I wrote about this in *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*: Jan Prochazka, an important figure of the Prague Spring, came under heavy surveillance after the Russian invasion of 1968. At the time, he saw a good deal of another great opposition figure, Professor Vaclav Cemy, with whom he liked to drink and talk. All their conversations were secretly recorded, and I suspect the two friends knew it and didn’t give a damn. But one day in 1970 or 1971, with the intent to discredit Prochazka, the police began to broadcast these conversations as a radio serial. For the police it was an audacious, unprecedented act. And, surprisingly: it nearly succeeded; instantly Prochazka was discredited: because in private, a person says all sorts of things, slurs friends, uses coarse language, acts silly, tells dirty jokes, repeats himself, makes a companion laugh by shocking him with outrageous talk, floats heretical ideas he’d never admit in public, and so forth. Of course, we all act like Prochazka, in private we bad-mouth our friends and use coarse language; that we act different in private than in public is everyone’s most conspicuous experience, it is the very ground of the life of the individual; curiously, this obvious fact remains unconscious, unacknowledged, forever obscured by lyrical dreams of the transparent glass house, it is rarely understood to be the value one must defend beyond all others. Thus only gradually did people realize (though their rage was all the greater) that the real scandal was not Prochazka’s daring talk but the rape of his life; they realized (as if by electric shock) that private and public are two essentially different worlds and that respect for that difference is the indispensable condition, the sine qua non, for a man to live free; that the curtain separating these two worlds is not to be tampered with, and that curtain-rippers are criminals.

This is what’s known as a "Defend/Attack/Qualify" prompt. Typically, one of the three essays that you will write on the AP Exam is in this format. [The other two, more common, prompts will most likely be "Analyze the Argument" questions like the ones we’ve worked on so far.] This is also known as an "Original Argument," because, rather than analyzing someone else’s argument, you will be focusing on creating your own.

Like all AP questions, you must read this one carefully. It asks you to "support, qualify, or dispute Kundera’s claim" and support YOUR argument with "appropriate evidence." First, you must identify WHAT Kundera’s claim is. What point is he trying to make? What is his "thesis"? Remember to be an educated, "sensitive" reader. Stating that Kundera "doesn’t have a point" or "can’t write" (or variations thereof) will likely gain you a very low score.

After identifying Kundera’s claim, you must support it, qualify it, or dispute it. [Remember: to qualify a point you are conceding to some parts of the argument, but disputing others.] The prompt tells you to "[s]upport your argument with appropriate evidence." "Appropriate evidence" can draw from any or all of the following: your life experience, your reading, your study in school, etc. Remember that you are trying to persuade your reader of your position regarding Kundera’s claim. Outside knowledge and experience regarding any related issues is especially helpful when writing this type of essay.
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General Directions: This scoring guide will be useful for most of the essays that you read. If it seems inappropriate for a specific essay, ask your Table Leader for assistance. Always show your Table Leader books that seem to have no response or that contain responses that seem unrelated to the question. Your score should reflect your judgment of the essay's quality as a whole. Remember that students had only 40 minutes to read and write. Therefore, the essay is not a finished product and should not be judged by standards that are appropriate for out-of-class writing assignments. Instead, evaluate the essay as a draft, making certain that you reward students for what they do well. All essays, even those scored 8 and 9, may contain occasional flaws in analysis, prose style, or mechanics. These lapses should enter into your holistic evaluation of an essay's overall quality. In no case should you score an essay with many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics higher than a 2.

9. Essays earning a score of 9 meet the criteria for 8 papers and, in addition, are especially sophisticated in their argument or demonstrate particularly impressive control of language.

8. Essays earning a score of 8 successfully establish and support their position in relation to Kundera's claim. Their arguments contain appropriate evidence and are well developed and cogent. The writing is effective but not flawless.

7. Essays earning a score of 7 fit the description of 6 essays but are distinguished by more complete or purposeful argumentation or by a more mature prose style.

6. Essays earning a score of 6 adequately establish and support their position in relation to Kundera's claim. Their arguments are generally sound and provide sufficient evidence, but they are less developed or less cogent than essays earning higher scores. The writing is generally clear but may contain lapses in diction or syntax.

5. Essays earning a score of 5 establish and support their position in relation to Kundera's claim, but their arguments may be inconsistent or unevenly developed. The writing usually conveys the writer's ideas but may contain lapses in diction or syntax.

4. Essays earning a score of 4 respond to the prompt inadequately. They may have difficulty establishing a position in relation to Kundera's claim, may use unconvincing evidence, or may be insufficiently developed. The writing generally conveys the writer's ideas but may suggest immature control.

3. Essays earning a score of 3 meet the criteria for the score of 4 but are less successful in developing their position or less consistent in their control of language.

2. Essays earning a score of 2 demonstrate little success in developing their position in relation to Kundera's claim. These essays may fail to present an argument, respond with unrelated ideas or inappropriate evidence, or substitute a simpler task such as summary. They may seriously misread the passage or make unsubstantiated claims. The writing often demonstrates consistent weaknesses.

1. Essays earning a score of 1 meet the criteria for the score of 2 but are undeveloped, especially simplistic in their argument, or weak in their control of language.

0 Indicates an on-topic response that receives no credit, such as one that merely repeats the prompt. Indicates a blank response or one that is completely off topic.