### 1NC – Spec Sovereignty

#### Interp – The aff must specify the sovereign rights of tribes against the plan in a delineated text in the 1AC. To clarify, you must specify the influence and decision-making powers of tribal authorities over implementation of the plan in tribal lands – they don’t.

#### Ambiguity is a tool for settlers to define the terms of engagement with tribes. The liberal intentions of the 1AC don’t matter—absent defined standards, the policies will reproduce colonial domination.
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A traditional definition of "sovereignty" is: "The supreme, absolute, and uncontrollable power by which any independent state is governed."' 3 Questions regarding the sovereign rights of tribes are often the starting point of any federal Indian law issue. Although the whole of federal Indian law is quite complex,14 the essence of tribal sovereignty is simply the extent to which a tribe can attend to its own affairs and control its own cultural, societal, and economic development free from outside restraints. Under the current legal and political regimes, the extent of tribal control is ambiguous. The Handbook of Federal Indian Law lists three "fundamental principles" that demonstrate the anomalous and restricted nature of tribal sovereignty: (1) Indian tribes possess all the powers of a sovereign state; (2) conquest renders the tribes subject, however, to the legislative authority of the United States and terminates the tribes' external sovereign powers, but does not affect the internal sovereign powers of the tribes; and (3) these powers are subject to qualification by treaties and congressional legislation.' 5 Cohen's three principles demonstrate the dichotomy between internal and external sovereignty16 that pervades the concept of tribal sovereignty. Tribes are supposedly full sovereigns with respect to their own internal affairs and interests. At the same time, however, the United States government has completely extinguished their external sovereign powers.17 This state of affairs might not be problematic if defined standards for maintaining the relationship between the tribal and federal governments existed and the relationship were based upon the consent of the tribes. The history of tribal-federal relations demonstrates, however, that neither standards nor consent exist, and that the relationship is uncertain at best. Tribal-federal relations have periodically oscillated between two diametrically opposed views on the status of Indian Tribes. At one end of the spectrum is the belief that tribes are independent political communities and should control their own development.'8 At the other end lies the belief that the tribal system should be dismantled and individual Indians should be assimilated into the greater American society.19 While these views appear to be in extreme conflict, their implementation produces very similar results. The United States government dominates the tribal-federal relationship, allowing it to manipulate the situation to protect federal interests. The following historical background will demonstrate how the lack of definition and consent in the relationship promotes federal dominance.

#### Vote neg—

#### 1 – Critical Education – The policymaking process is not innocent. Force them to study how their practice of fiat can *itself* reproduce settler colonialism. For tribes, these details are life and death.

#### 2 – Ground – Tribal sovereignty is the first question in any debate about policies that affect natives – avoiding it is unfair, irresponsible, and bad for education.

#### 3 – Presumption – If their framing is right, then the state will always manipulate its policies to screw over tribes – you should presume no sovereignty.

#### 4 – CX doesn’t check: (A) My interp forces them to research these issues before round. (B) I can’t prep a strat against their aff until CX. (C) Footnoting DA—reduces crucial issues of sovereignty to a mere afterthought. (D) Specifying sovereignty should be the default—I shouldn’t have to ask.

#### It’s drop the debater – anything else advantages the aff by letting them shift in the 1AR. No RVIs – (A) They don’t get a cookie for proving they aren’t colonialist. (B) Guts substance—we should debate the aff whenever possible. One shell is fair—they have plenty of time in the 1AR. Competing interps – reasonability leads to a race to the bottom where debaters get away with terrible practices. Any bright line is arbitrary—you can’t be “educational enough.”