messina.

OR Candidates may refer to long-term factors weakening the old regimes:

- the long decline of corrupt regimes before 1848

- the extent of nationalism previously awakened by Gioberti, which guaranteed a strong response in favour of Garibaldi.

To reach Level 4, candidates should be able to make links and provide depth of explanation and evaluation. One example of this might be explanation of the reasons why Cavour's attempts to block Garibaldi were unsuccessful.

Question 3

- 06** 'In the years 1858 to 1870, Napoleon III's involvement in Italian affairs did little to assist the people of Italy to achieve unification.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that Napoleon III 'did little to assist' unification against evidence that disagrees, claiming that French intervention had a central, even all-important role.

Evidence that agrees Napoleon 'did little' might include:

- Louis-Napoleon did not act mainly with Italian interests at heart. During the revolts of 1848–49 he sent French troops to Rome to help crush the Mazzinian-inspired rising and restore Papal power. French troops remained in Rome until 1870, blocking Garibaldi's attempts to 'liberate' the capital
- Napoleon III's main aim was to further the expansion of France. He wanted Savoy and Nice from the Piedmontese in return for his military support in the war against Austria in 1859. He set out his aims at Plombières in 1858
- Napoleon went behind Piedmont's back by suing for peace at Villafranca in July 1859. Piedmont was largely excluded from Napoleon's talks with the Austrians at Villafranca and little of the Plombières agreement was honoured by France
- by helping Piedmont assert itself in northern Italy, France would create a client state that would allow it greater influence in that region. He hoped to further the political and dynastic interests of family members by engineering their appointment to kingdoms in central and southern Italy
- candidates may also refer to events in 1867 when Garibaldi attempted to seize Rome. Louis-Napoleon had withdrawn his troops in 1864 on condition that no Italian claim was made upon the city. They returned in 1867 to block Garibaldi's attempted invasion and remained there until September 1870, when it was the pressures of the Franco-Prussian War that resulted in their eventual withdrawal, not any desire to help unification.

Evidence that goes against the key quotation might include long-term factors up to 1858:

- as a young man, Louis-Napoleon had demonstrated enthusiasm for the notion of Italian nationalism and liberty through his participation in the 1831 revolt in Rome. Even after its failure he retained this romantic view
- when he became emperor and took France into the Crimean War he was grateful to Piedmont for its military support. After the 1856 Congress of Paris he maintained contact with Cavour through intermediaries regarding Italy's future
- the failed assassination attempt by Orsini in 1858 (and Orsini's appeal during his trial) inspired the Emperor to agree to meet Cavour at Plombières; as a consequence, France allied with Piedmont and went to war against Austria in 1859. Lombardy was ceded to France by Austria and then handed over to Piedmont.

Evidence suggesting French assistance in and after the 1859 war was important might include:

- Napoleon negotiated with Cavour to cede Nice and Savoy to France in return for the Emperor's acceptance of Piedmontese annexation of the central Italian states, subject to plebiscites. The unification of 1861 was only possible because of this
- after the French victories in 1859 Italy gained Lombardy – this would never have happened without French intervention
- in 1866, Italy gained Venetia only through French diplomacy – Italy was defeated in war but Napoleon III gained Venetia as a reward for French neutrality between Prussia and Austria; France then handed Venetia over to Italy.

One feature of higher-level answers may be the ability to differentiate between the unification desired by the 'people of Italy' and the unification that actually existed by 1870 – e.g. brigandage in the South, or the disillusionment of people such as Mazzini and Garibaldi.