#### **Document 1: Wealth**

- 2 Andrew Carnegie
- 3 North American Review, June 1889

We accept and welcome . . . as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves great inequality of environment, the concentration of business industrial and commercial—in the hands of a few, and the law of competition between these as being not only beneficial but essential for the future progress of the race. ... That this talent for organization and management is rare among men is proved by the fact that it invariably secures for its possessor enormous rewards, no matter where or under what laws or conditions. ... 

...It is a law, as certain as any of the others named, that men possessed of this peculiar talent for affairs, under the free play of economic forces, must, of necessity, soon be in receipt of more revenue than can be <u>judiciously</u> expended upon themselves; and this law is as beneficial for the race as the others.

There are but three modes in which surplus wealth can be disposed of. It can be left to the families of the <u>decedents</u>; or it can be <u>bequeathed</u> for public purposes; or, finally, it can be administered during their lives by its possessors. Under the first and second modes most of the wealth of the world that has reached the few has hitherto been applied. Let us in turn consider each of these modes.

The first is the most injudicious. In monarchical countries, the estates and the greatest portion of the wealth are left to the first son that the vanity of the parent may be gratified by the thought that his name and title are to descend to succeeding generations unimpaired. ... Under republican institutions the division of property among the children is much fairer, but the question which forces itself upon thoughtful men in all lands is: Why should men leave great fortunes to their children? If this is done from affection, is it not misguided affection? Observation teaches that, generally speaking, it is not well for the children that they should be so burdened. Neither is it well for the state. ...

 As to the second mode, that of leaving wealth at death for public uses, it may be said that this is only a means for the disposal of wealth, provided a man is content to wait until he is dead before it becomes of much good in the world...

 Poor and restricted are our opportunities in this life; narrow our horizon; our best work most imperfect; but rich men should be thankful for one inestimable boon. They have it in their power during their lives to busy themselves in organizing <u>benefactions</u> from which the masses of their fellows will derive lasting advantage, and thus dignify their own lives. ...

wisely

direct relative/ given

public gifts

This, then, is held to be the duty of the man of wealth: first, to set an example of modest, unostentatious living, shunning display or extravagance; to provide moderately for the legitimate wants of those dependent upon him; and after doing so to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds which he is called upon to administer, and strictly bound as a matter of duty to administer in the manner which, in his judgment, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community—the man of wealth thus becoming the mere agent and trustee for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves. . . .

In bestowing charity, the main consideration should be to help those who will help themselves; to provide part of the means by which those who desire to improve may do so; to give those who desire to rise the aids by which they may rise; to assist, but rarely or never to do all. Neither the individual nor the race is improved by almsgiving. Those worthy of assistance, except in rare cases, seldom require assistance. The really valuable men of the race never do, except in cases of accident or sudden change. ... He is the only true reformer who is as careful and as anxious not to aid the unworthy as he is to aid the worthy, and, perhaps, even more so, for in almsgiving more injury is probably done by rewarding vice than by relieving virtue. . . .

 Thus is the problem of rich and poor to be solved. The laws of accumulation will be left free; the laws of distribution free. Individualism will continue, but the millionaire will be but a trustee for the poor; entrusted for a season with a great part of the increased wealth of the community, but administering it for the community far better than it could or would have done for itself. ...Of such as these the public verdict will then be: "The man who dies thus rich dies disgraced."

Such, in my opinion, is the true <u>gospel</u> concerning wealth, obedience to which is destined someday to solve the problem of the rich and the poor, and to bring "Peace on earth, among men goodwill."

# **Document 2: TRADE UNIONISTS PROTEST THE GIFT OF A "CARNEGIE LIBRARY"**

New York World, March 25, 1901

 Andrew Carnegie offered the town of New Castle, Pennsylvania, fifty thousand dollars for a public library in 1901, and, following similar action by the city Trades Assembly, Division 89 of the Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees passed the following resolution.

That such donations are <u>inimical</u> to that independence American manhood is assumed to possess (on general principles) and especially so in this case where such flagrant injustice, even to murder, has been done to those whose toil is represented in every dollar of the money thus tendered. It was

giving money to the poor

understood truth

harmful

well said by a delegate that between the lines of the books thus obtained one could easily see the sweat and blood of thousands of workers and on the margins of every page the tragedy of Homestead. The spirit of hero-worship that prompts the acceptance of such gifts and that looks upon structures thus erected as monuments to the memory of the donor is only another form of manifesting the spirit for the monarch: a recognition of the divine right of kings on the one hand and utter disregard of how the money was made on the other. biased To erect such a library here and by its partisan, outspoken influence induce our children to look upon it as a logical, necessary and unavoidable method of obtaining certain benefits, tends to destroy in the minds any idea of national justice or human rights and makes of them willing supplicants at beggars the mercy of this system of corporate greed which deals out a part of the sum in charity it originally appropriated from the producer to whom it alone rightfully belongs, which sum if they had fully received would have enabled them to have owned a library instead of now being, as are all others who are similarly robbed, the objects of charity. It would be something like a semblance of justice if these donations were misleading appearance made to the widows and orphans at Homestead. We deem them as worthy of remembrance as the Maine. A city will enrich enormously a few men and then be itself an object of charity. We, therefore, condemn this library move as an insult to him it is said will benefit most, the working man; he does not want charity but justice. 

## Teacher's Guide

Name of Text: Doc 1: Wealth; Doc 2: Trade Unionists Protest the Gift of a "Carnegie Library"

First and Last Names of the Question Composers: Johanna Sergott, Janet Roberts, Elena Kelly, Sue Davis

Standards: Nevada State: H.1.2, .3 H.3.2,

CCSS: RH 1.1, .2, .4, .6, .7, .10 WHST.1,

Text Dependent Questions  In line 6, Carnegie says we must accept and welcome that wealth should be in the "hands of the few." Explain why Carnegie believed that this would be beneficial for the race.	Teacher Notes and Possible Textual Evidence For Student Answers  Line 8/9 - essential for the future progress of the race Line 9 - the talent for organization and management is rare among men  Reasoning: the purpose of the question is to orient students with the main idea of the excerpt.
According to Carnegie, what are the 3 modes for disposing of surplus wealth?	Line 21 – it can be left to families Line 21/22 – bequeathed for public purposes Line 22/23 – administered during their lives by the possessors Reasoning: illuminates Carnegie's claim and counterclaims.
Explain Carnegie's argument for distributing wealth while alive instead of when deceased found throughout the text.	47 - gives dignity to those who make the donations 50 - sets an example of modest, unostentatious living 56 - beneficial results for the community 59/61 - doing for them (the community) better than they would or could do for themselves 65 - almsgiving harms the race 79 - "the man who dies thus rich dies disgraced"  Reasoning: evidence to support Carnegie's claim.

ext Dependent Questions	Teacher Notes
	and
	Possible Textual Evidence
	For
	Student Answers

### Document 2 Questions / Discussion

Who were the authors of this resolution discussed in the <i>New York World</i> , and what was the purpose of issuing it?	84 - Trade Unionists 90 - City Trades Assembly, Division 89 of the Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees 93 - to protest the gift of the library 91 - to pass a resolution protesting the gift
	Reasoning: introduces opposing perspective
From lines 93-99, what can you infer about the Homestead tragedy?	95 - murder 96 - toil represented in every dollar of the money thus tendered 98 - sweat and blood of thousands of workers 99 - tragedy
	Reasoning: students are analyzing meaning by examining the structure of the writing and this section provides further support of the opposing claim.
Why does the union feel that this library is charity? What terms does the union use to convey that the library is charity?	101 – gifts 102 – monuments to the memory of the donor 110/111 – supplicants, mercy 112, 115, 120, 122 – charity 117 – donations
	Reasoning: evidence to support opposing viewpoint's claim
How does the union's opinion on the library conflict with Carnegie's gospel of wealth?	101 – hero worship versus Carnegie's betterment of society 109/110 – tends to destroy in the minds any idea of national justice or human rights and makes of them willing supplicants 111 – system of corporate greed which deals out a part of the sum in charity it originally appropriated from the producer to whom it alone rightfully belongs 119/120 – A city will enrich enormously a few men and then be itself an object of charity 121 – an insult to him it is said will benefit most

#### Writing Prompt:

Defend either Carnegie's gospel of wealth OR the unionist's protest of Carnegie's gift in a letter to the editor of the New York World. State a claim. Use three pieces of textual evidence to support your claim. Use reasoning to explain how each piece of evidence fits with your claim. Then, acknowledge the counterclaim with one piece of evidence and refute this counterclaim.

Checklist identifying key points that will assist in measuriong student success and/or difficulty with the close reading and/or writing prompt

#### Claim 1 - gospel of wealth

#### Possible Evidence:

- 1) republican philosophy (line 30/31)
- 2) beneficial for race (8-9)
- 3) to serve the community (56)
- 4) help those who help themselves (61-62)
- 5) reform society (68)

Claim 2 – unionists protest against charity

#### Possible Evidence:

- 1) blood money (98, 105)
- 2) placate the masses with charity
- 3) creates hero worship (101, 102)
- 4) unjust (110)
- 5) violates human rights (110)