

2022

AP<sup>®</sup>

 CollegeBoard

---

# AP<sup>®</sup> European History

## Free-Response Questions

**EUROPEAN HISTORY**

**SECTION I, Part B**

**Time—40 minutes**

**Directions:** Answer Question 1 **and** Question 2. Answer **either** Question 3 **or** Question 4.

Write your responses in the Section I, Part B: Short-Answer Response booklet. You must write your response to each question on the lined page designated for that response. Each response is expected to fit within the space provided.

In your responses, be sure to address all parts of the questions you answer. Use complete sentences; an outline or bulleted list alone is not acceptable. You may plan your answers in this exam booklet, but no credit will be given for notes written in this booklet.

**Read the passage below and answer all parts of the question that follows.**

“The Enlightenment was an eighteenth-century movement of ideas and practices that made the secular world its [main focus]. It did not necessarily deny the meaning or emotional hold of religion, but it gradually shifted attention away from religious questions toward secular ones. By seeking answers in secular terms—even to many religious questions—it vastly expanded the sphere of the secular, making it, for increasing numbers of educated people, a primary frame of reference.

In the Western world, art, music, science, politics, and even the categories of space and time had undergone a gradual process of secularization in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; the Enlightenment built on this process and made it into an international intellectual cause.

Attachment to the world—the here and the now—to a life lived without constant reference to God, became increasingly commonplace and the source of an explosion of innovative thinking about society, government, and the economy, to mention but a few areas of inquiry.”

Margaret Jacob, historian, *The Secular Enlightenment*, 2019

1. a) Describe the main argument the author makes about the Enlightenment in the passage.
- b) Explain how one piece of evidence not in the passage supports the author’s claims regarding the Enlightenment.
- c) Explain how secularization as described in the passage influenced one political change in the period 1750 to 1850.

Use the image below to answer all parts of the question that follows.

**Thomas Benjamin Kennington, English artist, *The Pinch of Poverty*, 1891**



Coram in the care of the Foundling Museum, London/Bridgeman Images

2. a) Describe the attitude toward poverty expressed in the painting.
- b) Describe a broader context in which the painting was produced.
- c) Explain one way in which reformers during the late 1800s and early 1900s attempted to address the problems of poverty in Europe.

**Question 3 or 4**

**Directions:** Answer **either** Question 3 **or** Question 4.

**Answer (a), (b), and (c).**

3. a) Describe one significant cultural or intellectual change during the Renaissance.
- b) Explain one cause of cultural or intellectual change during the Renaissance.
- c) Describe a significant difference between the art of the Italian Renaissance and the art of the Protestant Reformation.

**Answer (a), (b), and (c).**

4. a) Describe one significant change in the relationship between Western Europe and other parts of the world after 1945.
- b) Explain one cause for a change in the relationship between Western Europe and other parts of the world after 1945.
- c) Describe one continuity in the economic relationship between Western Europe and other parts of the world in the period from the late 1800s through the late 1900s.

**END OF SECTION I**

**EUROPEAN HISTORY**

**SECTION II**

**Total Time—1 hour and 40 minutes**

**Question 1 (Document-Based Question)**

**Suggested reading and writing time: 1 hour**

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

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

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

In your response you should do the following.

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

---

**Begin your response to this question at the top of a new page in the separate Free Response booklet and fill in the appropriate circle at the top of each page to indicate the question number.**

1. Evaluate whether the English Civil War (1642–1649) was motivated primarily by religious reasons or primarily by political reasons.

**Document 1**

Source: Sir Thomas Peyton, member of the House of Commons, letter to his brother-in-law on King Charles I's dissolution of Parliament, 1640

I have no good news to send you. The King thanked the House of Lords for their respect and readiness to do him good services, and [said that] were it not for some rowdy and popular members of parliament, he might have received as much respect from the House of Commons. Therefore he would not blame all of the members for the faults of some agitators. As for their grievances, . . . he assured them that he would preserve religion in its purity and truth, and have as tender a care of the church as can be required of any Christian prince. And so, he left the royal pleasure to be delivered by the lord keeper [an officer of the crown], who only said, "it is his majesty's pleasure this parliament be dissolved."

**Document 2**

Source: Report by royal officials accusing a group of Anabaptists of meeting secretly in a private house, 1641

The accused being brought before Sir John Lenthall, he demanded why they would not go and resort to their parish church, according to the law of 35 Elizabeth.\* They answered:

1. That the law of 35 Elizabeth was not a true law, because it was made by the bishops; and that they would not obey it.
2. That they would not go to their parish churches. That those churches were not true churches; and that there was no true church but where the faithful met.
3. That the king could not make a perfect law, because he was not a perfect man.
4. That they ought not to obey the king except in civil things.

\*the 1593 act enforcing attendance at Anglican parish churches

**Document 3**

Source: *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, Governor of Nottingham Castle and Town, Written by his Wife Lucy*, based upon Lucy Hutchinson's diary, which recounts events of 1641

Finding rumours beginning to stir, Mr. Hutchinson applied himself to understand the things then in dispute, and read all the public papers that came forth between the king and parliament, besides many other private treatises, both concerning the present and fore-going times. Hereby he became abundantly informed, and convinced of the righteousness of parliament's cause under the civil law. And he was also convinced that there were attempts to bring back popery [Roman Catholicism] and subvert the true protestant religion, which indeed was apparent to everyone that impartially considered it. But he did not think that those attempts were as clear grounds for the war as was the defence of the just English liberties. Although he was clearly swayed by his own judgement and reason to parliament's side, yet, thinking he had no warrantable call at that time to do anything more, he contented himself with praying for peace.

**Document 4**

Source: Lady Sydenham, wife of a Royalist, letter to Lady Verney, the wife of a Parliament supporter, September 1642

My dear Lady Verney, I did long for your answer to my letter, because you did express a trouble in yours to me about your husband's resolutions. My dear heart, now I hope that you are resolved of what he will do, and that I find it is better for one to be certain, than to live between hopes and fears of what will happen. I know your husband has chosen the strongest side, though I cannot think it the best. But I am confident he does believe it is the best, and for that reason he chose it. Truly, my heart, it staggers me that he should not see clearly all their ways, being they are so apparent. For instance, how is it the liberty of the king's subjects to take all from those who are not of like mind, and to pull down their houses, and imprison them, and leave them to the mercy of the unruly multitude?—I cannot find that this is the liberty of the subject. Nor do I find that it is in God's law to take arms against their lawful king to depose him. . . . My dear, if any of my friends fall in this quarrel I trust their souls will be happy, for sure 'tis lawful to fight for one's lawful king.

**Document 5**


Source: Jonathan Langley, Shropshire merchant, letter to Sir Francis Ottley, Royalist politician, and Henry Bromley, Sheriff of Shropshire, February 1643

Right Worthy Sirs,

I take so much boldness on me to write my mind unto you. I have left my father, my wife, and children, in what state of mind God knows, and how much I desire to return to them you shall see by this letter. I never had an Intention, nor yet have, of taking up Arms on either side. My reason is that my protestation [oath] already taken binds me to both king and to parliament. There are two Armies each seeking to destroy the other . . . each taking the Protestant religion for their Standard. Yet one claims the other are Papists [Roman Catholics] and the other side claims their opponents are schismatics, but (for my part) my conscience tells me they both intend [to support] the Protestant Religion. What reason have I therefore to fall out with either? Now, if you'll be pleased to shelter me by your power, to live at Home is my earnest desire, beseeching you that no more protestations be urged upon me, for I find in my own Conscience I have sufficiently enough of this, nor to be compelled to bear arms, nor clapt up [chained in irons] as disaffected to his Majesty, which very word I abhor from my heart.

Document 6

Source: A sketch of the battle flag of Captain Hooker, officer in the Parliamentary Army, carried during the English Civil War



*Captan Hooker sonn to Captaine  
hooker of London.*

© British Library Board. All Rights Reserved/Bridgeman Images

*The Latin text above the scroll representing the Magna Carta reads: "Preserve the Law, O Lord."*

**Document 7**

Source: “The Soldier’s Catechism,” distributed as a leaflet to the army of Parliament, 1644

1. I fight to recover the King out of the hands of a Popish malignant company, that have seduced His Majesty with their wicked Counsels and have withdrawn him from his Parliament.
2. I fight for the Laws and Liberties of my country, which are now in danger of being overthrown by them that have long labored to bring into this country an Arbitrary and Tyrannical government.
3. I fight for the preservation of our parliament, in the being whereof (under God) consists the glory and welfare of this Kingdom; if this foundation be overthrown, we shall soon be the most slavish nation in the Christian World.
4. I fight in the defence and maintenance of the true Protestant Religion, which is now violently opposed, and will be utterly suppressed in this Kingdom and the Popish Religion again advanced, if the armies raised against Parliament prevail.

**END OF DOCUMENTS FOR QUESTION 1**

**Question 2, 3, or 4 (Long Essay)**  
**Suggested writing time: 40 minutes**

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

In your response you should do the following.

- Respond to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis or claim that establishes a line of reasoning.
  - Describe a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.
  - Support an argument in response to the prompt using specific and relevant examples of evidence.
  - Use historical reasoning (e.g., comparison, causation, continuity or change over time) to frame or structure an argument that addresses the prompt.
  - Use evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the prompt.
2. Evaluate the most significant similarity between the French Revolution of 1789–1799 and the Revolutions of 1848.
  3. Evaluate the most significant difference between economic development in eastern Europe and economic development in western and central Europe in the 1800s.
  4. Evaluate the most significant similarity between the regimes of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia in the interwar period.

---

**Begin your response to this question at the top of a new page in the separate Free Response booklet and fill in the appropriate circle at the top of each page to indicate the question number.**

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

**STOP**

**END OF EXAM**