

2018 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

EUROPEAN HISTORY

SECTION II

Total Time—1 hour and 40 minutes

Question 1 (Document-Based Question)

Suggested reading and writing time: 1 hour

It is suggested that you spend 15 minutes reading the documents and 45 minutes writing your response.

Note: You may begin writing your response before the reading period is over.

Directions: Question 1 is based on the accompanying documents. The documents have been edited for the purpose of this exercise.

In your response you should do the following.

- Respond to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis or claim that establishes a line of reasoning.
- Describe a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.
- Support an argument in response to the prompt using at least six documents.
- Use at least one additional piece of specific historical evidence (beyond that found in the documents) relevant to an argument about the prompt.
- For at least three documents, explain how or why the document’s point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument.
- Use evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the prompt.

2018 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

1. Evaluate whether the Thirty Years' War was fought primarily for religious or primarily for political reasons.

Document 1

Source: Holy Roman Emperor Matthias, open letter to his Protestant subjects in Bohemia, 1618

It has been alleged that the free exercise of religion will be abolished. We want to make it clear to you through this open letter that we have no intention of rescinding the agreement between the religions, still less want anyone else to do this, despite what others in Bohemia may have said. Moreover, we have always intended, and still intend, to preserve all the Bohemian privileges, liberties, and treaties. Anyone who claims otherwise slanders us before God and the world. Rest assured, dear obedient, loyal, and true Bohemian subjects, and do not give credence to such falsehoods. We would like nothing more than to return in person to our royal throne and residence amongst our loyal and obedient subjects and inhabitants and clear up these misunderstandings with God's help. However, we cannot come to our Bohemian territories at the moment, partly through poor health, but also pressure of other important affairs. Capable and prominent individuals will be appointed to clear up this misunderstanding. Since no enemy threatens us as ruler of Bohemia, there are no constitutional grounds to raise soldiers to defend the country, and thus no grounds for anyone, whoever, they might be, to use the territorial privileges, letters of majesty, ordinances, freedoms, or laws to justify arming.

2018 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Document 2

Source: Selections from the constitution of the Bohemian Federation, a coalition of nobles and city governments, 1619

Since the Almighty has also given his grace and blessing as this Confederation is solely in defense of religion, the territories have agreed that each and every one of their coreligionists should follow a Christian life according to the Calvinist teaching and faith, avoid and prevent sin, vice, public trouble, hypocrisy, in whatever form, and follow strictly the admonishments from the pulpit and the authorities. . . .

All churches in these united territories currently in Calvinist hands are to remain so in perpetuity. . . .

The free exercise of Calvinist religion is extended to every man and woman in all united territories and towns regardless as to whether they belong to the king or queen, permitting the construction of churches, schools, and cemeteries, and the appointment of Calvinist pastors and schoolteachers. Everyone shall be allowed to follow the old ceremonies of their Christian conscience in their own church. However, to ensure better unity and to prevent all kinds of difficulties and bitterness, there are to be no insults or personal attacks from the pulpit upon pain of removal from office. . . .

Should, contrary to hope, a king attempt anything contravening the religious concessions, unions, and this constitution, and thereby force the territories to take defensive measures, then all of these united kingdoms and provinces are released from their duty and cannot be subsequently held to account for any insults to the royal sovereignty and majesty.

Document 3

Source: Bernhard Baumann, Jesuit official in Heidelberg, report to Elector Maximilian of Bavaria on efforts to re-Catholicize previously Protestant areas after the Catholic victory in that region, 1628

Four hundred in the town and 1,200 outside it have been freed from heresy; on feast days we get around 700 communicants in the Church of the Holy Spirit. We alone look after parish duties, visit the sick and converts daily, conduct catechism inside the town and outside, and deliver two sermons on Sundays. These crowds are gathered with great difficulty; since only six months ago the richer townspeople were so obstinate, that two or three hundred declared they would emigrate if they were forced to convert. Then entire districts (they had arranged this in advance) declared they would keep the faith of their ancestors, because we could not steal this like other possessions. Since the orders arrived from Munich [to intensify Catholic conversions] they have used unbelievable deceptions to try to circumvent these. Furthermore, they complain to the Holy Roman Emperor, but the secular government, to its undying credit, knew how to stop this.

2018 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Document 4

Source: Letter from Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden, to the Protestant elector of Brandenburg, 1630

I have come into this land for no other purpose than to free it from the thieves and robbers who have so plagued it, and, first and foremost, to help his Excellency [the elector] out of his difficulties. Does his Excellency then not know that the [Holy Roman] emperor and his followers do not mean to rest till the Protestant religion is wholly rooted out of the empire, and that his Excellency has nothing else to expect than being forced either to deny his religion or to leave his country? Does he think by prayers and pleas and such like means to obtain something different? . . . I seek not my own advantage in this war, nor any gain save the security of my kingdom; I can look for nothing but expense, hard work, trouble, and danger to life and limb.

I tell you plainly that I will know nor hear nothing of “neutrality”; his Excellency must be either friend or foe. When I reach his frontier he must declare himself either hot or cold. The fight is between God and the devil. If his Excellency is on God’s side, let him stand by me; if he holds rather with the devil, then he must fight with me; there is no third course, that is certain.

Document 5

Source: Confidential account of a meeting between Axel Oxenstierna, Swedish high chancellor, and Sweden’s ally Brandenburg after the death of Gustavus Adolphus, 1633

Concerning the late Gustavus Adolphus’ intentions:

They were, in general, to disrupt the plans of the enemy, whose intentions with regards to the Baltic Sea are sufficiently well-known. His Majesty therefore intended to ensure the safety of his kingdom and the Baltic region, and liberate the oppressed lands [of Germany]; and thereafter to proceed according as events might develop: it was no part of his original intention to march as far into Germany as he did. He saw and clearly understood where that would lead, but the enemy and the circumstances compelled this. His majesty was there in person wherever the greatest danger was.

2018 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Document 6

Source: Jean Gagniere, "The elimination of heresy, and of rebellion, through the care of Cardinal Richelieu," France, 1640. Richelieu, the chief minister of France, removes caterpillars representing Protestant Huguenots from the fleur-de-lis, the symbol of France, while the lion and eagle, representing Catholic Spain and Austria, are kept restrained by chains.



Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris, France/Bridgeman Images

2018 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Question 2, 3, or 4 (Long Essay)

Suggested writing time: 40 minutes

Directions: Answer Question 2 or Question 3 or Question 4.

In your response you should do the following.

- Respond to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis or claim that establishes a line of reasoning.
 - Describe a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.
 - Support an argument in response to the prompt using specific and relevant examples of evidence.
 - Use historical reasoning (e.g., comparison, causation, continuity or change over time) to frame or structure an argument that addresses the prompt.
 - Use evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the prompt.
2. Evaluate the extent to which Europe’s interactions with its overseas colonies in the period 1500 to 1650 differed from its interactions with its overseas colonies in the period 1815 to 1914.
3. Evaluate the extent to which the political consequences of Britain’s Glorious Revolution differed from the political consequences of the French Revolution.
4. Evaluate the extent to which Europe’s political relationship with the United States in the period 1918 to 1939 differed from Europe’s political relationship with the United States in the period 1945 to 1989.

WHEN YOU FINISH WRITING, CHECK YOUR WORK ON SECTION II IF TIME PERMITS.

STOP

END OF EXAM

**AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 1 — Document-Based Question

Maximum Possible Points: 7

“Evaluate whether the Thirty Years’ War was fought primarily for religious or primarily for political reasons.”

Points	Rubric	Notes
A: Thesis/Claim (0-1)	<p>Thesis/claim: Responds to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis/claim that establishes a line of reasoning. (1 point)</p> <p><i>To earn this point the thesis must make a claim that responds to the prompt rather than restating or rephrasing the prompt. The thesis must consist of one or more sentences located in one place, either in the introduction or the conclusion.</i></p>	<p>The thesis must take a position on whether the Thirty Years’ War was fought primarily for religious or primarily for political reasons with some indication of the reason for taking that position.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The Thirty Years’ War was fought overwhelmingly for religious purposes, with countries being drawn into war to defend the sanctity of one religion or another, and always divided Catholics and Protestants.” • “The Thirty Years War was primarily fought over religion and all stemmed from a little squabble in Bohemia.”
B: Contextualization (0-1)	<p>Contextualization: Describes a broader historical context relevant to the prompt. (1 point)</p> <p><i>To earn this point the response must relate the topic of the prompt to broader historical events, developments, or processes that occur before, during, or continue after the time frame of the question. This point is not awarded for merely a phrase or reference.</i></p>	<p>To earn the point the essay must accurately describe a broader context relevant to the motivations for the Thirty Years’ War.</p> <p><i>Examples might include the following, with appropriate elaboration:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earlier Protestant-Catholic conflicts • Protestant and Catholic Reformations • Habsburg vs. French dynastic rivalries

**AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

+C: Evidence (0-3)	<p>Evidence from the Documents: Uses the content of at least three documents to address the topic of the prompt. (1 point)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Supports an argument in response to the prompt using at least six documents. (2 points)</p>	<p><i>To earn 1 point the response must accurately describe — rather than simply quote — the content from at least three of the documents to address the topic of motivations for the Thirty Years' War.</i></p> <p><i>To earn 2 points the response must accurately describe — rather than simply quote — the content from at least six documents. In addition, the response must use the content from the documents to support an argument in response to the prompt.</i></p> <p>See document summaries for examples of evidence.</p>
	<p>Evidence beyond the Documents: Uses at least one additional piece of specific historical evidence (beyond that found in the documents) relevant to an argument about the prompt. (1 point)</p> <p><i>To earn this point the evidence must be described, and it must be more than a phrase or reference. This additional piece of evidence must be different from the evidence used to earn the point for contextualization.</i></p>	<p>Statements credited as evidence from outside the documents will typically be more specific details relevant to an argument, analogous to the function of evidence drawn from the documents.</p> <p>Typically, statements credited as contextualization will be more general statements that place an argument or a significant portion of it in a broader context.</p>
D: Analysis and Reasoning (0-2)	<p>Sourcing: For at least three documents, explains how or why the document's point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument. (1 point)</p> <p>See document summaries for examples of possible sourcing.</p>	<p><i>To earn this point the response must explain how or why — rather than simply identifying — the document's point of view, purpose, historical situation, or audience is relevant to an argument that addresses the prompt for each of the three documents sourced.</i></p>

**AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

	<p>Complexity: Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical development that is the focus of the prompt, using evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the question. (1 point) <i>This understanding must be part of the argument, not merely a phrase or reference.</i></p>	<p><i>Examples of demonstrating a complex understanding for this question might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explaining nuance of an issue by analyzing multiple variables, such as how religious and political motives interacted and overlapped• Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods, such as comparing the Thirty Years' War to other European conflicts• Explaining both political and religious motivations with an evaluation of the primary reason for the war• Qualifying or modifying an argument by considering diverse or alternative views or evidence, such as pointing out the political interests that influenced religious support for the war
--	---	--

If response is completely blank, enter - - for all four score categories A, B, C, and D.

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

Document Summaries and Possible Sourcing

Document	Summary of Content	Explains the relevance of point of view, purpose, situation, and/or audience by elaborating on examples such as:
1. Emperor Matthias's letter to Bohemian Protestants (1618)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims he has no plans to rescind the free exercise of the Protestant religion in Bohemia, therefore there is no reason for Bohemia to take up arms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emperor wants to reassure Protestant subjects to prevent rebellion (POV-situation). Protestants in Bohemia feared the reimposition of Catholicism by the Empire (audience).
2. Constitution of the Bohemian Federation (1619)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cites the need to defend Calvinism as the motivation for creating the Confederation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bohemian leaders are justifying their actions to take defensive measures if necessary (POV). Bohemians desire to protect the free exercise of Calvinism against Catholicism (purpose).
3. Baumann report to Elector Maximillian (1628)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes problems with reimposing Catholicism in Protestant areas of Bavaria after the Habsburg victory there 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habsburgs are winning the war against the Protestant German states and re-imposing Catholicism (situation). Jesuit seeks to reassure the Elector Catholicism is winning despite Protestant resistance (purpose).
4. Letter from Adolphus to Elector of Brandenberg (1630)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adolphus claims Swedish intervention is to prevent Catholic Habsburgs from wiping out German Protestantism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to intimidate the elector into supporting the Swedes (purpose). Protestant king wants to support other Protestant princes in Germany (POV).
5. Oxenstierna meeting notes (1633)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that Sweden looked to secure the safety of Sweden and command of the Baltic Sea 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oxenstierna justifies Adolphus' land acquisition (POV). Confidential meeting with allied government reveals political power (purpose).
6. Richelieu engraving (1640)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Portrays the Cardinal protecting France from Huguenot Protestants and rival Catholic powers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tries to influence public opinion as to the wisdom of Richelieu's policies (audience). France is intervening on behalf of the Protestants in Germany to weaken the rival Habsburgs (situation).
7. Pope Innocent X declaration (1648)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criticizes Peace of Westphalia and claims that it is not legitimate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sees the settlement as a defeat for the Catholic side (POV). Chastises the Catholic rulers for putting secular interests ahead of faith (audience).

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

Scoring Notes

Introductory notes:

- Except where otherwise noted, each point of these rubrics is earned independently, e.g., a student could earn a point for evidence without earning a point for thesis/claim.
- **Accuracy:** The components of this rubric require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, the response may contain errors that do not detract from the overall quality, as long as the historical content used to advance the argument is accurate.
- **Clarity:** Exam responses should be considered first drafts and thus may contain grammatical errors. Those errors will not be counted against a student unless they obscure the successful demonstration of the content knowledge, skills, and practices described below.

Note: Student samples (when available) are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors.

A. Thesis/Claim (0–1 point)

The thesis must take a position on whether the Thirty Years' War was primarily fought for religious or political reasons with some indication of the reason for taking that position.

Responses earn 1 point by responding to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis that establishes a line of reasoning about the topic. To earn this point the thesis must make a claim that responds to the prompt rather than simply restating or rephrasing the prompt. The thesis must suggest at least one main line of argument development or establish the analytic categories of the argument.

The thesis must consist of one or more sentences located in one place, either in the introduction or the conclusion.

Examples of acceptable theses:

- “While the Thirty Years’ War was religious in that it was fought to protect the freedom of religion throughout the Holy Roman Empire, it was also political in that it was used to strategically help certain powers protect themselves and stay prominent.”
(The response addresses the prompt with an evaluative claim that establishes a line of reasoning.)
- “The Thirty Years’ War was fought overwhelmingly for religious purposes, with countries being drawn into war to defend the sanctity of one religion or another, and always divided Catholics and Protestants.”
(The response addresses the prompt with an evaluative claim that establishes a line of reasoning.)
- “The Thirty Years’ War was primarily fought over religion and all stemmed from a little squabble in Bohemia.”
(The response addresses the prompt with a claim that establishes a minimally acceptable line of reasoning.)

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

Examples of unacceptable theses:

- “The Thirty Years’ War was fought for political but primarily religious reasons.”
(The response merely indicates the position that will be argued without giving any indication as to the line of reasoning. If this statement was immediately followed or preceded by another sentence suggesting a valid reason for taking this position, then the two sentences taken together could receive credit.)
- “The Thirty Years’ War was primarily fought for religious and secondarily fought for political reasons. It is hard to determine this because the two go together hand in hand and have proportional causes and effects.”
(While this sentence acknowledges the terms of the question, the line of reasoning is nonspecific. If this statement was immediately followed or preceded by another sentence suggesting a valid reason for taking this position, then the two sentences taken together could receive credit.)

B. Contextualization (0–1 point)

Responses earn a point for contextualization by describing a broader historical context relevant to the prompt. To earn this point the response must accurately and explicitly connect the context of the prompt to broader historical events, developments, or processes that occur before, during, or continue after the time frame of the question. This point is not awarded for merely a phrase or reference.

To earn the point the response must accurately describe a context relevant to whether the Thirty Years’ War was fought for primarily political or religious reasons.

Examples of acceptable contextualization:

- “Prior to the Thirty Years’ War period, Luther had been spreading his ideas of Protestantism and individual interpretation of the Bible. As a result European states were divided without the Catholic Church holding them together. The religious tension, primarily between the Holy Roman Empire and France, marked the period prior to the Thirty Years’ War.”
(The response relates broader events and developments to the topic of motivations for the war.)
- “During the Thirty Years’ War the Peace of Augsburg was taken away. In the Peace of Augsburg it states that the leader of the country can choose to have a Protestant or Catholic country. This was taking away people’s freedom and religious toleration ... Cardinal Richelieu from France did not like the idea of Huguenots gaining power because they were Protestant.”
(The response relates broader events and developments to the topic of motivations for the war.)

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

Example of unacceptable contextualization:

- “The Thirty Years’ War sparked large amounts of disruption in Europe. Although it involved primarily the French Huguenots and the Holy Roman Empire (Catholics) it caused many other European countries to be involved.”
(Though largely accurate, without a clear link to the question of motivations for the war, this statement by itself would not constitute acceptable contextualization. If these sentences were followed by some further discussion of why many areas were involved then, taken together, this would constitute acceptable contextualization.)

Students may choose to discuss such potentially relevant examples of context, such as:

- Religious conflict in England
- The Peace of Augsburg
- The Edict of Nantes
- Jesuits and the Catholic Reformation
- Fragmentation of the Holy Roman Empire
- Huguenots and French wars of religion
- Emergence of Lutheranism and Calvinism
- Increasing power of monarchies
- Defenestration of Prague

C. Evidence (0–3 points)

a) Document Content — Addressing the Topic (1 point)

In order to achieve the **first point**, the response must use the content of at least **three** documents to address the **topic** of the prompt. (1 point) To earn 1 point for evidence from the documents the response must accurately describe — rather than simply quote — the content from at least three of the documents to address the topic of motivations for the Thirty Years’ War.

Examples of describing the content of a document:

- (Document 6): “In 1640 the Thirty Years War had reached the ‘French Phase’. This phase was known as one of the bloodiest phases to exist. Jean Gagniere paints Richelieu carefully removing the French Calvinists (Huguenots) from France.” Gagniere paints Catholic Austria and Spain as chained back but vicious.”
(The response describes the document accurately, and thus is credited as addressing the topic, but does not explicitly tie the description to an argument in response to the prompt.)

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

- (Document 7): “In Doc 7 is the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia which is known to be the signing that ended religious conflicts. Pope Innocent X responds on how the authority of the Catholic church should not prevent you from seeking other interests other than God.”
(The response describes the document accurately, and thus is credited as addressing the topic, but does not explicitly tie the description to an argument in response to the prompt.)

b) Document Content — Supporting an Argument (1 point)

In order to achieve the second point for evidence from the documents, the response needs to support an **argument** in response to the prompt by accurately using the content of at least **six** documents. (2 points) The six documents do not have to be used in support of a single argument, but they can be used across subarguments or to address counterarguments.

Examples of supporting an argument using the content of a document:

- (Document 1): “The Holy Roman Emperor attempted to convince others that he wasn’t motivated to start war because of religion, since he doesn’t plan on altering religious policies. However this is wholly untrue since the Holy Roman Emperor continues to be a Catholic power.”
(The response connects the contents of the document to an argument about motivations for the Thirty Years’ War.)
- (Document 4): “However the war was in fact religiously motivated. In a letter from Gustavus Adolphus to the elector of Brandenburg, Adolphus declares that the HR Emperor only wants to root out the Protestant religion.”
(The response accurately describes and connects the content of the document to an argument about the motivations for the Thirty Years’ War.)
- In a paragraph arguing for political motivations, Holy Roman Emperor Matthias (Document 1) is referenced as seeking to regain his throne in Bohemia and to dilute tensions there, while Swedish King Adolphus (Document 4) is used in reference to his intent to keep a lasting peace in the Baltic region, and, finally, Swedish Chancellor Oxenstierna (Document 5) is used as evidence in reference to Swedish political motivations for entering the war.
(The response accurately describes and connects the content of the documents to an argument about the motivations for the Thirty Years’ War.)

c) Evidence beyond the Documents (1 point)

The response must use at least one additional piece of specific historical evidence (beyond that found in the documents) relevant to an argument that addresses the motivations for the Thirty Years’ War (1 point). To earn this point the evidence must be described, and the description must be more than a phrase or reference. This additional piece of evidence must be different from the evidence used to earn the point for contextualization.

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

Typically, statements credited as **contextualization** will be more general statements that place an argument or a significant portion of it in a broader context. Statements credited as **evidence from outside the documents** will typically be more specific details relevant to an argument, analogous to the function of evidence drawn from the documents.

Examples of providing an example or additional piece of specific evidence beyond the documents relevant to an argument that addresses the prompt:

- “When messengers arrived bearing news that the emperor had lied in the document, the townspeople responded by throwing the messengers out the window in the infamous Defenestration of Prague.”
(The response occurs in a discussion of motivations for the war.)
- “Richelieu was responsible for convincing King Louis to enter the war, seeing it as a way to extend French power. Richelieu’s ambitions were successful, as the war severely weakened the Holy Roman Empire, and cemented France as the dominant European power.”
(The response provides a piece of evidence not in the documents relevant to an argument that addresses the prompt.)

D. Analysis and Reasoning (2 points)

Document Sourcing (0–1 point)

For at least **three** documents, the response explains how or why the document’s point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument that addresses the prompt. (1 point) To earn this point the response must explain how or why — rather than simply identifying — the document’s point of view, purpose, historical situation, or audience is relevant to an argument addressing the prompt for each of the three documents sourced.

Example of acceptable explanation of the significance of the author’s point of view:

- (Document 3): “When this letter was written in 1628, religious tensions were still high. As a Jesuit, Baumann was a militant Catholic and held great disdain for Protestants.”
(The response provides sourcing regarding the POV of the author relevant to an argument addressing religious motivations for the war.)

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

Example of acceptable explanation of the relevance of the historical situation of a document:

- (Document 7): “Document 7 is an excerpt from Pope Innocent 10th denouncing all articles of religious freedom as noted in the Treaty of Westphalia. The Pope was not allowed to partake in the Westphalia agreement which signified a continent wide severing of the relationship between church and state. For this reason Pope Innocent’s identity and historical situation in the balance of power at that time adds significance to his outraged and saddened tone in the response.”

(The response provides sourcing regarding the historical situation of the engraving relevant to an argument regarding the motivations for the war.)

Example of acceptable explanation of the significance of the audience:

- (Document 5): “As a confidential account, doc. 5 likely offers an honest telling of Adolphus’ motives and reveals that there were indeed political motives behind Adolphus’ actions”
(The response provides sourcing regarding the audience of the declaration relevant to an argument that addresses the political motivations for the war.)

Demonstrating Complex Understanding (0–1 point)

The response demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical motivations and factors that led to and continued the Thirty Years’ War, using evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the question.

Demonstrating a complex understanding might include:

- Explaining nuance of motivation by analyzing how religious and political considerations were often hard to distinguish, or that people within the same religious group could have differing goals
- Explaining both political and religious motivations
- Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods, such as comparing the Thirty Years’ War to other religious conflicts in Europe, such as division within the Catholic Church dating back to the Medieval period, French Wars of Religion, and the English Civil War, as well as political conflicts such as the Seven Years’ War and 18th-century balance of power conflicts
- Confirming the validity of an argument by corroborating multiple perspectives across themes
- Qualifying or modifying an argument by considering diverse or alternative views or evidence, such as pointing out the political considerations behind the religious claims that states and leaders made during the war

This understanding must be part of the argument, not merely a phrase or reference.

**AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

Examples of demonstrating complex understanding:

- Nuance: The response acknowledges that Cardinal Richelieu in Document 6 is achieving political gains and using religion as an excuse. As a *politique* he is willing to disregard his religious beliefs in favor of the state. He is killing two birds with one stone by removing Huguenots and increasing unity in France. Along with Adolphus, these leaders are extending the security of their states and increasing their power.
(The response explains nuance of an issue by analyzing how a ruler can use religious and political motivations to achieve their goal of increasing the power of the state, thus demonstrating an understanding of broader historical developments behind the document.)
- Explains multiple causes: The response discusses both religious and political reasons but makes a clear chronological demarcation between the two. The transition is based on the intervention of France and Sweden into the conflict. The response uses Document 1 (Emperor is trying to comfort and pacify the agitation) and Document 2 (Bohemia's response ... defending its right to practice Calvinism). A discussion of religious reasons is followed by an analysis of Documents 4, 5, and 6 discussing Adolphus and France's intervention into the war.
(The response explains multiple motivations by analyzing how the aims of Sweden and France changed the complexity of the war from religiously to politically motivated actions.)
- Corroboration: The response establishes the argument that the true purpose of the Thirty Years' War was the gain of power. Document 1 is used to explain how Matthias tries to avoid alienating Protestants by allowing the free practice of religion, but in reality this is a façade to protect his own power by deterring the Bohemians from taking up arms. The response then corroborates this line of reasoning by suggesting that the coalition of Calvinist nobles and cities is deceptive in that its actual motivation is political rather than being based on religious freedom.
(The response confirms the validity of an argument by using religion as a pretext for political motives from the differing perspective of a Catholic and a Protestant ruler.)
- Connections: To support an argument that the Thirty Years' War can be connected to the Spanish Inquisition, the response uses Document 6 to contrast the relatively placid way that Richelieu removed Protestants from France with the violent way in which Philip forced the exodus of Spanish Jews who would not convert. The response continues by noting that Richelieu's approach is less violent than the treatment Huguenots could expect in Spain or Austria.
(The response explains relevant and insightful connections between the Thirty Years' War and the Spanish Inquisition using outside evidence elaborating on an analysis of Document 6.)