

2016 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

EUROPEAN HISTORY

SECTION II

Total Time—1 hour, 30 minutes

Question 1 (Document-Based Question)

Suggested reading and writing time: 55 minutes

It is suggested that you spend 15 minutes reading the documents and 40 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.

- **Thesis:** Present a thesis that makes a historically defensible claim and responds to all parts of the question. The thesis must consist of one or more sentences located in one place, either in the introduction or the conclusion.
- **Argument Development:** Develop and support a cohesive argument that recognizes and accounts for historical complexity by explicitly illustrating relationships among historical evidence such as contradiction, corroboration, and/or qualification.
- **Use of the Documents:** Utilize the content of at least six of the documents to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument.
- **Sourcing the Documents:** Explain the significance of the author’s point of view, author’s purpose, historical context, and/or audience for at least four documents.
- **Contextualization:** Situate the argument by explaining the broader historical events, developments, or processes immediately relevant to the question.
- **Outside Evidence:** Provide an example or additional piece of specific evidence beyond those found in the documents to support or qualify the argument.
- **Synthesis:** Extend the argument by explaining the connections between the argument and ONE of the following.
 - A development in a different historical period, situation, era, or geographical area.
 - A course theme and/or approach to history that is not the focus of the essay (such as political, economic, social, cultural, or intellectual history).
 - A different discipline or field of inquiry (such as economics, government and politics, art history, or anthropology).

1. Evaluate whether the policies of Otto von Bismarck’s government represented traditional conservatism or a new kind of conservatism in nineteenth-century Europe.

2016 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Document 1

Source: Legislation passed by Bismarck's government, 1869–1878

Law Concerning the Equality of all Religions with Respect to Civil Rights and Citizenship of July 3, 1869: All restrictions on citizenship or civil rights based on differences in religious confession are abolished. The right to hold public office shall be independent of religious confession.

School Inspection Law of March 11, 1872: The supervision of all public and private school and educational institutions is solely under the control of the state and not of any clergy.

Law Concerning the Order of the Society of Jesus [The Jesuits] of July 4, 1872: The Order of the Society of Jesus and similar order-like Congregations, are banned hereby from the territory of the German Reich. The members of the Order of the Society of Jesus or similar order-like Congregations can be banished, if they are foreigners; if they are natives, their residence in certain districts or places can be denied, or they can be banished.

Law Against the Publicly Dangerous Endeavors of Social Democracy from October 21, 1878: Societies which aim at the overthrow of the existing political or social order through social-democratic, socialist, or communist endeavors are to be prohibited. Public festivities and processions shall be treated the same as meetings. Publications in which social-democratic, socialist, or communist endeavors aimed at the overthrow of the existing political or social order are manifested in a manner calculated to endanger the harmony among all classes of the population are to be prohibited.

2016 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Document 2

Source: Wilhelm Liebknecht, German socialist, political speech, 1869

Is it the duty of the Socialists to send delegates to the Reichstag [German parliament] at all? Our Social-Democratic Party (SPD)* must not, under any circumstances, or in any field, engage in transactions with its opponents. *We can only transact business where there is a common basis.* To do business with those who are your opponents in principle is equivalent to a sacrifice of principle. . . . The slightest concession in matters of principle is a relinquishing of the principle entirely. He who parliamentarizes, compromises.

Suppose a candidate comes up for election and the government is absolutely opposed to having him in the Reichstag. The government will confiscate the newspapers that advocate his election—it will do so legally; it will confiscate his election handbills—also legally; or it will give permits for meetings of electors and then dissolve them—again legally; it will arrest the candidate's campaign managers—quite legally; it will arrest the candidate himself—also legally. They recently arrested a delegate to the Reichstag, and that delegate would still be in prison right now if the National Liberals** had not been convinced by Bismarck of his harmlessness. There is no possibility of our having an influence on legislation. Tell me, in heaven's name, what would be the use of a presentation of our principles in the Reichstag? Do you think you would convert the members of the Reichstag? The idea is more than childish; it is infantile.

*the largest socialist party in Germany

**one of the main parties supporting Bismarck's government at the time

Document 3

Source: Hermann Wagener, high public official and conservative politician, memorandum written for Otto von Bismarck, "Why the Government Cannot Ignore the Social Question: A Conservative View," 1872

It is extremely dangerous to take up the battle against the ultramontane [extremely Catholic] and socialist parties simultaneously. It is important to keep those pursuing anti-national aims away from the social movement but it would be a political mistake to subject socialist leaders to emergency laws on account of their social advocacy, particularly without also doing something substantial to satisfy the just efforts of their followers. It would be hopeless to fight a powerful idea merely with material means, and, with respect to the extremely powerful Catholic-clerical idea, there is currently only one idea that can be used as a political counterweight with any prospect of success—and that is the social idea. The "social Kaiser" has a stronger position than even the "social Pope." At the moment, the mass of the population is wavering, unsure of the direction in which to turn. So far, the international agitation has not gained a broader basis; where the masses turn, however, will be of crucial significance not just for politics but also for the character of the army. The army will only be completely reliable if the workers, who make up its main contingent, are won over and bound to the idea of the Reich through its very benefits and performance.

2016 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Document 4

Source: “At the helm,” political cartoon portraying Bismarck, published in a satirical German magazine, 1879



bpk, Berlin / Dietmar Katz / Art Resource, NY

Caption: The Liberal says to the other two: “Don’t worry; when the wind shifts, I’ll be on top again.”

2016 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Document 5

Source: Kaiser Wilhelm I's speech opening the Reichstag, Berlin, November 1881

We, Wilhelm, German Emperor by the Grace of God, King of Prussia announce that in February of this year, We let Our conviction be known that curing social defects will be pursued not only through the repression of Social Democratic excesses but also through the promotion of workers' welfare. We deem it Our Imperial Duty to urge the Reichstag to take this task to heart once again. We would look back with all the more satisfaction on the many successes with which God has blessed Our government [and] We could be content having left the fatherland lasting guarantees of internal peace and having given the needy greater security and the assistance to which they are entitled. We trust that we have the support of the Reichstag, despite party differences.

The draft bill submitted during the last session on insuring workers against industrial accidents will be revised. Another bill will be added; the additional bill will give consistent organization to the commercial health insurance system. [It should not be forgotten], however, that all those persons who have become unfit for gainful employment through age or disability also have a legitimate claim to a greater degree of state welfare than they have received thus far. Finding the proper ways and means to ensure this level of welfare is difficult, but it is also one of the highest tasks of any community that rests upon the moral foundation of a Christian national life.

Document 6

Source: Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, speech in support of the new accident insurance bill, Berlin, March 5, 1884

Government according to Frederick the Great is to serve the people; the opposite is to dominate the people. We want to serve the people. It is not correct that we made the proposal to win more support for the Anti-Socialist law. At the time of the proposal of the law, His Majesty the Emperor and the majority of the Reichstag promised that as a corollary to this law there would also be a serious effort to better conditions for the workers.

The whole problem is rooted in the question: does the state have the responsibility to care for its helpless fellow citizens, or does it not? I maintain that it does have this duty and not simply the Christian state but indeed every state. There are objectives that only the state can fulfill including national defense and the general system of transportation. But the state must help persons in distress and prevent the workers' complaints that can be exploited by the Social Democrats.

If one argues against my position that this is socialism, then I do not fear that at all. The question is what are the limits of state socialism? Each law for poor relief is socialism. There are states that distance themselves so far from socialism that poor laws do not exist at all. These states take the French view that every French citizen has the right to starve and that the state has no responsibility to hinder him in the exercise of his right.

2016 AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Question 2 or Question 3

Suggested writing time: 35 minutes

Directions: Choose EITHER question 2 or question 3.

In your response you should do the following.

- **Thesis:** Present a thesis that makes a historically defensible claim and responds to all parts of the question. The thesis must consist of one or more sentences located in one place, either in the introduction or the conclusion.
 - **Application of Historical Thinking Skills:** Develop and support an argument that applies historical thinking skills as directed by the question.
 - **Supporting the Argument with Evidence:** Utilize specific examples of evidence to fully and effectively substantiate the stated thesis or a relevant argument.
 - **Synthesis:** Extend the argument by explaining the connections between the argument and ONE of the following.
 - A development in a different historical period, situation, era, or geographical area.
 - A course theme and/or approach to history that is not the focus of the essay (such as political, economic, social, cultural, or intellectual history).
 - A different discipline or field of inquiry (such as economics, government and politics, art history, or anthropology).
2. Describe and explain significant continuities and changes in attitudes toward and the experiences of European women from the Reformation through the Enlightenment. (*Historical thinking skill: Continuity and Change*)
3. Describe and explain significant continuities and changes in attitudes toward and the experiences of European women from the First World War through the Cold War. (*Historical thinking skill: Continuity and Change*)

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

STOP

END OF EXAM

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question

“Evaluate whether the policies of Otto von Bismarck’s government represented traditional conservatism or a new kind of conservatism in nineteenth-century Europe.”

Maximum Possible Points: 7

Please note:

- Each point of the rubric is earned independently, e.g., a student could earn the point for argument development without earning the point for thesis.
- Unique evidence from the student response is required to earn each point, e.g., evidence in the student response that qualifies for the contextualization point could not be used to earn the point for synthesis or the point for sourcing the documents.

A. Thesis and Argument Development (2 points)

Targeted Skill: Argumentation (E1, E4, and C1)

1 point Presents a thesis that makes a historically defensible claim and responds to all parts of the question. The thesis must consist of one or more sentences located in one place, either in the introduction or the conclusion.

Scoring Note: Neither the introduction nor the conclusion is necessarily limited to a single paragraph.

1 point Develops and supports a cohesive argument that recognizes and accounts for historical complexity by explicitly illustrating relationships among historical evidence such as contradiction, corroboration, and/or qualification.

0 points Neither presents a thesis that makes a historically defensible claim and responds to all parts of the question nor develops and supports a cohesive argument that recognizes and accounts for historical complexity.

— Is completely blank

B. Document Analysis (2 points)

Targeted Skill: Analyzing Evidence: Content and Sourcing (A1 and A2) and Argumentation (E2)

1 point Utilizes the content of at least six of the documents to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument.

1 point Explains the significance of the author’s point of view, author’s purpose, historical context, and/or audience for at least four documents.

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

0 points Neither utilizes the content of at least six of the documents to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument nor explains the significance of the author's point of view, author's purpose, historical context, and/or audience for at least four documents.

— Is completely blank

C. Using Evidence Beyond the Documents (2 points)

Targeted Skill: Contextualization (C3) and Argumentation (E3)

Contextualization

1 point Situates the argument by explaining the broader historical events, developments, or processes immediately relevant to the question.

0 points Does not situate the argument by explaining the broader historical events, developments, or processes immediately relevant to the question.

Scoring Note: Contextualization requires using knowledge not found in the documents to situate the argument within broader historical events, developments, or processes immediately relevant to the question. The contextualization point is **not** awarded for merely a phrase or reference, but instead requires an explanation, typically consisting of multiple sentences or a full paragraph.

Evidence Beyond the Documents

1 point Provides an example or additional piece of specific evidence beyond those found in the documents to support or qualify the argument.

0 points Does not provide an example or additional piece of specific evidence beyond those found in the documents to support or qualify the argument.

— Is completely blank

Scoring Notes:

- This example must be different from the evidence used to earn other points on this rubric.
- This point is **not** awarded for merely a phrase or reference. Responses need to reference an additional piece of specific evidence and explain how that evidence supports or qualifies the argument.

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

D. Synthesis (1 point)

Targeted Skill: Synthesis (C4, C5, or C6)

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| 1 point | Extends the argument by explaining the connections between the argument and one of the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) A development in a different historical period, situation, era, or geographical area.b) A course theme and/or approach to history that is not the focus of the essay (such as political, economic, social, cultural, or intellectual history).c) A different discipline or field of inquiry (such as economics, government and politics, art history, or anthropology). |
| 0 points | Does not extend the argument by explaining the connections between the argument and the other areas listed. |
| — | Is completely blank. |

Scoring Note: The synthesis point requires an explanation of the connections to a different historical period, situation, era, or geographical area, and is **not** awarded for merely a phrase or reference.

On Accuracy: The components of this rubric each require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, the essay may contain errors that do not detract from the overall quality, as long as the historical content used to advance the argument is accurate.

On Clarity: These essays 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 and skills described above.

Scoring Notes

Note: Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors. Where no student example of a particular type was found, a hypothetical example was used instead.

A. Thesis and Argument Development (2 points)

a) Thesis

Responses earn one point by presenting a thesis that makes a historically defensible claim that responds to all parts of the question (1 point). While the thesis does not need to be a single sentence, it does need to be discrete, meaning it cannot be pieced together from across multiple places within the essay. It can be located in either the introduction or the conclusion, but not split between the two. An acceptable thesis must take a position on whether Bismarck's rule was either a traditional or new kind of conservatism, as well as provide reason(s) for this assessment.

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

Examples of acceptable theses:

- “Essentially, von Bismarck’s government policies represented a new kind of conservatism in nineteenth-century Europe in which he valued traditional ways but also pushed for open-minded, idealistic reforms that were aligned with socialism and helped the nation as a whole.”
- “Otto von Bismarck’s government embodied the new conservatism, as he advocated for workers’ rights, religious equality, and socialized education systems. His new form of government was criticized on both sides of the spectrum. Traditional conservatives accused him of being a socialist, while socialist argued he was not liberal enough.”

Examples of unacceptable theses:

- This attempt does not work because it does not argue that Bismarck’s governmental policies represent traditional conservatism or a new kind of conservatism: “During Otto von Bismarck’s time as the head of State in Germany during the late 80s to the early 90s, he was well-known for his advocacy of social security for the poor on the basis of a government’s responsibility to its people even though it was not so widely popular with the more conservative people.”
- The thesis attempts to take a position, but its explanation of Bismarck’s policies relating to conservatism is muddled and unclear: “Otto von Bismarck’s government represented new conservatism in nineteenth century Europe. It represented new conservatism because the policies were not finished, because differences in opinion were not yet established, and because had just begun his secularization of the government.”

b) Argument Development

Responses must move beyond a single sentence or a listing of facts in support of the thesis or argument; they must explain the relationship of historical evidence to a complex and cohesive thesis or argument and do so throughout a substantial portion of the essay (1 point). Evidence can be related to the argument in ways such as contradiction (e.g., using evidence to address a possible counterargument to the main argument in the essay), corroboration (e.g., combining multiple pieces of evidence to support a single argument), or qualification (e.g., use of evidence to present an argument that is subsequently made more complex by noting exceptions).

Unacceptable argument development would include:

- Responses that do not develop a cohesive argument
- Responses that simply repeat the content of the documents or list the documents in order
- Responses that fail to organize documents in any meaningful way
- Responses that do not reconnect the evidence back to a thesis or argument

Examples of acceptable argument development:

- The response states that Bismarck’s policies reflect a new conservatism because of his separation of state and church. It then demonstrates complexity of argument by using evidence from Documents 1 and 3 to qualify that point, discussing the formulation of religious policy by the state and the state’s power over the Church and education for the purpose of promoting national identity.

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

- In a paragraph concerning Bismarck’s political strategy, the response emphasizes his willingness to compromise with certain political groups in order to defeat rival political groups. It draws on corroborating analyses of Documents 5 and 6 as evidence of Bismarck’s desire to avoid revolution.
- To critique Bismarck’s practice of shifting policies when it suited the interests of appealing to differing political parties or groups, the response creates a complex and cohesive treatment of Documents 4 (the cartoon) and 7 (the newspaper article celebrating Bismarck’s dismissal).

Examples of unacceptable argument development:

- Response refers to both traditional and new conservatism but never clarifies what these terms involve with evidence from the documents in support of a cohesive argument.
- Response discusses Bismarck’s policies but fails to link this discussion to an argument that Bismarck was more of a traditional than a new kind of conservative.
- Response makes multiple errors in interpreting documents (e.g., “Document 3 shows that Bismarck knew how to appeal to a mass audience...”), which prohibits their successful use as evidence of an argument.

B. Document Analysis (2 points)

a) Document Content

Responses earn one point by utilizing the content of at least six of the documents to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument (1 point). Responses cannot earn a point by merely quoting or paraphrasing the documents with no connection to a thesis or argument.

Examples of acceptable utilization of content from a document to support a thesis or relevant argument:

- For Document 1 (Laws in Germany): “In 1869 and 1872 [Bismarck] passed laws granting freedoms of religion and granting access to citizenship, rights, and political offices, and education to all religions (Document 1). Bismarck instituted policies to bolster support for his regime as chancellor.”
- For Document 2 (Liebknecht speech): “Liebknecht, a socialist, expressed frustration with how Bismarck suspended freedom of the press, ended campaigns and imprisoned targets to prevent social democrats from holding office in the Reichstag.”
- For Document 3 (Wagener memo): “Hermann Wagener, a supporter and aide to Bismarck, notes that ‘the army will only be completely reliable if the workers ... are won over and bound to the idea of the Reich,’ which illustrates the importance of nationalism and institutions to maintain order. The army is essential for a nation to garner respect and legitimacy and only through an army can completely in support of the values of a nation is that possible.”
- For Document 4 (Political cartoon): “Document 4 shows Bismarck giving favor in turn to Liberal, Conservative, and Ultramontane parties. This flexibility, ensuring no party got the upper hand, was essential to Bismarck’s maintenance of his new conservatism. Rather than simply favoring only Conservatives, as a traditional conservatist would, Bismarck balances all 3 parties.”

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

- For Document 5 (Kaiser speech): “[Bismarck] also even decided to insure ‘workers against industrial accidents’ (Document 5). Through his perspective, he was not playing nice, but like many of the past, he was playing realpolitik. By alleviating the concerns of the workers, anti-Socialist laws could be passed. As a result, the traditional order was preserved.”
- For Document 6: (Bismarck speech): “Bismarck, who argued that the state had a ‘duty’ to provide aid to ‘its helpless fellow citizens,’ (Document 6) did so not out of the realpolitik view that “lasting guarantees of internal peace” could occur ...”
- For Document 7 (Richter editorial): “In this article he openly criticizes Bismarck for promoting socialist ideas, but going against the socialist party. Richter described it as ‘offering the carrot one moment and applying the stick the next.’ This Document further expresses the belief that Bismarck wasn’t a traditional conservative at all, and had very socialist ideologies, but still identified as a conservative.”

Examples of unacceptable utilization of content from a document to support a thesis or relevant argument:

- Beyond the misinterpretation of the document, the response does not clearly connect the document to a position on Bismarck’s policies supporting either traditional or new conservatism: “Wagener [Document 3] seems to be trying to influence Bismarck to pick a side, and stop bouncing between conservatism and socialism. The Document seems to be criticizing Bismarck and even blaming him for the army not being fully reliable.”
- Not only does the response misunderstand the document’s content and purpose, the interpretation of the document lacks coherence in explaining how it does or does not support new conservatism: “In document 2, Wilhelm Liebknecht made the point that there was “no possibility of [their] having an influence on legislation.” A more traditional conservative would already have secret meetings for those who did not agree with the ruler. By the existence of such meetings, the ruler is influenced. Yet, this new conservatism was able to keep meetings from happening by “dissolv[ing] their rights to meet.”

b) Significance of Point of View, Purpose, Context, and/or Audience:

Responses earn one point by explaining the significance of the author’s point of view, author’s purpose, historical context, and/or audience for at least four documents (1 point). (*See the document summaries section for description of point of view, purpose, historical context, and audience for each document.*)

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

- For Document 7: “Even though Richter was heavily biased against Bismarck, because he was a liberal, these words rang true for all, including socialists and the ultramontane party, because Bismarck repressed them just the same as liberals.”

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

- For Document 1: “Since Bismarck wrote these laws, they would not hold any bias.” (This attempt provides no explanation for how and why the laws might be biased.)

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

Example of acceptable explanation of the significance of the author's purpose:

- For Document 4: "However, one should be careful in using this as a measure of how far Bismarck was willing to go as it comes from a German satirical magazine which can often use exaggeration to improve the point being made."

Example of unacceptable explanation of the significance of the author's purpose:

- For Document 2: "The author of Document 2 is a socialist, however, so he most likely is exaggerating in order to win sympathy for his speech." (No explanation is provided as to how and why a socialist may engage in exaggeration, e.g., for being oppressed by the government.)

Example of acceptable explanation of the significance of the historical context of a document:

- For Document 6: "Bismarck was alive to see the radical socialist Paris Commune take control, and was likely scared of a similar occurrence in Germany. Thus, he made 'a serious effort to better conditions for the workers.'"

Example of unacceptable explanation of the significance of the historical context of a document:

- For Document 1: "This religious toleration makes sense for Bismarck's policy within Germany because he had witnessed failure in his suppression of religious groups through his Kulturkampf." (The law referenced [from 1869] occurred before the failure of the Kulturkampf, thus rendering the analysis chronologically erroneous.)

Example of acceptable explanation of the significance of the audience:

- For Document 5: "The Kaiser undoubtedly intended for his speech to be heard most importantly by the disillusioned working class. While they had previously been neglected and exploited by forces like modernization, the working class was now being newly emphasized."

Example of unacceptable explanation of the significance of the audience:

- For Document 4: "In the cartoon, the magazine pokes fun at Bismarck's constant shifts in policy to support different political perspectives, whether Liberal, Conservative, or Ultramontane. The audience for this image was the German people." (Although the statement may correctly identify the intended audience, there is no analysis to support how this fact affected the content or presentation of the document.)

C. Using Evidence Beyond the Documents (2 points)

a) Contextualization

Responses earn a point for contextualization by explaining the broader historical events, developments, or processes immediately relevant to the question (1 point). To earn the point, the essay must situate the thesis, argument, or parts of the argument by accurately and explicitly evaluating whether Bismarck's policies represented a new or traditional type of conservatism. Examples might include:

- Social insurance legislation
- Pensions
- Anti-Catholic and Anti-Semitic policies
- Support for the monarchy
- 1848 and its effect on Bismarck

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

- Great power rivalries
- Anti-Socialist laws
- Growth of political parties in Germany such as Socialist party, known as the Social Democratic Party SPD
- German unification
- Prussian militarism
- Growth of Marxism as ideology
- Prussian Junker class

Example of acceptable contextualization:

- “Traditional conservatism was long a powerful force in European politics. At the 1815 Congress of Vienna, the entrenched rulers of Europe gathered to reaffirm principles like legitimacy and the balance of power. Great effort was exerted to maintain the order of things as they had always been. As nationalism grew in potency with the revolts like those of 1830 and 1848, governments shifted their focus from preserving the overall state of things to preserving their own stability.”

Example of unacceptable contextualization:

- The response’s references to a “difficult time” and “political unrest” are too general and do not help in setting up the thesis: “Otto von Bismarck was the chancellor of Germany. He held a lot of influence over much of Europe in his attempts to unify some countries. Bismarck ruled during a difficult time, there was much political unrest and a need for societal improvements.”

b) Evidence Beyond the Documents

Responses earn a separate point for providing an example or additional piece of specific evidence beyond those found in the documents to support or qualify the argument (1 point).

Example of providing an example or additional piece of specific evidence beyond those found in the documents to support or qualify the argument:

- “Bismarck utilized what he called Realpolitik in his policy and diplomacy which allowed him to react to any situation in the most efficient manner for the situation. The agendas of traditional conservatism did not restrict Otto von Bismarck’s policies.”

Example of improperly providing an example or additional piece of specific evidence beyond those found in the documents to support or qualify the argument:

- The parenthetical reference to Russia is not developed or specific enough, nor does the response connect it to the stated thesis: “In traditional conservatism, the government and the Church often jockeyed for power in places where the Church and head of state were not the same person (as in Russia).”

Distinguishing contextualization of argument from supporting evidence from outside the documents:

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

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

for a particular point made in the argument, analogous to the function of evidence drawn from the documents.

D. Synthesis (1 point)

Responses earn a point for synthesis by extending their argument in one of three possible ways (1 point).

- a) Responses can extend their argument by appropriately connecting their argument as to whether Bismarck was a traditional or new conservative to developments in other times and places (Synthesis proficiency C4). These connections must consist of more than just a phrase or reference.

Example of acceptable synthesis by appropriately connecting the argument to a development in a different historical period, situation, era, or geographic area:

- “Bismarck’s conservative policies strengthened the power of central governance in Germany and contributed to the cultivation of a strong sense of national identity. The United States government followed a similar policy when America first gained independence. American government was built on the principle that the power should be vested in the political elite instead of the masses — senators were indirectly elected through state legislators and the president was chosen through the electoral college. An institution like the Reichstag was not truly subject to the will of the people, but rather the political elite.”

Example that did not accurately connect the argument to a development in a different historical period, situation, era, or geographic area:

- Though the response refers to subsequent events in Germany, the reference does not specifically explain the link to the question of Bismarck’s conservative policies: “Although it would be the economic crisis following WWI and the Great Depression that would ultimately put the Nazis in power, Bismarck’s conservatist failures elevated religious indifferences and the rise of socialism that would allow the National Socialist Party to stick their foot in the door of the German political landscape.”
- b) Responses can extend their argument by appropriately connecting an evaluation of Bismarck’s conservatism to course themes and/or approaches to history that are not the main focus of the question (Synthesis proficiency C5). These connections must consist of more than just a phrase or reference. Responses for this question could earn a point for this type of synthesis for using a theme or approach that is not political history, for example, economic or social history.

Example of acceptable synthesis by connecting the argument to different course themes and/or approaches to history that are not the main focus of the question:

- “Religious toleration can be seen throughout history many times as anti-conservative. Famous conservative leaders, such as Ferdinand and Isabella, did things such as the Inquisition, which removed Muslims & Jews from Spain, so there would be a unity of Catholic faith. Bismarck, however, wanted religious toleration. This time period was after the 30 Years War, so because of the Treaty of Westphalia, it is allowed for Calvinists, Lutherans, and Catholics all to be a part of Germany.”

AP® EUROPEAN HISTORY 2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

Example that did not appropriately connect the argument to course themes and/or approaches to history that are not the main focus of the question:

- A response might hypothetically include the following: "This time period was also defined by the Second Industrial Revolution, which allowed Germany to challenge Britain as a leading industrial power. However, the advances in industry also created many social problems, like overcrowded cities and new social classes." Though accurate, this additional approach of economics is not linked in any way to the topic of Bismarck's policies or conservatism.
- c) Responses can extend their argument by using insights from a different discipline or field of inquiry (e.g., economics, government and politics, art history, anthropology) to better understand a given historical issue (Synthesis proficiency C6). These connections must consist of more than just a phrase or reference.

Example of acceptable synthesis by connecting the argument to different disciplines or fields of inquiry:

- A response might hypothetically include: "Bismarck's appeal, along with that of the Kaiser, by using traditional language of God and charity in a paternalistic way, would have a tremendous psychological impact on many Germans raised in a Protestant traditional religious society. These appeals were designed to appeal to the innate conservative desire for order and security in an age of change."

Example that did not appropriately connect the argument to different disciplines or fields of inquiry:

- A response might hypothetically include: "The Bismarck cartoon in document four is an example of the use of mass media as propaganda. Using images like this, new conservatives like Bismarck could manipulate the growing reading public." This is an attempt to use media studies/sociology to argue that Bismarck was a new conservative but fundamentally misreads the purpose and authorship of the document.