PART I. Respond to two of the following three questions:
1) How do the Mexican Revolution and the regime that emerged from it reflect broader
trends and tensions in Latin American history? Discuss in connection to at least two
other countries.

2) Scholars of Latin America have often studied nation building and related projects and
ideologies (Liberalism, republicanism, etc.) from different perspectives, with one school
casting attention on elite actors and another preferring to write history more from “the
bottom up.” Through a comparison of Brazil and at least one other country from Spanish
America, please provide your own answer to the question “who builds nations?” and
explain how that answer compares to the foregoing scholarly consensus.

3) Please compare and contrast the scholarly literature on authoritarianism in two of the
following countries: Argentina, Brazil, and Chile. What are the most salient issues and
units of analysis employed in each? How has the scholarship changed over time?

PART II. Respond to one of the following two questions:
4) Writing at the turn of the twenty-first century, a historian commented on the dramatic
increase of scholarship about gender in Latin America the last thirty years and suggested
that that increase made the field difficult to survey. “[I] will leave to a future historian,”
the scholar wrote, “the task of evaluating whether gender analysis has moved ‘from the
margins to center’ in the ways historians have integrated it, or at least mentioned it, in
studies that do not specifically focus on gender or women.” In your view, is gender now
at the “center?”

5) In the last thirty years, labor historians have paid increasing attention to gender. How
has this development changed our understanding of workers and their histories? Do we
now understand labor history in a different light, or have scholars simply broadened our
purview by adding women to formerly male-centric narratives?