

Unit 3 exam

Attorneys, witnesses, and jurors: Respond to **two** of the following prompts. Each response should be **no longer than** five paragraphs. You may consult the case materials provided in the Commonwealth v. Carnegie mock trial packet. This exam is based on your understanding and analysis of the Homestead Strike.

1. Was this a strike or a lockout? Was it both? Why is this significant? We have talked a lot about **power**, but mostly from the perspective of Carnegie and Frick. What power did the AAISW have? How did they use it? List and describe five major issues involved in the dispute. How many of these issues came directly from arguments between the AAISW and the board of Carnegie Steel? Were the AAISW's interests *necessarily* in conflict with Carnegie Steel's?
2. How should the Homestead Strike be remembered? Did your experience in the trial change what you think its "lesson" is?
3. How could you explain the difference between Carnegie's actions during the strike and his pro-labor persona? How does the outcome of the strike reflect the relationship between labor and capital in the 1890s? How should we interpret the actions of Frick? Of Carnegie?
4. How does reenacting the strike as a mock trial make the event more human – or more complicated?
5. Read the attached poem, "Touring Clayton, the Estate of the Industrialist Henry Clay Frick" by Robert Gibb, written in 2007. Use the poem to reinterpret your own visit to Clayton and use the visit to interrogate the poem's perspective. Let the mock trial frame your thinking about guilt, power, and memory. Here are a few questions to get you started:
 - What details from your tour feel different or more complicated after reading the poem?
 - Where did your tour similarly emphasize or omit certain narratives?
 - How does Gibb's voice disrupt or expand the curated interpretation?
 - Should a house so linked to 1892 present itself as beauty, as power, as trauma, or something else?
 - Connect your juror/attorney experience to the museum experience: Did the trial make Clayton feel different? How so?
6. In 1887, AFL founder and president Samuel Gompers wrote that "it is impossible for capitalists and laborers to have common interests." Was he right? Using the events at Homestead as a lens, refute or support his claim. Give specific supporting details from the trial or the case materials.
7. How does Homestead change the way you understand labor relations today?
8. When Pittsburgh's steel industry collapsed in the 1980s, thousands of high-paying union jobs went with it. But while other rust belt cities like Buffalo, Detroit, and Cleveland have struggled to recover their former manufacturing strength, Pittsburgh has reinvented itself as a locus of technology and medicine. This reinvention would have been impossible without world-class institutions like the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Mellon (founded as Carnegie Tech, then a trade school, by Carnegie himself in 1900).

Consider Carnegie's life and legacy, his business tactics and the institutions he founded.

Consider that we have villainized both Carnegie and Frick for the better part of a month.

Consider also that the mock trial materials for *Commonwealth v. Carnegie* were created by exhausting the resources of the Carnegie Library System of Pittsburgh.

With all that in mind, do you find our modern-day benefit in Carnegie's philanthropy highly ironic or perfectly appropriate? Explain.

Remember: **This is not a research paper.** Everything you need is in the packet or in the Schoology folder for this unit.

The Homestead Strike, in my opinion, should be remembered as an example of what happens when companies are not held by law to any sort of standard, and are therefore able to do what they like with minimal repercussions except to the individual.

We see throughout the case materials and writing we went over that Carnegie Steel was not operating under any kind of policies that governed the industry. This industrialization period was still such a fresh thing that these kinds of regulations had not come into play yet. They didn't have any clear cut rules for how they were to treat their employees, what the bare minimum was, what they could and could not do as a company; most of those were not yet on the table. The lockout from the works and the aftermath of it, to me, starts and ends as an abuse of power on the corporation leader's behalf.

I'd say the trial I got to play a part in did reshape my idea of the "lesson." I was a part of the prosecution, so I worked a lot more on the Homestead workers side and those who were effected by it. Especially doing the bits where I crossed people like McLuckie, who just happened to be a worker on the other side of the fence, I think I got a lot more of that "the corporation is operating in a shady sort of way" vibes more than I otherwise might've.

The thing I took away from it was that sometimes the way companies operate doesn't exactly favor those who work under it. The affair at Homestead was complicated, multifaceted, and something I think is very good to look at from as many of those shards that you can. People are not stark black or white / good or evil, and I think what happened with the Homestead works is a great example of that.

It's something that can be remembered, as I already stated, as something that happened because of a powerful group not having regulations. Alternatively, it's an example of the ways people were treated. The decisions those in power had to make. The outcomes of those decisions, and whatever consequences they bear (for example, the involuntary manslaughter and criminal negligence charges we were able to get during our mock trial.). It should be remembered as something important that shaped unionization for decades in its wake, and a global news story.

Reenacting the trial was something I personally found really interesting. Studying these people as historical figures is one thing- you can box them up kind of neatly to fit the narrative and write a blurb about them on the margins of your powerpoint. Playing them, studying them as people in a case, figuring out questions and actually getting to get deeper into who they were, however, made it feel more personal. It made them feel more like the reality of it all; they were all people who walked this earth at some point before us. Complex people.

Frick, for example, was someone we villainized over the course of our trial. Several of my own questions and talking points hammered that nail in the coffin. He was made up to be the one kind of puppeting the Homestead affairs closer to home and overseeing the setup to crush the Homestead union. And that's not all exaggerations- he really did do that, mostly. But he was only human. We learned afterwards about his humanity, his family, his home and the way he climbed socially. People don't usually fit into the neat boxes we sometimes wish they would.

It got all of us a more in depth knowledge I don't think taking notes or watching any kind of movie would've as well. I feel like studying the case materials, planning how to direct and cross examine, building our established points and what we as the prosecution needed to prove was something that really got me deeper into the detail and important parts of the lesson.

Additionally, mock trial is something I enjoy doing. I don't know if this was the case for everyone, but the way we got to do it really just helped me get a lot further into the material than I think I would've otherwise.

It made it logical while also making it clear that while we could present one side as clear cut guilt or non-guilt, there were different sides to every story. The McLuckies of the world are going to have different points of views than the Carnegies.