## **1**

**Interpretation: The affirmative must defend a just government as a general principle, not specify a subset**

**CCC** Capital Community College [a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation], “Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles AG

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

**Standards**

**[1] Precision outweighs - anything outside the res is arbitrary and unpredictable because the topic determines prep, not being bound by it lets them jettison any word.**

**[2] Limits and Ground - decimates clash by exploding limits to infinite governments with infinite possible interps of what constitutes a just one, each with different political climates, economies, and human rights problems which makes contesting the aff with unifying neg ground impossible and means they can always pick the most aff skewed country.**

**[3] TVA – read your aff as an advantage under whole res – we still get your content education and sufficient aff ground by switching up aff advantages, frameworks, implementation, etc. But, 1ar theory checks pics and they incentivize more of them because nothing but cheaty generics link**

## **2**

**Interpretation: The affirmative must specify what constitutes a strike with a delineated text in the 1ac.**

Professor Dr. Bernd **Waas**, *Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany*, September **2012**, “Strike as a Fundamental Right of the Workers and its Risks of Conflicting with other Fundamental Rights of the Citizens” <https://islssl.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Strike-Waas.pdf> //SR

In many other jurisdictions (for instance, Austria, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Spain) the legislator has refrained from providing a definition for the term “strike”. In these countries, the court has to step in and devise a definition. In Israel, the courts developed a relatively broad concept. According to the National Labour Court, a strike is a coordinated oppressive action, taken by a group of employees within the scope of an occupational struggle of employees against an employer, aiming to induce the employer to meet their demands with regard to work conditions or other work-related issues. According to the courts in Finland, the strike must be linked to the employment relationships. In Japan, the term “strike” is generally defined as a complete simultaneous stoppage of work by a group of workers. According to this definition, the underlying purpose of the action plays no role at all. The approach in the Netherlands is specific in that the term “strike” has neither been defined by legislation nor by the courts. Instead, the Dutch Supreme Court refers to the European Social Charter, which, however, does not include a definition of collective action or strikes, either.

**Vote neg for strat skew and clash--they can redshift the goal post to no link strike specific DAs and CPs and make normal means debates late breaking e.g. no violent strikes pic if strikes are only the stoppage of work and nothing more or anti-vax pic if purpose is irrelevant--makes the round irresolvable since the judge can’t know what you’re defending until it’s too late so originally underflowed parts of the debate become a big deal. Ow cuz all arg’s presume we can resolve them. No regress--our interp is grounded in the topic lit and limited words in the res means limited interps**

**Cx doesn’t check - a] prep skew - we were forced to prep a 1NC that hedges around the potential of you not speccing and had to prep multiple case negs b] incentivizes infinite abuse and hope you don’t get called out since its no risk if we ask you and you can strategically not meet then get extra time in cx to prep the shell since we asked c] non verifiable since judges don’t flow it d] no brightline to what constitutes a check**

**Fairness and education are voters - debate is a game that needs rules to evaluate it and teaches portable skills we use lifelong. Drop the debater for deterrence since the whole round was skewed. No rvis - a] illogical---you shouldn’t win for being fair b] baiting—they’ll bait theory and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse and chilling us from checking abuse. Competing interps---a] reasonability’s arbitrary and forces judge intervention b] norm setting---we find the best possible norms c] reasonability collapses---you use offense/defense paradigm to evaluate brightlines.**

# **3**

**BBB passes now but maintaining pc is key**

Garrett **Ross** **and** Eli **Okun**, **11/19**/2021 "POLITICO Playbook PM: House passes BBB. Now comes the hard part.," POLITICO, [https://www.politico.com/newsletters/playbook-pm/2021/11/19/house-passes-bbb-now-comes-the-hard-part-495173//DG](https://www.politico.com/newsletters/playbook-pm/2021/11/19/house-passes-bbb-now-comes-the-hard-part-495173/DG) (edited for readability)

But the journey is just beginning for the BBB, as the bill now ships over to the Senate, where it will be pulled in multiple directions at once, as progressives and moderates continue their tug-of-war over Biden’s signature legislation. — The view from the House: This morning, Pelosi downplayed the potential for changes in the Senate, per @sarahnferris, “saying what's in the bill is 90 percent agreed to with House, Senate and WH. ‘There were some differences at the end, and we’ll deal with that as we go forward.’” — The view from Senate progressives: Sen. BERNIE SANDERS (I-Vt.) said he hopes “to see it strengthened in a number of ways,” per WaPo’s Tony Romm, emphasizing his ambitions to make changes on taxes, drug pricing, climate provisions and expanding Medicare. — The view from Senate moderates: Here’s Sen. KYRSTEN SINEMA (D-Ariz.) speaking to Romm and Seung Min Kim about how she views the House-passed version of BBB: “So, that’s not the agreement the president put out in his framework several weeks ago. While I’m not going to comment on what’s happening in the House at this moment, I can just refer you back to the comments I made when the president put out his framework. … I’m looking forward to working with him to get this done.”

**Plan drastically saps PC from Biden and competes with other legislation**

**Wayne State University, 2-22**-2021, "Detroit News: Marick Masters on PRO Act," Mike Ilitch School of Business, <https://ilitchbusiness.wayne.edu/news/detroit-news-marick-masters-on-pro-act-42130> RCT//SR

President Joe Biden has vowed he will be "the strongest labor president you have ever had.” To fulfill that promise, he's thrown his support behind the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act. The bill cleared the Democratically controlled U.S. House last year but faltered in the Republican-led Senate. Now, Democrats have narrow majorities in both chambers and lawmakers are taking a second crack at passing the PRO Act — and this time, they may have a chance. "It is a very big deal. It's the most significant labor law reform legislative package on the table for decades, and I think the chances of it passing are more favorable than it has been for decades," said Marick Masters, a Wayne State University business professor who studies labor relations. There's been a dramatic decrease in union membership since the 1950s, Masters said, in part due to "defects embedded in the labor law, which is slanted in favor of employers... employers have felt increasingly emboldened over time to use the law to their advantage to make it more difficult to unionize." While Democrats, who are largely in favor of the legislation, control both chambers of Congress and the White House, it will be a challenge to make the bill into law. Proponents of the legislation would need 60 votes in the Senate to stop debate and move to a vote, which would require several Republicans to side with Democrats. They'll also be fighting for airtime amid a proposed COVID-relief package, climate policies and infrastructure priorities that are likely to take precedence. "It has a fighting chance. The odds are probably against it," Masters said. "I think it's going to be very very difficult. A lot depends on how much political capital the Biden administration and the Senate majority have to expend to get this through."

**PC is finite**

**Stanage, 1/24**/2021 (Niall, “The Memo: Biden gambles that he can do it all,” The Hill, https://thehill.com/homenews/the-memo/535502-the-memo-biden-gambles-that-he-can-do-it-all, YY) RCT//SR

President Biden is seeking to push forward on multiple fronts right away, even as he grapples with the coronavirus pandemic. Biden has submitted an immigration reform plan to Congress already, and he aims to advance on other topics from climate change to racial justice. There’s an argument for taking such a multipronged approach. Every president tends to have the greatest leverage at the start of their term, and momentum can be harder to generate as time goes on. But there is also the question of political capital, which tends to be finite. If Biden proves to have less heft than he thinks to pass legislation, he will disappoint key constituencies. “We’re going to need ... to be able to act on multiple fronts,” Brian Deese, director of the National Economic Council, said in the White House briefing room Friday. Deese was making that point in the context of the president’s proposed $1.9 trillion COVID-19 relief package advancing even as the Senate conducts former President Trump’s impeachment trial next month. But the same principle applies to other issues. Some Democrats are optimistic that across-the-board progress is possible. They suggest the pressure is on their Republican counterparts not to appear obstructionist. “If Biden does well, then people will be very upset if it looks like the Republicans are obstructing, particularly on the economy and on health — that will be very bad for them,” said Democratic strategist Tad Devine. “I’m not predicting that we are going to have immigration reform and all this stuff right at once,” Devine added. “But I do believe he has a very strong hand right now. There are a lot of votes out there for what Democrats want.” The issue of political capital and how best to deploy it is always a vexing one for new presidents. Former President Obama stuck to his commitment to enact health care reform even amid an economic catastrophe, persevering past the point when some advisers counseled him to settle for a more modest goal. He signed the Affordable Care Act into law in March 2010, only to see his party suffer crushing losses in the midterm elections later that year. Former President Clinton fared worse. His 1993 effort at health care reform ran aground, and other controversies also slowed his progress. Clinton early on sought to end the ban on LGBT people serving in the military and then backed off to the “Don’t Ask Don’t Tell” compromise policy that didn’t really satisfy anyone. Republicans suggest Biden could be vulnerable to comparable missteps. “He has got a very slim majority in the House and no real majority in the Senate,” said John Feehery, a Republican strategist and former GOP leadership aide who is also a columnist for The Hill. “I think the problem is when you throw a punch of spaghetti up on the wall and hope something sticks. You really want to be more targeted. Biden is going to be disappointing a lot of people if he is making promises he can’t keep.”

**BBB solves warming**

Li **Cohen**, **11-10**-2021, "Climate experts and activists applaud Biden's Build Back Better climate agenda: "This is a game changer"," No Publication,<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/climate-change-biden-build-back-better-agenda/> (Cohen is a journalist and social media producer for CBS)

The White House's revamped Build Back Better framework contains $555 billion to combat climate change — an amount President Biden has called the "most significant investment to deal with the climate crisis ever." But would the framework's impact be as significant as its size? Congress passed the first part of Mr. Biden's domestic agenda, the bipartisan $1.2 trillion infrastructure bill, late Friday night. And while that bill does set the stage for actions that could help curb climate change, including putting billions toward electric vehicles, the majority of the climate action on the table lies within Mr. Biden's $1.75 trillion Build Back Better agenda, which is still being negotiated. Climate experts and activists have expressed excitement for the framework and say that while not perfect, it can substantially help the U.S. tackle the climate crisis. "It makes dramatic new investments in fighting climate change," said Elizabeth Gore, senior vice president of political affairs for the Environmental Defense Fund, a non-profit group. "And these are transformational changes that would really, dramatically reduce emissions and really move us in the direction of the change that we need to reach the clean energy economy that we need." Gore said the thoroughness of the framework has garnered a lot of support from the environmental community, and that she and many of her colleagues are excited to see what it could mean for the coming decades. "I'm very optimistic," she said. "The environmental community, it doesn't always agree on everything, but this has unified our community in a way that we haven't seen in a long time." Environmental scientist Deborah Brosnan called it "a huge win for America." "This is a game changer, and it's almost like it takes us from the 20th century into the 21st century, heading for the 22nd century," she said. Here is some of what the framework promises to do, and what experts have to say about it. Cutting greenhouse gas emissions As it stands, the Build Back Better framework would cut more than a gigaton of greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, an amount that is between 50 and 52% lower than 2005 levels, according to the White House. Cutting these emissions, as repeatedly stated by the United Nations, is essential in limiting the amount the planet warms, as greenhouse gases trap heat in the atmosphere. The framework includes a waste emissions charge that would fine oil and gas producers that exceed an "applicable waste emissions threshold." But what really stuck out to Gore and others are the clean energy tax provisions included in the framework. The tax credits, amounting to roughly $320 billion, are outlined as lasting for 10 years and would help both people and companies invest in and transition to clean energy solutions, including purchasing electric cars, installing solar panels, and manufacturing wind turbines. Gore specifically referenced the electric vehicle provisions, as the framework includes whole-picture incentives related to the manufacturing and purchase of electric vehicles, as well as of charging stations. "It's trying to capture that whole sort of waterfront of issues that all contribute towards moving us towards electric vehicles," she said. "... And those pieces reinforce each other in a way that make them impactful." Models created by the Clean Air Task Force predict that under the Build Back Better framework, U.S. electricity sector carbon emissions will decrease nearly 30% more than they would without the proposed actions. Lindsey Griffith, federal policy director for the Clean Air Task Force, an environmental organization, told CBS News that the clean energy tax credits will get the to U.S. reduce emissions by nearly 70% in the energy sector, which is the nation's second-largest emitting sector. "What we see in our modeling is that that will lead to a massive deployment of renewables in this decade," Griffith told CBS News, "and also to start to incentivize some of those firm zero-carbon technologies that we're going to need to complement their deployment." Those provisions, Gore said, are things that would have a "pretty immediate impact." "Those are policies that can put market signals out that can drive change in the short term," she said, noting that the framework will also ensure that many of the policies, including the tax provisions, are in place for a decade. "That means that people who finance projects have some certainty," she said. "It's not the short-term, sort of herky jerky approach that we've seen to these tax provisions in the past, but really provides that long-range thinking so that you can start to make those investments and transform the economy." A push for environmental justice Perhaps one of the most notable aspects of the framework is an investment in communities that have had to bear the brunt of climate-related issues. As part of President Biden's Justice40 initiative, the framework outlines a new Clean Energy and Sustainability Accelerator that will invest in environmental justice projects. Forty percent of the benefits of the investments will go to disadvantaged communities, according to a White House fact sheet. Such programs include flood mitigation assistance for areas and tribes that repeatedly get flooded, a drinking water revolving fund to improve drinking water quality, and guaranteed loan financing and grants for agricultural producers and rural small businesses that move to renewable energy systems or make energy-efficient improvements. The numerous credit provisions in the bill also include rebate proposals to better assist homeowners in lower-income communities make changes that weatherize their homes and make them more energy-efficient. The framework also provides grants to entities that develop programs to help low-income communities, or those that are experiencing or at-risk of experiencing "adverse health and environmental conditions." Native and Indigenous groups would be able to receive millions in aid and grants to help tribes develop climate resilience plans and recover from extreme weather events. Gore said the environmental justice elements in the package are "strong" and make Build Back Better a "better package overall." "There has been a really fundamental shift within the environmental community, within policymakers, that we need to have environmental justice be foundational and not something that gets tacked on at the end," she said. Other aspects of the Build Back Better plan tackle poverty, health care inequities, affordable housing, education and child care. "This package includes a lot of provisions that put environmental justice front and center. ... This is an area that has been too long ignored or underrepresented in the debate of environmental policy, and this administration and I think a lot of other stakeholders have elevated it." Investing in land and its caretakers The framework includes $105 billion of resilience investments that focus on addressing and preparing for extreme weather events, including wildfires, droughts and hurricanes. The impact of such events on communities, as well as on forestry, wetlands and agriculture, is accounted for in the framework. The framework also dedicates money for farmers and ranchers, allocating billions in appropriations for farm loan borrowers and for farmers and ranchers who take part in agricultural conservation practices or enhancements. Climate change research is also getting a boost under the bill, with the Environmental Protection Agency set to receive $100 million until September 30, 2026 for research related to climate change mitigation, adaptation and resilience. For environmental scientist Deborah Brosnan, who primarily works in environmental risk reduction, what really stands out is the emphasis on resilience and helping agricultural workers. "A lot of farmers are finding that the crops they used to grow, they can't grow anymore, because of climate change," she said, adding that even the food supply chain has changed over the past few years as climate change accelerates. "Crops are changing, we're going to get used to a whole new order of things. ... We're going to see this whole new world." And, she said, the resilience aspects of the framework are a vital component to an ever-warming planet, as they "will avert a lot of human suffering and distress." "I think that sends a very positive message on climate, to include resilience and to help communities that are dependent on ecosystems and landscapes that are changing," she said, particularly because she does not believe the world will be able to stay under the 1.5 degree Celsius threshold of warming, based on what she saw at the COP26 summit. "I think countries are trying to do the best they can, given the political systems that they're working under," she said. "... I think we're likely to blow beyond 1.5, to be honest, but as we get closer and closer, I think the urgency is going to get greater and the countries and businesses will start to respond stronger." The fate of the bill remains to be seen. If it passes, the experts CBS News spoke with said it will be crucial to ensure that all of the plans outlined in the framework are effectively implemented, and soon. And whether it passes or not, they said, there is still more work to do in tackling the crisis. "We're still going to have a lot more to do, this year, next year. Hopefully every year we'll get another chance to do more in the climate policy space," Griffith said. "But we can't wait."

**Extinction**

**Schultz 16** (Robert Schultz [Retired Professor and Chair of Computer Information Systems at Woodbury University] “Modern Technology and Human Extinction,” <http://proceedings.informingscience.org/InSITE2016/InSITE16p131-145Schultz2307.pdf>) RW

There is consensus that there is a relatively short window to reduce carbon emissions before drastic effects occur. Recent credible projections of the result of lack of rapid drastic action is an average temperature increase of about 10o F by 2050. This change alone will be incredibly disruptive to all life, but will also cause great weather and climate change. For comparison purposes, a 10 degree (Fahrenheit) decrease was enough to cause an ice layer 4000 feet thick over Wisconsin (Co2gether, 2012). Recently relevant information has surfaced about a massive previous extinction. This is the Permian extinction, which happened 252 million years ago, during which 95% of all species on earth, both terrestrial and aquatic, vanished. The ocean temperature after almost all life had disappeared was 15 degrees (Fahrenheit) above current ocean temperatures. Recent information about the Permian extinction indicates it was caused by a rapid increase in land and ocean temperatures, caused by the sudden appearance of stupendous amounts of carbon in the form of greenhouse gases (Kolbert, 2014, pp. 102-144). The origin of the carbon in these enormous quantities is not yet known, but one possibility is the sudden release of methane gases stored in permafrost. This is also a possibility in our current situation. If so, extinction would be a natural side effect of human processes. There is also a real but smaller possibility of what is called “runaway greenhouse,” in which the earth’s temperature becomes like Venus’ surface temperature of 800o The threat of extinction here is not entirely sudden. The threat is, if anything, worse. Changes in the atmosphere--mainly increases in the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere-- can start processes that can’t be reversed but which take long periods of time to manifest. “Runaway greenhouse” may be the worst. Once again, suggestions of technological solutions to this situation should be treated with some skepticism. These proposals are often made by technophiles ignoring all the evidence that technology is very much subject to unanticipated side effects and unanticipated failures. What has happened concerning the depletion of the ozone layer should be a clear warning against the facile uses of technology through geoengineering to alter the makeup of the entire planet and its atmosphere. The complicating factor in assessing extinction likelihood from climate change is corporations, especially American fossil fuel corporations such as Exxon-Mobil and Shell. Through their contributions, they have been able to delay legislation ameliorating global warming and climate change. As mentioned before, recently released papers from Exxon-Mobil show that the corporation did accept the scientific findings about global warming and climate change. But they concluded that maintaining their profits was more important than acting to ameliorate climate change. Since it is not a matter of getting corporations to appreciate scientific facts, the chances of extinction from climate change are good. To ameliorate climate change, it is important to leave a high percentage of fossil fuel reserves in the ground. But this is exactly what a profit-seeking fossil fuel corporation cannot do. One can still hope that because fossil fuel corporations are made up of individuals, increasingly bad consequences of global warming and climate change will change their minds about profits. But because of the lag in effects, this mind change will probably be too late. So I conclude we will probably see something like the effects of the Permian extinction perhaps some time around 2050. (The Permian extinction was 95% extinction of all species.) This assumes the release of methane from the arctic will take place around then.

# **3**

**Counterplan: The United States ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike for prisoners except in the instance that prisoner strikes directly demand discrimination towards certain groups of individuals**

**BPSC** [Unfair Labor Practices by Union, http://bpscllc.com/unfair-labor-practices-by-unions.html, N.D., Business & People Strategy Consulting Group, California's trusted source for workplace human resources and employment law] [SS]

Causing or Attempting to Cause Discrimination: Section 8(b)(2) makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of Section 8(a)(3). The section is violated by agreements or arrangements with employers, other than lawful union-security agreements, that condition employment or job benefits on union membership, on the performance of union membership obligations or on arbitrary grounds. But union action that causes detriment to an individual employee does not violate Section 8(b)(2) if it is consistent with nondiscriminatory provisions of a bargaining contract negotiated for the benefit of the total bargaining unit, or if the action is based on some other legitimate purpose. A union’s conduct, accompanied by statements advising or suggesting that action is expected of an employer, may be enough to find a violation of this section if the union’s action can be shown to be a causal factor in the employer’s discrimination. Contracts or informal arrangements with a union under which an employer gives preferential treatment to union members also violate Section 8(b)(2). However, an employer and a union may agree that the employer will hire new employees exclusively through the union hiring hall if there is no discrimination against nonunion members on the basis of union membership obligations. In setting referral standards, a union may consider legitimate aims such as sharing available work and easing the impact of local unemployment. The union may also charge referral fees if the amount of the fee is reasonably related to the cost of operating the referral service. A union that attempts to force an employer to enter into an illegal union-security agreement, or that enters into and keeps in effect such an agreement, also violates Section 8(b)(2), as does a union that attempts to enforce such an illegal agreement by bringing about an employee’s discharge. Even when a union-security provision of a bargaining contract meets all statutory requirements, a union may not lawfully require the discharge of employees under the provision unless they were informed of the union-security agreement and their specific obligation under it. A union violates Section 8(b)(2) if it tries to use the union-security provisions of a contract to collect payments other than those lawfully required, such as assessments, fines and penalties. Other examples of Section 8(b)(2) violations include: Causing an employer to discharge employees because they circulated a petition urging a change in the union’s method of selecting shop stewards Causing an employer to discharge employees because they made speeches against a contract proposed by the union Making a contract that requires an employer to hire only members of the union or employees “satisfactory” to the union Causing an employer to reduce employees’ seniority because they engaged in anti-union acts Refusing referral or giving preference on the basis of race or union activities when making job referrals to units represented by the union Seeking the discharge of an employee under a union-security agreement for failure to pay a fine levied by the union

**Racist union strikes have happened before--flips their equality offense**

Allison **Keyes**, JUNE 30, **2017**, "The East St. Louis Race Riot Left Dozens Dead, Devastating a Community on the Rise," Smithsonian Magazine, https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/east-st-louis-race-riot-left-dozens-dead-devastating-community-on-the-rise-180963885/ //SR

Racial tensions began simmering in East St. Louis—a city where thousands of blacks had moved from the South to work in war factories—as early as February 1917. The African-American population was 6,000 in 1910 and nearly double that by 1917. In the spring, the largely white workforce at the Aluminum Ore Company went on strike. Hundreds of blacks were hired. After a City Council meeting on May 28, angry white workers lodged formal complaints against black migrants. When word of an attempted robbery of a white man by an armed black man spread through the city, mobs started beating any African-Americans they found, even pulling individuals off of streetcars and trolleys. The National Guard was called in but dispersed in June.