
AP European History

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Document-Based Question

- Scoring Guideline**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

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.)

Circle the question number that you are answering on this page. DBQ

Mandatory 1	Circle one 2 or 3 or 4
-----------------------	----------------------------------

A-1 of 3

The Thirty Years' war was from 1618 to 1648 and spread from localized regions to the majority of continental Europe. It is commonly referred to as the last of the religious wars. It has been divided into four phases: Bohemian phase, Danish phase, Swedish-Franco phase, and lastly, the Franco-Swedish phase. In the beginning, conflict arose between Bohemia and the Holy Roman Empire pertaining to religion. Calvinists were the majority in Bohemia, and the Holy Roman Empire was trying to exercise religion upon them. To the north of the Holy Roman Empire, conflict arose within the pockets of Danish territory nested within the Empire. Sweden soon got involved, trying to protect their territory and gain, funded by the French. Soon it was the Swedish funding the French. The ~~second~~ last two phases of the war reached across the continent and was about diminishing Hapsburg power. The first two phases were localized disputes over religion. Due to the large scale in which the battle for power occurred, it is clear this war was primarily political.

In 1618 the war began with religious conflict in Bohemia. The Holy Roman Empire said they were trying to preserve religion freedom at the same time they were diminishing it. This is best demonstrated by document one, a letter from the Emperor Matthias. He is clearly trying to settle threats of revolution and to calm his people, although it was to no avail. This war was breaking out due to the potential suppression of free religion. In 1619, the constitution of the Bohemian Federation (document two) perpetuated a movement against their ruler and any ruler who threatened their ~~people~~ liberties. The conflict between Bohemia and its ruler intensified on a small scale, over a religious cause. It is important to note Bohemia is a rather small portion of the Holy Roman Empire, and the catholic settled these quarrels, ending phase one while the Danish sent ^{territorial} threats to the north.

The war shifted to a more political domain with the entry of Sweden into the

Circle the question number that you are answering on this page.

DBQ

Mandatory 1	Circle one 2 or 3 or 4
----------------	---------------------------

A-20F3

conflict. The king of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus, stated ^{in a letter} to the Protestant Elector of Brandenburg in 1630 (document four) that the Holy Roman Emperor must make up his mind on how he would like to proceed with the war. He must take a side and fight to gain territory or keep what ~~territory~~ ^{there was} of the Holy Roman Empire. This was how about taking decisive sides and declaring allies, which points to a more political war. In document seven, the Pope Innocent X reacted to the Treaty of Westphalia, saying it was about one's own want and need, rather than religion. The thirty years' war was a conflict centered around which nations wanted what and who was on each side, which is what a political war was all about. The thought of religion was almost abandoned at this point in the war. → Lastly, land gain and control were major motivations for the war to spread to a larger scale, with involvement of the Spanish Habsburgs, France, Austria, Hungary, and Prussia. Diminishing the power of the Habsburgs of Spain and the Holy Roman Empire was essential to the involvement of multiple European nations in this war. This is shown with document six, an image of the chief minister of France, Richelieu. He got France involved in the war due to a want of balance of power. He ~~did not~~ ^{did not} want the Habsburg dynasty controlling all of Europe. This caused him to enter France into the war, to diminish ~~to~~ the Spanish Netherlands and disrupt their control. This would also lead to a gain for France. Also vying for power was the Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus, who had a navy rivaling the British at the time. In document five, Gustavus' intentions during war before his death was to retain Sweden and the Baltic sea. He wanted to retain power, his invasion of continental Europe also leads to the belief he wanted more territory and more control. Seeing as he was an absolute monarch, like Louis XIV, directed by Richelieu, this idea is very plausible. The retaining of power was also shown in document 3, written in the height of the war. This demonstrates

Circle the question number that you are answering on this page.

DBQ

Mandatory 1	Circle one 2 or 3 or 4
-----------------------	----------------------------------

A-3 of 3

the willingness of citizens to emigrate if their wants of religion were ignored. This prompted action, as Maximilian didn't want to lose any of his control of the population. It was about retaining power, and the Holy Roman Emperor did not comprehend the fact he needed the peoples support to win the war when he did not have it.

In conclusion, the involvement of most of continental Europe in this war, combined with their actions and stated motivations points to the fact that this small scale, religious war turned into a large politically driven conflict. As the war progressed, the contest for power and dominion revealed itself over the outlying facade of a religious war. It was about taking down the Habsburgs and establishing a balance of power (especially France) which was established with the Treaty of Westphalia, territories were determined, the modern day Germany was broken up into 300 states ruled by different princes, and the Holy Roman Empire was forced into a decline, with a Bourbon placed on the throne.

Mandatory

1

Circle one

2 or 3 or 4

B-1 of 3

The Thirty years war was fought over several reasons. The main one being religious reasons. While there were political parts of the Thirty years war the primary reason was ~~the~~ conflict between the protestants and catholics. There had been increased tensions between the two parties for a long time before the war. ~~The~~ The final straw was the destruction of Prague, in which catholics were thrown out of a building into a square. This led to physical conflict between the two parties because the Holy Roman Emperor (Catholic) went to Prague to restore order. The main ~~reason~~ ~~was~~ reason the war was fought was religious conflict although political conflict helped further the war.

In the first document which is written by the Holy Roman Empire, he tries to convince the people of Bohemia that he is not there for religious reasons, but he would not have been there if it hadn't been for a religious conflict (destruction of Prague). ~~He is~~ He is also there to take the throne. But in doing so he will make Bohemia a Catholic state. By being a Holy Roman Emperor my ~~political~~ ~~more~~ ~~like~~ ~~this~~ is inspired by his religion and the power granted him by the Pope.

Circle the question number that you are answering on this page.

DRQ

Mandatory ①	Circle one 2 or 3 or 4
----------------	---------------------------

B-2 of 3

Document 2 is written by a coalition of nobles. The point of this document is to not incite violence "All churches... in catholic hands are to remain so" (Doc 2). By announcing this to ~~the~~ the Holy Roman Emperor the kings are showing how they do not want to become catholic if he takes control of Bohemia. However the people will fight if they are to lose their religion as the passage states. There is nothing political about their reason to fight. It is ~~not~~ strictly religious.

Document 3 was written by a Jesuit official. It is about making protestant regions catholic by catholic's, catholic again. "1,200 outside it have been freed from heresy" (Doc 3). There main goal was to make protestant areas catholic again and this shows it. They even received orders to "intensify catholic conversions". If this was a political war they would have not received orders like that.

Document 4 is a letter from Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden and a protestant. In his letter he describes his reasons for fighting and joining the war.

"[Holy roman Emperor I... (does) not mean to rest until the protestant religion is wholly ~~at~~ rooted out of the empire" (Doc 4). By listing this as his reason to fight he confirms that this war was a religious one. He would not have

Circle the question number that you are answering on this page.

U1502

Mandatory ①	Circle one 2 or 3 or 4
----------------	---------------------------

B-3 of 3

joined the war if it hadn't been for the misbreachment of the protestants in the empire.

In ~~Doc~~ Document 5 is an account of a meeting after the ~~death~~ death of Gustavus Adolphus. The people in the meeting reflect on Gustavus' reasons to fight. The main one was "liberate oppressed lands" (Doc 5). By that statement he meant liberate protestants. There is very little political about liberating members of a persecuted religion.

Document 7 is from the end of the war after the Treaty of Westphalia. It is a declaration from the pope. He declares that all the parts of the Treaty that impinge on the Catholic Church are void. ~~He says~~ The Treaty would not contain things about the Catholic Church if it had been a political war.

In conclusion, there is no evidence to show that the war was fought primarily over political differences. While on the ~~other~~ other hand there is a plethora of evidence that shows that the war was fought over religious tension.

Circle the question number that you are answering on this page.

DBQ

Mandatory ①	Circle one 2 or 3 or 4
----------------	---------------------------

C-1 of 4

Throughout the seventeenth-century there has been many assertions throughout Europe in response to the processes of the Thirty Years' War. Although religion has been used throughout the Thirty Years' War as a faith in which lies several duties, there is a point made by the most influential religious icon of arguably all of Europe: The Catholic Church. The Church shows that the war was fought primarily for political reasons.

As expressed by Holy Roman Emperor Matthias, he uses his letter to free his subjects from the ideal of restricting religion. Throughout his letter there is heavy usage of words such as "obedient, loyal, liberties, etc." These phrases reinforced by the reassurance of God as a guide provides the religion as a means to remain unified within the Holy Roman Empire (Doc 1). Through the war to 1633 ~~after~~ the death of Gustavus Adolphus, the Swedish high chancellor seeks to make an important distinction regarding his letter from 1630. Through this account

Circle the question number that you are answering on this page.

DBQ

Mandatory ①	Circle one 2 or 3 or 4
----------------	---------------------------

C-20F4

it is revealed that Adolphus intended to disrupt the enemy. It is then stated that these intentions on both sides were in regards to the Baltic Sea which not only provides the means of defending the kingdom; which is exemplified by their weaker stance with regards to Russia between 1894 and 1906 but also provide important economic opportunities for the kingdom (Doc 5). However, on account of the fact that Gustavus Adolphus is deceased as of 1633, his letter written in 1630 directly undermines this thought. Adolphus leaves the letter with his argument between the war of God and the devil - which nullifies the importance of the Baltic sea over the unification of his subjects under god which is similar to that of the Holy Roman Empire (Doc 4).

Throughout the 1620's there was a large conflict on the subject of re-christianization. Bernard Baumann reports to Maximilian of Bavaria in a way that attempts to mask the Catholic's religiously imperialistic desires

Circle the question number that you are answering on this page.

DISC

Mandatory

①

Circle one

2 or 3 or 4

C-3 of 4

with the demeanor of freeing such peoples from heresy. This is a critical approach for both Baumann as well as the Catholics as the Protestants leading after Martin Luther were leading the downfall of the Catholic church in government since the Protestant Reformation in France, ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ (Doc 3). This overarching desire for political control through religion is further supported by the declaration of Pope Innocent X in 1648 where he directly states ~~the~~ ~~the~~ church's ignorance to the Treaty of Westphalia as it challenges Catholic authority. This is an example of how the Church continually advocates for a return to the old order. When the Renaissance was in the midst, the Catholic church held a monopoly on not only the Religious but governmental power as they ^(the popes) were the politicians of that day - although the negligible affect on the poor is prominent in Protestant popularity (Doc 7).

Circle the question number that you are answering on this page.

DBQ

Mandatory ①	Circle one 2 or 3 or 4
----------------	---------------------------

C-4 of 4

As of 1619 the intention within the Bohemian Federation are quite transparent despite the emphasis placed on Calvinist religion. This period - the Thirty Years' War - is a large example of the struggle of religion to separate from secular processes. Religion then plays the same role as propaganda did during the ~~late~~ ^{early} -twentieth century in both Russia as well as Germany, where Hitler and the Soviets united over socialist and communist nationalism, the Thirty Years' War was fought for ~~religious~~ ^{unity} through religious toleration or lack-of which is similar through the portrayal of Cardinal Richelieu (Doc 2). Within the image of Richelieu is a portrayal of Cardinal as a protector from both Protestant Huguenots as well as the likes of Catholic Spain and Austria. This early use of political device exemplifies not only the overarching structure of the Thirty Years' war, but the political intention itself (Doc 6).

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Question 1 — Document-Based Question

Overview

The Document — Based Question (DBQ) is designed to evaluate the degree to which students can analyze various types of historical documents in order to construct an analytical essay that responds to the tasks required by the prompt (as outlined in the exam instructions). This particular DBQ asked students to evaluate whether the Thirty Years' War was fought primarily for religious or primarily for political reasons. Students were provided with seven documents (including an image) on which to base their responses. In order to answer this question, students had to have an understanding of the 17th century and recognize that the Thirty Years' War was fought for a variety of reasons. These themes are discussed in Key Concept 1.5 in the curriculum framework. Responses were assessed on how they performed in the following four categories: thesis and/or claim, contextualization, evidence, and analysis and reasoning.

Sample: 1A

Score: 7

The response earned the thesis point in the introduction by stating that while the Thirty Years' War began with localized disputes over religion, it was primarily political in the last phases of the war as the goals shifted to diminishing Hapsburg power. The response earned the contextualization point in the introduction by successfully situating the Thirty Years' War chronologically and geographically. The response earned 2 evidence points for using the content of at least six documents to support an argument relevant to the prompt, by using all seven documents successfully. It earned 1 point for evidence beyond the documents with the discussion about Document 6 of the French goal in the Thirty Years' War, to diminish the power of the Spanish Netherlands in order to disrupt the political control of the Hapsburgs. The response earned the sourcing point by successfully analyzing Document 1 for purpose, Document 2 for historical situation, and Document 5 for purpose. The response earned the complexity point for a nuanced argument about the Thirty Years' War being primarily a political war about balance of power despite localized religious conflicts. It then describes the shift from religious to political motivations with the entry of Sweden for primarily political reasons, concluding that by the later stages of the war religious motives were a facade, covering the real motive of shifting the balance of power.

Thesis 1

Contextualization 1

Evidence 3

Analysis and Reasoning 2

Sample: 1B

Score: 4

The response earned 1 point for thesis because the introduction makes a historically defensible claim that the Thirty Years' War was a conflict between Catholics and Protestants, which eventually became political. It earned 1 point for contextualization by discussing the ongoing dispute between Catholics and Protestants, which lead to the Defenestration of Prague. The response earned 1 point for using at least three documents (Documents 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7) to address the topic of the prompt, but it did not earn a point for using the content of at least six documents to support an argument because, while it adequately uses content from Document 5, the response does not successfully use the document to argue that there was a political motivation for the war. It does not attempt sourcing for any of the documents. The use of the Defenestration of Prague in the first body paragraph earned 1 point for using at least one additional piece of specific historical

AP[®] EUROPEAN HISTORY

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

evidence relevant to an argument about the prompt. Note that the mere use of the phrase is not sufficient, but, coupled with the previous sentence explaining why the emperor is present, it is minimally acceptable, and it differs from the use of the Defenestration of Prague as contextualization. The response does not attempt to source any of the documents and did not earn a point for demonstrating a complex understanding of the historical development that is the focus of the prompt by corroborating, qualifying, or modifying an argument.

Thesis 1
Contextualization 1
Evidence 2
Analysis and Reasoning 0

Sample: 1C

Score: 1

The response did not earn the thesis point because it indicates that the Thirty Years' War had political causes but does not identify the motivation for the war, nor does it attempt to contextualize the war. The response earned 1 point for using at least three documents (Documents 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7) to address the topic of the prompt, but it does not use the content of at least six documents to support an argument. It attempts to connect Sweden and Russia with information that is not relevant to the motivation for the wars; thus, the response did not earn the evidence beyond the documents point. The response did not earn the sourcing point, despite the successful sourcing of Documents 1 and 5 for purpose, because one more successful attempt at sourcing is required to earn the point. The response attempts to compare Soviet and Nazi propaganda to the painting of Richelieu (Document 6) as an attempt at complexity, but the connection is neither valid nor insightful.

Thesis 0
Contextualization 0
Evidence 1
Analysis and Reasoning 0