

Prompt 4:

I feel when I have studied history in the past, it feels like a distant event, something so long ago I cannot really understand what happened. I feel like I cannot relate. The people seem real, yet unrealistic. The events seem like “this will never happen to me in my life.” Also, sometimes the tiny details either get swept under the rug, or feel so irrelevant, like “why am I learning this?” History is complicated and sometimes it is hard to remember who did what, where this took place and why. Packaging history in a case format makes it more human, and more complicated in a sense that it makes it easier to understand. In the mock trial, you have real people portraying people from history. The people in our class who played people had read their testimony and understood it in a way they could say it back in a real-life situation (a mock trial). The direct examination questions were questions about that person answered in short answers, that are easy to remember and understand. It makes these historical people feel real, seeing people portray them with emotions. All of the information in the testimonies was important information that we used in our case. Spending so much time with the case materials and exhibits, prepping and then the actual case, helped everyone understand this a lot better than just notes. We were acting this out, modernizing, and making it seem and feel real.

Does it make it more complicated? Yes. We could have easily covered that the battle was a lockout then strike, people died, no one was charged with any fault except some townspeople, and it was because of Frick’s no union policy. We could easily learn all that from notes. But we made it more complicated by giving facts about what happened at Homestead and trying to uncover a verdict. This process made us look at the tiny details

that could help us make our case. It helped us go more in depth and get the real experience of Homestead. Overall, the case really helped me learn about this at the full extent it could and should be.

Prompt 1:

This event at Homestead was both a lockout and a strike. This is significant because Frick locked the workers out before they started striking. They started striking after being locked out of the company, they had no other option. To Frick, he would call it a strike, saying his workers were on strike making it sound like it was their fault. The workers, however, would say it was a lockout, Frick locked them out and was going to replace them. Their side says Frick's fault. Because it was both a lockout and strike, is very significant because it points to the fact that both sides were to blame for what happened at Homestead.

In this event, the AAISW had the power to leave Frick with no one to work at his mills. They could quit or strike. This would disrupt the production from the factory. The biggest power they had was the fact they were in a union. Unions were powerful. Due to unionization there were a lot of issues in the disputes at Homestead. Five issues that arose during this time were wage cuts, the elimination of union recognition, the use of the Pinkerton Detective Agency, long working hours, and horrid working conditions. A lot of these issues stemmed directly from arguments with Carnegies board and the AAISW. These arguments arose due to the AAISW interests within the company. The union

supported and protected workers' rights and aimed improve the working conditions at the mill. However, Carnegie's company wanted to max out production, and maximize profits, often at the expense of the workers.