

2018

AP[®]

CollegeBoard

AP European History

Scoring Guidelines

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 1

Generic Scoring Guide

0–3 points

Score 3

Response accomplishes **all three** tasks set by the question.

Score 2

Response accomplishes **two** of the tasks set by the question.

Score 1

Response accomplishes **one** of the tasks set by the question.

Score 0

Response accomplishes **none** of the tasks set by the question.

Score NR

Is completely blank

Question-Specific Scoring Guide

- One point for describing an intellectual change that influenced the events described by Jaurès
- One point for explaining why the pattern of social changes identified by Jaurès led to the French Revolution
- One point for explaining how an ideology of the 1800s influenced Jaurès' interpretation of the causes of the French Revolution

Scoring Notes

General note: The “events described in the passage” refers to the events of the French Revolution — the subject of Jaurès' essays — and not to events in the early 20th century. The dual focus of the quote is on the intellectual changes brought about by the Enlightenment and the bourgeoisie's role as the main force behind the French Revolution. In dealing with the social aspects of the Revolution, Jaurès is offering a largely Marxist interpretation for the causes of the upheaval, though he frames it in nationalist terms. Acceptable responses may interpret “bourgeoisie” as “the middle class.”

Possible acceptable responses for part (a) (not exhaustive):

To meet the minimum requirement of “describe,” responses must do more than simply mention the word “Enlightenment” or name a particular thinker. An acceptable response should minimally describe some aspect of the Enlightenment or other intellectual changes in the 1700s that influenced the French Revolution. It is not necessary for an acceptable response to offer an explicit explanation of how a particular change influenced the French Revolution, but it must go beyond mere name-dropping.

- Enlightenment focus on reason, empiricism, or the application of scientific principles to society
- Enlightenment questioning of traditional authority and traditional political and social systems

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 1 (continued)

- Enlightenment skepticism about organized religion and religiously based justifications for existing institutions (e.g., divine-right monarchy)
- Descriptions of particular Enlightenment thinkers' theories or ideas that influenced the Revolution (e.g., Montesquieu, Condorcet, Rousseau, Voltaire, Locke)
- *Salons* and coffee shops used as a location where intellectual information is disseminated
- Printing press as a means of increased literacy and/or as a means of spreading of ideas via pamphlets

Additional notes:

- If responses only mention Enlightenment but do not describe how it influenced the events in the passage, they do not earn a point.
- Humanism, Individualism, Divine Right of Kings as ideas that are prior to and influence the French Revolution are acceptable if the response has a robust explanation.
- Responses may mislabel an intellectual change and still earn the point if the explanation of the intellectual change is in-depth and correct.

Possible acceptable responses for part (b) (not exhaustive):

The main social development identified by Jaurès is the rise of the bourgeoisie. To meet the minimum requirement of “explain” the response must provide some minimal linkage between a social development identified by Jaurès and some aspect of the French Revolution. Most responses will likely focus on the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789, but acceptable responses could also focus on how policies or institutions of the various French Revolutionary governments reflect the influence of the bourgeoisie.

- Growing wealth and/or education of the bourgeoisie conflicted with its lack of political power under the French monarchy.
- Under the monarchy government mismanagement and heavy taxation on the bourgeoisie created resentment because of the bourgeoisie's lack of an effective say in government.
- Growth in commerce and manufacturing led to the bourgeoisie playing a more important role in the French economy and demanding more political power.
- Growing belief by the members of the bourgeoisie that their class truly created wealth, while the nobility and the clergy were increasingly seen as “parasitic.”
- The abolition of the privileges of the clergy and the nobility in the early years of the Revolution resulted from the desire of the bourgeoisie to consolidate its power.
- The suppression of guilds and the banning of labor organizations and strikes (under the *la Chapelier* law) also resulted from influence of commercial and manufacturing interests on the Revolutionary governments.
- The ultimate rejection of the economic policies of the radical phase of the Revolution, such as the fixing of prices, also reflected the influence of the bourgeoisie on the course of the Revolution.

Possible acceptable responses for part (c) (not exhaustive):

To meet the minimum requirement for explaining how an ideology influenced Jaurès' interpretation, the response must make a clear reference to a 19th-century ideology or “ism” (either by name or by

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 1 (continued)

accurate description) and to assert some linkage between an idea, tenet, tendency, or emphasis in that ideology and the interpretation of the French Revolution expressed by Jaurès.

- Marxist thought described history as a series of class struggles. Jaurès' description of the revolutionary role of the bourgeois as a class shows the influence of Marxism on his interpretation. (Alternatively, his assertion that the bourgeoisie had attained “class consciousness” shows the influence of Marxism.)
- Nationalist thought foregrounded the achievements and struggles of nations as the most significant aspect of history. Jaurès' framing of the Revolution as a stage in French national development shows the influence of nationalism.
- Industrial Revolution — a period where workers' consciousness is developing much like the consciousness of the Third Estate.

Additional notes:

- Responses may mislabel an ideology of the 1800s and still earn the point if the explanation of the ideology is in-depth, correct, and linked back to influencing Jaurès' interpretation of the causes of the French Revolution.
- Responses in this part tend to lack the specificity to adequately explain an 1800s ideology and earn the point.

Other ideologies that might have influenced Jaurès' interpretation are liberalism with its emphasis on the development of freer, more rational political systems and positivism with its emphasis on scientific and intellectual progress in history.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 2

Generic Scoring Guide

0–3 points

Score 3

Response accomplishes **all three** tasks set by the question.

Score 2

Response accomplishes **two** of the tasks set by the question.

Score 1

Response accomplishes **one** of the tasks set by the question.

Score 0

Response accomplishes **none** of the tasks set by the question.

Score NR

Is completely blank

Question-Specific Scoring Guide

- One point for describing a cause of the financial difficulties faced by Germany in the early 1920s or a cause of the unwillingness of France and Britain to respond to German calls for aid
- One point for describing an effect of the financial difficulties faced by Germany in the early 1920s or an effect of the unwillingness of France and Britain to respond to German calls for aid
- One point for explaining the British cartoonist’s perspective on the financial situation of Germany in the 1920s

Scoring Notes

“The international situation depicted in the cartoon” can be understood as the economic/financial distress experienced by Germany in the aftermath of the World War I or as the unwillingness of France and Britain to respond to German calls for aid, or a combination of the two.

To meet the minimum requirement of “describe” in (a) and (b) responses, the response must offer an accurate description of a cause or effect of the international situation. Although it is not necessary for an acceptable response to offer an explicit, fully worked out explanation of how the cause or effect is connected to the situation portrayed in the 1921 cartoon, responses must offer some basic analysis (i.e., “World War II” by itself is not a sufficient explanation of an effect for part (b). For part (c) the response must do more than just quote the image captions and must contain analysis that moves beyond description of the image.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 2 (continued)

Possible acceptable responses for part (a) (not exhaustive):

- Economic reparations demanded of Germany by the Versailles Treaty as a result of the Allied declaration of Germany's "guilt" in World War I
- Political instability of the early Weimar Republic that made economic recovery more difficult
- Economic difficulties faced by post-war Britain and France that made them unwilling to help Germany

Additional note: A mere mention of "war guilt" or World War I in general is not enough to earn the point. The student must connect the war to the broader international situation of post-World War I Europe.

Possible acceptable responses for part (b) (not exhaustive):

- Ongoing hostility and mistrust in European international relations contributing to the rise of nationalism, Hitler and Nazism, and ultimately to the outbreak of the World War II
- Hyperinflation as the German government printed money to meet its reparations payments
- Rise of political extremism (Nazism, revolutionary communism) in Germany because of economic distress and/or the continued hostility of other countries
- Political resentment in Germany over France and Britain's unwillingness to help
- U.S. involvement in European economic and political affairs through the Dawes-Young Plan and the provision of loans to Germany after 1924
- Continued economic disruption in Germany
- Allied occupation of parts of Germany to secure reparation payments in goods rather than in inflated German currency

Additional notes: It is not enough for students simply to claim that World War II was an effect of the international situation. They must explain how or why World War II was connected to Germany's economic, social, or political situation in the aftermath of World War I.

You may also see students reference antisemitism as an effect of the situation depicted in the cartoon, which can work as long as the response explains that Nazis targeted Jews as scapegoats for the economic and political crises of post-World War II Germany and the response doesn't simply claim that the German population as a whole blamed Jews for the post-World War I international situation in the early 1920s.

Possible acceptable responses for part (c) (not exhaustive):

In part (c), "cartoonist's perspective" can be understood specifically as the cartoonist's assumption that Germany's distress is faked or more generally as a hostile view of Germany held by the cartoonist. Acceptable responses should make at least minimal acknowledgement of the chronological context of the cartoon (the immediate aftermath of World War I). Some responses may demonstrate awareness that the cartoonist was British, but a response can still achieve the point without directly acknowledging the cartoonist's national origin.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 2 (continued)

- The recent experience of war with Germany led British people like the cartoonist to be hostile to Germany and suspicious of its motives in the postwar period.
- The cost of the war with Germany or the belief that Germany was the aggressor led the cartoonist to condemn the German request for aid and/or portray it as a ruse.

Additional note: Many students are misinterpreting the cartoon by claiming that the cartoonist is sympathetic to the Germans and that the British and French are refusing to help a drowning Germany with an easily accessible lifebelt (i.e., “loans”). This is typically occurring because students are not closely reading the captions of the cartoon, which indicate that the British and French are “taunting” the German and that he is kneeling in the water, when he is capable of standing.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 3

Generic Scoring Guide

0–3 points

Score 3

Response accomplishes **all three** tasks set by the question.

Score 2

Response accomplishes **two** of the tasks set by the question.

Score 1

Response accomplishes **one** of the tasks set by the question.

Score 0

Response accomplishes **none** of the tasks set by the question.

Score NR

Is completely blank

Question-Specific Scoring Guide:

- One point for describing one reason for Martin Luther’s critique of the Catholic Church in the early 1500s
- One point for describing one Catholic response in the 1500s to Luther’s critique
- One point for explaining how Luther’s protest contributed to social change in Europe in the period 1517–1600

Scoring Notes

Acceptable responses to part (a) (not exhaustive):

“Reasons for Luther’s critique” can be understood as aspects of Church doctrine or practice that Luther denounced, either before his formal break with Rome or afterward. To meet the minimal standard of “describe,” the response must accurately recount a doctrine or practice that Luther criticized or rejected. It is not necessary for the response to offer an explicit explanation of why Luther criticized or rejected a particular doctrine or practice, but the response must do more than name-drop. Acceptable responses can also take the form of accurate descriptions of how a belief or practice of Luther led him to challenge established Catholic traditions (e.g., “Luther believed in the priesthood of all believers, so he felt that many of the Catholic sacraments were unnecessary.”)

- Sale of indulgences — Catholics were offered forgiveness for sins in return for payment to the Church. (Stronger responses will likely add that the practice — and, to some extent, the existence of Purgatory — lacked direct Scriptural authority.)
- Use of the Latin language in Catholic rituals that many people did not understand.
- The absence of explicit reference in the Bible to the number or details of the sacraments.
- Papal appointment of bishops and control over churches in German territories.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 3 (continued)

- The Catholic practices of allowing clergy to receive the income from several parishes without performing any pastoral duties there (plurality of office) or simony (the selling of Church offices).
- Inadequate priestly education, leading to errors in the Mass.
- The Catholic requirement that clergy remain celibate.

Additional notes:

Responses of this type, lacking any further information, should not be accepted:

- “Luther said the Church was corrupt.”
- “Luther attacked the Church in his famous 95 Theses.”

Acceptable responses to part (b) (not exhaustive):

“Responses to Luther’s critique” can be understood as actions taken by the Catholic Church in response to the words or actions of Luther and his followers. These actions can be **reforms initiated by the Church** or **actions intended to counter the spread of Lutheranism**, and not merely a generally oppositional stance to Luther’s ideas. To meet the minimal standard of “describe,” the response must accurately recount a Catholic action. It is not necessary to offer an explicit explanation of the connection between the Catholic response and a specific aspect of Luther’s critique, but it is necessary to do more than simply identify the Council of Trent.

The best responses will note that, particularly by means of Papal initiatives and at the meetings of the Council of Trent, the Church shored up its interpretation of some theological concepts while conceding points on others. It is not an acceptable response merely to state that the Church was “angered by” or “opposed to” Luther’s criticisms, nor merely that he was excommunicated or forced to attend the Diet of Worms. It is an acceptable response if either of these is connected to an attack on Luther’s criticisms, e.g., “Luther was told to recant his criticisms of the sale of indulgences and, if he did not, was threatened with excommunication or worse.”

- Reassertion of Catholic doctrine at the Council of Trent, such as the reinstatement of the Latin translation of the Bible (the Vulgate)
- Reforms of the Council of Trent, such as the abolition of plurality of office, the creation of new Catholic educational institutions, or the various decisions of the Council of Trent on indulgences (which were declared efficacious for salvation in 1563 and yet were banned for sale by Pope Pius V in 1567)
- Encouragement of anti-Protestant military campaigns by Catholic rulers (although these should be within the chronological period, e.g., not the Thirty Years’ War)
- Foundation of new religious orders — particularly the Jesuits and Ursulines — to combat the spread of Lutheranism and to reconvert Protestants to Catholicism
- Sponsoring of overseas missions to spread Catholicism beyond Europe

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 3 (continued)

Additional notes:

Some responses attempt to earn the point by listing an attack on Luther personally, rather than on his “critique”, as stated in the Prompt. Responses of this type, lacking further elaboration, should not be accepted:

- “Obviously, the Church was not happy with Luther’s criticisms since they tried to kill him.”
- “The Church ignored/rejected Luther’s criticisms.”
- “By excommunicating Luther, the Church hoped to discredit his critique.”

Acceptable responses to part (c) (not exhaustive):

To meet the minimal standard of “explain,” the response must offer some minimally accurate **linkage** between the spread of Luther’s ideas and a social change in Europe. “Social change” can be broadly understood to be any change in group identification, relationships among social orders or classes, gender roles, or family structure and relationships, which can be connected to Luther’s ideas.

The best responses will connect Luther’s theological arguments to a noticeable change in personal relationships, such as between social classes, within nation-states, or among family members. It is an acceptable response to comment that the proliferation of new Protestant groups shattered the religious unity of Western Europe, as long as it connects the resulting violence to a specific social change. However, it is not sufficient to state, simply, that “Lutheran” was a new way to identify oneself or that Lutheranism led to a separation of Church and State, at least in the 16th century.

- Luther’s ideas about the priesthood of all believers encouraged social uprisings and revolts, in particular the Peasants’ War (although this linkage was disavowed by Luther).
- Luther’s belief that everyone should read the Bible led to the encouragement of education and the growth of literacy.
- Lutherans’ use of vernacular languages strengthened the identification of various groups and individuals with particular nations.
- The violence of various wars of religion sometimes led to a recognition of the need for religious tolerance (e.g., the Peace of Augsburg, the rise of *politiques* and the Edict of Nantes, Elizabeth I “not making windows into men’s souls”).
- Lutheranism’s rejection of papal authority and of the sacramental function of priests led to the disappearance of the clergy as a politically recognized and privileged social order in many areas.
- The abolition of Catholic female religious institutions in Protestant areas removed an opportunity for some women to exercise authority.
- Luther’s rejection of celibacy led to a greater valuation of marriage and the family as a means of moral instruction (e.g., his marriage to the former nun Katharina von Bora).
- In some cases, the “priesthood of all believers” concept promoted assertiveness among women to read the Bible for themselves and to proclaim their own interpretations of it (e.g., the Anabaptists Elizabeth Dirks and Anna Jansz or the Lutheran Argula von Grumbach).

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 3 (continued)

Additional notes:

Some responses attempt to earn the point by listing a social change of the period but fail to connect it to Luther's protest. Responses of this type, lacking an explicit link to Luther's criticisms, should not be accepted:

- "There were a lot of new religious choices, and the Protestant Reformation would continue to change everything up until the present day."
- "A lot of people were killed in religious wars."
- "The printing press spread Protestant ideas."
- "Luther's protest led to the social changes of the Scientific Revolution/Enlightenment."

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 4

Generic Scoring Guide

0–3 points

Score 3

Response accomplishes **all three** tasks set by the question.

Score 2

Response accomplishes **two** of the tasks set by the question.

Score 1

Response accomplishes **one** of the tasks set by the question.

Score 0

Response accomplishes **none** of the tasks set by the question.

Score NR

Is completely blank

Question-Specific Scoring Guide

- One point for describing one of Lenin’s critiques of the Russian monarchy
- One point for describing one effect of Lenin’s critique on Russian politics
- One point for explaining how Stalin’s policies departed from Lenin’s policies

Scoring Notes

Acceptable responses to part (a) (not exhaustive):

To meet the minimal standard of “describe,” the response must accurately recount a feature of the Russian monarchy under the Romanovs that Lenin critiqued. The response does not have to offer an explicit explanation linking Lenin’s Marxist beliefs to aspects of the Russian monarchy that he criticized, but it must do more than name-drop.

- Oppressive nature of the Russian monarchy (censorship, secret police, political prosecutions)
- Political and economic ineptitude of the Russian government under the monarchy (it is backward, “Asian”)
- Involvement of the Russian monarchy in a disastrous war with Germany
- Extreme economic inequality under the Russian monarchy
- Mistreatment of workers and peasants under the Russian monarchy
- Use of government force to support the interests of landowners and capitalists in Russia
- Use of religious authority and symbolism to support the Russian monarchy
- Colossal bureaucratic apparatus of the Russian state
- Discrimination against non-Russian nationalities

Additional note: The response must describe a criticism Lenin makes of the Russian monarchy. Simply discussing Lenin’s political positions and goals will not earn the response a point.

© 2018 The College Board.

Visit the College Board on the Web: www.collegeboard.org.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 4 (continued)

Acceptable responses to part (b) (not exhaustive):

To meet the minimal standard of “describe,” the response must accurately recount a political effect of Lenin’s critiques on Russian politics. The response does not have to offer an explicit linkage between a specific critique by Lenin and a particular political effect, but it must do more than name-drop. The response can deal with effects in the period before the Bolshevik Revolution (October Revolution) or afterward.

- Growth of a Marxist-oriented socialist revolutionary movement in Russia in the period before 1917 (the Bolsheviks)
- Weakening of the Russian war effort during World War I through Bolshevik (and other dissenters’) agitation and propaganda
- Continued discontent with the Provisional Government’s policies after the February Revolution of 1917
- Overthrow of the Provisional Government and the establishment of a communist government in the Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917
- Withdrawal of Soviet Russia from World War I
- Establishment of socialist policies, such as land redistribution, government ownership of industry, and control of the economy (also includes the New Economic Policy or NEP)
- Encouragement of national independence movements (in Poland, Ukraine, etc.)

Additional note: While Lenin’s criticisms of the Russian monarchy did lead to his being exiled, stating this alone will not earn a response for part (b). To earn a point the response needs to describe the effect of Lenin’s critique on the Russian political situation, and not just the consequences for Lenin personally.

Acceptable responses to part (c) (not exhaustive):

To meet the minimal standard of “explain,” the response must accurately recount at least one way in which political, economic, social, diplomatic, or cultural policies of the Soviet Union under Stalin departed from policies under Lenin’s regime. It is not necessary for the response to deal with multiple, distinct policies, but the response should not be limited only to a description of either Lenin’s or Stalin’s policies.

- Stalin abandoned Lenin’s New Economic Policy (NEP), which had allowed for limited free markets, and reimposed strict state control over most of the economy.
- Stalin gave up Lenin’s foreign policy of trying to encourage Bolshevik-style revolutions in other countries, concentrating instead on developing “socialism in one country” and trading and cooperating to a limited extent with noncommunist countries.
- Stalin more actively fostered a cult of personality centered on himself as opposed to Lenin’s more ideological style of leadership.
- Stalin encouraged the bureaucratization of the Soviet state and communist party, whereas Lenin had sought to limit the bureaucracy and its importance.
- Stalin made the “politics of fear” (use of terror, secret police, GULAG, purges) a normative part of governance, whereas Lenin resorted to such measures primarily in exceptional situations (notably civil war).

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Short Answer Question 4 (continued)

- Stalin discouraged experimentation and innovation in the arts and culture — such as Soviet Expressionism, which had flourished under Lenin — and instead encouraged Socialist Realism as a more effective form of pro-Soviet propaganda

Additional notes:

- It will not be acceptable to distinguish between Lenin’s and Stalin’s policies simply by saying that Lenin promoted socialism/Marxism and Stalin promoted communism.
- Care needs to be taken with assertions that Stalin pushed the Soviet Union in a more totalitarian direction than had Lenin. In fact, Lenin had championed many developments that came to be associated with the Stalinist “police” state, most importantly the Communist party’s presence and a leading role in every aspect of state and society.
- Generally the response will need to explain both Lenin’s and Stalin’s policies. However, if the response to part (c) clearly reads as a follow-up to the response to part (b) (e.g., in the discussion of economic policies), a point may be awarded for part (c) for this more implicit comparison.

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)</p> <p><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
<p>If response is completely blank, enter - - for all four score categories A, B, C, and D.</p>		

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 re-imposition 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 reimposing Catholicism (situation). Jesuit seeks to reassure the Elector Catholicism is winning despite Protestant resistance (purpose).
4. Letter from Adolphus to Elector of Brandenburg (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.)

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 2 — Long Essay Question

“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.”

Maximum Possible Points: 6

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 merely 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 statement must make a historically defensible claim about 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 1815–1914, with some indication of the reasoning for making that claim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “While early colonialism from 1500-1650 was similar in its exploitation of the Natives and sudden obsession with newly found goods to its counterpart in 1815-1914 it differed in the grounds of how European people immersed themselves in the colonies’ culture.” • “Europe’s interactions with its overseas colonies did not differ extremely from the period 1500 to 1650 and the period 1815 to 1914. On a broad level we see imperialism evident as many European countries had colonies overseas that they economically and culturally changed for their own benefit. This is consistent throughout all eras of imperialism.”
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 a reference.</i></p>	<p>To earn this point the essay must accurately describe a context relevant to differences in European interactions with overseas colonies between the period 1500 to 1650 and the period 1815 to 1914.</p> <p><i>Examples of context might include the following, with appropriate elaboration:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voyages of exploration • American Revolution • Industrial Revolution • Decolonization

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 2 — Long Essay Question (continued)

C: Evidence (0–2)	<p>Evidence: Provides specific examples of evidence relevant to the topic of the prompt. (1 point)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Supports an Argument: Supports an argument in response to the prompt using specific and relevant examples of evidence. (2 points)</p>	<p><i>To earn the first point the response must identify specific historical examples of evidence relevant to European interaction with overseas colonies in the period 1500 to 1650 and/or the period 1815 to 1914.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>To earn the second point the response must use specific historical evidence to support an argument in response to the prompt.</i></p> <p><i>Evidence used might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jesuit missions • Spanish conquistadores • The Scramble for Africa • Social Darwinism/White Man’s Burden
D: Analysis and Reasoning (0–2)	<p>Historical Reasoning: Uses historical reasoning (e.g., comparison, causation, continuity, and change over time) to frame or structure an argument that addresses the prompt. (1 point)</p> <p><i>To earn the first point the response must demonstrate the use of historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument about the extent to which Europe’s interaction with overseas colonies differed, although the reasoning might be uneven, imbalanced, or inconsistent.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <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 prompt. (2 points)</p> <p><i>To earn the second point the response must demonstrate a complex understanding of differences in European interactions with overseas colonies between the period 1500 to 1650 and the period 1815 to 1914.</i></p>	<p><i>Examples of using historical reasoning might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The change from Spain and Portugal as dominant colonial powers to England, the Netherlands, and France • The changes in settlement patterns in overseas colonies • The differing forms of state and local resistance to European rule • The changing ideological rationales for overseas expansion <p>OR</p> <p><i>Demonstrating complex understanding might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzing the nuance of an issue by explaining significant changes in colonial interactions while also acknowledging ways in which those interactions remained consistent with earlier patterns • Explaining changes over time in different European countries’ relations with overseas colonies • Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across the periods 1500–1650 and 1815–1914 • Confirming the validity of an argument by corroborating multiple perspectives across themes • Qualifying or modifying an argument by considering evidence that supports an alternate position <p><i>This demonstration of complex understanding must be part of the argument, not merely a phrase or reference.</i></p>

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

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 2 — Long Essay Question (continued)

Scoring Notes

Introductory notes:

- Except where otherwise noted, each point of these rubrics is earned independently; for example, a student could earn a point for evidence without earning a point for thesis/claim.
- **Accuracy:** The components of these rubrics require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, responses may contain errors that do not detract from their 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 are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors.

A. Thesis/Claim (0–1 point)

Responses earn **1** point by responding to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis or claim about the extent to which European interactions with overseas colonies differed between the period 1500 to 1650 and the period 1815 to 1914.

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.

The thesis is not required to encompass the entire period, but must identify a relevant development or developments in the period.

Examples of acceptable theses:

- “In search of new trade routes, Europe took advantage of the “new lands” they discovered in the 1500s and 1600s (The Americas) and colonialism, gradually over time evolved into a much more grandiose and physically expansive form of colonialism: imperialism. As colonialism evolved into imperialism over time, the approach toward economics, the extent of expansion and understandings of decolonization changed as well. Thus, Europe’s interaction with overseas colonies in the 16th and 17th centuries is more different in the approach to colonialism compared to that of European interaction in the 19th and 20th centuries.” (*The response makes a historically defensible claim that addresses the extent of change and indicates the reasoning for that claim.*)
- “Europe’s interactions with oversea [*sic*] colonies in the period 1500 to 1650 differed from the period 1815 to 1914 because of the economic status, resources, and even religion and social standpoint.” (*This minimally acceptable thesis makes a historically defensible claim and indicates the reasoning for making that claim.*)

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 2 — Long Essay Question (continued)

- “Since the main motive for overseas expansion was economic gain, eras 1500-1650 and 1815-1914 have great similarities regarding the extent of European interaction.” (*This minimally acceptable thesis that makes a historically defensible claim and indicates the reasoning for making that claim.*)

Examples of unacceptable theses:

- “In evaluating the differences between the first and second wave of imperialism, it becomes clear that there are certain broad similarities as well as key differences in Europe’s relationship with its colonies during these times, contributing to waves which were broadly similar and yet very different.” (*While the response offers a historically defensible claim, it offers no indication of a specific line of reasoning. If this statement was immediately followed or preceded by another sentence suggesting a valid reason for taking this position, then it would earn the point.*)
- “Europe took to imperialism starting the 1500s. They began to colonize many countries, especially in Africa & take what they could give. It took a transition once entering 1815, as while they used to just take & take from their colonies, they began to change that aspect & not have as too much involvement in their colonies as they used to.” (*The statement is not historically defensible.*)
- “Over time Europe’s relation with its overseas colonies has changed dramatically. Colonies go from completely dependent to independent nation-states. Money-seeking Spaniards quickly turned into colony founders building industrialized cities.” (*The statement is chronologically incorrect, and therefore not defensible.*)
- “In the two time periods from 1500 to 1650 and 1815 to 1914, Europe’s interactions differed with its overseas colonies. One way it differed is socially. Another way it differed is economically. Lastly, it differed in terms of militarily.” (*While the response offers a historically defensible claim, the categories for reasoning are generic and unsupported.*)

B. Contextualization (0–1 point)

Responses earn **1** point by describing a broader historical context relevant to the prompt. To earn this point the response must relate the topic of the prompt to broader historical events, developments, or processes that occurred before, during, or continued after the time frame circa 1500–1650 and/or 1815–1914. This point is not awarded for merely a phrase or a reference.

To earn the point the response must accurately describe a context relevant to differences in European interactions with overseas colonies between the period from 1500 to 1650 and the period from 1815 to 1914.

Examples might include the following, with appropriate elaboration:

- The voyages of exploration by Columbus and da Gama
- The American Revolution
- The Industrial Revolution
- Decolonization

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 2 — Long Essay Question (continued)

Examples of acceptable contextualization:

- “Advances in cartography and shipmaking such as the stern-post rudder, lanteen [sic] sail and magnetic compass allowed for European ships to trade with foreign lands and to begin to create the first global economy.”
- “From 1650-1815 many of Europe’s colonies had become independent like the United States, parts of South America, and Mexico. Slowly but surely Europe lost it’s [sic] colonies in the Americas. By late 1800’s and early 1900’s European countries were colonizing Africa, India, and parts of Asia.”
- “After the Second World War, the nations of the oppressed [sic] countries in Africa and Asia finally had the chance to decolonize due to Europe having to focus on rebuilding and leaving much of its power to hold on to the colonies lost. The decolonization movement finally ended the European nations’ power.”

Examples of unacceptable contextualization:

- “As Enlightenment ideals began to seep into these colonies the natives [sic] populations sometimes tried to resist. But these rebellions were quickly shut down by powerful and growing European militaries.”
(The response vaguely references the Enlightenment and does not provide linkage between Enlightenment ideals and the rebellions.)
- “It might be argued that because of early colonization practices, minority groups are still treated with disdain by white majority today. But it can definitely be argued that without colonization, our world would not have grown largely as big.”
(The response vaguely references modern-day racism with insufficient elaboration.)

C. Evidence (0–2 points)

Evidence

Responses earn **1** point by providing at least two specific examples of evidence relevant to the **topic** of the prompt. Responses can earn this point without earning the point for a thesis statement. To earn this point the response must identify specific historical examples of evidence relevant to the topic of the extent to which European interactions with overseas colonies differed between the period 1500–1650 and the period 1815–1914. These examples of evidence must be different from the information used to earn the point for contextualization.

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** will typically be more specific information.

Examples of evidence used might include the following:

- The establishment of Portuguese trading posts and forts in the Indian Ocean
- The Spanish conquest of the Aztecs and Incas
- The Columbian Exchange
- Mercantilist vs. free-trade policies
- The growth of overseas migration from Europe

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 2 — Long Essay Question (continued)

- The Scramble for Africa
- The establishment of joint-stock companies chartered by the state, such as the Dutch and British East India Companies

Examples of evidence relevant to the topic:

- “Britain sent families to colonize the Americas, while France sent fur traders, and Spain sent conquistadors.”
- “The concept of Social Darwinism and the duty of the white man to civilize the unfit races of the world seen in Rudyard Kipling’s “White Man’s Burden” was also a major factor in European imperialism circa the years 1815-1914.”
- “The Berlin Conference organized by Otto von Bismarck shows the scramble for European nations to obtain valuable raw material [*sic*] in Africa.”

OR

Supports an Argument

Responses earn **2** points if they support an **argument** in response to the prompt using specific and relevant examples of evidence. To earn the second point the response must use specific historical evidence to support an argument regarding the extent to which European interactions with overseas colonies differed between the period 1500–1650 and the period 1815–1914.

Examples of successfully supporting an argument with evidence:

- “The 1815-1914 period, however, was mostly where European nations contested by squeezing money out of Africa and Asia to further their own agendas. African nations were arbitrarily cut with no regard to the indigenous populations in order to have a fast and easy way to make money for their European overlords. India was mostly controlled by Great Britain, and China was split by Britain, France, and others. The Africans made money for Europe by selling slaves, doing manual labor such as mining or farming on plantations. Other African “colonies” were extorted every month. India was a cotton manufacturing machine. China, Arabia, and the East Indies were all made into trade intensive places with China being controlled by Britain’s opium shipments. During this period, the missionaries sent to the colonies were few in number, so religion did not really take hold in Africa and Asia. The European nations spent the period 1815-1914 vying for power in the money it could make from their colonies.”
(The response uses specific pieces of evidence in accurate support of an argument that addresses the prompt.)

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 2 — Long Essay Question (continued)

- “In the period from 1815 to 1914 colonies were primarily governed by trading companies or puppet government. The British Raj is a prime example of this type of rule. The British Raj was run by the British East India Trading company. The company established a puppet government of officials elected from India itself to run the country provided that they answer to the East India Company which answered to the British government.” (*The response uses specific pieces of evidence in accurate support of an argument that addresses the prompt.*)

D. Analysis and Reasoning (0–2 points)

Historical Reasoning

Responses earn **1** point by using historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument that addresses similarity and/or difference by making an argument for the extent to which European interactions with overseas colonies differed between the period 1500–1650 and the period 1815–1914. To earn this point the response must demonstrate the use of historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument, although the reasoning might be uneven, imbalanced, or inconsistent.

Examples of explaining the historical relationship might include:

- Explaining the differences between the two by comparing the economic motivations in each period
- Explaining the changing nature of European imperialism by discussing the changing role of religion
- Explaining the changing scale of European imperialism in expanding from trading posts in Asia and Africa in the early period to large-scale empires and colonies in the later period

Examples of using historical reasoning:

- “Old Imperialism was all about creating new world colonies and sending people there to live and also control useful resources ... New Imperialism focused on behind the scenes control. Examples of this are Belgian Congo where the population stayed mostly natives, but Belgium used it for resources.” (*The response establishes a structure for analyzing differences between both periods.*)
- “Lastly, another difference is how the Europeans affected the colonies. In 1500-1650, the Europeans brought diseases to the colonies and wiped out entire tribes of indigenous people. However in 1815-1914, they came with the idea of the “White Man’s Burden” and sought to improve the lives of the people in the colonies. They converted them and provided them with a civilization unlike anything they were used to.” (*The response makes a direct contrast between both periods.*)

OR

Complexity

Responses earn **2** points by demonstrating a complex understanding of the differences in European colonial relationships during the two periods through using evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the question.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 2 — Long Essay Question (continued)

Demonstrating a complex understanding might include:

- Explaining the nuance of an issue by analyzing changes in European interactions with overseas colonies while noting the continuities in those interactions
- Explaining similarities and differences between colonial interactions of different European nations
- Explaining significant continuities in European interactions while also acknowledging the changing nature of those interactions by the end of the 19th century
- Qualifying or modifying an argument by considering evidence that supports an alternate position from the position established in the thesis

Examples of complexity:

- “In both of the periods, need for raw materials and luxury goods prompted colonization. During the first period, there was a growing demand for luxury goods, that sometimes colonies could only provide. Europeans became dependent on coffee & sugar, which were grown on plantations in colonies. Colonies in Asia could also provide silks & expensive spices to the high society of Europe. Every European country was motivated by this because it opened the door on endless economic opportunities & gains. During the second period, colonization was driven by the high demand of raw materials during the first & Second Industrial revolutions. For examples, the invention of cars during the 2nd Industrial Revolution led to the need for rubber, which was supplied by King Leopold of Belgium’s horrible crimes in his personal Congo “free” state. This inspired colonization for the same reason as the luxury goods as the first period did. The growing market economy needed supplies & whichever government provided these supplies would benefit immensely. Europe’s interactions with colonies differed between the two periods because the first was mainly about glory and labor, while the second was more concerned with trade & racial superiority. The main goals of the first period was state glory, which many states found through discovering of new lands & peoples. For example, Henry the Navigator brought glory to Portugal with his fundings of expeditions up and down the coast of Africa.”
(The response analyzes both similarities and differences with substantial evidence throughout.)
- “In 1500 to 1650, one of the main interactions of Europeans in the Americas with their colonies was to spread Christianity. This has many examples, the Spanish being one of them. As this was around the time of the Spanish Inquisition, Spanish conquistadors converted natives of the empires and tribes they conquered. One example of this is the conversion of the Aztecs to Christianity. When Hernán Cortés conquered the Aztecs, conversions of their people began almost immediately. The same occurred in its capital in South America with Pizarro’s defeat of the Inca. This process also occurred in British colonial holdings, many of which sought to convert natives and slaves that were not killed. The policies of European powers with their colonies in 1850 to 1914 changed significantly. Instead of directly seeking to spread Christianity, this being done by individual missionaries, European states sought to consolidate their control of African and Asian territories and left conversion to the Church. One example of this is British India, in which Hindus and Muslims remained the majority despite

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 2 — Long Essay Question (continued)

British rule. Britain was more concerned with preserving its political and economic power, as shown by the Sepoy Rebellion of the 1850s which caused the British government to take direct control of India from the British East India Company. Another example of this is King Leopold's Congo. King Leopold of Belgium privately owned the Congo in Africa, and it was only transferred to Belgium later. As its owner he did not seek to spread Christianity, but instead he used the labor of the Congolese to extract resources and enrich himself. While Europeans originally placed importance on faith in interactions with their colonies, they eventually came to place more importance on the economic and political gains they could make in colonizing.”

- Nuance: The response contains multiple variables in analyzing differences, including Spanish and British colonialism in the early period and British and Belgian imperialism in the later period. The response does not merely describe the variables but rather analyzes why various imperial nations interacted with indigenous peoples.

(Explains the nuance of an issue analyzing the way multiple imperial powers chose to deal with religion in the colonies)

- Insightful connections across periods: The response analyzes how the Spanish and British sought to Christianize indigenous peoples in the early period but allowed them to maintain their own religion in the later period.

(Contrasts the way that imperial powers dealt with religion in the colonies between the two periods)

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3 — Long Essay Question

“Evaluate the extent to which the political consequences of Britain’s Glorious Revolution differed from the political consequences of the French Revolution.”

Maximum Possible Points: 6

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 merely 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 statement must make a historically defensible claim about the extent to which the political consequences of Britain’s Glorious Revolution differed from the political consequences of the French Revolution, with some indication of the reasoning for making that claim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The political consequences of Britain’s Glorious Revolution differed from those of the French Revolution immensely as seen through the greater importance of Parliament and overall stability.” • “While the Glorious Revolution brought around a mainly peaceful change in leaders, the French Revolution was very deadly and unstable.”
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 a reference.</i></p>	<p>To earn this point the essay must accurately describe a context relevant to the consequences of the Glorious and/or French Revolutions.</p> <p><i>Examples of context might include the following, with appropriate elaboration:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Civil War and Cromwell • Enlightenment thought • Impact of the American Revolution • Further political instability in post-1815 France

**AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 3 — Long Essay Question (continued)

C: Evidence (0–2)	<p>Evidence: Provides specific examples of evidence relevant to the topic of the prompt. (1 point)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Supports an Argument: Supports an argument in response to the prompt using specific and relevant examples of evidence. (2 points)</p>	<p><i>To earn the first point the response must identify specific historical examples of evidence relevant to the consequences of the Glorious and/or French Revolutions.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>To earn the second point the response must use specific historical evidence to support an argument in response to the prompt.</i></p> <p><i>Evidence used might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen • The Committee of Public Safety and the Terror • Reactions of Austria and Prussia to the killing of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette • Fluctuations in French Government (Reign of Terror, Directory, Consul, Napoleon) • Napoleonic Wars • The Concert of Europe • The English Bill of Rights • The Code Napoleon • Limited violence in Ireland
------------------------------	--	--

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3 — Long Essay Question (continued)

D: Analysis and Reasoning (0–2)	<p>Historical Reasoning: Uses historical reasoning (e.g., comparison, causation, continuity, and change over time) to frame or structure an argument that addresses the prompt. (1 point)</p> <p><i>To earn the first point, the response must demonstrate the use of historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument about the extent to which the political consequences of the Glorious and French Revolutions differed, although the reasoning might be uneven, imbalanced, or inconsistent.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <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 prompt. (2 points)</p> <p><i>To earn the second point the response must demonstrate a complex understanding of differences in the political consequences of Britain’s Glorious Revolution and the political consequences of the French Revolution.</i></p>	<p><i>Examples of using historical reasoning might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wars of Napoleon compared to William of Orange’s wars against Louis XIV • The establishment of parliamentary supremacy in England compared to Napoleon and the Bourbon restoration • The differing responses of Europe to the Revolutions • The role of religion in both revolutions • The causes of both the Glorious and French Revolutions <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>Demonstrating complex understanding might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explaining the nuance of an issue by analyzing similarities and differences in the Glorious and French Revolutions • Explaining changes over time in the political consequences of the Glorious and French Revolutions (for example, English stability will lead to the Industrial Revolution, but French political instability will lead to future economic and political problems) • Explaining significant differences in consequences while acknowledging the ways in which those consequences shared similarities • Qualifying or modifying an argument by considering evidence that supports an alternate position to the one offered in the thesis (for example, noting different historical interpretations of the Glorious and French Revolutions based on the peaceful nature of the Glorious Revolution and the violence of the French Revolution) <p><i>This demonstration of complex understanding must be part of the argument, not merely a phrase or reference.</i></p>
<p>If response is completely blank, enter - - for all four score categories: A, B, C, and D.</p>		

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3 — Long Essay Question (continued)

Scoring Notes

Introductory notes:

- Except where otherwise noted, each point of these rubrics is earned independently; for example, a student could earn a point for evidence without earning a point for thesis/claim.
- **Accuracy:** The components of these rubrics require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, responses may contain errors that do not detract from their 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 are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors.

A. Thesis/Claim (0–1 point)

Responses earn **1** point by responding to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis or claim about the extent to which the political consequences of Britain’s Glorious Revolution differed from the political consequences of the French Revolution.

Responses earn the 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.

The thesis is not required to encompass the entire period, but it must identify a relevant development or developments in the period.

Examples of acceptable theses:

- “The French Revolution was preceded by the Enlightenment where morals, systems of government, and institutions were questioned. These ideas like natural rights, democracy, and constitutionalism hit France in full force causing a drastic revolution. The Glorious revolution differed from the French revolution as it established a stable constitutional monarchy and was nonviolent, and set the framework for future powerful democracies.”(*The response makes a historically defensible claim, which addresses the difference between the Glorious and the French Revolutions. The response clearly links the Enlightenment with the French Revolution and implicitly links the political consequences of the Glorious Revolution with the later American Revolution.*)

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3 — Long Essay Question (continued)

- “Both the Glorious Revolution and the French Revolution were instances where people were unhappy with their rulers and desired change. The bloodless manner of the Glorious Revolution and the way it simply shifted power to another monarch allowed for Britain to remain stable and encourage reform in the future while France’s Terror and complete remaking of the government created instability and a move towards authoritarian figures.” (*The response compares and contrasts both revolutions, sets up a line of reasoning, and addresses the prompt with links to future political events in both countries.*)
- “The political consequences were so incredibly different because England ended up with a constitutional monarch while France was left with Napoleon as a dictator and an unstable political future.” (*The response makes a historically defensible claim that the Glorious Revolution increased the power of Parliament and led to greater stability in England and makes a reference to political instability in France.*)
- “Though both had underlying effects of liberalism and represent turning points in each nation’s history, the Glorious Revolution’s affect [*sic*] took longer to have an effect were less directly influential on the European countries, and did not cause as much damage to its nation.” (*The response makes a historically defensible claim that sets up specific categories.*)
- “The Glorious Revolution was almost bloodless in stark contrast to the French Revolution was bloody.” (*Minimally acceptable thesis that makes a historically defensible claim and indicates the reasoning for making that claim. The response minimally references the differences between the Glorious and French Revolution, i.e., violence.*)

Examples of unacceptable theses:

- “The Glorious and French Revolutions had different political consequences for a variety of reasons.” (*While it offers a historically defensible claim, it offers no indication of a 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 Glorious Revolution greatly differed from the French Revolution when it came to areas such as the social, political and religious changes they brought.” (*The response sets up categories that are too general.*)
- “The major difference between the two revolutions was that the Glorious Revolution created a democracy.” (*The response is not historically defensible.*)
- “The political consequences of the French revolution were very different from the consequences of the earlier Glorious Revolution.” (*The response makes a claim that is little more than a paraphrase of the prompt and offers no specific line of reasoning. If the statement was immediately followed by another sentence suggesting a valid reason for taking this position, or specifying the difference, then the two sentences taken together could receive credit.*)

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3 — Long Essay Question (continued)

B. Contextualization (0–1 point)

Responses earn **1** point by describing a broader historical context relevant to the prompt. To earn this point the response must relate the topic of the prompt to broader historical events, developments, or processes that occurred before, during, or continued after the time frame of the Glorious and/or French Revolutions. This point is not awarded for merely a phrase or a reference.

To earn the point the response must accurately describe a context relevant to differences in the political consequences of the Glorious and French Revolutions.

Examples might include the following, with appropriate elaboration:

- The American Revolution
- The English Civil War and Cromwell
- The Anglo-French rivalry and conflicts
- Impact of Enlightenment thought
- Further political instability in post-1815 France

Examples of acceptable contextualization:

- “The English Civil War marked the end of Charles I power and the beginning of an interlude under Cromwell as the leader of England. Cromwell’s goals and promises fell short ... the Glorious Revolution truly determined the start of a new situation ... After the Glorious Revolution, England expanded and prospered as they became an increasingly significant European power.” (*The response relates the events of the Glorious Revolution to the previous Puritan Rule of Cromwell and the subsequent political stability and power associated with England.*)
- “In conclusion, the deliberate Glorious Revolution differs from the French Revolution’s bloody, drastic revolution. In Edmund Burke’s “A Reflection of the French Revolution”, we see why Britain prospered more after a slower revolution. People do not like drastic change and the deliberacy [*sic*] of the Glorious Revolution was what made it so successful. That is why great scholars like Burke advocate for it.” (*The response relates events in the Glorious Revolution to later evaluations of the Glorious and French Revolutions by political commentators like Edmund Burke clearly linking the violence of the French Revolution to negative political commentary by 19th-century conservatives.*)

Example of unacceptable contextualization:

- “In the French Revolution, 100 years later, there were many political consequences.” (*Although the response makes reference to a later period in French history, the statement is simplistic and not backed by additional information to give it support.*)

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3 — Long Essay Question (continued)

C. Evidence (0–2 points)

Evidence

Responses earn **1** point by providing at least two specific examples of evidence relevant to the **topic** of the prompt. Responses can earn this point without earning the point for a thesis statement. To earn this point the response must identify specific historical examples of evidence relevant to the topic of the extent to which the political consequences of Britain’s Glorious Revolution differed from the political consequences of the French Revolution. These examples of evidence must be different from the information used to earn the point for contextualization.

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** will typically be more specific information.

Examples of evidence used might include but are not limited to:

- The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen
- The English Bill of Rights
- The Committee for Public Safety and the Terror
- The Code Napoleon
- Napoleonic Wars
- Limited violence in Ireland
- Fluctuations in the French government
- Reactions of other European countries

Examples of specific evidence in student samples:

- “The French people killed the monarchs Louis and Marie Antoinette. From this, they entered the Reign of Terror. This happened when Jacobins took control after the end of the Bourbon dynasty.” (*Specific evidence included is Louis and Marie Antoinette, Reign of terror, Jacobins, end of Bourbon dynasty. This specific evidence is related to the prompt.*)
- “When James II became king, he began giving more power to Catholics, undermining previous rules set up by Parliament. Parliament was able to give the crown to William and Mary without bloodshed.” (*Response provides specific evidence concerning the Glorious Revolution.*)

OR

Supports an Argument

Responses earn **2** points if they support an **argument** in response to the prompt using specific and relevant examples of evidence. To earn the second point the response must use specific historical evidence to support an argument regarding the extent to which the political consequences of Britain’s Glorious Revolution differed from the political consequences of the French Revolution.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3 — Long Essay Question (continued)

Examples of successfully supporting an argument with evidence:

- “One example of the differences between the Glorious Revolution and the French Revolution was that after the Glorious Revolution parliament was supreme over the crown, where in the French Revolution, after a brief liberal phase, Napoleon ruled as Emperor and then the Bourbons were brought back after his defeat.” (*The response uses specific pieces of evidence in accurate support of an argument that addresses the prompt.*)
- “The political changes that resulted from the revolutions in Britain and France differed in which types of government emerged. Once James II had fled Britain against overwhelming opposition, the Parliament obliged William and Mary of Orange to agree to the English Bill of Rights placing a clear limit on royal power.” (*The response uses evidence about Parliament and the creation of the Bill of Rights to support the limited monarchy established during the Glorious Revolution.*)
- “The first difference in the revolutions was the reason why they occurred in the first place. The French Revolution has occurred from the bourgeoisie realizing their power, wealth, and abuse of rights. They noticed how the king, First Estate (clergy), and Second Estate (nobility) had been abusing their power by having less population yet gaining the most representation. The Third Estate (bourgeoisie) responded by declaring themselves the National Assembly and demanding more power by creating the Declaration of the Rights of Man. They fought for representation in society.” (*The response uses evidence about class inequality during the Ancien Regime to establish the grievances of the Third Estate and how those grievances were addressed.*)

D. Analysis and Reasoning (0–2 points)

Historical Reasoning

Responses earn **1** point by using historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument that addresses similarity and/or difference by making an argument for the extent to which the political consequences of Britain’s Glorious Revolution differed from the political consequences of the French Revolution. To earn this point the response must demonstrate the use of historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument, although the reasoning might be uneven, imbalanced, or inconsistent.

Examples of explaining the historical relationship might include but are not limited to the following:

- The different role that religion played in the motivations for each revolution.
- The effects of the French Revolution were wider than those of the Glorious Revolution.
- The wars of Napoleon compared to William of Orange’s wars against Louis XIV.
- The establishment of parliamentary supremacy in England compared to Napoleon and the Bourbon restoration.
- The differing responses of Europe to the Revolutions.
- The role of religion in both revolutions.
- The causes of both the Glorious and French Revolutions.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3 — Long Essay Question (continued)

Examples of acceptable historical reasoning:

- “England with a constitutional monarchy giving Parliament more power. They also created an English Bill of Rights for its citizens and made it so that no Catholic could take the throne. From then on England was stable and politically there were no problems. On the other hand, the French Revolution was just the start of France’s political instability and constant changing of powers.” (*The response addresses the different political outcomes of the Glorious and French Revolutions using the historical thinking skill of comparison/contrast.*)
- “One difference between the two revolutions was that the Glorious Revolution was peaceful and the French Revolution was violent. The Glorious Revolution was peaceful because William of Orange was invited by the British Parliament and there was no conflict. On the other hand, the French Revolution was very violent, as it started with riots in rural and urban areas along with the killings of French nobles. (*The response addresses the differences between the Glorious and French Revolutions in simplistic terms.*)

OR

Complexity

Responses earn **2** points by demonstrating a complex understanding of the differences between the political consequences of the Glorious and French Revolutions through using evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the question.

Demonstrating a complex understanding might include:

- Explaining the nuance of an issue by analyzing multiple variables
- Explaining similarities and differences between the political consequences of each Revolution
- Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods
- Confirming the validity of an argument by corroborating multiple perspectives across themes
- Qualifying or modifying an argument by considering evidence that supports an alternate position than the one offered in the thesis

Examples of acceptable complexity:

- “Despite their differences, both revolutions were motivated by similar ideas and in turn inspired other countries to follow those ideas. Both revolutions were influenced by or in line with the ideas of John Locke in his book *The Two Treatises of Government*; Locke wrote that the purpose of government was to protect the rights of the people to life, liberty, and property. The government ruled by the consent of the people and if it did not protect said rights, then the people had the right to institute new government. The Glorious Revolution as a successful implementation of these ideas influenced the American Revolution of 1776 ... The French Revolution as a temporarily successful implementation of similar ideas also influenced other revolutions around the world.” (*The response addresses similarities as well as the wider influence of the Glorious and French Revolutions. This response is an example of acceptable complexity that compares as well as contrasts both revolutions.*)

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 3 — Long Essay Question (continued)

- “The French Revolution’s consequences were more widespread than the those of the Glorious Revolution. The geographic isolation of Britain meant that the revolution had few direct impacts on continental Europe, other than perhaps influencing Enlightenment ideology or inspiring other revolutions in the future. In contrast, the French Revolution directly impacted most of Europe. During the Napoleonic Wars, Napoleon conquered much of mainland Europe. In the conquered lands, he abolished feudalism. Additionally, his foreign rule sparked the rise of nationalism in many states, most notably Spain and Germany who resented foreign influence.” (*The response links the French Revolution to future nationalist movements at the end of the 19th century. This example analyzes multiple different variables for the greater influence of the French Revolution compared to the influence of the Glorious Revolution.*)
- “One way in which the revolutions in Britain and France differed were the types of governments established. In Britain, the absolute monarch James II was overthrown and William of Orange was put in his place. In order to ascend the throne, William of Orange had to agree to establish a constitutional monarchy which he did, marking the end of totalitarian, absolutist rulers in Britain. In contrast, the French Revolution went from constitutional monarchy, republic, then to a dictatorship under Napoleon Bonaparte. Meaning that France essentially underwent no significant political change. This is similar to the Russian Revolution. The Tsar created a constitutional monarchy, was overthrown and replaced by a moderate, new form of government (communism under Lenin), which was then overthrown and replaced by a totalitarian regime (communism under Stalin). Both revolutions created little to no political change and the governments of both would eventually fail (Napoleon’s defeat in 1815 and the Soviet Union’s dissolution in 1989).

Another way in which the two revolutions differed was their impact on stability. Britain’s ‘reform from above’ left the people of Britain satisfied with the changes made therefore Britain did not experience political upheaval during this time period as the public was content with reforms. In France, the uprising or ‘reform from below’ caused instability that would endure within France. The government would change several times in the 19th century going from totalitarian regime to constitutional monarchy before finally landing on republic.” (*The response makes connections between events occurring from the 17th through the 20th century. Multiple differences are addressed and supported with evidence and analysis.*)

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question

“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.”

Maximum Possible Points: 6

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 merely 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 statement must make a historically defensible claim about Europe’s political relationship with the United States in the periods specified by the prompt, with some indication of the reasoning for making that claim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The US relationship with Europe between the two World Wars was limited by US isolationism, and refusal to join the League of Nations, where after the Second World War the US became much more involved in European affairs during the Cold War.” • “While the United States was heavily involved in European politics and economics in both 1918-1939 and 1945-1989, in 1945-1989 the US had extreme tension with specific European countries that they didn’t in 1918-1939.”

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question (continued)

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 a reference.</i></p>	<p>To earn this point the essay must accurately describe a context relevant to the political relationship between Europe and the United States in the period from 1918 to 1939 and/or 1945 to 1989.</p> <p><i>Examples of context might include the following, with appropriate elaboration:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• World War I• World War II• The Great Depression and global effects• The Cold War/the spread of communism after WWII• Rise of United States as superpower (versus Soviet Union)• Conflicts and proxy wars elsewhere: Korea, Vietnam, Suez Crisis• Fall of communism, 1989–1991• Early U.S. history and foreign policy, including isolation because of geography• History of European involvement in North America (War of 1812)
---	---	---

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question (continued)

C: Evidence (0–2)	<p>Evidence: Provides specific examples of evidence relevant to the topic of the prompt. (1 point)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Supports an Argument: Supports an argument in response to the prompt using specific and relevant examples of evidence. (2 points)</p>	<p><i>To earn the first point, the response must identify specific historical examples of evidence relevant to the political relationship between Europe and the United States during the periods specified.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>To earn the second point, the response must use specific historical evidence to support an argument in response to the prompt.</i></p> <p><i>Evidence used might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The League of Nations• The United Nations• The Marshall Plan• The Dawes and Young Plans• NATO (and Warsaw Pact)• Early foundations of EU• Truman Doctrine• Treaty of Versailles• Wilson’s 14 Points• Cuban Missile Crisis• The Suez Crisis• Soviet invasion of Afghanistan• Division of Germany, including Berlin airlift, Berlin Wall, U.S. support of Western Germany• Yalta and Potsdam agreements• Economic miracle• Great Depression/Stock market crash
------------------------------	--	---

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question (continued)

D: Analysis and Reasoning (0–2)	<p>Historical Reasoning: Uses historical reasoning (e.g., comparison, causation, continuity, and change over time) to frame or structure an argument that addresses the prompt. (1 point)</p> <p><i>To earn the first point, the response must demonstrate the use of historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument about the extent to which the political relationship between the United States and Europe differed in the two periods, although the reasoning might be uneven, imbalanced, or inconsistent.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Complexity: Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical development that is the focus of prompt, using evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the prompt. (2 points)</p> <p><i>To earn the second point, the response must demonstrate a complex understanding of differences in the political relationship between Europe and the United States in the two periods.</i></p>	<p><i>Examples of using historical reasoning might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • United States isolationism after World War I compared to involvement after World War II • The loans from the United States to Europe after World War I compared to the Marshall Plan • The League of Nations compared to the United Nations • United States’ post-WWII focus on alliance-building and intervention because of communism • Increasing European dependence on the United States as evidence of continuity and/or change over time <p>OR</p> <p><i>Demonstrating complex understanding might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explaining significant differences in the relationship between Europe and the United States while also acknowledging the ways in which the relationship was similar • Explaining multiple differences or multiple similarities over the course of the response • Employing a large, diverse body of evidence to develop a multifaceted or multilayered argument, such as explaining the consequences of U.S. intervention and policies in Europe • Explaining how and why the United States maintained different relations with Eastern versus Western European nations • Explaining how economic, military, or cultural factors shaped the political relationship between the United States and Europe over time • Demonstrating how the United States influenced Europe in other respects, such as cultural and economic realms • Qualifying or modifying an argument by considering evidence that supports an alternate position than the one in the thesis
<p>If response is completely blank, enter - - for all four score categories: A, B, C, and D.</p>		

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question (continued)

Scoring Notes

Introductory notes:

- Except where otherwise noted, each point of these rubrics is earned independently; for example, a student could earn a point for evidence without earning a point for thesis/claim.
- **Accuracy:** The components of these rubrics require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, responses may contain errors that do not detract from their 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 are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors.

A. Thesis/Claim (0–1 point)

Responses earn **1** point by responding to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis or claim about the extent to which Europe’s political relationship with the United States in the period from 1918 to 1939 differed from Europe’s political relationship with the United States in the period from 1945 to 1989.

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.

The thesis is not required to encompass the entirety of each period, but it must identify a relevant development or developments in each period.

Examples of acceptable theses:

- “Although America maintained its strong political support and economic assistance to allies during the entire period 1918-1939 and 1945-1989, the United States shifted to hold a much more interventionist stance with regards to European conflict and political crises following World War II in the period 1945-1949.” *(This response establishes a line of reasoning by focusing on change over time, particularly in terms of economic assistance.)*

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question (continued)

- “While the United States pushed for a stance of neutrality in the period 1918 to 1939, the American stance on foreign affairs drastically changed in the period 1945-1989, pushing America into a conflict of European involvement.” *(The response makes a historically defensible claim that addresses the extent of change and indicates the reasoning for this claim by differentiating between neutrality and interventionist policy as seen over the course of the 20th century.)*
- “The US had regulated a fairly isolated stance on the international stage. However, following the numerous threats to democracy and humanity, American worked to resolve these conflicts in hopes of a more peaceful and united world. Ergo, the US-European political relationship was able to mature and grow stronger through the twentieth century.” *(This thesis appears at the end of the essay and notes the shift from isolation to a more active policy seeking to resolve conflict. The line of reasoning establishes the motivations for this shift).*
- “Europe’s relationship with America took a long time to transform into what it is today. From 1918 to 1939 the relationship America had with Europe [was] not a very close one. However from 1945 to 1989 WWII and the Cold War brought the two very close.” *(This is a minimally acceptable thesis as it notes a transition from distant to close, which constitutes a basic line of reasoning.)*

Examples of unacceptable theses:

- “The political relationship between the United States and Europe from 1918-1939, although [it] may seem different from their relations in 1945-1989, there was little difference as the United States ultimately influenced Europe in both time frames.” *(This thesis both restates the prompt and establishes no line of reasoning.)*
- “The relationship changed from being negative to positive during those two time periods because of less conflict, agreements were made, and the two sides realized that if they worked together the lives of both sides would get better.” *(This thesis attempts to articulate a line of reasoning but lacks any specificity, merely describing the negative-to-positive change.)*
- “The extent to which the European nations’ political relationship with the United States during the period 1918-1939 differed from the political relationship between the United States and the European nations during the period 1945-1989 was quite great. During the period 1918-1939 the political climate was a ‘little’ strained after the implementation by the United States of the Monroe Doctrine, thus keeping most of the European nations out of the affairs of the Latin American countries. This was done mainly with the help of Britain.” *(The first sentence aims to establish a line of reasoning, but the chronological confusion creates a historically indefensible claim by placing the Monroe Doctrine in the interwar period.)*

B. Contextualization (0–1 point)

Responses earn **1** point by describing a broader historical context relevant to the prompt. To earn this point the response must relate the topic of the prompt to broader historical events, developments, or processes that occurred before or during, or continued after the time frame of 1918–1939 and/or 1945–1989. This point is not awarded for merely a phrase or a reference.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question (continued)

To earn the point the essay must accurately describe a context relevant to differences in the political relationship between Europe and the United States in the period from 1918 to 1939 and/or 1945 to 1989.

Examples might include the following, with appropriate elaboration:

- World War I
- World War II
- The Great Depression and global effects
- The Cold War/the spread of communism after World War II
- Rise of United States as superpower (versus Soviet Union)
- Conflicts and proxy wars elsewhere: Korea, Vietnam, Suez Crisis
- Fall of communism in 1989–1991
- Early U.S. history and foreign policy, including isolation because of geography
- History of European involvement in North America (War of 1812)

Examples of acceptable contextualization:

- “The threat of communism was the West’s biggest worry after World War II, as Stalin had manipulated the other Allies into allowing him to take control of many Eastern European countries in return for his help, which led to a Soviet political sphere of influence.” *(This discussion of World War II-related context appears in a body paragraph, explaining why the United States developed the Marshall Plan and NATO.)*
- “World War I marked a drastic shift for Europe and the world. For one, it massively impacted the lives of almost everyone it affected, and it was the first example of American intervention into Europe. Though previously, European powers had intervened into American affairs with French support of the American Revolution and British involvement in the War of 1812, this [WWI] marked the first real American involvement in Europe. America was reluctant to get involved, but did after the sinking of the Lusitania and other events that shifted American popular opinion.” *(This appears in the introduction and led to a thesis explaining the difference between nonintervention and intervention. It also shifts focus from U.S. actions and policies to European involvement in North America.)*

Note: In order to earn this point the response should clearly connect the relevant contextual information to the topic. A mere passing reference to another event or time period, such as colonial America, does not suffice for this point.

Examples of unacceptable contextualization:

- “Europe was seen as the base for major powers in the world. When it began to colonize, revolutions led to an emergence of new countries capable of competing with the European world. The United States was originally composed of thirteen colonies governed by the British empire.” *(This is the introduction to the essay, and this statement is followed directly by the thesis. This attempt at contextualization does not effectively link the context to an argument related to the prompt.)*

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question (continued)

- “Since the American revolution, Britain and American relations have changed over time as America found its place in the world. The world wars challenged the nations’ loyalty for one another as common capitalistic countries, but in the end, America still remains Britain’s closest ally.” (*This is the introduction to the essay, and this statement is followed directly by the thesis. The connections between the earlier period and the twentieth century are not explained and are too generalized. There is no transition between American revolution and the time period of the prompt, and references to world wars are not specific.*)

C. Evidence (0–2 points)

Evidence

Responses earn **1** point by providing at least two specific examples of evidence relevant to the **topic** of the prompt. Responses can earn this point without earning the point for a thesis statement. To earn this point the response must identify specific historical examples of evidence relevant to the topic of the extent to which the political relationship between Europe and the United States differed in the period 1918–1939 from the period 1945–1989. These examples of evidence must be different from the information used to earn the point for contextualization.

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** will typically be more specific information.

Examples of evidence used might include:

- The League of Nations
- The United Nations
- The Marshall Plan
- The Dawes and Young Plans
- NATO (and Warsaw Pact)
- Early foundations of EU
- Truman Doctrine
- Treaty of Versailles
- Wilson’s 14 Points
- Cuban Missile Crisis
- The Suez Crisis
- Soviet invasion of Afghanistan
- Division of Germany, including Berlin airlift, Berlin Wall, U.S. support of Western Germany
- Yalta and Potsdam Agreements
- Economic miracle
- Great Depression/Stock market crash

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question (continued)

Examples of successful use of evidence:

- “After World War One, the Treaty of Versailles was being created. The US was involved in it for a little while, but the Senate rejected it. This made the US reject the League of Nations, too, overall not allowing it to happen.” *(This evidence is contained in a paragraph describing the United States’ noninvolvement in Europe.)*
- “As Russia also wanted to extend their influence, America responded with the Marshall Plan which would aid in the rebuilding of Western Europe. [...] America was involved with the Berlin airlift, which gave supplies to West Berlin. [...] They used the Truman Doctrine to justify their entrance into the [Vietnam] War.” *(This evidence is contained in a paragraph describing the imposition of American capitalist and democratic ideals in Europe.)*

OR

Supports an Argument

Responses earn **2** points if they support an **argument** in response to the prompt using specific and relevant examples of evidence. To earn the second point the response must use specific historical evidence to support an argument regarding the extent to which the political relationship between Europe and the United States differed in the period 1918–1939 from the period 1945–1989.

Examples of successfully supporting an argument with evidence:

- “The United States foreign policy regarding Europe was largely isolationist following World War I, but then was markedly more interventionist following World War II. The most prominent examples of America’s isolationism following WWI was its refusal to sign the Treaty of Versailles as well as refusal to join the League of Nations, an institution created by American president Woodrow Wilson.” *(Organized according to categories of analysis, this response uses specific pieces of evidence, including the refusal to join the League of Nations and sign the Treaty of Versailles, as well as the creation of NATO and joining the United Nations to support this argument.)*
- “After 1945, The United States became much more involved in European politics. The Truman Doctrine was established to make it known that the US would intervene if communism threatened European nations and practice containment. The US also became a part of the United Nations, formally aligning itself with many European nations.” *(This response uses specific pieces of evidence, including the Truman Doctrine, joining the UN, and the Marshall Plan, to support this argument.)*
- “During the Interwar period, although the US played some role in the European economy (especially in Germany), they were generally uninvolved in European politics. After WWI ended, Woodrow Wilson wanted to establish an international body, the League of Nations, to oversee global affairs and to ensure that there wasn’t another world war. However, his proposal wasn’t ratified by Congress, and the US shifted towards a more isolationist viewpoint.” *(This response uses specific pieces of evidence, including the refusal to ratify the Treaty of Versailles, as well the refusal to honor the U.S. promise to support Britain and France in a future war and the Great Depression’s influence on the United States’ growing isolationism to support this argument.)*

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question (continued)

Note: Typically, responses have been organized according to time period, but others may organize according to category of analysis. Both are acceptable as long as the response articulates a line of reasoning and supports it with relevant pieces of evidence.

D. Analysis and Reasoning (0–2 points)

Historical Reasoning

Responses earn **1** point by using historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument that addresses similarity and/or difference by making an argument for the extent to which the political relationship between Europe and the United States differed in the period 1918 to 1939 from the period 1945 to 1989. To earn this point, the response must demonstrate the use of historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument, although the reasoning might be uneven, imbalanced, or inconsistent.

Examples of explaining the historical relationship might include the following:

- United States isolationism after World War I compared to involvement after the World War II
- The loans from the United States to Europe after World War I compared to the Marshall Plan
- The League of Nations compared to the United Nations
- United States' post-World War II focus on alliance-building and intervention because of communism
- Increasing European dependence on the United States

Examples using historical reasoning skills:

- “Following the Allied victory in WWII, the United States acted much differently than it had during the interwar period. This difference is largely the result of the Soviet Union which operated on the basis of communism as opposed to the United States democratic foundations.” *(This claim, using the historical thinking skill of comparison, explores the reasons informing changing American policy. It appears at the beginning of the second body paragraph. The first body paragraph discusses America’s efforts to remove itself from foreign conflicts.)*
- “More differences characterized Europe’s relationship with the US during these distinct time periods than similarities. While Europe in the period from 1918–1939 was not divided into any two particular campaigns or ideologies, the continent was enveloped by the Cold War between 1945 and 1989.” *(These claims appear at the beginning of the second body paragraph. The first body paragraph examines similarities between American responses and aid after both world wars. The remainder of the response examines the differences between American responses and aid.)*

OR

Complexity

Responses earn **2** points by demonstrating a complex understanding of the differences between the political relationship between Europe and the United States in the two periods through using evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the question.

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question (continued)

Demonstrating complex understanding might include:

- Explaining significant differences in the relationship between Europe and the United States while also acknowledging the ways in which the relationship was similar
- Explaining multiple differences or multiple similarities over the course of the response
- Employing a large, diverse body of evidence to develop a multifaceted or multilayered argument, such as explaining the consequences of United States intervention and policies in Europe
- Explaining how and why the United States maintained different relations with Eastern versus Western European nations
- Employing a large, diverse body of evidence to develop a multifaceted or multilayered argument
- Explaining how and why the United States maintained different relationships with different countries, particularly Western Europe versus the Soviet Union
- Explaining how economic, military, or cultural factors shaped the political relationship between the United States and Europe over time
- Demonstrating how the United States influenced Europe in other respects, such as cultural and economic realms
- Qualifying or modifying an argument by considering evidence that supports an alternate position than the one offered in the thesis

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

Examples demonstrating complexity:

- “The last difference between these two periods ... is the new alliances that the US has made with the help of plans such as the Marshall Plan and NATO. The US had no alliances with Greece, Italy, Austria, and a couple other countries during 1918-1939, but with the development of plans such as NATO, the US was able to create new alliances with countries such as Spain, Belgium, and Italy.”
(This response identifies and explains three distinct differences in the relationship between the United States and Europe. The first discussion of differences explores isolationism versus intervention; the second articulates a difference in the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. The third, cited here, examines the changing nature of alliances in the late 20th century.)

“During this time period, Europe and the US’ political relationship was further developed through the Cold War. The Cold War strained the US and the European-USSR’s relationship. The Berlin Blockade and the US airlift in response only confirmed the political opposition between the US, GB, and France (democracy) against the USSR (communism). During this time period, the US was extremely involved in European politics, on the side of European democratic nations and against the USSR and its satellite nations. The Cuban Missile Crisis further spurred the political strain between the US and the USSR. Despite many years of tension, Margaret Thatcher (GB), Ronald Reagan (US) and Mikhail Gorbachev (USSR) were able to settle the political tension with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Though there were positive and negative relationships, overall, there was a dramatic difference in the political relationship between 1918 and 1939 and 1945 to 1989.” *(The two paragraphs preceding this one assess the United States’ changing relationship with European countries as largely positive, demonstrated by the Marshall Plan and other forms of assistance offered after World War II. In the final body paragraph, the*

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 4 — Long Essay Question (continued)

response qualifies the earlier positive assessment by examining how the Cold War affected the United States' relationship with the USSR.)

- “From one of these time periods to the next, a greater influence of American culture is seen as well. Instances of counter culture popping up in Europe somewhat mirror movements that were gaining influence in the US. The rise of consumerism in America likely played a significant role in the economic comeback of Europe after WWII and the rise of consumerism they saw as well. This American influence was not seen in the years following WWI, because the US had very little involvement in Europe so there were almost no opportunities for the US and American culture to influence European culture. American influence allowed for the political ties between the US and Europe to become stronger because the once unique individual nationalist identities of these nations soon began to morph into a more unified globalist identity. The formation of the EU and the EEC are results of this globalist movement that may have been inspired originally by the US involvement and influence in Europe.” *(The response’s introductory paragraph argues that the European-American relationship changed because of U.S. involvement and influence, and the struggles of the Cold War. The first body paragraph explains the various reasons for American noninvolvement and intervention, and the second body paragraph, cited here, develops an argument about America’s increasing cultural influence in the second period. An additional paragraph then delineates how the Cold War impacts U.S. involvement in Europe.)*