# AP<sup>®</sup> UNITED STATES HISTORY 2011 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)

#### Question 4

Compare and contrast the foreign policies of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson.

#### The 8-9 Essay

- Contains a clear, well-developed thesis that compares and contrasts the foreign policies of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson.
- Develops the thesis with substantial, relevant historical information.
- Provides effective analysis of the foreign policies of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson; treatment may be somewhat uneven.
- May contain minor errors that do not detract from the quality of the essay.
- Is well organized and well written.

## The 5-7 Essay

- Contains a partially developed thesis that compares and contrasts the foreign policies of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson.
- Supports the thesis with some relevant historical information.
- Provides some analysis of the foreign policies of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, but treatment may be uneven.
- May contain errors that do not seriously detract from the quality of the essay.
- Has acceptable organization and writing.

## The 2-4 Essay

- Contains an unfocused or limited thesis or one that simply paraphrases the question.
- Provides minimal relevant information or lists facts with little or no application to the question.
- May address the question only partially, with limited or no analysis.
- May have major errors.
- May be poorly organized and/or written.

#### The 0-1 Essav

- Lacks a thesis or simply restates the question.
- Demonstrates an incompetent or inappropriate response.
- Has numerous errors.
- Is organized and/or written so poorly that it inhibits understanding.

## The — Essay

• Is completely off topic or blank.

# AP<sup>®</sup> UNITED STATES HISTORY 2011 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)

## Question 4 (continued)

#### **Information Sheet**

The beginning of the twentieth century saw a new era in world politics. The cornerstone of what Henry Luce would later dub "The American Century" having been laid with the Spanish–American War in 1898, the United States stood ready to play a more active part in shaping world affairs. Although this shift in the nation's approach to the conduct of diplomacy had begun before 1898, it was only in the early twentieth century that the nation's policymakers assumed the new responsibility of helping orchestrate international affairs.

Between 1901 and 1920, the United States increasingly intervened in the affairs of other nations. The presidents during this period, Theodore Roosevelt, William Taft, and Woodrow Wilson, despite differences in background and temperament, held similar views regarding the redemptive nature of United States values and the nation's obligation to further Western civilization. Each subscribed to the notion that political advancement and economic progress were two sides of the same coin, that democracy and republicanism were corollaries of free trade. All three championed policies that, in their estimation, furthered both.

If their opinions and actions were similar, their effect on long-term policymaking was not. The administrations of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson bookend the Progressive Era. They established the key principles that would animate United States foreign policy for the remainder of the century and beyond.

Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson were both Progressives, and their domestic proclivities colored their approach to foreign affairs. Both men promoted federal intervention in the nation's economy to free Americans from the subjugation of big business. This penchant for activism shaped their statecraft as well. Each man willingly deployed United States power to free the people of other nations from what he saw as despotism and enslavement.

They believed in the centrality of decisive leadership in foreign affairs. As a result, both were impatient with Congress's role in dealings with other countries. Throughout their tenures, each man worked to minimize the legislature's capacity to impact events. So, too, did they work to minimize the role of the State Department, marginalizing it by relying on friends and personal contacts rather than professional diplomats whenever possible. Among the consequences of this point of view was the establishment of precedents that would accelerate the evolution of the imperial presidency.

Despite their push to expand presidential prerogatives in the conduct of foreign affairs, both men understood that there were constraints regarding what they could do and limits on what they could achieve. Roosevelt and Wilson understood that the public's enthusiasm for empire was past, and, with rare exceptions, neither added substantially to United States territory. Though each understood the public's aversion to foreign entanglements, they differed in their willingness to test the boundaries of that dislike. And, even though an arrogance of power generally marked their undertakings in Latin America and the Caribbean basin, they appreciated the checks on the ability of the United States to influence developments in Asia and drew back from that region.

Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson shared a desire to move the United States into the mainstream of world power but chose different means to do so. The more pragmatic of the two, Roosevelt was less ambitious than Wilson and, in many ways, the more successful. He saw the United States as a global adjudicator, whereas Wilson hoped to remake the world in the image of the United States.

# AP<sup>®</sup> UNITED STATES HISTORY 2011 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)

## Question 4 (continued)

Each of these men can be seen as transformative leaders. But of the two, Woodrow Wilson towers over United States foreign policy. Wilson was certain of his and the nation's destiny. Sure that American values were both unique and universal, he thus believed no conflict existed between pushing the nation's ideals and furthering its self-interests. The fate of his grandest initiatives aside, the term "Wilsonian" is firmly ensconced in the lexicon of United States foreign policy. This term conjures notions of anti-imperialism, self-determination, and the obligation of nations to act in concert in order to ensure peace and spread democracy.

Notwithstanding their many accomplishments, these two presidents left a mixed legacy. In Latin America, their confidence in the providential nature of United States initiatives translated into a high-handedness that tarnished how the United States was, and still is, seen in the region. Although a degree of United States dominance in the region was an unavoidable reality, efforts to "Americanize" Latin America and to make it secure for United States investment created economic instability and retarded the development of representative government.

With respect to Europe, the First World War accelerated the transformation of the global role of the United States, and Woodrow Wilson deserves much of the credit. Yet President Wilson's hopes for "a peace without victory" collapsed when the 1919 Treaty of Versailles was rejected by the U.S. Senate. His vision for a peaceful future based on the Fourteen Points did not become reality.

gentlemen's agreement

# Significant Events and Individuals Associated with the Foreign Policies of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson

#### Events and Terms Associated with Theodore Roosevelt

Algeciras Conference (1906)
American China
Development Company
annexation of Hawaii, Guam,
Puerto Rico
annexation of the Philippines
anti-imperialists
arbitration treaties
(Asia/Latin America)
Article 231 (1919)
big stick diplomacy
Boxer Rebellion (1900)
China
China Consortium (1909)
Cuba

dollar diplomacy

(1907)Great White Fleet (1907) Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty (1903)Hay-Pauncefote Treaty (1901)insular cases (1901–1903) Manchuria Mexican Revolution (1910) Monroe Doctrine (1823) Nicaraguan intervention (1911)Nobel Peace Prize (Roosevelt, 1906) Open Door Notes Panama Canal (1904–1914)

Platt Amendment (1901)
Rio de Janiero Conference
(1906)
Roosevelt Corollary (1905)
Root-Takahira Agreement
(1908)
Russo-Japanese War (1904–
1905)
Second Hague Conference
(1907)
Spanish-American War
(1898)
Taft-Katsura memo (1905)
Treaty of Paris (1898)
Treaty of Portsmouth (1905)
Venezuelan crisis (1905)

# AP® UNITED STATES HISTORY 2011 SCORING GUIDELINES (Form B)

## Question 4 (continued)

## Events and Terms Associated with Woodrow Wilson

Allies, the American Expeditionary

Force (1917) Armistice (1918)

Article X of the League of Nations Covenant "association of nations"

(1916)

Belleau Woods (1918)

Black Hand

"blank check" (1914) Bryan–Chamorro Treaty

(1914)

Central Powers

Château-Thierry, battle of

(1918)

Columbus, New Mexico, raid

on (1916) Committee on Public

Information (1917)
"community of power" (191

"community of power" (1917)
Dominican intervention

(1916)

Espionage and Sedition Acts

(1917)

Fourteen Points (1917)

Gore–McLemore Resolution

(1915)

Haitian intervention (1911,

1916)

House–Grey memorandum

(1916)

irreconcilables

Lansing-Ishi Agreement

(1917)

League of Nations

League to Enforce Peace

(1916)

Liberty Leagues Lusitania (1915)

"make the world safe for

democracy"

Meuse-Argonne Offensive

(1918)

National Defense Act (1916)

National Security League

(1915)

October Revolution (1917)

pan-American mediation

(1917)

"peace without victory"

(1917)

Pershing expedition (1916)

preparedness (1916)

Provisional Government,

Russia (1917)

Red Scare (1919–1920)

Russian Revolution (1917)

Sarajevo (1914)

strong and weak

reservationists

submarine crisis (1915)

Sussex Pledge (1916)

Tampico incident (1914)

Treaty of Versailles (1919)

Twenty-One Demands, made

by Japan on China (1915)

Underwood-Simmons tariff

(1913)

unlimited submarine warfare

(1917)

Vera Cruz, occupation of

(1914)

Virgin Islands (1916)

"war to end all wars"

Weimar Republic

Zimmerman telegram (1917)

#### Individuals

Aguinaldo, Emilio Beveridge, Albert

Bryan, William Jennings

Bullitt, William C. Bunau-Varilla, Philippe

Carranza, Venustiano Clemenceau, Georges

Creel, George

Edward VII, king of England

Franz Ferdinand, archduke of

Austria

Franz Joseph I, emperor of

Austria

Harding, Warren

Hay, John

House, Edward

Huerta, Victoriano

Hughes, Charles Evans Kerensky, Alexander

Knox, Philander

Lansing, Robert Lenin, Vladimir

Lloyd George, David Lodge, Henry Cabot

Madero, Francisco McKinley, William

Nicholas II, tsar of Russia

Orlando, Vittorio Palmer, A. Mitchell

Porfirio Díaz, José de la Cruz

Princip, Gavrillo Reed, John Root, Elihu

Pershing, John

Spring-Rice, Cecil Taft, William Howard

Trotsky, Leon

Twain, Mark (Samuel

Clemens) Villa, Pancho

Von Sternberg, Speck Wilhelm II, emperor of

Germany (Kaiser Wilhelm)

Zapata, Emiliano

Circle the Section II question number you are answering on this page.

Mandatory
Part B — Circle one
Part C — Circle one
1 2 or 3 4 or 5

The presidencies of Theodore Roosevett and Woodrow Wilson both featured significant
The presidencies of Theodore Roosevett and Woodrow Wilson both featured significant in plan threegon policies. Although Roosevett was more imperialist and actually featured more direct involvement of the foreign policies.
while Wilson was more redealist and didn't achieve the most significant part of his foreign policy, the
America's entry into the League of Nections, both presidents were determined in asserting America's influence as
a world power in international affairs.
Theodore Roosevett, primarily known for his progressive policies, was also an imperialist. For example,
he tried to seure American possession of a canal in central America to help connect sea routes in between
the East and West coasts. When the Colombian government refused to grant America the right to build a rand,
Russevelt supported a revolution in columbia that led to the creation of Danama, whose government readily
allowed America to start constructing the Panama Canal. Roosevett was also active on Cuba; who had recently
received independence from spain. The plat Amenament allowed the british States to interfere limited Cubus
self-government and for American interests. Robsavelt would also introduced the Robsavelt Corollary to the Monroe
Dutoine, asserting that American could interfere in the domestic posture affairs of Lostin American nations
to "preserve # their stability" Wilson wasn't nearly as acting in Latin America, his main interactions with
them being conflicts with the Mexican Huarta government and annexing Purto Rico.
Meanwhile, Wilson was more atthre on interactive with European nections, partly due to the outbreak
of the First World War. William envisioned a new America, after initially attempting to remain neutral (with
"he kept us out of the war" being a ralying cry that supported Utilson's reelection), Joined the world WarI
following German aggression in Johnanine warfare and the Zimmerman Telegram. Wilson enumbed a new world
order in which international disputes could be pracefully solved, a league of Nations to arbitrate disputes existed,
and America was a contral point of hater global peacl. These ideals were expressed in Wilson's Fourteen Points,
which advocated free trade, open sear, open treaties, colonial dispute medicition, and the arration of the league of Nations.
Rousevett, was not as idealistic, instead focusing on imperialistic goals in the western Hemisphere, material to
conflect with European powers.
Despite significant differences between Rooseverts and Wilsonk policies, both presidents shared
some that an idealogical trimilarities. Both were intent an octabilitation America as a world much

Circle the Section	II question number you are	answering on this page.	4
Mandatory 1	Part B — Circle one  2 or 3	Part C — Circle one  or 5	2

Koosevert ins an imperialist nation and wilson as an intermational arbiter of peace. Both presidents were
significantly distant from isolationism advocuted by Washington's Farcuck Address and various significant
national figures after word. Both other on progressive beliefs, Rossach for the property of Both had
Similar goals in mind, they just took different methods to achieve them. Littmately, Rossevelt capationeed more
Succession in Implementating
Uttimentally Roosevelt experienced more success in implementing his foreign policy, since Williams proposed for
The include of veregilles proved too interventionist for bolationist sentiments. If Housevert and Utilian Park took different
steps in establishing. American influence on the world scene and met different success, but each had a similar
Intent behind their actions.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Mandatory Part B — Circle one Part C — Circle one 1 of 3 or 3or 5

Both Theodore Rosevelt see and woodrow wilson had simultaniand a goal of increasing US economic power and overall similar strenath. often through foreign intervention. However, both also heid often tach cally different methods. Theodore Roosevelt's foreign policy focused on economic gain through foreign involvement, as well as a gain in power and notability through imperialistic ventures, while Woodrow Wilson's foreign policy focused almost entirely on www and his League of Wations diearo, fourses on maintaining alliances gain, and for the most Dart with European nations Britain, France, and spain, while promoting power oversear outside of economic potential. "League of Nations! and international alliance, and peace. Theselote Roosevell had an aggressive foreign policy, very much contrasting former presidents. His influence in Latin America in particular - his building of the Panama canal, and the Usis purchase of the land, was gained through encouraging rebellion in Panama, and using military force to protect the Panenamams - and secure the land. Later, the Spanish - American war over the mistreatment of cuba left the US with the Phillipines. The US being in possession of the Phillipines as a colony, thereso button sealer the attendent the was America's venture into the imperialistic nature of the European further powers. Possevell also extended influence into latin America through the "Rossevell Corrollery", an adecation to the wonroe boctrine. Furthermore, Poosevelle also extended influence into Asia - specificaly, Jupan and China, as well as the Phillipines. Roosevert first proposed China's open door plan - promoting free trace - although it was never fully accepted by

		8 - 1 - 1 - 8 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	10
Mandatory	Part B — Circle one	Part C — Circle one	415
1	2 or 3	4 or 5	2 13
			L OF )

many international powers the also established close relations
with Japan, authorigh these relations were often tense. When
anti-Japanese sentiments rose in the Us, resulting in immigration
restrictions and segregated schools, Roosevelle issued the
Gentleman's agreement to queu hostilities. Pooscueux also
ade ordered, in a show of the Usis naval power, a for the
US navy to tour around the world. Roosevelt greatly increased
military proficiency, and established nawal bases worldwide -
including Pearl Harbor, Hauvaii. Roosevelt's foreign policy was
centered mounty around economic gain and improved military
proficiency. Despite being ostentations at times, Prosevent maintained international in
reasonably friendly relations
Woodrow Wilson's foreign policy was heavily influenced by his
woodrow wilson's foreign policy was heavily influenced by his accision to enter www. wilson was less concerned with
•
aecision to enter WWI. WIISON was less concerned with
decision to enter WWI. WIISON was less concerned with economic ventures or promoting military power, and focused
economic ventures or promoting military power, and focused more on creat pushing international alliances and
decision to enter WWI. WIISON was less concerned with economic ventures or promoting military power, and focused more on execut pushing international alliances and international peace. Wilson was, arguably, and idealist
decision to enter WWI. WIISON was less concerned with economic ventures or promoting military power, and focused more on execut pushing international alliances and international peace. Wilson was, arguably, and idealist his dream of the League of warions colored a large
decision to enter WWI. WIISON was less concerned with economic ventures or promoting military power, and focused more on creat pushing international alliances and international peace. Wilson was, arguably, and idealist - his dream of the League of warions colored a large amount of his foreign policy, and his desire for international
decision to enter WWI. Wilson was less concerned with economic ventures or promoting military power, and focused more on creal pushing international alliances and international peace. Wilson was, arguably, and idealist - his dream of the League of warions colored a large amount of his foreign policy, and his desire for international alliance was one of the deciding feetors in the US
decision to enter WWI. WIISON was less concerned with economic ventures or promoting military power, and focused more on exact pushing international accionace and international peace. Wilson was, arguably, and idealist - his dream of the League of warions colored a large amount of his foreign policy, and his desire for international accionace was one of the deciding feetors in the US entering www. After the war, the League of warions was
decision to enter WWI. WIISDN was less concerned with economic ventures or promoting military power, and focused more on execut pushing international alliances and international peace. Wilson was, arguably, and idealist - his dream of the League of waeions colored a large amount of his foreign policy, and his desire for international alliance was one of the deciding feetors in the US entering www. After the war, the League of Waeions was created - nowever, Congress rejected it, and the US

Mandatory Part B — Circle one Part C — Circle one 4 or 5

2 PZ

Roosevect's foreign policy was often aggressive and the bold,
while wilson's was boused on peaceful relations.
However, both Rossever and Witson had a common goar of
furthering US international influence and forming international
alliances, which both (to an extent) accomplished.

	Mandatory  1	Part B — Circle one  2 or 3	Part C — Circle one  or 5	2012
At the the	beginn of both	h century, United Store		beane policies
	to make	//	the county better	and
1				
				·
			•	

# AP<sup>®</sup> UNITED STATES HISTORY 2011 SCORING COMMENTARY (Form B)

#### **Question 4**

Sample: 4A Score: 7

This essay's thesis compares and contrasts the foreign policy of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. It offers some relevant information to support that thesis (Roosevelt: "progressive policies," Panama, Platt Amendment, Roosevelt Corollary; Wilson: Mexico, Huerta, "'he kept us out of the war,'" Zimmerman Telegram, Fourteen Points, Treaty of Versailles rejected). It has some good analysis of the information provided for Roosevelt as an imperialist and Wilson as an idealist. The analysis that both men shared "idealogical [sic] similarities" in seeking to establish "America as a world power" and that both "were significantly distant from [the] isolationism advocated by Washington in his Farewell Address" but "employed different methods to achieve them" is quite good. The essay is acceptably organized and written, but its greater depth of analysis regarding Roosevelt than regarding Wilson prevents it from rising above a score of 7.

Sample: 4B Score: 4

The essay addresses the question with an unfocused thesis. The treatment of the Panama Canal is good, but the essay erroneously claims that the Spanish–American War, the inauguration of the Open Door policy, and the establishment of the naval base at Pearl Harbor occurred during Roosevelt's presidency. The reference to the Roosevelt Corollary is undeveloped. The essay is unbalanced, presenting limited relevant information on Wilson's foreign policy, especially the League of Nations. These flaws prevented the essay from being scored higher than a 4.

Sample: 4C Score: 1

This essay is acceptably organized and written, contains a thesis, and offers some evidence to support its assertions. These elements notwithstanding, it remains an ineffective response to the question. The thesis, found in the first paragraph, is vague. The essay is bereft of analysis, and apart from referring to the Monroe Doctrine and George Washington (with errors in both names), the evidence it contains is general. The essay reflects a misunderstanding of the time period, but its structure and limited content were enough to keep it from receiving a score of 0.