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Abstract

The most stunning example of two historical figures working both together and against one another to fashion a shared goal is the demonstration of power and compromise displayed by Count Camillo Benso di Cavour and Giuseppe Garibaldi during the Sicilian Revolution of 1860 and additional events during the greater Italian Risorgimento. This thesis is an attempt to uncover the bargaining strategies utilized by Cavour and Garibaldi throughout their political interactions as well as reach important conclusions concerning the use of interpersonal relationships to aid, not hinder, the outcome of a common political aim. This case study focuses on the years from 1852 to 1870, but specifically looks at 1859 to 1861, largely considering the theoretical framework of political game theory as outlined by Thomas Schelling. After forming two distinct hypotheses regarding both the competitive and cooperative nature of the two men’s relationship, this thesis finds a greater cooperative characteristic to their historic interactions, although both hypotheses contribute to a relationship that formed the state of Italy.
“I am leaving Rome. Whoever is willing to follow me will be received among my people. I ask nothing of them but a heart filled with love for our country. They will have no pay, no provisions, and no rest. I offer hunger, cold, forced marches, battles, and death. Whoever is not satisfied with such a life must remain behind. He who has the name of Italy not only on his lips but in his heart, let him follow me.”

-Giuseppe Garibaldi, 1849

---
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### Timeline of Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Event(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1796-9</td>
<td>France occupies Italy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814-15</td>
<td>After the Congress of Vienna, Austria becomes the main ruler of Italian lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820-1</td>
<td>Constitutional revolutions in the Two Sicilies and Piedmont are suppressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Revolts in Parma, Modena and part of the Papal States around Bologna; “Young Italy” formed by Mazzini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834-7</td>
<td>Mazzini is exiled to London as “Young Italy” is suppressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848-49</td>
<td>Revolutions throughout Italy in Sicily, Piedmont, the Papal States, Tuscany, Lombardy and Venetia; Constitutions limiting monarchical power are granted; Piedmont goes to war against Austria but is defeated at Custozza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>A republic is declared in Rome; Piedmont goes to war against Austria but is defeated at Novara; the Roman Republic defeated by France and the Venetian Republic by Austria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Cavour becomes the Prime Minister of the Piedmont state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Napoleon III and Cavour host their secret meeting that would later become famous at Plombieres in July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Piedmont and France, after a secret treaty is signed by Napoleon III and Victor Emmanuel, defeat Austria at Magenta and Solferino; the armistice signed at Villafranca; Lombardy annexed by Piedmont; revolt in Tuscany; Garibaldi travels to Naples while Cavour’s Piedmont troops head to Rome; Cavour resigns as Prime Minister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Cavour returns to office; Tuscany and Emilia vote to join Piedmont; revolt in Sicily; Garibaldi conquers Sicily, Naples and transfers them to Victor Emmanuel; plebiscites held in Sicily, Umbria and Marches result in their joining Piedmont; Nice and Savoy join France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Italian-wide elections held; Victor Emmanuel proclaimed King of Italy; Cavour dies in June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Garibaldi unsuccessfully marches on Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>The Italian army is defeated by Austria at Custoza and its navy at Lissa; Austria hands Venice to Napoleon III, who transfers it to Italy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>French troops withdraw from Rome; Italian forces occupy Rome; the papacy is established in Vatican City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ch. 1 Introduction

Fighting the war on terror in Iraq and Afghanistan, negotiating over sanctions against Iran, or dealing with North Korea’s nuclear ambitions compose the current perspective on politics in the United States. Every night, Americans sit down with images of national and international politics blaring from their television screens. One must wonder: how do world leaders recognize and decide on their preferred outcomes for these important political issues? As examples, how does President George W. Bush negotiate with President Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan to secure border zones against the Taliban, or with President Vladimir Putin of Russia to work out an acceptable compromise on Iran, or with President Hu Jintao of China to pressure North Korea on canceling its nuclear testing? The complexities surrounding these tense situations run even deeper when one considers each politician’s interior motives, goals, and desires for their state and for individual power. How does the situation change when two individual actors desire a common goal and yet have different motivations for that goal?

One of the most stunning examples of two politicians working both together and against one another to fashion a shared goal is the demonstration of power and compromise displayed by Camillo Benso di Cavour and Giuseppe Garibaldi during the Sicilian Revolution of 1860 and the greater Italian Risorgimento. Camillo Benso di Cavour, a noble bent on a moderate revolution, did not want to contemplate the thought of a revolution by common peasants. On the other hand, Giuseppe Garibaldi, a radical revolutionary, was determined to make the unification a product of the people. As Garibaldi told a friend in May 1860, “…the people have welcomed us with enthusiasm
and are joining up in crowds… I hope we shall become an avalanche."\(^1\) Garibaldi was an apprentice of Giuseppe Mazzini, the alleged founder of the Italian *Risorgimento*, and Garibaldi was not willing to sacrifice the majority of precepts he had learned from his teacher. Nonetheless, despite mutual feelings of ill will and distrust, Cavour and Garibaldi used similar thought processes to determine their courses of action.

The central question to be addressed is: How and in what ways do competitive relationships have an effect on the successful production of a common goal? That is, how did the relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi have an effect on the achievement of Italian unification? This case study focuses on the years from 1852 to 1870, but specifically looks at 1859 to 1861. In the end, I want to uncover the strategies of Cavour and Garibaldi. How can one interpret the outcome—the unification of Italy—in a manner consistent with the interplay of these strategies? Through this study, important conclusions can be reached about the use of interpersonal relationships to aid, not hinder, the outcome of a common political goal. Furthermore, when we delve deeper into the causes of this political relationship, we can assume two primary models that explain what ultimately caused the leaders to push and pull against the other. I determine that either domestic and/or external influences caused Cavour and Garibaldi to work both against one another and with one another to form an independent Italian state. One argument emphasizes cooperation while the other stresses competition. In each case, I must focus on analysis at the individual level. Thus, in order to address my central question, I will

research which influences, outside or inside, had the greater effect on this political relationship.

My methodology will rely upon strategic bargaining and games of politics that have not yet been explored apart from the macro-level. From afar, it can be observed that the relationship between the two politicians was a game of Chicken. In other words, both men were attempting to scare the other into making a first move in order to capitalize on the last move for their own benefit. Yet this game changes when it is set in the context of a long-term relationship in which trust and mutual respect will eventually become tools to reach their goal. Thus, I will use central works of political bargaining like Thomas C. Schelling’s study entitled *The Strategy of Conflict*. I will apply this analysis to historical events and correspondence from the two leaders written throughout the period prior to Italian unification. I will not use all of the primary source literatures, as they are written in various Italian dialects of that time and have not been translated into English.

In addition to works concerning political bargaining, I chose historical biographies written by Alfonso Scirocco, Frank J. Coppa, Harry Heider, A.J. Whyte, and Denis Mack Smith. To complement the historical perspective, I selected cultural understandings of this period, primarily *Making and Remaking Italy: The Cultivation of National Identity around the Risorgimento* and *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*. Other articles dealing with individual political actors and the balance of power are “The Second Image Reversed” by Peter Goureivitch, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics” by Putnam, and “Let Us Now Praise Great Men” by Byman and Pollack. Many of the historians listed above chose either a “big picture” explanation of the Italian *Risorgimento* or an
individual leader perspective. I want to do neither. Instead, I would like to create a synthesis of actions at both the international, state, and individual levels. I am able to do this only with the aid of political analyses created by Gourevitch, Byman, Pollack, and Schelling.

Both these questions and conclusions about the *Risorgimento* and political bargaining go beyond satisfying historical curiosity. First, while the topic is rooted in the past, it is unquestionably relevant to current controversies like those mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. World leaders are attempting to cooperate in order to avoid a mutually undesirable outcome. Yet regardless of common goals, these political leaders want to increase their own power or pursue their preferred outcome. Thus, the relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi transcends time and demonstrates the inner workings of power politics and game theory. Second, as this topic is set in the mid-nineteenth century and is not well known, it provides another case study for social and political scientists to compare with other case studies, leading to an even clearer depiction of this point in Italian history. Third and last, for political scientists who usually focus on state- and system-levels of analysis, an investigation of the actions and decisions of individual leaders will demonstrate how deeply one politician’s actions, motives, or feelings towards another politician can affect the public, in both negative and positive ways.

I will begin my thesis with a chapter briefly outlining the process of Italian unification from 1852 to 1870. I will include events of both foreign and domestic interest. In this chapter, I will also list the literature I researched in the process of this thesis and
my reasons for doing so. I will explain my approach to the topic as opposed to other researchers and I will answer why I decided to approach my topic in a specific and unique way. Chapter Three details my research design and describes how I apply game theory analysis to historical events. I include added analysis of arguments I found beneficial to my argument such as the importance of the relationship between international and domestic politics as well as the crucial research of individuals in the field of political science. The next three chapters, Chapters Four through Seven, will elucidate historical events in depth, spanning the course of three crucial years, from 1859 to 1861. Each chapter will include a brief history of the events surrounding the case study along with my analysis according to my research design of game theory and bargaining strategies. Chapter Seven will summarize the accomplishment of Italian unification, final personal sentiments of Cavour and Garibaldi toward one another, and my research findings. I will end my thesis with a brief conclusion.
Ch. 2 The *Risorgimento*: 1852-1870

The research for this thesis is divided into four subject areas: the relationship of Cavour and Garibaldi, the movement toward Italian unification, game theory and rational choice, and lastly, power politics and interpersonal political relationships. Within the relationship of Cavour and Garibaldi, I will investigate their theories of how best to obtain Italian unification, their personal feelings towards one another, and their individual goals. Furthermore, I discuss their political careers prior to the Italian *Risorgimento*, the origination of political support from their community, and the goals of their respective foundational bases. In order to gain a sense of the individual lives of Garibaldi and Cavour, I consulted biographies on the two men from writers like Frank J. Coppa, A.J. Whyte, Denis Mack Smith, Alfonso Scirocco, and Harry Hearder. While they all contribute immensely to the library of Italian history and politics, it is crucial to read them with an analytic eye for my own purposes. For example, Frank Coppa’s biography of Cavour made a grand contribution to the research community as he incorporated newly released documents from the Vatican Archives and the Italian government. As a biographer of Cavour, however, he does present a narrative that is in favor of the elite politician. Coppa writes, “United Italy is the greatest testament to his success.”¹ Since my thesis aims at the relationship between the two, I must be mindful of Coppa’s perspective on the brilliant statesman, Cavour. Nevertheless, this biography is unquestionably valuable as I shape Cavour’s character and its effects on the *Risorgimento*. The same is true for Whyte’s version of Cavour’s political life and personal biography. Whyte

stresses the importance of Cavour’s strategies over his personality to the unification of Italy. Thus, Whyte’s book presents a less biased version of the life of Cavour. These two historical works provide two examples of how I critically analyzed the position of the author in order to frame the history and ideas it set forth.

Secondly, to gain a sense of the historical relationship between the two men as the Italian Risorgimento evolved, I used Denis Mack Smith’s book, entitled Cavour and Garibaldi, 1860 to the fullest extent. From the title, one can deduce that this book will center on the emotions and conversations surrounding the relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi. This work is assumed to be the most extensive piece of literature on this topic. Additionally, Smith agrees with my thesis insofar as individuals, along with their competing political parties and ideologies, formed the foundation for an Italian state. Peter Browning, an alternative historian on the subject, recognizes the importance of the relationship between Garibaldi and Cavour. In his book entitled Revolutions and Nationalities, Browning asks a number of questions central to my thesis: “Did Cavour publicly oppose Garibaldi while privately helping him to succeed? Or was the only help he provided that of not interfering with Garibaldi’s plans?” These, and others, lead me to pay attention to the unique perspective of Browning and his meticulous research into the tension between the two men. Finally, as the Italian Risorgimento took place in the mid-nineteenth century, the only primary resources available are diaries, memoirs, and letters written by Cavour and Garibaldi. As many have not been translated in English, I was only able to use them minimally in my research.

2 Peter Browning, Revolutions and Nationalities: Europe, 1825-90 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 45.
I divided the next section concerning the historical background of the movement into the structure of leadership in major city-states, including Sicily, the peasants’ view of the unification movement, and international events and opinions prior to the Sicilian Revolution. For this section, I utilized another book by Frank J. Coppa on the origins of the Italian conflicts for independence. The argument he puts forth in the book acknowledges all opinions and contributions the research community has argued thus far concerning the Italian *Risorgimento*. Coppa reflects upon the importance of the moderates, the radicals, the rich, the peasants, and the other individuals that added to the movement. Many researchers have focused in on one of these groups, stressing their role in the *Risorgimento* above all others. Yet Coppa hesitates to argue the overarching significance of one of these groups, making him the least biased researcher to be found.

In addition, I consulted *Making and Remaking Italy: The Cultivation of National Identity around the Risorgimento* and *Italy in the Nineteenth Century*. In *Making and Remaking Italy*, the editors von Henneberg and Ascoli focus on the role of culture in the Italian *Risorgimento*. They ask how societies or groups of people use “cultural means to promote nationalist goals.” Since they largely emphasize culture, they note their ignorance of other factors including sociology, gender, or ideology. My main interest in this study is its concentration on the cultural elites in Italian society. It asks how the elites ordered themselves to support certain political leaders and visions of a unified state. Davis’ monograph, on the other hand, takes a completely different approach to the formation of Italy. External influences, primarily on a state level, comprise his main

---

argument in which outside forces had the greatest effect on the creation of Italy. Other influences, particularly domestic, are rarely mentioned as having significant value. This provides me with an additional perspective on the Risorgimento. Still, I will consider both domestic and external determinants when constructing my game theory case analysis.

The major events bringing the Risorgimento to its fruition and culmination occurred between the years of 1852 and 1870. To understand the strategic bargaining games employed by Garibaldi and Cavour, it is fundamental to understand first the chronology of actions that took place. (A brief timeline of events can be found at the beginning of this thesis on pages iv-v.) The Risorgimento can be outlined in four basic phases: unification potential prior to the 1850s, Mazzini and the people, Cavour and the Piedmont state, and Garibaldi and the South.

As early as the 1830s, people were revolting and conspiring against existing governments throughout regions of present-day Italy. In both 1833 and 1834, Giuseppe Mazzini attempted to overthrow the Piedmont monarchy. As would become his reputation, he had lofty ideological ideas but did not have as much popular backing as was necessary to achieve success. Despite Mazzini’s defeat, there were a number of internal and external reasons for the growing discontent throughout the region. Outside of Italy, a regime change took place in France and the Hapsburg Empire fell into complete debt under Ferdinand I, who served from 1835 to 1848. Domestically, most of the ruling societies were unstable and became increasingly unresponsive as the people were burdened with growing taxes and censorship. To capitalize on these changes, Mazzini
and his followers began a campaign of believable and effective propaganda. Mazzini slowly began raising popular support throughout Italy. He founded a radical, republican organization with its mission being a national revolution by the people and for the people. He struck the heart chords of many, winning future Italians and foreigners to his side.

Another influential man was Vincenzo Gioberti, a man who initiated a liberal, patriotic assembly that advocated a confederation of Italian states to be controlled and supervised by the papacy. Not surprisingly, the future Pope, Pope Pius IX, loved Gioberti’s plan and helped it achieve widespread support.

By the mid-1840s, economic depression was crippling most Italian and other European societies. Harvest failures hit the South and the Hapsburg monarchy, slow to respond, caused a large amount of bitterness to spread amongst the people. All classes, from the poor to the elites, supported some form of self-government as well as social and political reform. In 1847, as the masses grew louder and more forceful, some concessions were granted. Unfortunately, for those in power, the concessions did not satisfy the people. Within a year, a revolt occurred in Sicily in which the people demanded their own constitution. Ferdinand II, along with countless other Italian leaders, granted limited constitutions in a matter of years. A month after the revolt in Sicily, another revolt took place in Paris. As the number of revolts steadily increased, the entire French monarchy was overthrown with ease. Leaders of the Italian peninsula watched with apprehension as they feared similar outcomes. Encouraged by the actions of the Parisians, Italians led popular demonstrations in the streets and demanded additional rights.

---

In 1848, the revolutionary fervor in Rome reached an incredible pitch. Pope Pius IX, fearful of the potential revolution’s might, fled the city. Mazzini’s popularity was at its highest; most Roman citizens were prepared to support him. Here, Giuseppe Garibaldi made his entrance into the Italian unification scene. A political apprentice of Mazzini, Garibaldi encouraged the Romans to create their own republic. For Mazzini, Gioberti, Garibaldi, and many others supporting unification and revolution, the tables quickly turned. A young, Roman republic collapsed as foreigners bent on sustaining Catholic power intervened and placed the Pope in his rightful position. Still anxious about a military revolution, Pope Pius IX forgot the republican principles of Gioberti and acted only to maintain political stability. The Bourbons were restored to their throne, where they continued to foster both Italian and foreign discontent. By 1850, almost all constitutional forms of government collapsed, crushed by a united team of political leaders backed by a strongly supportive military.

Since the Risorgimento, historians have viewed and have written about Giuseppe Mazzini in many different ways. In Great Britain, he was and is widely admired. Traditionally, British history has portrayed Mazzini as a type of Italian saint. This depiction has carried over into much of North American history and research. Italian history, on the other hand, has represented him from the perspective of rivals and opponents. In reality, he was a figure who both repulsed and welcomed people from all points of the globe. In principle, Mazzini was an autocratic democrat. He believed neither in majorities nor in nationalism. Rather, he hoped for an eventual foundation of

---

international cooperation to stabilize an Italian state. In 1853, he founded the group known as “Party of Action,” solely as a project to counter the politics and policies of Camillo Benso di Cavour in northern Italy. It was widely known as the “militant Church of the national movement.”

The only exception to the failed revolutions of Italian city-states in 1848 was the Piedmont state, ruled by the House of Savoy. Unlike other states, it was not dependent on Austria and managed to retain its new Constitution. Most importantly, it gained the incredible leadership of Count Camillo Benso di Cavour. Much to his credit, economic and social reforms were successful as the middle class grew in power and economic status through new manufacturing opportunities, innovative methods of agriculture, and commercial investments. Thus, throughout the 1850s, Piedmont developed into a model state for Italian unification. After the Sicilian revolt, the Piedmont state’s “economic system, constitution, legal codes, and bureaucracy” was copied into the new state system, admired for its unique mixture of reform and tradition.

Cavour was the major instigator of the original Piedmont form of government. After outmaneuvering an opponent in 1852, he became the Prime Minister of Piedmont. Early in his life, Cavour supported the juste milieu, or the middle path, which advocated a gradual process of reform for city-states. Consequently, Cavour opposed democracy and rapid revolutions, which explains his future resistance to the plans of Garibaldi and Mazzini. Many historians explored in-depth the proposal that Cavour was the first Italian

---

6 Ibid., 99.
8 Browning, Revolutions and Nationalities, 39.
realist. Some seem to agree, aligning him with the famous German politician, Otto von Bismarck. Smith, on the other hand, refuses to confirm Cavour’s realpolitik but marks him as a shrewd and cynical negotiator. He desperately wanted independent city-states in order to follow in the footsteps of other European power houses and for this reason, supported the help of French soldiers and the use of diplomacy. Unlike others involved in the Risorgimento, Cavour and the Piedmont state already possessed a significant amount of freedom from Austria and France. This provided him and his administration with the opportunity to consider self-government, as oppression was not a factor. Thus, Cavour stated,

“We are preparing ourselves for a new life, with the assiduous examination of events taking place in countries that are most advanced in the ways of civilization, with close attention to the great lessons proclaimed from the stages of England and France.”

On the other hand, Mazzini felt that Cavour was simply playing into the hands of external powers instead of working toward Italian unity. Peter Browning, an American historian, agrees with Mazzini’s opinion, stating that Cavour wanted Italy to be autonomous but not necessarily unified. Always possessing the counter-opinion, Mazzini would later inform Garibaldi that he wanted a fresh culture that was distinctly “Italian.” Mazzini became increasingly worried when the Piedmont state decided to intervene in the Crimean War on the side of France and Great Britain against Russia. While this boosted the success of moderates in the Piedmont state and throughout the

---

10 Ibid., 26.
12 Browning, Revolutions and Nationalities, 41.
northern region of Italy, it only upset Giuseppe Mazzini, who did not want any form of understanding between the Piedmont state and the various European monarchies. In the future, Mazzini was convinced that this would prolong the struggle to Italian unity. Cavour, however, entered into the conflict primarily because of increasing pressure from France and Great Britain. Both of these great powers wanted Austria to participate in the Crimean War but Austria had only agreed to join if Piedmont did the same.

Cavour, feeling his hands tied, agreed to contribute in order to solidify future amicable relations with Great Britain and France. In hindsight, historians note that Cavour’s decision was a wise one. While the Crimean War caused the break down of the status quo in several nation-states, Cavour exploited these problems to further his political interests. Cavour attended the Paris Peace Congress after the Crimean War, where he met numerous monarchical rulers and collaborated with them to plan the Italian independence process. Mazzini was even more outraged when he learned that Cavour had placed no timeline on his strategic schemes. Instead, Cavour was relying upon his calculating diplomatic skills, a fact which scared Mazzini. He believed the secrets and nuances that characterized European diplomacy would not bode well for peace in Italy.¹³ This clearly demonstrates the difference in mentality that Mazzini and Cavour carried with them from the beginning, which was later absorbed by Garibaldi. Both had fundamentally dissimilar ways of attaining the goal of Italian sovereignty and unification. Perhaps this could begin to form the structure of why both men acted the way they did and what caused them to veer away from certain options. Upon his return from the Paris

---

Peace Congress, Cavour founded the “National Society,” which advocated “Piedmont leadership, constitutional monarchy, and a piecemeal approach to unification.”

If not for Giuseppe Garibaldi’s intervention at this point, Italian self-rule and unification may have never taken place. Garibaldi offered to accept Cavour’s rules, as defined by the “National Society,” while supporting Mazzini’s principles. Mazzini had taught Garibaldi that the unification of Italy should always be his first priority as a political leader. Although he was at odds with Mazzini concerning a possible Italian king, he still regarded Mazzini as the “prophet and standard-bearer” of the Risorgimento.

Thus, he acted as the only bridge between Mazzini and Cavour. In 1857, Cavour embarked upon a plan to disengage Austria from Italy. No longer focused narrowly on a plan for Italian autonomy, Cavour encouraged discontent toward the Austrian government and patriotism for the Piedmont state. He officially severed diplomatic relations with Austria while he developed beneficial, international relations with Russia, Prussia, and France. In January 1859, Cavour signed an official treaty with Napoleon III, the leader of France, an agreement in which Napoleon pledged military support for increasing Italian independence in exchange for territory gained as a result of a future war with Austria. In April 1859, war began between Austria and a French-Piedmont coalition. Against Cavour’s will, an armistice known as the Treaty of Villafranca was signed between France and Austria in July of the same year. Napoleon claimed that he agreed to end the conflict because he could not suffer additional French casualties and moreover, he did not completely trust the Piedmont government. Because of this, Cavour’s plan of

---

14 Sarti, “Giuseppe Mazzini and His Opponents,” in Italy in the Nineteenth Century, 1796-1900, 101.
working with France, and against Austria, a state that still had a hold in Italy, lost legitimacy. When Cavour learned that Victor Emmanuel II supported the Treaty of Villafranca, Cavour resigned from his governmental position. Mazzini won a small victory, as many people then believed that Italian unification should come without outside help as a result of Cavour’s botched alliance. Despite his slightly stained reputation, Cavour resumed a place in the Piedmont government within six months and continued to work with foreign powers. Soon, he earned the regions of Lombardy, the Central Duchies, and Romagna for Nice and Savoy in a secret treaty with Napoleon III.

Within the next decade, Garibaldi agreed to lead one thousand volunteers into Sicily to assist with a pre-existing revolution. Garibaldi eventually ruled the South, with varied support from Victor Emmanuel II and the Piedmont Army. Refusing to suffer another loss, Mazzini made sure Garibaldi’s triumphs appeared to the people like the result of republican leadership. As time progressed, Garibaldi promised his services to Mazzini as long as he did not have to separate his success from the name of Victor Emmanuel II, to whom Garibaldi felt he owed political allegiance. As his power increased, Garibaldi wanted to move north with the support of Great Britain behind his troops. Cavour, fearful of provoking war with greater powers, waned between support, opposition, and indifference toward Garibaldi. Many citizens were skeptical of Cavour’s behavior, regardless of what it was. In early 1861, Italian sovereignty and unification became a reality as Victor Emmanuel II was recognized as the King of Italy and the people, ultimately about 2% of the population, voted their first parliament into office. Unfortunately, these developments were not internationally well received. While Great
Britain openly supported Italian unification, France only quietly approved, Russia broke diplomatic relations with the Piedmont government, and Austria built up additional military power in Venice and in its other strongholds in the region.

As the movement developed, Cavour’s leadership arguably acted as an obstacle to progress. He would not grant any regional autonomy, ignorantly believing instead that the differing regions of Italy all possessed one, unified culture. Cavour denied rights to almost 98% of the population, holding to a bias in favor of the elite and the nobility. Garibaldi argued that Cavour’s leadership style contributed in part to the civil war of the South in the 1860s. Now, many historians defend Cavour, claiming that he did not have multiple options when constructing a new nation in a short period of time. Furthermore, other historians such as Lucy Riall claim that without the Sicilian Revolt of 1860, Italian unification would never have occurred. If Cavour had acted any differently, he may have hindered the outcome. The people of the South were unsatisfied with the government for a number of reasons: economic depression, unemployment, an unsuccessful harvest, and an unfair taxing system. They wanted change.

Garibaldi helped them achieve a conversion through an astounding military attack against the Bourbon government. Eventually, the Bourbon kingdom died from heavy international pressure, compounded by the defeat of Austria in 1859, subsequent revolutions in Italy, and a financial crisis. Cavour quickly attempted to seize power and impose monarchical authority on the southern people. As he knew essentially nothing about their culture, however, his political plans failed and he was forced to cede some
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amount of power to Garibaldi. Additional historical context could be given as to events post-1859 in this section. However, as the majority of this history will come under my critical analysis, I choose to end this brief overview here and continue with additional background in subsequent chapters. This summary of the Risorgimento will act as the roadmap to the history of Cavour and Garibaldi’s relationship.

At face value, the Risorgimento seems little more than a small speck on the historical timeline of Europe, especially when considering the great wars and conflicts of the last few centuries. Yet understanding the Risorgimento and its main actors is central to a comprehension of greater European politics as well as Italian domestic politics and culture, where its remnants are still visible today. Lucy Riall highlights the importance of this era first and foremost in her book. She remarks that for Italy, this was a colossal undertaking, as it implied an Italian people, culture, and language that had never before existed. Furthermore, in the span of 150 short years, Italy formed itself into a modern European state, becoming a member of the European Union (EU) and the Group of Eight (G8). Many of its EU allies were unified states or had been building foundations for unification at a much earlier time. Thirdly, this gave the Italian people an opportunity to form their own political ideals and values as well as boast of Italian founding fathers, who remain the focus of this thesis.18

Opportunely, there is a substantial amount of modern literature on the topics of bargaining, game theory, and power politics on the individual level. I chose to focus particularly on The Strategy of Conflict by Thomas C. Schelling in addition to scholarly

18 Ibid., 1.
articles mentioned earlier. These, and many other sources, addressed numerous crucial questions concerning my thesis as to why Cavour and Garibaldi either compromised or fought over certain issues and events. The first essential question my thesis concerns is “When should a person cooperate, and when should a person be selfish, in an ongoing interaction with another person?”, a question that many of these sources confront.¹⁹ The other books and articles I utilized are outlined in Chapter Three as well as my bibliography. The majority of the sources were found at Boston College libraries or through interlibrary loans.

Ch. 3 An Alternative Approach

Historians of the *Risorgimento* hold a number of opinions concerning the relationship of Cavour and Garibaldi. Many only marginally mention the two men, directing their focus toward certain events, international leaders, or societal pressures of the period. Others choose one of the men, either Cavour or Garibaldi, as the main catalyst of Italian independence and unification. Instead, I argue that both men were fundamental to the movement because of their unique relationship with one another and its effects on the *Risorgimento*. Thus, my research design centers on how this relationship formed and which events or agents drove the two men to communicate with one another while remaining competitive. In order to accomplish this, I will compose a process-trace of critical events over the course of their relationship and communication. By examining these events, I will observe how the two men acted using a political game theory approach. A number of scholars, and their respective studies, will be used to connect the various events and their implications.

We can assume that the politician is an actor that affects the shape of the state’s strategies. During the *Risorgimento*, there was no single, effective strategy nor was there a single state. Yet the assumption that individuals have the ability to affect political nation-states still holds merit for this argument, which will be made visible through the events themselves. Garibaldi and Cavour did not come from remotely similar backgrounds. As a result, they did not have any experiences, problems, or values in common that allowed them to become instant friends. In addition, their individual experiences caused them to develop completely different political theories. As mentioned
before, Garibaldi was a radical revolutionary while Cavour was a moderate revolutionary and elitist. From this knowledge, it is possible to develop one background hypothesis.

BH: In a competitive, political relationship, opposing leaders possessing different political theories will be less able to reach a compromise.

Aside from the case study, this background hypothesis predicts that conflicting theories and ideas extend beyond the relationship between competitive politicians. This hypothesis allows us to assume that different ideas, theories, and processes between individuals will hinder the end goal of a cohesive result in addition to causing a greater personal and political divide between those individuals. Thus, this background hypothesis predicts that the greater the disparity in the political theories, the greater the inability of the politicians to compromise. Yet what is most interesting with this case study is that the opposing leaders did possess different political theories and yet, were still able to reach a concession, or at the least, a satisfactory outcome. How did they come to conciliation and why? From this question, I will construct two models to determine the answer.

Before constructing my research design, I will highlight four articles that I will use in my mental framework and throughout this paper as building blocks to my argument. The first article, entitled “The Second Image Reversed”, argues that the international system has a much larger effect on the domestic realm than many political
scientists note.¹ Gourevitch suggests that the international system affects both a nation’s amount of power as well as its economy. In my argument, I rely heavily on the idea that the international balance of power will dictate an emerging nation’s success and acceptance into the global community. It is highly relevant to my thesis as certain forms of government and world leaders were crumbling as Italian unification took place. How did the international system of the nineteenth century have an effect on Italian independence and unification, and more importantly, what was its effect on Garibaldi, Cavour, and their relationship? Gourevitch, if correct, can identify the external events that most heavily influenced Garibaldi and Cavour. Alongside this crucial idea, Gourevitch mentions the theory of complex interdependence, in which actors on many different levels of the political game must be included. He writes that this theory “alters domestic structures because it entails shifts in power away from certain governmental institutions toward other ones, or even shifts outside the government to private actors, or to international actors, or other foreign actors.”² I found this theory to be vital to examination of the *Risorgimento* as a whole. Power shifts occurred frequently during the time period, especially between the two main characters of study. Unlike other political scientists, Gourevitch highlights the potential power individual actors can wield on a certain situation, regardless of their status as private, international, or foreign actors.
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The second article, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games,” echoes several opinions put forth in Gourevitch’s article. Yet it delves more deeply into the idea of international bargaining as a two-level game. As a negotiator, one is forced to consider both the opinions of the domestic constituency as well as the international governing community. Even with these considerations in mind, Putnam admits that each leader, in my case both Garibaldi and Cavour, believe they are acting and making decisions for the common good of the community or the state. In this situation, how does a negotiator use factors like uncertainty and credibility to his benefit? In addition, how does the success and failure of international bargaining have an effect on domestic politics? These questions are valuable to my thesis as Garibaldi and Cavour were placed in situations concerning international and national bargaining. Did these situations produce a relationship that was mostly cordial or hostile? How did these men use international and domestic bargaining as a two-level game? It is here that the multiple-level nature of the political game becomes clear. As Putnam explains, the game of politics has become akin to a game of chess: one move may reveal both benefits and disadvantages to a particular case. Therefore, the politician is always striving to make moves which are advantageous to the many parties he serves: his group of constituents, supporters, elites, as well as other nation-states he is trying to win to his cause. As much as researchers and academics try to discover the science of political bargaining and game theory, as is more prominent with Schelling, history proves a difficult example, mainly
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because it is full of exceptions to the rule, unclassifiable relationships and events, and human nature. All of these, and more, make the art of political game theory analysis virtually unscientific. Despite these obstacles, delving into a certain historical period can uncover truths about relationships or events that were otherwise unknown, which is exactly what I aim to accomplish.

Domestically, Putnam asks academics to embrace a view of politics that does not solely reflect the movements of the governing elite. Instead, Putnam desires an observation of domestic politics that serves constituents and supporters on the ground level. In other words, he writes of a growing need for tales of domestic events which “…stress politics: parties, social classes, interest groups (both economic and non-economic), legislators, and even public opinion and elections [author’s emphasis].”

Although Garibaldi does not constitute one of the elite during the Risorgimento, I must consider all aspects of both worlds: the elite world of Cavour and the middle- to lower-class, revolutionary sphere of Garibaldi. Both men created movements that encompass all aspects of domestic politics, which Putnam outlined above. Thus, I must demonstrate that my research can reflect the necessary balance.

The question concerning the line between international and national politics distinguishes Putnam from Gourevitch as Putnam argues for a balance in research that does not attribute cause and effect to one, distinct side. He faults researchers who miss the point of narration and history by breaking a story down into which realm, be it international or national, is doing the acting. This is largely important to the formulation

\[\text{Ibid., 432.}\]
of how I will construct and frame the telling of the interaction of these two men. While pursuing multiple academic questions, can I balance international and domestic research fairly and without placing it at the center of my research? These questions can be used to outline my argument and act as a measuring stick of the causes and effects I choose to highlight.

The third article, “Let Us Now Praise Great Men”, contains the main building block of my thesis. Unlike previous theories of political scientists, it states that the individual is imperative to the politically scientific mind and must be attended to in order to gain a full perspective of the particular historical situation under examination. Most academics have been prone to follow the teachings of Kenneth Waltz, a political scholar who considered individual study but ultimately rejected it as a legitimate level of political analysis. Why did Waltz argue this? He mainly avoided individuals because he felt that theories could not be formed by observing human nature. Instead, I align my views with those of Byman and Pollack, authors of the above article, who argue that theories can be based upon a “…distribution of these traits across the population and their impact on international relations.”

By doing a case study of Garibaldi and Cavour, I hope to do this: form an elegant theory based upon certain studied traits in these two men.

Byman and Pollack contribute significantly to the foundation of the study of individuals in political science with their thirteen basic hypotheses, nine of which are directly related to my study of Garibaldi and Cavour. Their article explains the importance of individuals as they shape policy intentions, supersede the power of
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diplomacy and even the military, affect the decisions of other domestic and international leaders, and create a stabilizing or destabilizing force with their method of policy implementation. Hypothesis Eleven is of particular meaning to my thesis, stating, “Individuals are more important when circumstances are fluid.” I contend that Garibaldi and Cavour substantially influenced the Risorgimento because it was a time of change. Thus, their actions and their relationship had a magnified effect on the movement. Without this understanding, a researcher is unable to fully comprehend how the Risorgimento was successful or for what reasons.

The above article is thought about in accordance with “The Concept and Theory of Charismatic Leadership,” written by Roger Eatwell, which outlines the characteristics and situations surrounding a leader that can potentially develop into charismatic leadership. Although it can be minimally applied to both Garibaldi and Cavour, I found it is more applicable to Garibaldi. In analyzing his leadership more closely, this article can help us understand how this individual became so important to the Risorgimento. The four desired qualities – possession of a missionary vision, use of symbiotic hierarchy, a Manichean demonisation, and personal presence – all resided to some degree in Garibaldi. Observing the passion of Mazzini, Garibaldi had inherited a vision of Italy in which it could begin a completely new era in Europe. He intensely desired the involvement of the common people and the middle class in politics, evident by his use of collective language and the genuine humility demonstrated in front of his supporters.
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Garibaldi rarely resorted to overt tactics that pointed to an outside “other” to serve as enemy but internally, he was not averse to opposing the policy decisions of Cavour and the Piedmont state, as well as those whom he believed wrongly possessed power. Finally, there can be little doubt that Garibaldi was a magnetic figure for many, not only Italians. Statues and roads throughout Italy bear his name; the majority of Italian citizens today view him as the main forefather and founder of the state. Thus, this article can shine light on the reasons behind Garibaldi’s powerful leadership and the factors that aid individual political leadership.

Using game theory and rational choice as my thesis’ structure, I assume that the main actors, Garibaldi and Cavour, are rational. In other words, when presented with a number of different options, they will choose the course that they believe will be most beneficial to them and to their goals. Unlike economics, however, this cannot be measured in money or another quantifiable measure. In the realm of politics, the best possible outcome for individual actors could include a number of possibilities: an increase in power, either domestically or internationally, an increase in fame or wealth, and acceptance from the people. In the case of Garibaldi and Cavour, we must also consider that they will choose a course in which their power over the other has significantly improved. From example models of game theory, I choose the game of Chicken as the best metaphor for the long-standing confrontation between Garibaldi and Cavour. Below a visual matrix of the game of Chicken is presented.
Two actors face each other, attempting to persuade the other of giving up first in this game. The actor who outlasts their opponent wins. This mirrors the conflict between the two men, as they try to force the other out of the power struggle in Italy throughout the mid- to late nineteenth century. Unlike a simple game of Chicken, however, their relationship would last years. They would return to the arguing “table” many times, a fact that they were well aware. Therefore, a long-term relationship changes the game of Chicken. From one single game comes a reiterated series of games. As long as the two actors knew that they would meet again, and perhaps have to cooperate, they may be more likely to collaborate earlier on or make compromises that the other would remember in the proceeding debate. I decided to develop this model of the game of Chicken primarily through the insights and thoughts of Schelling. I plan to consider with care Schelling’s ideas concerning the reasons behind negotiation or non-negotiation in light of both a long-term relationship and respective support, both domestic and international. Additionally, Schelling allows me to re-process events of the Risorgimento as parts of a rational process.
Considering this thesis as a rational process is fundamental to Schelling’s ideas in his book, *The Strategy of Conflict*. Scholars must assume historical characters follow behavioral patterns, both conscious and unconscious. This model, however, must remain solely that; academics must play a balancing act between creating a consistent personality, for the benefit of the reader, and allowing an individual to remain based in reality. Thus, Schelling emphasizes the idea that rational actors can make irrational decisions; they are neither super-human nor robots.\(^9\) Irrationality simply may not remain the basis of their behavior. Since Schelling’s research forms the foundation of my critical analysis, rationality will play a central role in the examination of Garibaldi and Cavour. The goal is not to compartmentalize these two figures but rather, to analyze their thought processes in the context of their individual personalities.

More importantly, Schelling explicitly states that his theory cannot be useful for actors who are committed to remaining enemies. If two people hold completely opposing interests, Schelling’s ideas will not contribute to their analysis. There must be ample space for compromise. Thus, when two parties are at the bargaining table, a win for one may not necessarily translate into an equal loss for the opposite party. Instead, winning is “gaining relative to one’s own value system.” In academic terms, then, this thesis is put forth as a “variable-sum” game instead of a “constant-sum” game.\(^10\) Victory and loss are not in black and white, respectively. Game theory, although a “theory,” is more nuanced and allows the actors to become more than static figures on the pages of history. In this way, Garibaldi and Cavour become historical actors with their own political fears,
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personal jealousies, and character flaws. From there, they can be critically analyzed to a greater degree, as the researcher is able to read into what each man would consider a gain or a loss. This game they play is cleverly referred to by Schelling as a “precarious partnership” or an “incomplete antagonism,” directly relating to the dual natures I outlined as either competitive or cooperative. Although I will not explain them in detail, there are countless tools each individual can utilize in order to obtain more bargaining power including threats, promises, bluffs, communication failures, and more. Initially, game theory seems simple as there are only four possible outcomes, assuming two actors who individually face two different choices. Upon closer inspection, one must consider all of the various likelihoods in order to realize the full gamut of possibilities within one single game.

Many varying theses could be formed as to the nature of this political relationship. I will consider what ultimately caused the two to compete cooperatively throughout their interactions during the Risorgimento. In doing this, I assume that the examined sequence of events is not an historical accident. In other words, I ask if their relationship developed as a result of internal bargaining or externally driven events, supported by a realist argument. As stated earlier, one argument emphasizes cooperation while the other stresses competition. In each case, the individual level must be central to my analysis while arguments for organizations, regions, or states must exist on the periphery.

If I assume the former possibility, I begin with the knowledge that each political leader had a power block in certain physical regions of present-day Italy. Cavour held
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fast to the nobles and elites, particularly in the North, while Garibaldi commanded the “Italian” people, who lived throughout the southern regions. Both recognized, however, that neither of their individual power blocks was sufficient to create a state or to bring effective sovereignty. Thus, they were mutually dependent upon one another while desiring the greatest amount of power for themselves. This makes the case for the first hypothesis, what I will refer to as H1.

\[ H1: \text{Domestic influences cause enemy politicians to struggle with one another for a greater amount of power and control of the state while working toward a successful unified outcome.} \]

In other words, both leaders realized that they could not make it to a successful end alone. They needed the aid and intelligence of the other. This also upholds the importance of nationalism. Despite differences between them, their desire for independence and to some degree, a unified state, superseded all else. Yet they did not want to give up all of their power to the other, which is why they continued competing. This argument, then, emphasizes the competition element in their relationship. In the following hypothesis, I will consider fear of outside power to a greater degree. However, in this argument, the distrust of the other is more essential. To confirm the claim made by this hypothesis, the two men will obscure the true intentions behind their actions in order to keep their opponent guessing. Unwilling to cooperate, the men will use modes of communication that are vague and incomplete. They may use the presence of a third party in order to bind
the other to an action that will increase their power. In light of competition, bargaining and negotiation will be less important. The fact that unification is a long-term game of Chicken may not be fully realized until later years. Each man will use brinkmanship, trying to force the other to act in an undesired manner. At times, they may see the benefit of cooperation but their desire for domestic power dominates all other factors.

If I assume the latter possibility of external pressures, many events were affecting the international landscape around the Italian principalities at the time of unification. Instead of acknowledging the amount of power the other held, they accommodated one another for fear that an outside power would overtake Italy. In this hypothesis, Cavour and Garibaldi realized that the differences that stood between them were narrow and that their individual common goal, the attainment of an autonomous Italian state, was held in common. Thus, for the time being, they ignored political discrepancies to become more cooperative. From this, I form the second hypothesis, what I will refer to as H2.

**H2: External pressures from the international world push rival political leaders to aid one another in pursuit of a common goal.**

In this hypothesis, they do recognize a common need to create a state. Unlike H1, H2 places more emphasis on the element of cooperation. As Schelling wrote, “mutual dependence is part of the logical structure and demands some kind of collaboration or mutual accommodation” in reference to mixed-motive games.\(^\text{13}\) Cavour and Garibaldi

\(^{13}\text{Ibid., 83.}\)
were not afraid of the other in this argument so much as they were apprehensive of the international powers surrounding them like France, the Austrian Empire, and the Ottoman Empire. They did not want to lose all that they had accomplished to outsiders who were willingly prepared to carve up their budding state. If true, this hypothesis implies that without external pressure, Cavour and Garibaldi would not have aided one another, suggesting that they would have continued to compete with one another. Thus, Italian unification may not have been achieved with these two men or perhaps at all. To pursue a common goal, this hypothesis suggests that outside pressure is necessary to force individuals to work together. Otherwise, they will be absorbed with their own theories and strategies, not willing to consider the impact they are having on the greater movement. Fear of the outside propelled Cavour and Garibaldi to unite so that they could utilize the amount of power that the other had gained.

If this model were true, it would imply that regardless of mutual distrust, actions by both men would become more predictable. As they realized their need to work together to ensure the achievement of self-government and unification, they would take care to make their actions expected and clear, so as not to confuse the other. This, then, would produce a stronger and more enduring alliance between Cavour and Garibaldi. Thus, to refute the claim made by H1, actions of both men would be obvious and well conveyed. Their use of communication, in letter or word, would confirm the future action they would take. They should demonstrate their desire to bargain or compromise before their power is lost. If this hypothesis is true, the men will become increasingly friendly toward contenders on the other side. They will go to great lengths to appease them as
they realize the unification process will not be over soon. The personal relationship between Garibaldi and Cavour would be able to overcome additional dynamics and factors that had not been considered.

To test both models within my case study, I will create a timeline that includes events surrounding Italian unification throughout the nineteenth century. From there, I will do a process trace analysis, wherein I will search for the causal narrative and inquire into what effect varying influences had on the two men. I will utilize game theory and mixed-motive games to analyze the relationship chronologically. For additional insight into their personal lives, I will read and analyze the memoirs of Cavour and Garibaldi as translated and interpreted by other historians.

I propose that game theory and rational choice can be employed as tools to dissect and understand decision-making methods. This particular case study is a model to aid further understanding of the effect of interpersonal relationships on the greater world of national politics. Therefore, this paper will undertake a political, theoretical analysis of the relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi during the Risorgimento with the use of various political theories including game theory, bargaining strategies, and rational choice theory. My focus concerns two men and my attempt to research how they both separately and collectively chose a certain course of action. While doing this, I am assuming that they have the rational capacity to make these kinds of decisions. Interpretive theory will also be essential to my thesis. In looking at individuals, I will have to take into account their beliefs, preferences, and the social structures they have
experienced. With my topic, this is especially crucial because of the dichotomy between the men concerning radical and moderate revolutionary theories.

I have chosen to focus on three case studies of historic encounters between the two men within a span of three short years. These three years include the main events surrounding and following the accomplishment of Italian self-rule and unification. Although the years prior to 1859 were important, they only serve my thesis to provide the background of the study. I would like to provide a short example of what my analysis will look like in the following three chapters.

For example, at various points throughout my analysis, I am provided with critical moments concerning the leadership of Cavour, his involvement with foreign governments, and the development of the Piedmont state. If H1 is accurate, Cavour will negotiate and bargain more with outside powers than with Garibaldi, Mazzini, or their allies. Unconcerned with the power of others, Cavour will rely upon outside power to add to his own. On the other hand, if H2 is correct, Cavour will shy away from bargaining with outside nation-states and revert back to domestic influences to remain a political figure. Cavour will approach his opponents in order to secure success for his aims as well as the greater goals of the future state.

Of the three analytical chapters, I would consider Chapter Four to be the most crucial, as I will center it on the Sicilian Revolution. This event marks the combined leadership of Cavour and Garibaldi in the midst of the Risorgimento. As mentioned earlier, many historians believe the Sicilian Revolution to be the central determinant of Italy as a state. As Garibaldi marches into Sicily with the love of the people and Cavour
questions whether to support Garibaldi or not, they are presented with a number of situations that act as essential reflections of their leadership. This event is complicated to summarize but if H1 is confirmed by examining the leadership of these two years, Cavour and Garibaldi will continually vie for power over one another. Although they are met with external powers that desire to end the unification process, they will not seek out the help of the other. Instead, they will turn to their respective support bases for increasing power and backing for their ideas. They may individually approach outside powers in order to secure a small amount of success for unification, in the form of territory, financial support or military support. If H1 is refuted by this case study, Cavour and Garibaldi will oppose the intervention of outside powers in Italy and fight against them. This does not necessarily translate into a battle that is fought together. Rather, they may discreetly support the decisions of one another and gradually begin to hold the same perspective regarding various events. Chapters Five and Six add to the historic relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi. Chapter Five centers upon Garibaldi’s growing opposition to Cavour’s policies and analyzes his strategic plan of attacking Rome. Chapter Six contemplates the possibility of communication between the two men after a number of bargaining situations. Additionally, it takes into consideration the thoughts and statements made by both men concerning the other to determine their true opinions. The last chapter before the conclusion, Chapter Seven, analyzes my findings as a whole and summarizes my opinions concerning the nature of their relationship and the various hypotheses at stake.
As stated earlier, the history between Cavour and Garibaldi did not begin in 1859. Beforehand, there was an additional series of events that caused them to become political enemies or competitors, which I was unable to include in my thesis. Although it is possible that they started equally in power, my opinion is that Cavour began with a better bargaining position than Garibaldi. By looking back at Fig. 1, this means that Cavour as Player 1 and Garibaldi as Player 2 would be situated in the (B, T) cell. By this time, Cavour was very friendly with a number of outside powers, including Napoleon II. He had won significant territories for Italy and retained a high position within the Piedmont government. Garibaldi had considerable influence as well but it was mostly held at the low and middle-class levels. Although he was well loved, the people were not capable of equipping him with international or even domestic power. The source of Garibaldi’s strength came from Victor Emmanuel II while Cavour was able to stand on his own in the political arena. Thus, in the first case study, H1 predicts that Cavour will act quickly to insure his power over all others, particularly when Garibaldi enters the political field. Garibaldi, unsure of his standing, may take more time to realize the game that is being played. If H2 correctly defines the situation, Cavour will be the first to approach Garibaldi with the possibility of negotiation or bargaining in order to add to one another’s power. Garibaldi may resist Cavour until he is sure of the danger that the external powers present.
Ch. 4 First Historical Episode

Frank J. Coppa, a noted historian of the Risorgimento, divides his analysis of the period into external and internal factors that began this “war” for an Italian state. In the early 1850s, the West was pitted against the East as Great Britain, France, and Austria were concerned about the fighting occurring between Turkey and Russia. Initially, seeing Great Britain and France united in this cause, Cavour approached their governments around the mid-1850s in order to sway them to support Italian independence from the Hapsburg monarchy. Surprisingly, Cavour found that Napoleon was more receptive than Great Britain’s administration. As a representative at the Congress of Paris in 1856, Cavour used his time to verbally scold Austria for its power-hungry politics in Italy and their negative military presence.¹ Internally, Garibaldi entered the political scene as a supporter of Cavour and his politics. In August 1856, according to historian George Martin, Cavour and Garibaldi met for the first time as a result of the rumors Cavour had heard of Garibaldi’s popularity among the people and his possible support for Victor Emmanuel II.² Garibaldi voiced support for the policy against Austria, noting that this was crucial to the ultimate goal of Italian unification. Ironically, what ended as a competitive political relationship began as a fairly amicable and beneficial relationship for both men.

What some historians, Coppa included, have recognized as the greatest catalyst to Italian independence and unification was the secret meeting held between Napoleon
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Bonaparte III and Cavour in July 1858, concerning a possible war with Austria.³ The basis of the meeting centered upon Napoleon’s affection for the Italian cause and agreement to go to war with the Piedmont state against the Austrians. Cavour quickly saw the advantage of using the Italian nationalist cause to promote his own during the late 1850s. The nationalist cause was seen as stable and generally approved of not only by the French but also gradually by the British. In this way, Cavour set up Austria for disaster as Italy was portrayed to Napoleon as the underdog simply wanting to assert its nationalist sentiments.⁴ In exchange for his support, Napoleon wanted Savoy and Nice, two pieces of land owned by the Italians, for his loyalty in addition to Cavour’s insurance that the war could bring Italy long-lasting stability.⁵ After the arrangement had been settled, Cavour contacted Garibaldi later in the year, asking him for his help with the Piedmont army. Garibaldi, eager to help the name of Victor Emmanuel II, did not bother to gain further information about Cavour’s international agreements. Instead, he fought with his soon-to-be famous group known as the Cacciatori delle Alpi, or the “Hunters of the Alps,” while Cavour attempted to keep many of Garibaldi’s successes private.⁶ Coppa notes that many people raised eyebrows at the time over the situation of Cavour reaching out to the unknown Garibaldi for military assistance. However, Cavour was so excited about the possibility of additional support to defeat the Austrians that he disregarded the

³ Peter Browning, Revolutions and Nationalities: Europe, 1825-90 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 42.
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negative publicity.\(^7\) The skirmish was shortened to only two months, which began in April 1859. Cavour’s secret treaty became public as Napoleon III entered into a peace settlement with Austria known as the Villafranca Treaty. Cavour was so enraged that he resigned from his position with the Piedmont government, met with Napoleon III at the Treaty of Turin, and dejectedly passed Savoy and Nice into French hands. Without French aid, Emmanuel refused to continue the fight.\(^8\) (By early 1860, Victor Emmanuel II would hire Cavour once again for the Piedmonts.)

The events of 1859 must also be considered, when rumors were flying concerning the ill will towards Garibaldi, or Garibaldi’s men, entering the ranks of the national army. Garibaldi had heard that one particular commander, General del la Marmora of the Piedmont army, had no intention of allowing Garibaldi’s men into his army, as he believed it would disrupt the routine of national soldiers.\(^9\) From there, the situation intensified when additional cabinet members of the government voiced their disapproval of the addition. Cavour, who was then acting as President of the Cabinet of Ministers, desired peace with Garibaldi as he publicly applauded the Garibaldini for their successes, voicing support for their new entry into the national army.

Although the above situation produced negative press for Cavour and the Villafranca Treaty was a seeming loss, he quickly gained the states of Tuscany and Emilia due to international pressure on Napoleon III, uniting much of northern and central Italy by 1861. Garibaldi, finally realizing the details of Cavour’s deal with

\(^7\) Coppa, *The Origins of the Italian Wars of Independence*, 85-86.

\(^8\) Ibid., 98.

Napoleon, was furious and vowed never to forgive Cavour for his treasonous actions, by and large because Nice was Garibaldi’s birthplace. Garibaldi approached Cavour concerning the betrayal, as he saw it, of Nice.\textsuperscript{10} Denis Mack Smith explains that according to his research, Cavour had only formed an alliance with Louis Napoleon in order to legitimize the revolution by using diplomacy, not force.\textsuperscript{11} (Unfortunately for Garibaldi, as it has been mentioned before, Cavour did not mind giving up territory in order to gain stability for the Piedmont state.) Cavour defended himself by explaining that it was the government, not he, who had supported this policy; the vote went to Chamber, not solely to him. In other words, Cavour laid the blame upon others, demonstrating that perhaps he did not want residual ill will over this event between himself and Garibaldi. Unfortunately, as many historians have noted, Garibaldi would never live this down.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
& Yes & No \\
\hline
Cavour (1) & & \\
\hline
Garibaldi (2) & Yes & S, B \\
& No & W, S \\
\hline
& T, W & B, T \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The above figure outlines one way in which the first interaction between Garibaldi and Cavour could be explained. As this is my initial construction of political game theory in

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., 356.
in this historical context, I would like to explain that this model does not suggest the only construction of the motivations of these two men. Other configurations could have similar merit to the one I have put forth. With every situation I propose in my thesis, I will do so for specific reasons, which I will explain. It is important to note, however, that this structure of game theory is founded upon a central assumption by the author. This supposition consists in the fact that game theory bases itself upon rational members, members who are “…motivated by a conscious calculation of advantages, a calculation that in turn is based on an explicit and internally consistent value system.”¹² In other words, academics and scholars draw upon history to determine the motivations and reasons behind the behavior of the actors, an exercise based upon rationality. Without adhering to this assumption, I would be unable to argue my thesis concerning the relationship between Garibaldi and Cavour.

Positioned as Player 1, Cavour’s best option is war with Austria, together with the help of Garibaldi. Due to the success Cavour had in his secret discussion with Napoleon, there is no reason why Cavour would dismiss war. Regardless of whether Garibaldi accepts his plea for help, support from France will remain. Military aid from Garibaldi, however, would not go unnoticed. Cavour was not well-versed in matters regarding battle strategy and so, Garibaldi’s help could be vital in obtaining support for Cavour’s cause. Garibaldi or Player 2, on the other hand, was generally uninterested in international affairs. As mentioned previously, he was convinced a revolution brought on by the people was the only way to achieve independence and unification. Yet Garibaldi must

have recognized that refusing Cavour’s opportunity to become involved could send Cavour an unfriendly message. This was not the right way to begin, if Garibaldi wanted to have power for the coming political as well as military struggles. His second best option is to agree to involvement in the war. His third and worst options could be argued differently but I believe Garibaldi would have leaned toward war without the aid of Cavour rather than the other way around. He was not content to sit on the side lines while Cavour was given free reign over the future of Italy, even if it was in the arena of international affairs.

Unbeknownst to Garibaldi, well before he was approached to aid the war against Austria, Cavour was already the official in charge. He had acted quickly, securing the aid of a powerful international state. From the beginning, Cavour uses a tactic that determines the outcome of this game: he makes the first move. Schelling discovered that the player to make the first move or commitment is usually the player who wins in a game of strategy. Consequently, the second player is forced to choose from two available options instead of four. In this case, when Cavour commits to war with Austria, Garibaldi has no option but to go to war with him. The only remaining alternative is to allow Cavour to act alone, which I previously explained was Garibaldi’s worst possible choice. Therefore, by breaking this situation up into smaller pieces and using game theory analysis, Cavour won their first encounter, largely because he recognized the advantage of acting first. This model of game theory then is accurate in that it is able to correctly predict the course of history. As Cavour makes a defining move, Garibaldi is

---

forced to choose between his second best option and his worst option. By the standards of game theory, Garibaldi will choose his second best outcome and he does.

Initially, my second hypothesis from Chapter Three marks the beginning of their relationship. The external pressures caused by the great European powers led Cavour to reach out to Garibaldi for military support. Because of his devotion to Victor Emmanuel II, Garibaldi immediately trusts Cavour and agrees to support his international endeavors, ignorant of his private dealings with Napoleon. When the Villafranca Treaty is made known, H1 no longer applies to Cavour and Garibaldi. As stated earlier in Chapter Three, the accuracy of H2 would be proven by the evidence that Cavour was negotiating and bargaining with outside powers while Garibaldi and the less powerful revolutionaries would be pushed aside. Essentially, this is what occurs between Cavour, Garibaldi, and Napoleon III during the lead up to the signing of the Villafranca Treaty. Within the first stage of Garibaldi and Cavour’s relationship, the first hypothesis can no longer aptly characterize the situation.

The year of 1860 proved significantly difficult for Cavour. Filled with uprisings and revolutions, instigated by Garibaldi, Cavour did all he could to keep domestic politics and international allies stable. Early in 1860, Garibaldi was determined to gain the territory of Nice back from France. He even went so far as to approach Victor Emmanuel II, stating, “Sire, if you wish, in six weeks you and I can make Italy. Rid yourself of this diplomat [Cavour] who ties your hands, and then we will go forward.”¹⁴ Yet during the spring of 1860, Garibaldi turned away from his homeland of Nice and constructed his

---

historic revolt, known as the Sicilian Rebellion, which was supported by a thousand men who were famously known as “The Red Shirts.” Many historians claim that without this invasion, Italian unification would never have occurred, particularly Lucy Riall and George Martin. Garibaldini were hoping to reach the mainland of Sicily and gain the support of Great Britain.

Idea of a rebellion in the South did not originate with Garibaldi. Revolution grew from the sustained dislike of the Neapolitan Bourbon rulers from all Sicilians, not one social or economic class. From this, an uprising occurred in Palermo, Sicily on April 4, 1860. It is true, however, that uneducated Sicilians were the chief contributors to the uprising primarily because they did not have the basic means of survival and thus, had little to lose by rebelling. Tides quickly turned after the uprising as middle and upper class families refused to continue in their action against the government. Rather, they were intent upon restoring the social order of the kingdom. Garibaldi aligned himself with those of the lower classes after the Palermo uprising and designed his plan out of this reaction against a corrupt Sicilian government. When Garibaldi landed in Palermo on May 11, 1860, he was welcomed by many of the Sicilians. Within two weeks and a successful military attack, he became the self-proclaimed ruler of Sicily. As a result, Garibaldi consolidated power and quickly proceeded to appoint governors, local committees, and private armies. This provisional government was looked upon positively by the majority of Sicilians.

---
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At this point in history, I find extremely differing historic opinions of the relationship between Garibaldi and Cavour. To begin the discussion, J.P. Taylor wrote, “Cavour did nothing to interfere with Garibaldi” at this time during the Risorgimento. Some historians, such as Riall, Martin, Smith, and Davis, advocate that Garibaldi’s schemes proved extremely dangerous to Cavour’s carefully crafted plans, as he did not want to provoke war with the great European powers with which he had negotiated to support the Piedmont state. Thus, D. Mack Smith asserted, “Cavour did all he dared to stop him [Garibaldi].” Of course, Garibaldi echoed this sentiment in his memoirs, citing Cavour’s “…insidious and miserable opposition over our expedition right to its very end”. Yet at the same time, he did not want to lose the friendship, or even the indifferent attitude, of Garibaldi and so, Cavour remained silent as to whether he defended Garibaldi’s southern move before it happened. Coppa, on the other hand, writes that Garibaldi approached Cavour to ask his opinion on the matter of invading the South. The Piedmont administration responded with its indifference while secretly agreeing to aid Garibaldi’s cause. Coppa does explain that neither the administration nor Cavour ever revealed their support to the public. (Napoleon, meanwhile, was furious that Cavour was not expressing his fervent anger over the matter.)

One must also consider the research of Peter Browning, who makes four excellent points concerning the relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi during the events

22 Martin, The Red Shirt and The Cross of Savoy, 538.
surrounding the attack on the South. First, Browning points out that Cavour never publicly assisted Garibaldi in any way. As historians, we have no proof that Cavour wanted to contribute to the cause in a conspicuous manner. Secondly, Browning believes that Cavour knowingly allowed Garibaldi to depart for the South because he had performed poorly in recent Piedmont elections and could not afford to lose any constituents. Moreover, Cavour was unsure of Garibaldi’s revolutionary plans; he was not expecting the overwhelming support and power of the Red Shirts to overthrow the monarchy. Finally, Victor Emmanuel II largely supported Garibaldi, particularly his attempts to unite the Italian people under one banner. Thus, Cavour could not oppose his boss and future king. The only act of public defiance by Cavour was his arrest of Garibaldi after the skirmish in the South.

It is hard to decide which side is correct or at the least, most accurate from the above arguments and opinions. As a politician, one must take into account that Cavour constantly changed his words and actions to fit the opinions of the person with whom he was meeting. For instance, he attempted to assure Napoleon that all was being done to stop Garibaldi in the South while at the same time, telling his Neapolitan ambassador that he wanted to aid a revolution there. Many of these details remain unclear. In order to go forward with a clear and concise thesis, I will propose more than one permutation of this particular phase of the relationship and finally, argue as to which figure I believe best matches the historical data I have found, using Schelling’s model of game theory as my method.

In both the above and below figures of Figures 3A and 3B, I have assumed that Garibaldi’s priorities remain the same, regardless of the public and private opinions of Cavour. Although Coppa writes that Garibaldi asked for Cavour’s opinion considering his military offensive, he is the only historian of this period from my research who has made this statement. The others have overwhelmingly argued that Garibaldi was unafraid of acting on his own, especially when one considers the unexpected number of men he had supporting him. Moreover, the first case study from this chapter ended with Garibaldi’s anger concerning Cavour’s indifferent sell-out to Napoleon of his homeland. As the attack on the South occurred less than a year after the emergence of the Villafranca Treaty, it is doubtful that Garibaldi’s anger had subsided. Considering these factors, Garibaldi’s best option was decided as attacking the South alone, without help from the Piedmont state. Physically, he has enough support, or so he believes, to carry out his mission and prefers not to have to cater to the desires and whims of Cavour and the powerful Piedmont administration. Yet he would rather have a rebellion than no rebellion, so taking assistance from Cavour becomes the second best outcome. His worst fear is to stand by as Cavour takes over the South, which is an unnecessary fear as
Cavour lacks the knowledge to do so. (This will make itself evident when Cavour does try to manage the South, about which he knows virtually nothing.) Finally, this leaves the bottom right-hand cell open to Garibaldi’s third best outcome.

As stated by historians Riall, Martin, Davis, and Smith, Figure 3A is focused on the assumption that Cavour was both publicly and privately opposed to Garibaldi’s move toward the South. Averse to any confrontation, Cavour takes the contrary view of Garibaldi; his best outcome occurs when neither he nor Garibaldi take any action. Although a thousand men seemed a large number to Garibaldi, Cavour thought it would amount to nothing in front of the Bourbon kingdom, the monarchy that was ruling the South at that time. Some in the Piedmont administration believed Cavour’s public indifference was emphasized in order to give Garibaldi a false sense of hope and thus, send him on a suicide mission. (One could argue, however, that always desiring to be the man in control, the second, third, and worst outcomes should be shuffled for Cavour.) If war was to occur, due to the power-seeking nature of Cavour, he would rather be in command than have to collaborate with Garibaldi, securing the third and worst outcomes to the bottom and top left-hand cells, respectively.

Fig. 3B Southern Revolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cavour (1)</th>
<th>Garibaldi (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes S, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No W, S</td>
<td>B, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T, W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As stated by historians Coppa and Browning, Cavour’s actions imply that he publicly opposed the Southern rebellion while privately supporting it. This seemingly small change in details drastically changes the game theory surrounding the situation. The top left-hand cell is marked as Cavour’s best outcome, as he not only wanted war but in some way, wanted to be involved in it as well, noted by the refusal of Cavour to stop Garibaldi’s forces (as desired by Napoleon). Furthermore, if Garibaldi had changed his mind about the South, Cavour would have possibly accepted the notion of attempting the mission alone. In the recent elections, according to Browning, Cavour had realized the overwhelming support Garibaldi had garnered with the people. Although it is plausible that Cavour could only profit from this power with Garibaldi in the public eye, I do not believe he would have wholly rejected any attempt to seize power in the South. If Garibaldi had firmly objected to Cavour’s involvement, I still do not believe Cavour would have stopped the rebellion, even though he most likely would have been able to, with his power of persuasion over Victor Emmanuel II. Instead, Cavour would have allowed Garibaldi to continue on while secretly convincing himself that if he had to take power in the South, it could always be accomplished in the future. The second best outcome for Cavour is marked as Cavour fighting in the South without Garibaldi’s involvement and the third best outcome is determined to be Garibaldi’s attack without the aid of Cavour. (To reiterate, Garibaldi’s outcomes are left in the same cell as they are seen in Figure 3A. I have assumed similar motivations and goals for both figures.)

In both historical models, Schelling’s model of a “variable-sum” game instead of a “constant-sum” game is evident, both for the men involved as well as the analysis of
this event. Schelling writes that opposing parties acting in tacit or explicit bargaining situations do not want to use force against one another, regardless of the differences in opinion that stand between them. Rather, they are intent upon using their own behavior and persuasion to force the other party’s hand.\textsuperscript{26} Although Cavour allegedly threatened to stop Garibaldi’s forces on their way to the South, this is a far cry from declaring outright force against him. In addition, Garibaldi’s forces were aimed against the Bourbon kingdom in Sicily, not at any of the Piedmont forces. Thus from the first analysis, this situation can be considered a bargaining one, regardless of the fact that Garibaldi and Cavour may have never met face-to-face in order to argue the consequences of their actions. They acknowledged the idea that the other would have an effect, positive or negative, on their own political maneuvering and in doing so, marked the importance of the other’s role.

As Garibaldi’s motivations and priorities were similar in both Figures 3A and 3B, an analysis of his actions according to Schelling’s tools of bargaining will be explained first. Garibaldi begins immediately by employing what Schelling deems the most important strategy of tactical bargaining: binding oneself.\textsuperscript{27} In 1860, without asking for the advice of others or allowing anyone else to know, Garibaldi constructed the terms of the Southern revolt. This meant that Cavour would be forced to work from this point onward, as Garibaldi had already devoted himself to going into the South and achieving what he could with his supporters. Garibaldi demonstrated unwavering commitment to this cause and Schelling explains that, in most cases, the first party to show this type of

\textsuperscript{26} Schelling, \textit{The Strategy of Conflict}, 5-8.  
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commitment will achieve their desired outcome. (In Figure 3A, this is true while in Figure 3B, Garibaldi achieved his second best outcome.) Running parallel to the idea of commitment is Schelling’s tool of pushing the status quo. In stating his desire to change the status quo in the South, Garibaldi forced Cavour to advertise a similar line of thought to those in power in Piedmont. In other words, Cavour could not advocate a continuance of the status quo in the South after Garibaldi had decided to move forward and had not met with opposition. In this way too, the situation can be seen as forcing Cavour’s hand to take action, albeit in private. Finally, Garibaldi was unafraid to use communication to his advantage in numerous ways. He began by making public statements about his intentions to go into the South with his many supporters. (In addition, Garibaldi’s “Red Shirts” could be considered to some extent the use of a third party in bargaining tactics, but I will not pursue this in detail.) Garibaldi was known throughout the principalities of future Italy as well as Europe and even the world as a revolutionary. His “principles and precedents,” as Schelling calls them, were set in a theory that called for the people to form their government and way of life. Thus, Garibaldi used decisions from his past to dictate his future as the liberator of the South. As a leader, he wanted to appear consistent and so, staying with his original idea to create a revolt in the South was a perfect way to see many goals fulfilled.

As Cavour’s motives and desires have been blurred throughout history, the analysis of his actions in light of game theory is difficult but extremely useful and essential to my thesis. Observing solely the actions of Cavour, and not Figures 3A and 3B
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nor the differences in opinion of noted historians, his experience and skills as a politician are evident as he displayed many key tools that Schelling sets forth in his bargaining thesis. The fact that, even today, analysts are poring over documents to ascertain the true goal of Cavour is a tribute to his ability to mislead others and use communication for his benefit. One of Cavour’s best tactics was his use of silence to keep both international and domestic allies happy. He did not defend Garibaldi’s move, satisfying those who did not approve of Garibaldi’s revolt but neither did Cavour publicly oppose Garibaldi, allowing Cavour a certain amount of slack with Garibaldi’s supporters. In effect, Cavour made himself unavailable for comment, a tactic outlined by Schelling that allows the actor to remain aloof to situation, as he cannot be “reached.” The use of a third party was not unknown to Cavour; in fact, he used it many times throughout the course of his career in Piedmont. He often cited international allies, Victor Emmanuel II, and others as those who decided his opinion for him. For example, in this situation, Browning explains that Cavour used his boss’ support of Garibaldi to remain blameless of the happenings in the South, as Emmanuel II was generally known as a supporter of Garibaldi. This tactic is similar to the last tool that I want to mention briefly, which is what Schelling defines as “intersecting negotiations.” Like the use of a third party, intersecting negotiations are those in which one demonstrates to the other party how one is bound by other bargains of which he is already a part. This tactic is self-explanatory, in that Cavour was a politician and thus, he would naturally have been involved in many different bargaining situations at one time. Unlike other politicians, however, he greatly used this to his

---
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advantage and strengthened his dedication to one party in order to obscure how much he could do in another concurrent situation, including the event surrounding Garibaldi and his “Red Shirts.”

Figures 3A and 3B provide adequate models of what may have been the priorities of Cavour and Garibaldi during the Southern Rebellion; is one more correct than the other? When taking into consideration the many historical opinions on this matter, Figure 3B seems to be most correct, or at the least, the most plausible. To argue for Figure 3A is to assume that Cavour was not averse to Garibaldi being destroyed in battle. This seems in direct opposition to both his wishes as well as to the terms of bargaining as outlined by Schelling. Cavour knew of Garibaldi’s immense support amongst the people; for this, he had suffered in recent elections. Additionally, his boss was greatly admired by Garibaldi and thus, as one of his officials in Piedmont, Cavour must have been aware of the possible influence he could wield over Victor Emmanuel II, and consequently, Garibaldi. Furthermore, as Schelling states, to be engaged in bargaining means to come in conflict with one another in terms of opinion. This does not extend to wishing the other party the loss of life; this would be equivalent to war and not bargaining. From these simple observations, a strong argument is created in favor of the latter game theory model.

Additionally, a vital piece of my analysis is to determine whether the model of game theory helps or hinders the interpretation of this historical event. In Figure 3B, it was determined that Garibaldi made the first move; in doing so, he forced Cavour to choose between the two top cells. After little analysis, it is clear that the game theory model successfully predicted the outcome of this situation as Cavour was only deciding
between his best and his third best options. Cavour made a simple judgment and advocated going with a Sicilian Rebellion. As with Figure 2, this model continues to serve its purpose by predicting the complex decisions made during bargaining situations.

The Sicilian Rebellion’s model, decided as Figure 3B, fits closest with my second hypothesis or H2. H2 states that Garibaldi and Cavour will be forced to work in concert as outside powers will pressure them to turn toward the domestic front. As conjectured earlier in Chapter Three, both men fought against the intervening powers of others. Neither man turned to outside allies for aid or assistance, even though the possibility existed, most notably for Cavour. Instead, Cavour sought to quell the worries of his international allies while keeping communication with them to a minimum. This was displayed as Cavour sought to dispel rumors that Napoleon had heard about Garibaldi’s troops heading southward while refusing to send any of the Piedmont troops there in case such a need arose. In other words, he misled his international supporters to make them believe that he and the Piedmont administration were concerned about Garibaldi’s move while secretly supporting it, thus providing evidence that Cavour began to aid the domestic side of politics in the region. With the benefit of observing these events in the past, Cavour truly held a win-win situation in his hand. As a private supporter of the rebellion, Cavour could hide his support in the case that Garibaldi was unsuccessful. Yet if Garibaldi did manage to overthrow power in the South, as he would, Cavour would be able to use his support of Garibaldi to future advantage and eventually incorporate the South into his own plans for independence from foreign powers and perhaps, unification of an Italian state as arranged and organized by the Piedmont government.
Ch. 5 Second Historical Episode

Once Garibaldi’s success in Sicily became clear, Cavour moved in quickly to harness a certain amount of power for himself, as predicted at the end of the previous chapter. Cavour demanded complete annexation of Sicily to the Piedmont state, demonstrating his belief in annexation of Italy region by region.¹ This was not the only reason for occupation. D. Mack Smith believes that Cavour advocated this measure in order to steal Garibaldi’s momentum, preventing him from similar rebellions in Rome or Naples. What is paradoxical about this situation is that at heart, Garibaldi did believe that Sicily should one day become a part of the Piedmont state.² Unlike Cavour, he did not require power for himself but he did insist upon a plan that aimed at ultimate unification. When Sicilians (and others) heard this from a political figure like Garibaldi, they were astounded. One man remarked, “There is a sort of intimate communion of mind between Garibaldi and the masses which is perfectly electrifying.”³ Although Sicily was eventually unified with the kingdom of Savoy, Garibaldi unconsciously gained personal power as well as drive for his plan of national revolution.

Despite Cavour’s rise in power and recognition as a result of southern control, Garibaldi could still capitalize on Cavour’s many shortcomings.⁴ Although Cavour possessed ground-breaking skills as a diplomat and ambassador, his love for the Piedmont state created many problems for young “Italians” throughout the 1860s and into
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the 1870s. His obsession with the Piedmont region was clear to all, even Europeans outside of Italy. Many grew prejudiced and distrustful of any of Cavour’s actions that disguised itself as something that would benefit all Italian regions. In addition, he refused to recognize that several different cultures and traditions existed in soon-to-be Italy and thus, continually decided against granting regional autonomy. Moreover, Cavour did not trust those who did not share his socio-economic background; only the intellectuals of the elite and nobility were granted rights and freedoms that were not passed down to middle-class revolutionaries or peasants. On the other hand, Garibaldi had an impressive reputation as temporary ruler of Sicily. Smith expounds the efficiency of Garibaldi’s government, noting how Sicilians trusted and even worshiped him. His character was marked by an “…earnestness of purpose, a disinterested love of his country, a zeal for social reform, and a simplicity of character and absence of ostentation or personal ambition.”5 All of these factors contributed to the success of Garibaldi and his eventual status as hero and forefather of the Italian nation-state.

In the end, Cavour won the battle in the South but Garibaldi ultimately won the war. Garibaldi’s military success against the monarchy had lifted the spirits of the Sicilians in a way that turned their loyalty completely away from Cavour and the Piedmont administration. (Interestingly enough at this time, Garibaldi wholeheartedly believed in Cavour’s involvement in the entire process. He stated that liberal-conservatives, as Cavour and his allies were categorized, were “necessary for success.”6) Only when Cavour became aware of the Sicilians’ devotion to Garibaldi did he make a
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point of announcing his government’s condemnation in the *Official Gazette of Turin*, where he stated, “The Government disapproved of General Garibaldi’s expedition, and has sought to prevent it by all the means which prudence and the law permitted.” In the same year of 1860, Cavour’s frustration overflowed; he decided to impose monarchical authority, rooted in Victor Emanuel II, on the South. Here was where Garibaldi and Cavour’s different visions of an Italian future became evident: Cavour wanted regional independence from outside powers while Garibaldi wanted complete unification. Seeing as Cavour understood little about southern culture added to recent sentiments of loyalty only to Garibaldi, Cavour failed. Law and order could not be established as Cavour had envisioned. Garibaldi’s victory in the South gave him the motivation to move on in order to conquer Rome. Cavour wanted to halt any movement toward central Italy, particularly because the international consequences could prove fatal to Cavour’s international diplomacy. Unfortunately for him, he could not afford to oppose Garibaldi for fear of the public. Tensions had not quieted in the South either. Cavour continued to worry about an impending civil war between the South and Piedmont, ultimately instigated by Garibaldi.

---

Fig. 4 Military Action on Rome
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With this figure, it must be noted that the “No” column does not simply outline a course of inaction. Specifically for Cavour, the option to vote “No” to military action on Rome leaves open the possibility of opposing Garibaldi’s forces.

As Garibaldi instigated this conflict with his initial commitment to military action in Rome, his priorities naturally determined Cavour’s reactions and how he would understand the conflict from his perspective. With all of Cavour’s downfalls, as outlined above, Garibaldi had an opportunity to seize the momentum of the day and continue with his original plan of unifying all of Italy. Unlike Figures 3A and 3B, dealing with the Sicilian Rebellion, Garibaldi had by this point observed Cavour’s tactics in action. After Garibaldi had succeeded in gaining power, Cavour had been unafraid to work through Victor Emmanuel to take control for himself. Thus, Garibaldi was determined to work alone this time. His best choice is marked in the top right-hand cell, in which he is able to orchestrate all of the military action on Rome. The next three priorities are difficult to assess and some historians would argue against the order I will propose. However, I believe Garibaldi’s second best option would be allowing Cavour’s troops to act, either in concert with his own or even opposing his own troops. At first, this may seem in direct contrast to how the situation has been explained historically. After being controlled and manipulated by Cavour, Garibaldi wanted to return to his original plan of unification. Yet he needed to capitalize on the support recently received in Italy and in the international realm. At that point, he would rather take military action than no military action, even if that involved Cavour. This matches Schelling’s point on the idea of progress, on which he states that both parties involved in a bargaining conflict would rather reach an end
than make no progress at all.\textsuperscript{9} Yet this idea does not fully extend to action rather than inaction. In the two bottom cells of Figure 4, Garibaldi’s worst outcome would be military action in Rome without his involvement. This would allow Cavour to immediately seize all of the power in Rome, which would most likely instigate little change in Rome’s power structure. As Cavour was aligned largely with the interests of Napoleon, he was thus bound to keep the Pope in power. This outcome would have meant a great setback for Garibaldi and his hopes for Rome.

From Cavour’s perspective, this situation is even more complex than as viewed by Garibaldi, particularly because Cavour is allowed the option of opposing Garibaldi’s plan in Rome. At this point, Cavour’s sole priority in Rome is to consolidate power so as to retain his French ally and not create trouble for the Pope. His best outcome is marked in the bottom left-hand cell, in which he is able to take military action alone. Furthermore, unlike Garibaldi, Cavour is content with the current situation. He may not wield as much power as desired but there is no obvious conflict of interests from his point of view. Cavour’s second best option is to keep everything as it is, without increased military action from him or from Garibaldi. His worst outcome is to allow Garibaldi to go into Rome on his own. With the recent rise in popularity, Cavour is afraid that Garibaldi will easily capitalize on the momentum and grab hold of this powerful city. If this occurred, Cavour would have to work diligently in order to re-gain that territory for his own plans of Italian independence. This determines the last two options as the third best outcome in the top left-hand cell and the worst outcome in the top right-hand cell.

In this case, the game theory model correctly predicts the outcome. Since Garibaldi commits by announcing his plans on Rome, Cavour has little choice. Cavour must settle for the third best outcome rather than the worst outcome, which signified military action on Rome from both himself as well as Garibaldi. Unable to break with his French allies, Cavour ultimately decides to fight against Garibaldi. Surprisingly, Cavour would not regret this decision. Contrary to Schelling’s theory, Cavour’s maneuver is successful as he uses the power of the third party to lead Garibaldi to bow to his will. Schelling notes that the majority of the time, the party that is able to make the primary commitment during the bargaining game is the one that will achieve its desired outcome.\(^\text{10}\) Yet this is another example of the fact that game theory models, while seemingly simple, are exceedingly complex and do not often match preconceived notions of what should and should not occur. Garibaldi utilized a fair share of Schelling’s bargaining tools as well. He began by making a strong public statement about his position, forcing the opposing party to react to his designs instead of providing them with the freedom to choose the first course of action. Also, Garibaldi created a forceful public opinion, mostly garnered from his advances in the South, to support his ongoing work in Rome. The people’s opinion may be one of the most formidable tools as they can play a large role in either the rise or fall of a political leader. At this moment, one can see how publicity played a central and definitive function for both men on every occasion when they came into conflict.

\(^{10}\) Ibid., 26.
Of my two original hypotheses, the situation surrounding the first military action on Rome is decidedly supportive of H1. Cavour’s decision to work in opposition to Garibaldi was largely dependent on his alliance with France. Little else was taken into consideration. He did not attempt to depend upon his domestic allies or reverse the broad public sentiment. Garibaldi’s actions are more difficult to categorize as he generally did not communicate with international supporters, though there were quite a few. Yet the case can still be made that his behavior, when analyzed, aligns itself with H1 as well. Garibaldi was concerned, as was Cavour, with increasing his amount of power. Because his actions were often justified as benefiting the goal of the future state, this is difficult to observe. If, however, Garibaldi had been truly dedicated at this point to serving the interests of the greater Italy, he would have heeded Cavour’s advice as Cavour’s power had greater potential for the organization and formation of a state, particularly one based upon international approval. Yet Garibaldi turned a blind eye to these considerations and acted according to his own personal plan, one that did not leave any room for the opinions of others, especially those who did not support his political theories. Thus, this situation is largely characterized by a sense of competition, not cooperation. Military action on Rome caused the chasm between the two men to grow larger.

Although torn between feigned ignorance and military action, Cavour quickly moved to invade the Papal States with the military forces of the Piedmont Army against Garibaldi’s Red Shirts. As mentioned earlier, he felt Garibaldi’s plan was unwise as it went against his theory of republicanism; if Garibaldi successfully took Rome, it would undermine the power of Victor Emmanuel II, despite the fact that Emmanuel had secretly
approved Garibaldi’s march on Rome. People would look to Garibaldi as the true leader of the new Italian state.\textsuperscript{11} Unfortunately for Garibaldi, his troops only made it as far north as Naples. Cavour had succeeded in convincing Emmanuel to plan an invasion reaching all the way down to Naples, with Emmanuel as the head of the military forces, in order to put a stop to Garibaldi’s forces.\textsuperscript{12} Again, this forced Cavour into another secret agreement with Napoleon in which Cavour assured Napoleon that the Piedmont state was in no way interested in occupying Rome and this action would not come in the way of French troops continuing their hold on the Vatican. Although this could have proved disastrous to Cavour’s campaign, it miraculously worked to his advantage. With the allegiance of Garibaldi to Victor Emmanuel, Garibaldi could not consider fighting against the Piedmont troops, although he continued to urge Emmanuel to fire Cavour.\textsuperscript{13} (Being fed up with Garibaldi’s continuous attempts to fire Cavour, Victor Emmanuel replied through a messenger that Garibaldi should annex his territory in the South or get out of the Italian power struggle altogether.\textsuperscript{14}) He quickly handed over conquered territories for the use of Victor Emmanuel, translating into an additional victory for Cavour on October 25, 1860.

A month later, the king was scheduled to travel to Caserta, a small town north of Naples, to review Garibaldi’s forces that had helped him bring together a state.

Unfortunately, the king never showed and Garibaldi, instead of blaming the man who was absent, blamed his rival, Cavour. In reality, Cavour had known that the king, becoming increasingly aware of his position as royalty, would not show and had tried to

\textsuperscript{13} Martin, \textit{The Red Shirt and The Cross of Savoy}, 597.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 605.
convince many members of the government that Garibaldi’s men deserved some form of praise.\textsuperscript{15} Garibaldi felt insulted another time as the king, not Cavour, decided to break up the volunteers of the Red Shirts and disperse them throughout the regular army. According to him, this would be the only way to keep an army unified and not incite jealousy by splitting the army into different divisions.\textsuperscript{16} By 1861, only the cities of Venice and Rome were missing from the united state of Italy. After failing to gain Venice, Garibaldi tried again to assess the situation in Rome. Garibaldi assembled another volunteer force in the South that moved in on Rome. They were quickly stopped by an Italian force, ordered by Rattazzi, who by that time had taken Cavour’s political position.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 624.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 642.
Ch. 6 Third Historical Episode

On April 18, 1861, Garibaldi was asked to attend a meeting of the Parliament in Piedmont and was given a chance to speak out about his grievances involving the Savoy administration.\(^1\) Garibaldi used this event to its fullest potential. He slyly accused Cavour and his boss of inciting a civil war at the expense of his volunteer army. Cavour, who was in attendance, was so infuriated with this outcry that he shouted back at Garibaldi and a near riot ensued. Consequentially, the meeting had to be adjourned and restarted. A man named Bixio, a long-time ally of Garibaldi and one of his former soldiers, voiced his dream to see the two “enemies” shake hands at this meeting and recognize the contributions of both to the state of Italy. It was obvious that Cavour wanted this as well, as he visibly made himself ready to greet Garibaldi face-to-face. Garibaldi, on the other hand, made no move to shake Cavour’s hand, though his memoirs insist otherwise.\(^2\)

The main arguments in this session concerned the eventual invasions of Venice and Rome. Both men had opinions on differing sides of the spectrum as to how this should occur. Neither was willing to concede. In addition, this brought up Garibaldi’s opinion about his special army and how it should be reinstated particularly for these missions. In the end, Garibaldi was unsuccessful and the members of the Parliament voted in favor of Cavour. Historians note that this vote was not completely unbiased as it largely represented the interests of the monarchists and not the republicans. Whether out of annoyance or a sense of defeat, Garibaldi left the two-day long debate and did not

---


return. Despite his poor showing, Garibaldi’s public opinion polls did not necessarily decrease. The majority of his supporters could not read and thus, were not concerned with what happened in some Parliament in the North. In addition, Cavour had always appeared as the diplomat who was unconcerned about the fate of Italy and only used these events to stay in power, which may not be wholly false. At the end of April, the king arranged a meeting of peace between Garibaldi and Cavour. Neither attempted to shake hands but it seems both left with as little hatred in them as possible.³ Both advocated a future in which they continued to communicate but veered away from any other form of relationship.⁴

Fig. 5 Future Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cavour (1)</th>
<th>Garibaldi (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes T, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No W, B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Ibid., 646-650.
⁴ Scirocco, Garibaldi, 317.
tactics used by Cavour or worse, they believed his methods worked in opposition to the creation of an Italian state. What would only further this ill-will toward Cavour would be a conciliatory gesture rejected by the Piedmont politician. This determines Garibaldi’s best outcome as saying yes to some form of communication with Cavour while Cavour would say no. Otherwise, a gesture of a possible alliance was not a priority for Garibaldi. As he had already established a relationship with Victor Emmanuel, he felt no need to place an equal or greater amount of energy into a relationship with Cavour. To Garibaldi, Cavour was simply an associate and subordinate to the king. This explains why his second outcome is one in which neither men form a concord. However, Garibaldi would not want to be seen as opposing a relationship while Cavour held his arms open for change. Although there is no reason to believe this would have caused a major difference in Garibaldi’s popular status, Garibaldi attempted, on many occasions, to appear moderate for the sake of legitimacy. Therefore, Garibaldi’s third outcome is when both agree to a relationship while the worst outcome is when only Garibaldi refuses ongoing contact.

Unlike his acclaimed “enemy,” Cavour could not boast of a similar popularity among the people. Based largely upon this factor, Cavour’s cells in the game theory model are ordered differently. Immediately, Cavour would have recognized the possibility for him to capitalize on a public sign of reconciliation with Garibaldi. Throughout my thesis, I have cited the immense disregard Cavour had for those who knew little of politics or state-building, namely, ordinary citizens. Thus, he had easily generated a general disregard amongst the masses. Although late in the Risorgimento, this
small gesture could reap large benefits for Cavour’s popularity. His best option was to signal to Garibaldi his desire to remain in touch regarding their differing political plans. Cavour’s second cell marks a large break with Garibaldi’s thinking. Rather than desiring no communication if he could not appear as the reconciler, I believe Cavour’s second best outcome would be to have both men agree to honest and open communication. For Cavour, standing alongside Garibaldi would reflect positively on his own character and would cause many to reconsider their preconceived notions of him. Moreover, Cavour was a brilliant politician and was well-aware of the fact that he could always change his mind afterwards. He was intent, however, upon using certain forms of publicity to work to his advantage. Thirdly, Cavour would opt for no communication between the two of them, as a situation in which Garibaldi agreed and he did not would be decidedly worse.

Although I hinted briefly at Cavour’s bargaining tactics in this situation, I would like to reiterate them more strongly, for both men used them to a certain extent. Dissimilar to the other conflict situations in this thesis, neither party chose to bind themselves to a particular outcome, largely because of the nature of their meeting. It is possible that both men knew in advance of the meeting of peace desired by the king but they were not notified as to what exactly would be expected of them. Thus, they had little time to plan and to examine what strategies they should use in the cases of X, Y, or Z. Before their audience with the king (that is, during their meeting with Parliament), both

---

Unfortunately, this is another facet of political game theory that I am unable to examine: the factor of time in all bargaining situations. In creating elaborate bargaining schemes for opposing parties, academics assume that not only are these actors rational, but also they will consider in detail the outcomes before making important decisions. This is rarely the case and is exhibited continually in our daily lives.
made clear to the public how they felt about the other. Garibaldi, while verbally abusing the Piedmont administration, clearly signaled his dislike of Cavour and his indifference toward any respectful relationship. Cavour, on the other hand, was upset with Garibaldi but still managed to demonstrate a desire for peace in the face of harsh criticism. Garibaldi succeeded by making himself unavailable for further negotiation with Cavour, as he left the debate and decided not to return to the meetings of Parliament. Cavour could neither fight further with Garibaldi nor make a sudden compromise. In the end, publicity was the sole determining factor of this situation. Both men knew that the media and personal communication had the potential of reaping incredible harm or bolstering popularity. This meeting of peace arranged by the king was not intended to remain secret although there is no evidence that Victor Emmanuel wanted it to be immediately conveyed to the public. Finally, one could also argue that Cavour was able to remain true to his original principles, as displayed at the parliamentary meeting. Schelling states that once one party is able to use a similar decision from the past, they can argue that they must remain consistent with that original decision. In the end, then, Garibaldi had to make a considerable break with his past decision on April 18, which can be attributed largely to his allegiance to the king.

History reveals that Garibaldi and Cavour ultimately ended this conflict, and the Risorgimento as a whole, with a confirmation of peace. In this study, I also want to ask if

---

7 Ibid., 31.
8 Ibid., 34.
9 I state that this ended the *Risorgimento*, insofar as their relationship applied, because a few short months after they met with the king for this meeting, Cavour died unexpectedly. This will be explained in greater detail in the following chapter.
this is what game theory would predict. After careful reflection, I would not corroborate game theory’s ability of correctly determining which outcome would be fulfilled. To begin, neither the top right-hand nor the bottom left-hand cells would be considered because the two men’s interests are extremely opposed in these cells. The real dilemma is determining which cell, either the top left-hand or the bottom right-hand, are the most plausible. As they are equal, the only determining factor must be the players involved. If this is the case, the only way the final outcome could be determined, without the use of commitments, promises, or threats, is to take into account the history behind the individual parties. This is not a legitimate option for those analyzing game theory models. One is only allowed to assess the information as provided within the four cells. Therefore, in this case, game theory can narrow down the four cells down to two but is unable to take any further step.

Although the game theory model does not capably predict a sound outcome, it does clarify the role of either H1 or H2 in this final scene between Garibaldi and Cavour. The interaction between the two men was almost entirely domestic. By 1861, the majority of territory had come under the power of Victor Emmanuel. Garibaldi and Cavour still had an ample amount of causes to disagree about but their main battles had largely been fought. International alliances were continuing their vitality for the Piedmont administration but at this meeting of potential peace, fewer outside pressures came to bear on the two men. This may have been the only opportunity in which Cavour and Garibaldi were given the freedom to make a decision solely based upon their reputation, although this still had international implications. Yet the heart of the decision was
domestic and thus, inarguably determines the relevancy of H2. Both men reverted back to a form of politics to influence the domestic agenda and decided to meet their own personal goals as well as aims that would benefit the kingdom and the state. They may have been tempted, particularly Garibaldi, to follow H1 and strive to create a greater chasm but in the end, the benefits were greater when they agreed to work in pursuit of a common goal, at least nominally.

Interestingly enough, despite the countless attacks on him from Garibaldi, Cavour rarely harbored ill will toward Garibaldi’s personal character. (He did not hesitate to act in hostility to many of Garibaldi’s military plans.) On the contrary, he admired Garibaldi for his honesty and popularity with the people to such an extent that he wrote about these admirations in letters. (I must mention that it is suspected that he wrote these words in the hope that someone would show them to Garibaldi in order to improve relations.)

Nevertheless, in August of 1860, Cavour went so far as to state,

“… I tell you without emphasis that I would rather see my popularity disappear, my reputation lost, and yet see Italy made. To make Italy at this juncture, we must not set in opposition Vittorio Emanuele and Garibaldi.”

In this quote, one can easily say that Cavour may not have written this from his heart but was most likely writing for a particular audience or group of people. “Making Italy” was never Cavour’s top priority; Cavour wanted to ensure the Piedmont state its sovereignty from foreign powers. It is very difficult to argue any end further than that. However,
Garibaldi has great moral influence; he enjoys an immense prestige not only in Italy but above all in Europe... If tomorrow I started a struggle with Garibaldi, it is possible that I should have the majority of the old diplomats for me, but European public opinion would be against me. And public opinion would be right, because Garibaldi has rendered to Italy the greatest services that man could render to her: He has given the Italians confidence in themselves; he has proved to Europe that Italians know how to fight and die on the field of battle to re-conquer their own country... So long as he is loyal to his flag we must march in step with him.”

In my opinion, from observing Cavour’s other letters from the Risorgimento, Cavour is not speaking solely for a certain audience in this passage. The benefits of extolling both Emmanuel and Garibaldi in the previous section are apparent but here in the previous section, Cavour admits the qualities of Garibaldi’s leadership that he was unable to match. This letter does, however, arrive at the end of the major campaign for Italian unification. Thus, it does not reflect Cavour’s sentiments towards Garibaldi for the entire Risorgimento but simply his last thoughts concerning his political enemy.11 This brings to mind Eatwell’s article, “The Concept and Theory of Charismatic Leadership,” that has contributed to my thinking of Garibaldi throughout my research process, but makes itself distinctly known here. In this part of the letter, Cavour alludes to three of the four qualities that Eatwell outlined as central to the character of one with charismatic leadership.

To begin, Cavour marks Garibaldi’s ownership of a new vision for the country, a trait Eatwell referred to as “missionary vision.”\textsuperscript{12} Garibaldi wanted to act as the creator of an innovative era for the entire Italian people. In stating that the majority of European public opinion would be against him, Cavour is defining Garibaldi’s role as one who stood in stark contrast with the diplomacy and strategies of the past. Secondly, Garibaldi utilized the theory of “symbiotic hierarchy,” a term used by Eatwell to explain the way in which leaders wanted to be accepted by the common people and to do so, expressed their thoughts and ideas in collective terms, which included those who had previously felt excluded by political leaders. Scirocco, author of \textit{Garibaldi: Citizen of the World}, explains, “Garibaldi established a dialogue with the crowds, inspired them with rhetorical questions, and provoked fervent patriotic replies.”\textsuperscript{13} Cavour fully knew that Garibaldi had accomplished this, as he mentions the confidence he brought to the people and the way they were convicted to die for a nation-state of their own. Eatwell describes this characteristic as one that does not necessarily need to be honest or genuine, but only expressed to the people. Here, I would like to point out that, although it may be the case that dishonest symbiotic hierarchy is possible, Garibaldi did not utilize these means. Unlike other political leaders, Garibaldi honestly felt as if he was one of the ordinary men, one of the common people. From my limited study of him, it seems he did not have to humble himself for those who supported him, but that it was simply part of his nature. The last of the three qualities recognized by Cavour in this short passage would be


\textsuperscript{13} Scirocco, \textit{Garibaldi}, 323.
Garibaldi’s personal presence, which is greatly linked with the previous personality trait. I would particularly like to point out Cavour’s statement that Garibaldi has “great moral influence,” which is the most demonstrative in outlining Garibaldi’s magnetic leadership. Italians wanted to follow Garibaldi’s proposed moral and national system because they were drawn to his character and his care for the common people.

In addition to these three of four qualities Eatwell explains in his article, Eatwell also touches upon the important point of why exactly these traits within an individual have such a lasting influence. As before, there are four approaches, which can be mixed in order to effectively understand an atmosphere in which individual leadership can thrive. First, Eatwell discusses structural crisis, a situation that undoubtedly held significance for the Risorgimento. It is specifically socio-economic, which was the case with those in Sicily and could also be argued strongly for Italians across the South. Secondly, Garibaldi was able to demonstrate “cultural legitimation,” the way in which Garibaldi made his leadership seem, either truthfully or untruthfully, radically different from those of the past.14 He did want to be seen as the traditional authority, much like Cavour and his Piedmont administration were being viewed in certain regions. The third approach, political facilitation, does not aptly apply here and so, there is only one remaining approach to explain: psychological personality. Eatwell remarks that three characteristics of the public – fear, anxiety, and existential dread – cause an environment in which people lean toward and support a certain leader or type of leadership. Eatwell puts forth fascism, in both Italy and Germany during World War II, as an example of

---

14 Eatwell, “Charismatic Leadership,” 149.
Although Garibaldi may have used these sentiments to his benefit, I would like to stress that they were in no way used in the same fashion as those who supported the fascist doctrine. Garibaldi embodied everything that was the exact opposite of fascism and I would not want to mislead with this example. The majority of Garibaldi’s supporters were experiencing fear and anxiety about their future on a subsistence level. They questioned whether they would have enough food, water, and shelter for their families. It could be argued that a small amount of dread played a role as well, as they expected disappearance of certain traditions and rituals at the mercy of foreign governments. In turn, Garibaldi was seen as special and accountable to this situation, mainly because of his character and statements in which he alluded to his perceived duty to free the people.

Garibaldi was not as welcoming to Cavour and on the whole, failed to recognize the achievements that he had wrought for Italy. Harry Heander writes, “…he never forgave Cavour for failing adequately to reward his red-shirts.” Despite the political maneuvering and risks Cavour had taken for Garibaldi, Garibaldi either refused to honor them or was ignorant of Cavour’s dealings in the first place. The relationship, as touched upon earlier, did not begin this way. When Garibaldi first met Cavour, he was willing to align with many of the plans as set forth by the Piedmont administration. Yet over the course of five years, Garibaldi would slowly grow frustrated with Cavour and his seeming lack of care for the Italian people. On a number of occasions, Garibaldi attempted to tempt Victor Emmanuel with power from the South in exchange for

---

15 Ibid., 151.
Cavour’s banishment from the administration.\textsuperscript{17} During the fall of 1860, Garibaldi wrote, “Till now I have been silent about the shameless opposition I have suffered from Cavour… I must implore your Majesty, for the good of the holy cause I serve, to dismiss those individuals.”\textsuperscript{18} He felt betrayed by the cession of Nice, Cavour’s creation of obstacles for Southern power, his opposition to campaigns on Rome, his supposed support of civil war, and the disbanding of his volunteer army. When asked to speak in front of Parliament in the spring of 1861, Garibaldi was able to uphold the honor of his military army while insulting Cavour at the same time. He stated, “Above all I should tell of its [the military’s] glorious deeds. The marvels it accomplished were dimmed only when the cold and hostile hand of this Ministry began to impose its evil effects.”\textsuperscript{19} This last statement was an obvious reference to the policies of Cavour and created a chasm between them that could no longer be healed, as I mentioned earlier in this chapter. Within the same meeting of Parliament, Cavour expressed this to the deputies, explaining, “I know that between the Honorable General Garibaldi and myself exists a fact that creates an abyss between the two of us.”\textsuperscript{20} His words were prophetic. Despite their reconciliation in front of Victor Emmanuel, Garibaldi vehemently opposed the majority of Cavour’s policies during 1860, up until the date of Cavour’s death.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{17} Scirocco, \textit{Garibaldi}, 298-299.
\textsuperscript{19} Martin, \textit{The Red Shirt and The Cross of Savoy}, 646.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 648.
\textsuperscript{21} Smith, \textit{Cavour and Garibaldi, 1860}, 442.
Ch. 7 Accomplishment of Unification

After examining multiple books, articles, and other pieces of research on Garibaldi and Cavour, it is impossible to attribute Italian unification simply to the cause of their work. Many other factors led to the Italian state including increasing support of the concept of Italian nationalism, the growing power of the Piedmont state and Victor Emmanuel, the decreasing strong holds of the Austrian empire, and encouragement from great European powers, such as Napoleon III.\(^1\) A plebiscite was established shortly after physical unification of the state, in which the reality of Cavour’s goals became evident. The Piedmont system and Constitution became the system and Constitution of all of Italy. Only 2% of the population could vote, severely limiting its definition as democratic or representative. Shortly after seeing many of his political goals realized, Camillo Benso di Cavour died on June 6, 1861. The prime minister position was given to Bettino Ricasoli, a supporter of Tuscan revolution.\(^2\) Despite a slew of replacements, none were recognized to be as brilliant.

After Cavour’s death, Mazzini tried once again to become involved in the final stages of unification. He did not hesitate to note that Venice, occupied by Austria, and Rome, occupied by the Pope and the French, were still missing from the envisioned Italian state. After collaboration with Garibaldi, who continued to hold international prestige, Mazzini began to prepare to take over Rome while Garibaldi amassed his armies

for Austria. At this time, Garibaldi was also offered a military position in the American Civil War, but turned it down because of President Abraham Lincoln’s refusal to make a formal declaration against slavery. During 1862, Garibaldi was involved in a number of democratic associations and societies in Italy in order to continue creating possible policies to be accepted by Victor Emmanuel. Believing Rome was the more viable option of the two remaining cities, Garibaldi changed his mind and headed to central Italy. Victor Emmanuel, now the King of Italy, heard rumors of Garibaldi’s plans and was not willing to cause trouble with the French. In August 1862, he did all he could to politically distance himself from the controversial ideas of Garibaldi.

Yet Garibaldi refused to believe Emmanuel’s lack of support. He also failed to realize the weakness of his volunteers, the lack of strategic military planners, and the decline of public opinion. Without any alternative, Victor Emmanuel sent his Italian troops to Rome to attack Garibaldi’s also allegedly “Italian” troops. Hearing of impending danger, Mazzini returned to self-exile in London as Garibaldi was shot and arrested by Victor Emmanuel. In 1864, the King finally appeased Garibaldi with his two-year agreement to empty Rome of the French in collaboration with Napoleon.

Two years later, the French had left Rome but had not fulfilled Garibaldi’s dream; Rome remained in the hands of the Papacy. In addition, Italy had made the poor decision of going to war with the Prussians against Austria in an attempt to gain Venice. Garibaldi

---

3 Ibid, 317.
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5 Ibid., 321.
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was asked to lead the military force of 15,000, which eventually doubled.\textsuperscript{7} Italy received its due compensation but inflicted heavy costs on itself. In 1867, still dreaming of Rome, Garibaldi formed another small army and unsuccessfully attacked. Yet again, Garibaldi was arrested by the Rattazzi government (Ricasoli had resigned in the spring of 1862) and was forced into exile while Napoleon and his French troops returned to Rome, citing that they could no longer trust Victor Emmanuel’s government to defend the Papal States. In 1870, after a complicated attack on Rome by Victor Emmanuel, Rome officially became the capital of the Italian state. After being sent into exile, Garibaldi continued military campaigns, particularly in France and Prussia. Eventually, he accepted a deputy position in the Italian parliament and died after much service to the Italian state in 1882.

Harry Header, the author of \textit{Cavour}, sadly notes that Garibaldi died after fighting a larger political battle for Italian democracy against Rattazzi than Cavour.\textsuperscript{8}

At face value, the \textit{Risorgimento} seems little more than a small speck on the historical timeline of European history, especially when considering the great wars and conflicts of the last few centuries. Yet understanding the \textit{Risorgimento} and its main actors is central to a comprehension of greater European politics as well as Italian domestic politics and culture, where its remnants are still visible today. Lucy Riall highlights the importance of this era first and foremost in her book. She remarks that for Italy, this was a colossal undertaking, as it implied an Italian people, culture, and language that had never before existed. Furthermore, in the span of 150 short years, Italy formed itself into a modern European state, becoming a member of the European Union (EU) and the elite

\textsuperscript{7} Frank J. Coppa, \textit{The Origin of Italian Wars of Independence} (London: Longman, 1992), 126.
\textsuperscript{8} Harry Header, \textit{Cavour} (London: Longman, 1994), 203.
Group of 8 (G8). Many of its EU allies were unified states or had been building foundations for unification at a much earlier time. Thirdly, this gave the Italian people an opportunity to form their own political ideals and values as well as boast of Italian founding fathers, who remain the focus of this thesis.⁹

Due to the large amount of controversy surrounding the historical study of the *Risorgimento*, historians hold different views of how the *Risorgimento* continues to affect the modern state. Benedetto Croce, an Italian historian of the late 1920s, defended the notion of Italian liberalism, which had originated during this period. On the other hand, Antonio Gramsci, a historian of the post-World War II era, felt fascism and liberalism were tightly connected. According to Gramsci, liberalism undoubtedly led to the future fascism of the state. This was largely based on his understanding that the *Risorgimento* was not a true revolution but only a conservative revolution, in which an agreement had been made within the upper echelons of Italian society. These two conflicting historians began the great Italian historical debate between Marxists and liberal historians. Marxist historians exacerbated the differences between moderates and democrats during the *Risorgimento* while liberal historians pointed to all of the economic and political problems occurring during the mid-1800s.¹⁰ Denis Mack Smith, the infamous British historian, would make significant contributions to the analysis of Italian history during the 1950s. Without ascribing to Marxist philosophy, Smith did not speak highly of Cavour or his elite allies. Many American and British historians grew to agree with

---

¹⁰ Ibid., 2-3.
Smith’s work. However, negative views of the *Risorgimento* did not last long. By the 1980s, historians of a new generation had additional opinions to offer concerning the events. Modern historians have refused to look at the *Risorgimento* as something inherently different from its past. Now, aspects of the *Risorgimento* are separated and analyzed as they stand on their own, not as a part of a larger whole. ¹¹

Upon first observation, this thesis seems to come to only a semi-clear conclusion. Of the four situations I observed, three were determined to meet with the Second Hypothesis (H2) while only one seriously matched with the First Hypothesis (H1). In other words, the results oscillated a small fraction between both hypotheses that I set forth in Chapter Three. Thus, my finding is to declare the validity of the Second Hypothesis. Yet I do not want my result to seem strict or legalistic. The research I have done surrounding Garibaldi and Cavour are not solely characterized by the Second Hypothesis. On the contrary, they are a mixture of both. I have only deemed that H2 has been more probable and has had a greater influence on the course of observed events.

In Chapter Three, the events leading up to the war with Austria clearly match H2 to a greater extent than H1. Cavour relies heavily on outside powers and is unafraid of beginning their relationship with an element of cooperation, inviting Garibaldi to join in the military struggle with him. Unfortunately, Garibaldi was caught unaware of Cavour’s secret deals with Napoleon, which leads Garibaldi to be more competitive in future interactions. Nevertheless, I consider this a larger demonstration of H2. Later in the same chapter, I examine the difficult history of the Southern Rebellion, led by Garibaldi. After
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settling upon Figure 3B, it is clear that the two men were attempting to cooperate secretly in the midst of the power struggle in the South, although Cavour may have done so to a greater degree. Foreign powers pushed the two to unite for a brief moment and successfully defeat the monarchy in Sicily. During the second historical episode, their relationship changes in dynamic and the possibility of military action on Rome demonstrates H1. Both men are clearly in opposition, unwilling to compromise yet wanting action. In the end, Garibaldi and Cavour compete with one another for power in Rome, greatly distancing themselves from a shared final goal. Finally, in Chapter Seven, Garibaldi and Cavour decide to leave open the possibility of future communication regarding their political plans for Italy. Although there is no agreement concretely met concerning the details of their individual plans, this change in the conversation marks their relationship again by further adherence to H2, in that they desire cooperation more than competition. Yet I do not want to solely rely on a simply majority to determine my conclusion to this large amount of research. In addition, in this final chapter, I will return more explicitly to the mindsets and theories I explained earlier, specifically the frameworks as I understood them from Gourevitch, Putnam, Byman and Pollack.\textsuperscript{12} These will demonstrate how H2 fits into the framework of my research cleaner than does H1.

The main thesis of Gourevitch’s article, that international politics has greater political ramifications than domestic politics, is critically imperative to my findings of the effects of the Risorgimento. By examining key events, Gourevitch’s article and my thesis support one another to a large degree. His theory that the current international balance of

\textsuperscript{12} In addition, I consider Eatwell and his article to be central to my thesis. However, as I spent considerable energy devoted to him in Chapter Six, I feel no need to return and reiterate the same ideas in this chapter.
power would determine the outcome of a nation’s road to independence matched the conditions I examined.\textsuperscript{13} Since France and Great Britain would defend Italian independence and unification to varying degrees, Garibaldi and Cavour were freer to pursue their desires on an international scale. Additionally, as I mentioned in Chapter Three, the traditional monarchies of Europe were losing power and so, Italian leaders could amass greater momentum in order to gain strength. The interdependence of this historical situation, as outlined by Gourevitch, is highly relevant as there may no longer be a great distinction between foreign and domestic politics.\textsuperscript{14} Gourevitch, too, was certain of the incredible influence that individuals could have on the international and domestic spheres, which was greatly in line with the thinking of Eatwell, Byman, and Pollack.

Putnam of “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games” asks researchers to focus on how parties use domestic and international bargaining and to what degree. There are links between both, which Putnam lists as voluntary and involuntary defection, the use of uncertainty in communication, and international pressures power within the domestic world.\textsuperscript{15} Returning to the figures I constructed, although both levels of bargaining are constantly a factor, international bargaining made a larger impact. When considering a potential war with Austria, Cavour’s relationship with France and Austria as well as Garibaldi’s early sentiment against Austria set the tone, which he did not hesitate to communicate to Cavour. At the beginning of my

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[14] Ibid., 908.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
examined three-year period, international struggle lay at the center of this seemingly regional conflict. The Sicilian Rebellion could be principally considered an international matter, as both Cavour and Garibaldi ultimately opposed the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, a kingdom in no way affiliated with the Piedmont state. It must not be forgotten that international allies played a large part in this situation, as Garibaldi and his supporters hoped for the friendship of Great Britain while Cavour kept many of his true sentiments hidden, so as not to upset France. With the invasions on Rome, a great degree of the international impact voiced in the previous situation, concerning the Sicilian Rebellion, could be repeated here. In this particular case concerning Rome, however, the domestic struggle did have a bigger influence on Garibaldi and Cavour than the international affairs. Lastly, I determined the meeting of the peace between the two men to align itself more with the Second Hypothesis than with the First, which does not seem correct. However, I made this decision after examining that the pressures, while they were not explicitly international, were still present as they wanted to uphold their political reputation. This, along with other factors, ultimately forced the men to choose an outcome that was decidedly more in favor of cooperation than competition.

Unfortunately, due to Cavour’s untimely death, it is difficult to assess whether both men’s intentions were true or whether they were simply produced to satisfy those around them, particularly Victor Emmanuel. This brief synopsis provides a clearer outlook of the involvement of international relations in Garibaldi and Cavour’s relationship. Since international affairs were involved to a great degree, one can strongly argue in favor of the Second Hypothesis, based upon the question originally posed by
Putnam. I do want to end this discussion of international versus domestic bargaining with an emphasis on balance in research. Putnam echoed the call for an equilibrium concerning this type of research, as he desired a meshing of the theories of Waltz and Gourevitch.\textsuperscript{16} Although the thesis of my argument advocates the greater impact of international affairs on the relationship of Cavour and Garibaldi, I have demonstrated the effect of domestic politics as well. I highlight this as a simple exercise in game theory, which allows academics and scholars to observe the issues from an original perspective.

Another issue Putnam stressed was the significance of examining politics at the ground level. Frustrated by the lack of analysis from the middle and lower classes, Putnam pleaded with researchers to place emphasis upon the ordinary people who either determine the political agenda or suffer at the hands of another’s political agenda. I attempted to include this aspect in my research, as I lingered upon the sentiments of the people, their reactions to both Cavour and Garibaldi in light of different events, and the way they too contributed to the \textit{Risorgimento}. Because I believe strongly in the importance of two individual men, I would not want to overlook the other individuals who played a role in their success.

The criticality of the individual is fundamental to my thesis as well as to the article by Byman and Pollack, which I outlined in Chapter Three. The amount of information and research on this small topic displays the legitimacy of studying individual actors throughout history. Here, I would like to disprove the three reasons that

\textsuperscript{16} Putnam, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics,” 430.
Byman and Pollack explained as arguments behind purposefully neglecting the study of individuals in politics.

First, past political scientists have argued that only major events shape international politics and so, individuals by themselves do not hold enough bearing upon these major events. On the contrary, I argue that the personality of the individual creates certain tensions and emotions that lend themselves to a plethora of international relations situations. In other words, although researchers assume the process of rationality in their actors, the actors themselves are still understood within their own unique history. I only need to point to my research to disprove the notion that individual personalities cannot have an effect on the world around them. Garibaldi was only one man and yet, his plan to begin a rebellion in Sicily arguably sparked the *Risorgimento* and created a new European power. Furthermore, Cavour was only one diplomat but his relationship with Napoleon created one of the most advantageous diplomatic friendships to a small city-state. The authors of this article note that with research, political scientists of the past also criticized culture, ideology, ideas, and norms as being simply too difficult to operationalize. Now, the research community has found ways to operationalize all of those academic fields. Therefore, in this case, it is not possible to argue that the two individuals I have studied did not cause major changes on an international scale.

Second, some state that humans cannot be generalized and because of this, theories based upon their behavior are inaccurate and largely irrelevant. Although it is difficult to predict human behavior, these exercises in academic research are neither

---

inaccurate nor irrelevant. Although scholars must assume rationality in their actors, they still display a wide variety of reactions and emotions, which relate directly to the historical experiences of others. This can then be studied in detail and utilized for further knowledge. They do undoubtedly relate to a specific past situation but this can aid future researchers as they attempt to understand certain relationships, time periods, and specific events. I concur with Byman and Pollack, who argue that in academia, one strives to be accurate, not economical.\(^{18}\) Similar to the game theory model, the task of creating theories based upon personalities is complex and rarely creates a perfect hypothesis. Yet it can still be used in other research, if not simply to consider history in a different manner than before. My research has afforded me the opportunity to do that, just as Denis Mack Smith did in the 1950s. He initially believed in a relationship between Garibaldi and Cavour that exceeded what was historically argued. The fact that much of his research, since then, has been greatly debated is a tribute to the meaning of forming political hypotheses centered upon the effects of the individual.Previously small pieces of the *Risorgimento*, Garibaldi and Cavour, and more importantly their working relationship, have given researchers ideas to form new theories that will benefit our view of Italian and European history, bargaining strategies, political competition, and the impact of individual leaders.

Third, many surrender to the thought that although humans may produce some change on a state or local level, this cannot then be transferred to an international level of

understanding history.\(^{19}\) This is exacerbated by the fact that humans are extremely diverse in personality, motivations, and desires; they can only be studied individually and the findings are not transferable to the international realm. Yet many, including Byman and Pollack, see serious similarities between human beings that share characteristics, regardless of culture, religion, or place of origin. History constitutes a chain of influence as individual leaders create their own intentions, which in turn affects the policies of the state, which finally impacts its neighbors, its region, and the world. Turning back to my thesis, within this short report, one can see how Cavour began as a politician for the Piedmont state. Quickly, his ambitions for independence from foreign powers was made known and allies from the upper classes rallied to his side. Later, Italians across the peninsula would hear of his plans, which caused enough attention for Cavour to travel around Europe in search of additional support. This short synopsis of one simple way in which Cavour impacted the world automatically disproves the third argument against studying the political individual.

The nine hypotheses I deemed important to my thesis also uphold an argument that directly opposes the proposal behind the three reasons listed above. Byman and Pollack’s main opinion explicitly states that the goals and abilities of individuals can potentially supersede domestic and international politics to become a unified strategy against an opposing party.\(^{20}\) This was made evident in the case study I created, in which two men contributed greatly to a single strategy that gradually paved the way to state formation. Byman and Pollack’s nine hypotheses were easily verifiable throughout the

---

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 113.
\(^{20}\) Ibid., 109.
history of the *Risorgimento*. I would like to briefly explain them in order to validate their relevancy and demonstrate my central finding, which is the magnitude of international affairs and pressures on Garibaldi and Cavour’s relationship.

The first three hypotheses are similar, in that they are concerned with the influence that leaders can wield on a state level. In Hypothesis 1, individuals set the ultimate and secondary intentions of a state. Simply put, leaders have the ability to shape the people’s opinion of another leader and to create crucial goals for the state that others have ignored. It has been thoroughly determined at this point that both men possessed these capabilities: Garibaldi had power with the people to “…magnify the extent of the state’s revisionist ambitions” while Cavour inarguably played domestic factors off of one another for his benefit.\(^{21}\) Hypothesis 2 states that individuals can be an important component of a state’s diplomatic influence and military power. Both Cavour and Garibaldi were involved in building alliances in order to gain power, an exercise that extended past domestic politics. Although Garibaldi is consistently thought of as the military leader, Cavour commanded the Piedmont Army alongside Victor Emmanuel. This demonstrates the truth of Hypothesis 2 in my thesis. I would like to emphasize that this hypothesis should particularly cause academics to think about its international implications and how, as I have already mentioned, diplomacy and military power easily transferred into power on an international level. The last idea I want to align with the previous two is Byman and Pollack’s third hypothesis, which attributes the shaping of state strategy to individual leaders. As I discussed this previously, particularly with

regard to the first argument that Byman and Pollack seek to disprove, I will not reiterate the ideas and theories I have already stated. These three preliminary hypotheses overwhelmingly show the extent that individuals affected international relations on a purely foundational level.

The subsequent group will be made up of four hypotheses as described by Byman and Pollack and these principally deal with the nature of leaders’ relationships outside of a state or an alternate domestic grouping. While I do not want to dwell on Hypothesis 4, I do think it is an important piece of the creation a broader image of how international alliances and conflicts function. Hypothesis 4 declares that individual leaders affect the behavior of opposing states that must react to leaders’ idiosyncratic intentions and capabilities.\(^{22}\) The most apparent example of this is Cavour’s relationship with Napoleon and the ways in which he was able to manipulate his will toward the pursuit of Italian independence. It must be recognized, however, that Napoleon began the *Risorgimento* as an immediate supporter of the movement. For some reason, perhaps because of Cavour’s diplomacy and eloquence, Napoleon was instantly drawn to the cause.

There exists a strong link between this idea and Hypothesis 5, which poses that states led by risk-tolerant leaders are more likely to cause wars.\(^{23}\) Although Cavour was not averse to using risk in diplomacy, I believe Garibaldi would be a more fitting example of the type of leader who exemplifies the fifth hypothesis. His numerous military plans of rebellion and capture constitute huge risks for his personal safety, the safety of his troops, and the overall wellbeing of his plan to unite a state. The leadership

\(^{22}\) Ibid., 135.

\(^{23}\) Ibid., 137.
of Garibaldi and Cavour did not lead to wars against their own people but they did contribute mightily to the war with Austria as well as the intense animosity with the Vatican. Why would Garibaldi risk such a large amount politically and physically for these plans? The answer lies within Hypothesis 7, which points to the inclination of leaders with grandiose visions to destabilize the political system.\textsuperscript{24}

Of the four hypotheses listed in this grouping, the seventh is the most relevant to my thesis and the most imperative to unification. This sentiment, of being taken with a vision for a certain region or for a future political state, was true for the entire Risorgimento and all revolutionary leaders involved, even including the liberal-conservatives of Cavour’s ideology. As an intellectual and political child of Mazzini, Garibaldi was a revolutionary who wanted his dreams to match reality. On the other hand, Cavour was not taken with the fervor of the movement or the people. Yet he was deeply concerned with his place of power in the Piedmont administration and utilizing that for the best of the government. In the end, he most likely saw that his actions would destabilize the larger system but it was only a by-product of his desire to increase the power and international reputation of the Piedmont state.

In sum, Garibaldi, Cavour, and the countless other politicians and revolutionaries who added to the Risorgimento desired a change in political system, either directly or indirectly. They were passionate about replacing the monarchy, ridding themselves of corrupt governments, uniting the people, and creating a society in which each member could live, at least at a subsistence level. Finally, the last hypothesis contained in this

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 138.
short study is Hypothesis 9: the more power is concentrated in the hands of an individual leader, the greater the influence of that leader’s personality and preferences.\textsuperscript{25} When Garibaldi entered the southern city of Palermo with his one thousand men, contrary to some people’s beliefs, he had amassed a substantial amount of power in his hands. Thus, he had a greater opportunity to influence the people, to turn them even more against their rulers and the monarchical institutions. Garibaldi’s simple and revolutionary personality as well as his preference for the oppressed and the lower classes was only made available because of the power he had gained. These four hypotheses have provided enormous insight into the lives of Garibaldi and Cavour as two different kinds of leaders during the *Risorgimento*.

Byman and Pollack have two additional theories to conclude my thinking on the individual as an object of study. One hypothesis I have already mentioned earlier in my research is the eleventh, which espouses the idea that individuals are more important when circumstances are fluid.\textsuperscript{26} This hypothesis supports why leaders such as Mazzini had less of an effect on the people than Cavour and Garibaldi, mainly because they worked and led at a time when an increasing number of people had grown accustomed to the reality of unification and/or independence and were more supportive of the movement. This additionally shaped my understanding of the events when Cavour seemed to steal the power or momentum of Garibaldi’s leadership. Being a brilliant statesman, Cavour wanted to capitalize on the influence of Garibaldi’s power as it affected the people’s sentiments concerning the Piedmont state and the situation as it

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 140.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 142.
affected the world internationally. Cavour observed how Garibaldi, and his own personal style of leadership, had the ability to form public opinion, which in turn shaped several added factors like bureaucratic politics, organizations, and institutions. The last hypothesis, which has already been described as it relates to the Putnam article, states the ability of individuals to form the third image.\textsuperscript{27} From this study of Cavour and Garibaldi, one sees how leaders can contribute to the feelings and policies of other leaders toward their own state. International leaders chose to either trust or not trust Garibaldi and Cavour, which led to alliances, hostility, or indifference. Interestingly enough, this leadership did not necessarily have to be direct. For example, Great Britain supported the Risorgimento not because of direct contact made by Cavour or Garibaldi but simply because they enjoyed hearing stories of Garibaldi’s bravery and character. Many varying facets of leadership led to the Risorgimento’s international impact.

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 144.
Ch. 8 Conclusion

After performing this simple exercise in political game theory involving Cavour and Garibaldi, I find it extremely interesting that so little research has been dedicated to their joint efforts during the Risorgimento and their relationship, which hung in the balance between opponents and colleagues. Furthermore, according to my research, this is not due to a lack of historical data. On the contrary, many researchers have chosen either Cavour or Garibaldi to account for the state of Italy because there is a wealth of knowledge existing in memoirs, diaries, newspapers, and other first-hand accounts from that period. The only reasoning I find, on a wholly speculative basis, to justify this gap is that the history of the Risorgimento is utterly complex, full of numerous historical figures, political theories, ruling parties, and regional differences. Thus, an attempt to gather this information into a coherent theory is daunting if not seemingly impossible. For this, I originally decided to narrow my thesis to the relationship between these two men within the course of three years, the years I deem were crucial for the formation of a nation-state. Otherwise, even if I had expanded my thesis to include a few additional years of the Risorgimento, I would not have been able to create a well-structured academic paper due to the plethora of information.

After examining this trend in the research, it would be easy to assume that the lack of research done on the two men’s relationship signifies the inability to apply it further, either to Italian history or to the structure of the modern Italian state. Yet I would disagree with both viewpoints. Remnants of their relationship can be seen in many facets of Italian politics, history and culture today. On a surface level, Garibaldi and Cavour
were known to have a cooperative and competitive relationship. Their parties were extremely opposed to one another on the political spectrum.

To their credit, it was Garibaldi and Cavour who stepped away from their respective constituents with the hope of forming a compromise or agreement with one another or with others involved in the Risorgimento. This type of political atmosphere thrives in Italy today, as various political parties vie for power while seeking to form coalitions with one another to pass desired legislation. The relationship between Garibaldi and Cavour was one of the first to set such a precedent for future Italian governments. If the relationship had been less cooperative and more competitive, it is difficult to predict whether the state would have unified at all. The success of the movement was largely due to the interplay between the two men and the ways in which they publicly and secretly allowed the other to assume a more powerful role in a particular region or at a specific point in time.

Historians are able, to some extent, to determine how Garibaldi’s achievements were due to Cavour’s actions and vice versa. Militarily, historians know that it was within Cavour’s power to halt Garibaldi’s forces from invading Sicily, if he had so desired. He had the well-trained forces of Victor Emmanuel to command while Garibaldi had only unequipped and inexperienced volunteers. Yet without this crucial movement in the South, the unified state of Italy today may solely include the northern regions. After re-examining my research, I conclude that Cavour’s actions most likely had a larger effect on Garibaldi’s achievements simply because Cavour had greater access to power as well as international influence. One could argue that Garibaldi’s positive reputation,
particularly as it grew in Great Britain, aided Cavour as it convinced Great Britain to stay out of the struggle. In this way, Cavour had a bigger amount of freedom to act as he pleased and work against the unfair policies of the European monarchies. However, this being said, Cavour’s authority had a more lasting effect on the Risorgimento as it applies to Garibaldi’s successes. These predictions are speculative but it is easy to see how one change in either man’s actions could have impeded the process to statehood or dramatically changed it. Thus, I make the argument that had they not cooperated to the extent that they did, the state of Italy would be different in addition to the historical unification process.

Furthermore, the modernization of the Italian state can largely be attributed to these two men as well. Although they adhered to differing political ideologies, both were set upon independence and unification, two ideas that did not align themselves nicely with the European ruling families of the period. David I. Kertzer states, “The nineteenth century saw the emergence of Italy as a unified state and as a modern political system, moving from the ancien regime of monarchs and feudal aristocracies to an elected parliament and civil rights.”\(^1\) These values of parliamentary politics and civil rights were explicitly advocated by both Cavour and Garibaldi, respectively. The Italian political tradition of a democratic, parliamentary system has its origins in these two men.

Unfortunately, there are negative ramifications to their historical relationship as well, including the pervasive thought that distinctly characterizes the North and the South of the country. Immediately upon observing the suffering of the Italians in the South,

Garibaldi advocated for their freedom and began devising a plan to overthrow the monarchy. This, as mentioned earlier, was not a part of Cavour’s schemes and thus, he wavered between opposition and indifference to Garibaldi. In the end, this had lasting effects on Italy as Cavour attempted to rule the South, after Garibaldi’s success, within the framework of the Piedmont system, which simply did not coincide with southern culture. Therefore, Lucy Riall writes, “…the war [the Southern Rebellion] contributed to perceptions of a ‘Southern Question’, to a sense of southern ‘difference’ which came to dominate historical and contemporary understandings of the South.”

From my own experiences in Italy, the above statement is self-fulfilling. As southern regions in Italy have been informed of their dissimilarities with the North, they have gradually contributed to that view by ostracizing themselves and opposing cultural norms of greater Italy. Although this pervades every aspect of Italian life in the North and the South, it is most stark in the economic realm, as the poverty and ‘backwardness’ of the rural South contrasts with the wealthy, urban North. Additionally, this contributed to the lack of national unity that exists into the twenty-first century. Before his death, Cavour tried to frame a government for the entire country that was largely based upon his own administration in Piedmont. Many regions of Italy rejected it, adding to the loyalty Italians felt for their own region. Again, this coincides with my observations of Italy as many Italians will first identify themselves with their region before they demonstrate nationalist sentiments for the Italian state.

---

Another aspect of Italian culture that had its founding in Garibaldi and Cavour is the state’s relationship with the Catholic Church in Rome. Because their history during the Risorgimento was full of controversy, it seemed plausible that the relationship between church and state would not flourish. Yet Cavour was an elitist, and thus, he was familiar with a political atmosphere in which all European governments consolidated power with the Church. He was aware of the fact that if he opposed the Church, he would lose the loyalty of many Italians as well as international allies, like France, an ally of the Vatican. Garibaldi, on the other hand, did not come from a similar background and thus, did not understand the implications the Church had on state power. However, he was extremely allegiant to Victor Emmanuel II, who sought after a close, working relationship with the Pope. In the end, the tension that existed between Cavour and Garibaldi regarding the Church contributed to the state’s relationship with the Vatican today, in which the state acknowledges the power and influence of the Church while ultimately ruling the Italian state on its own.\(^4\) The Church has not easily accepted this notion. Falling back on the history of this period, the Church is known as an institution that presses for increasing amounts of political power and attempts to situate itself amidst Italian issues across the spectrum. The Italian people have also been affected by Garibaldi and Cavour in the way that they now view Catholicism individually. Kertzer explains, “…there is reason to believe that the rejection of the Church did not mean a full rejection of Catholic belief and practice.”\(^5\)

\(^5\) Ibid., 204-205.
Church, he still encouraged faith based upon Christianity among the people, which led them to develop their own practices and rituals. These largely resembled Catholicism but as they were not recognized by the Vatican, they existed as more authentic spiritual beliefs of the Italian people. This sentiment is alive today as the majority of Italians would identify themselves as Catholic but rarely fully practice the religion.

In terms of their rivalry, these matters listed above could have been dealt with by Cavour and Garibaldi in a more cooperative manner to shape a less divisive Italy. With the South, Cavour knew of Garibaldi’s knowledge and love for that region of the state. It would have been unproblematic for Cavour to share a certain amount of power with Garibaldi instead of attempting to run a system in the South, a place where Cavour had little to no experience. Even if Cavour had been unwilling to lose power, Garibaldi could have been included in discussions on how the South was to be governed or placed in a lesser seat of power in the South to deal directly with the needs of the people. These types of actions could have had long-lasting effects on the state by erasing the stark economic and cultural line that still exists between the North and the South. Additionally, this could have led to different political parties, greater cultural understanding between the two regions and a level economic playing field for all Italian citizens.

The two men’s relationship with the Church could have contributed to a new version of Italy but it is more complex than the North-South distinction. One could argue that until recently, the Catholic Church has held a great amount of spiritual as well as political power. Even today, the Pope is the head of the Vatican, recognized by the United Nations as its own nation-state. Thus, when Garibaldi and Cavour were debating
about the issues concerning the inclusion of Rome into the new state, the debate carried deep political connotations. As a politician, Cavour was better able to understand the power politics that were at stake. Garibaldi, on the other hand, was only concerned with unification and he rarely hesitated when he became aware of an additional region that needed to be included in the state. If Garibaldi had listened to the advice of Cavour or attempted to ascertain the common theme surrounding Cavour’s policies and the Papacy, he may have agreed to a plan that differed from his original. Unfortunately, Garibaldi had little patience and did not believe in waiting months or years for the state to be made whole. Changed behavior on Garibaldi’s part could have led to less violence at the time but more importantly, Rome could have been more willing to enter into the state of Italy.

All of these factors and more draw their heritage directly from the relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi. Looking back on the history I have researched, the impact of their relationship seems unlikely. The two men began as acquaintances, as Cavour enrolled the help of Garibaldi for his military schemes. They both agreed to war with Austria, as exhibited in Figure 2, and thus, lean toward H2 rather than H1. The Southern Rebellion, however, quickly pulled the two apart as they became fast enemies, vying for power on a national scale. Although the history of this period is complex, I conclude that Figure 3B is closer to the historical reality I have observed regarding the military attack on Sicily. As with Figure 2, Figure 3B corresponds with H2. In Chapter Five, Cavour and Garibaldi oppose one another as both debate the advantages and disadvantages of military action on Rome. As Cavour largely relies upon France and reacts to the influence of international allies, H1 characterizes this event. Lastly, in the third historical episode,
Victor Emmanuel presents Cavour and Garibaldi with the opportunity to make peace with one another and begin a relationship that represents increasing amounts of compromise. With hesitation, both agree, leading me to see this situation as a representation of H2.

In Chapter Seven, I explain my findings as leaning toward the implications of H2 and suggest why that hypothesis is more probable in the light of all of the events I included in my research. I am able to conclude that to pursue a common goal, outside pressure is necessary to force individuals to work together. I do not, however, discount the validity and applicability of H1 on a number of levels. My findings are not intended to be legalistic but rather, to act as a reflection of the many facets existing simultaneously within this incredibly convoluted period of Italian history. The relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi is simply one of an infinite number of subjects that could be studied when researching the Risorgimento. The interactions between these two men have been vastly underrepresented on the pages of history and it is my hope that more academically rigorous research will be done to delve deeper into their relationship and its manifestations in modern Italy. The Italian word, Risorgimento, translates in English as “rebirth,” a fitting description of how Cavour and Garibaldi formed a mass of land into a new creation and a new people. Benedetto Croce describes it similarly, stating,

“It was called the Risorgimento, just as men had spoken of a rebirth of Greece, recalling the glorious history that the same soil had witnessed; but it was in reality a birth, a sorgimento, and for the first time in the ages there was born an Italian state with all and with only its own people, and moulded by an ideal.”

---

That ideal, an ideal of sovereignty and freedom, began in the heart and mind of Giuseppe Garibaldi and Camillo Benso di Cavour. When the two ideologies came together, united with competition and cooperation, they were able to form a nation-state of Italians.
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