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# AT: Bison CP

**Their solvency advocate concludes the counterplan is already being done and the aff is still key**

**CBC News 10**Bison population needs land to grow: studyLast Updated: Tuesday, March 2, 2010 | 7:34 PM ET CBC News http://www.cbc.ca/news/technology/story/2010/03/02/alberta-bison-study-calgary-plains.html

Restoring the wild bison population in North America depends on the land made available for roaming and a change in public attitude towards the animal, says a new study co-edited by a Calgary researcher. "We're on the brink of making some major breakthroughs in terms of re-establishing significant populations of bison, restoring them ecologically on the continent," said Cormack Gates, a co-editor of a report released Tuesday called American Bison: Status survey and conservation guidelines 2010. Finding proper land for bison to breed and roam freely is the biggest challenge, said Gates, a professor of environmental design at the University of Calgary. "The message to the government is to look at the bison as legitimate wildlife and find places within their jurisdictions where this is possible to restore them as such to the landscape," Gates told CBC News. The report notes some ideal areas for the massive mammals, including five watersheds within Banff and Jasper national parks. Bison populations can be threatened by limited habitat and severe winters. But a public perception that bison only ran wild in the past, or that they're only good for burgers today, needs to change, Gates said. Experts from around the world have been trying to figure out how to bolster the bison population since war and hunting nearly wiped out all bison species in North America during the late 1800s. The American bison, which includes plains and wood bison, is considered near-threatened by the International Union for Conservation of Nature. As of 2008, there were about 400,000 bison in commercial herds in North America, but there has been little effort to increase those numbers, said the group.

**CP doesn’t solve – the type of bison that are conserved are genetically different – can’t solve the bio-D internal**

**Freese et al. 07** (Curtis H. Freese, Northern Great Plains Program, World Wildlife Fund; Keith E. Aune, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks;Delaney P. Boyd; James N. Derr, Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, Texas A&M University; Steve C. Forrest; C. Cormack Gates, Faculty of Environmental Design, University of Calgary; Peter J.P. Gogan, USGS Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center;Shaun M. Grassel, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Department of Wildlife, Fish and Recreation; Natalie D. Halbert, Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, Texas A&M University; Kyran Kunkel, Northern Great Plains Program, World Wildlife Fund; Kent H. Redford, WCS Institute, Wildlife Conservation Society] Second chance for the plains bison <http://www.americanbisonsocietyonline.org/Portals/7/Freese%20et%20al%202007%20-%20Second%20chance%20for%20the%20plains%20bison.pdf>, ken)

Species extinctions occur in two basic ways: (1) the last individuals of a species die, bringing the genetic lineage of that species to an end; (2) the genetic makeup of a species changes substantially over time, whether through natural evolutionary processes, anthropogenic selection, or hybridization, resulting in genomic extinction (Rhymer and Simberloff, 1996; Allendorf et al., 2001). A new species need not emerge before we can label this genetic transformation an ‘‘extinction.’’ For example, though domestic cattle (Bos primigenius taurus) belong to the same species as their extinct wild ancestor, the aurochs, it is not justiﬁable to claim that the Heck breed of cattle, the attempted re-creation of the aurochs, is a suitable substitute for aurochs conservation, despite having distinctly aurochs-like characteristics. Bison barely escaped the ﬁrst type of extinction in the late 1800s. Now, more than a century later, the plains bison is confronting the second form of extinction due to two major problems: (1) domestication and anthropogenic selection and (2) cattle gene introgression. In addition, we can now add ecological extinction to our concerns, a concept not generally considered by conservationists a century ago. 2.1. Anthropogenic selection and small herd size There is a disconnect, if not antagonism, between bison conservation and intensive anthropogenic selection for domestication of bison. Domestication may not only be irreversibly altering the bison gene pool and its morphology, physiology and behavior (Price, 1999; O’Regan et al., 2005), but the large and growing number of commercial bison herds one sees while traveling around the continent may create complacency and weak support among the public for bison conservation. A continent-wide survey in 2002 by Boyd (2003), conducted on behalf of the World Conservation Union’s North American Bison Specialist Group (IUCN Bison Specialist Group), found that of the roughly 500,000 plains bison in North America fewer than 20,000 are in herds managed principally for conservation purposes. The rest (96%) are being bred for commodity-production purposes such as ease of handling and meat production. In fact, the number of bison in conservation herds has stayed relatively constant since it peaked in the 1930s, while the number of bison in private, commercial herds has exploded since around 1970, when the number of bison in commercial herds surpassed those in conservation herds for the ﬁrst time (Fig. 1) (McHugh, 1972). Apart from the potential problems posed by domestication of such a large portion of the bison population of North America, conservation of the wild bison genome is further compromised by problems confronting conservation herds, such as small herd size, conﬁnement to fenced areas, introgression of cattle genes, intensive management and culling practices, absence of major predators, and non-native diseases.

**The CP can’t solve for Bison behavioral patterns which is key**

**Freese et al. 07** (Curtis H. Freese, Northern Great Plains Program, World Wildlife Fund; Keith E. Aune, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks;Delaney P. Boyd; James N. Derr, Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, Texas A&M University; Steve C. Forrest; C. Cormack Gates, Faculty of Environmental Design, University of Calgary; Peter J.P. Gogan, USGS Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center;Shaun M. Grassel, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Department of Wildlife, Fish and Recreation; Natalie D. Halbert, Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, Texas A&M University; Kyran Kunkel, Northern Great Plains Program, World Wildlife Fund; Kent H. Redford, WCS Institute, Wildlife Conservation Society] Second chance for the plains bison <http://www.americanbisonsocietyonline.org/Portals/7/Freese%20et%20al%202007%20-%20Second%20chance%20for%20the%20plains%20bison.pdf>, ken)

Large-scale biodiversity restoration always involves various layers of social complexity. Clewell and Aronson (2006) discuss the ﬁve major motivations or rationales for the restoration of ecosystems (and their associated species). These include technocratic, biotic, heuristic, idealistic, and pragmatic rationales and often result in apparent social conﬂicts. Restoration of bison and their native ecosystems is no exception, as a diversity of socioeconomic factors, from local to regional to international scales, are involved. Some of these factors are largely unique to bison conservation because bison occupy a rather distinct spiritual, iconic, and legal status among wildlife of the Great Plains, if not more broadly across much of North America, and because they are particularly important culturally and economically for many Great Plains Indians (Wyckoff and Dalquest, 1997). The cattle ranching culture and economy, occupying more than 95% of the Great Plains grasslands, is the successor to the bison economy of Native Americans that previously dominated the region. The potential for restoring bison at a meaningful ecological scale is therefore inextricably linked to the existing cattle industry. The Buffalo Commons concept for ‘re-bisoning’ the Great Plains proposed by geographers Frank and Deborah Popper in the 1980s (Popper and Popper, 1987) created a ﬁrestorm of protest among communities of the region that continues to taint discussions about present-day bison conservation. Nevertheless, the Popper’s predictions have withstood the test of time as the economic tailspin and human population decline, with the exception of the Native American population, continues unabated in the Great Plains (Forrest et al., 2004). These conditions create both a socioeconomic need and an opportunity for large-scale conservation of bison and native grasslands. The economic revitalization of many rural communities may be possible through the development of a natural-amenity economy based on grassland reserves and abundant wildlife, whether done through privately or publicly funded initiatives. Abundant wildlife and wildlands brought the wealthy from the east coast and Europe on safari to the Great Plains in the 1800s, and the Rocky Mountain West provides many examples of the positive effect today that wildlife and wildlands have on the economic vitality of local communities (Rudzitis and Johansen, 1991; Rudzitis, 1999; Rasker and Hansen, 2000). The depopulation of rural areas, an ageing population of current ranch owners, and relatively low land prices in much of the Great Plains provide the conditions for large-scale changes in land ownership, in the subsequent management of those lands, and in the rural economy over the next decade. How these changes will unfold remains to be seen, but conservationists, Native American tribes, and ranching communities have perhaps an unparalleled opportunity over the next few years to restore ecological relationships, structure, and function at a regional scale in a manner that is sensitive to cultural history and heritage while providing economic opportunities.

**The counterplan establishes roaming land for “wild bison” – but US law classifies them as “livestock” which means they wouldn’t have access to the roaming land.**

**Freese et al. 07** (Curtis H. Freese, Northern Great Plains Program, World Wildlife Fund; Keith E. Aune, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks;Delaney P. Boyd; James N. Derr, Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, Texas A&M University; Steve C. Forrest; C. Cormack Gates, Faculty of Environmental Design, University of Calgary; Peter J.P. Gogan, USGS Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center;Shaun M. Grassel, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Department of Wildlife, Fish and Recreation; Natalie D. Halbert, Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, Texas A&M University; Kyran Kunkel, Northern Great Plains Program, World Wildlife Fund; Kent H. Redford, WCS Institute, Wildlife Conservation Society] Second chance for the plains bison <http://www.americanbisonsocietyonline.org/Portals/7/Freese%20et%20al%202007%20-%20Second%20chance%20for%20the%20plains%20bison.pdf>, ken)

Bison also fall into an unusual legal framework that greatly complicates conservation efforts. Unlike any other native animal species in North America, bison are commonly not classiﬁed or managed as ‘‘wildlife,’’ but rather, with some exceptions, as ‘‘livestock’’ by state and provincial agencies, although they are considered wildlife in federal refuges and parks (Forrest et al., 2004) and on some state and provincial lands (Gates et al., 2001; Boyd, 2003). This leaves one of North America’s most majestic and adaptable native grassland species, legally and in the public’s mind, straddling the fence between being wild and domestic (Cahalane, 1944).

**Indians are already doing the counterplan – risk that they solve better means vote aff**

**Freese et al. 07** (Curtis H. Freese, Northern Great Plains Program, World Wildlife Fund; Keith E. Aune, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks;Delaney P. Boyd; James N. Derr, Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, Texas A&M University; Steve C. Forrest; C. Cormack Gates, Faculty of Environmental Design, University of Calgary; Peter J.P. Gogan, USGS Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center;Shaun M. Grassel, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Department of Wildlife, Fish and Recreation; Natalie D. Halbert, Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, Texas A&M University; Kyran Kunkel, Northern Great Plains Program, World Wildlife Fund; Kent H. Redford, WCS Institute, Wildlife Conservation Society] Second chance for the plains bison <http://www.americanbisonsocietyonline.org/Portals/7/Freese%20et%20al%202007%20-%20Second%20chance%20for%20the%20plains%20bison.pdf>, ken)

Native American Tribes have made available thousands of acres of land for bison restoration and thus there is considerable potential for tribes to play an important role in the ecological recovery of bison. Tribes often take a ‘‘hands-off’’ approach to bison management and allow, to the extent possible, natural processes to unfold. Because many of the tribal bison herds were started or reinforced with surplus bison from national parks and refuges, some herds may be free of domestic cattle introgression and most, if not all, are brucellosis-free.

# AT: Self Determination DA

**Non unique – 41 extensions of Indian Self determination in the past 40 years**

**Cornell and Kalt 10** (Stephen and Joseph P., The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development “American Indian Self-Determination: The Political Economy of a Successful Policy” November, [http://nni.arizona.edu/pubs/jopna-wp1\_cornell&kalt.pdf](http://nni.arizona.edu/pubs/jopna-wp1_cornell%26kalt.pdf), ken)

We can investigate the nature and relative strength of bi-partisan support for tribal self-determination policies by examining patterns of such support in the U.S. Congress. Very few legislative measures on Indian affairs have gone to roll call votes in the U.S. House or Senate over the last several decades. Public Law 95-638, itself, was approved by voice vote. We can capture support for relevant legislation, however, in the records of legislative sponsorship. Over 1973-2010, there have been 151 sponsors of **41** combined House and Senate legislative **proposals supporting or expanding tribal self-determination**. Over the same period, there have been 2,405 sponsors of 305 legislative measures aimed at improving conditions for American Indians, typically through increased spending on health, education, housing, and the like.

**Recent Court ruling expands Indian self determination**

**Indian Country Today Media Network 6/27/12** (“High Court: Feds to Contract with Tribe” <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2012/06/27/high-court-feds-to-contract-with-tribe-120389>, ken)

In another **win for tribal self-determination**, the U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear a government appeal concerning the Southern Ute Indian Tribe’s operation of a health clinic formerly run by the Indian Health Service and the subject of years of litigation. The Supreme Court’s refusal to consider the appeal followed a Native rights-friendly decision by the high court **last week** in Salazar v. Ramah Navajo Chapter, which requires the government to pay the contract support costs (CSC) of tribes that administer programs that had been operated by the federal government. The Supreme Court let stand a ruling of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in 2011 that the Department of Health and Human Services and IHS must contract with the Southern Ute Indian Tribe to **operate its own clinic**. The issue of tribal control over the clinic had been in litigation both before and after the tribe assumed management of the Southern Ute Health Center in Ignacio, Colorado October 1, 2009, when the tribe and IHS agreed the tribe would begin management of the Health Center while issues were resolved that led to the court dispute.

**The internal link is empirically denied – international norms have adopted rights to indigenous self-determination**

**Curley and Ortiz** **12** (Andrew is Diné and a Ph.D. candidate within the Department of Development Sociology at Cornell University and Roxanne Dunbar is a long-time writer, activist, and scholar. “The International Indigenous Movement for Self-Determination (Part I)”, March, <http://www.newsocialist.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=595>, ken)

In North America, gaining Indigenous autonomy from the colonial powers of the United States (US) and Canada has involved efforts at state-formation, that is, tribal governance. For decades, Indigenous activists and organizers in North America have worked tirelessly to assert the validity of treaties and establish the sovereignty of tribal nations. These nations seek to gain control over their social and political institutions without compromising what they consider unique and essential cultural markers. In Latin America, Indigenous efforts to combat colonialism have taken a different strategy. These peoples have organized into movements against racialized social hierarchies, and have agitated for increased rights. They have overtly challenged the state and contemporary capitalism, drawing upon an ethical reading of Marxism that calls for improved social rights and economic justice. Within international discourse, new Indigenous alliances have found resonance in Indigenous claims against the states that act as their colonizers. In response to Indigenous movements around the world, even the United Nations (UN) has been compelled to formally recognize Indigenous rights. The UN Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) has provided Indigenous peoples with legal grounds from which to argue for increased autonomy and recognition of their social, cultural, and political practices in places where they have been historically exploited and marginalized.

**No Impact**

**Curley and Ortiz 12** (Andrew is Diné and a Ph.D. candidate within the Department of Development Sociology at Cornell University and Roxanne Dunbar is a long-time writer, activist, and scholar. “The International Indigenous Movement for Self-Determination” June, <http://www.internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article2671>, ken)

Anthropologist Anna Tsing writes about the interactions between indigenous peoples and processes of global capitalism as a form of “friction,” producing movement, action, and effect. In the case of the Navajo Nation, the friction between the coal industry and environmental organizations exposes the contradictions of both within the space of global capitalism during this era of neoliberalism. Today we have to understand how neoliberalism affects tribal communities, but also understand there is opportunity in it for articulating a socialist alternative. In a statement we circulated among Indigenous activists in the United States, arguing for a perspective and strategy of Indigenous socialism, we stated: Indigenous peoples have well developed alternative ideas of social orders that can be incorporated into modern governments. Our historic forms of governance were tied to spiritual traditions and simpler subsistence practices but have broader applicability. To be responsive to the larger scale of political and economic activities, we take from western theoretical frameworks and models what we might find appropriate and applicable to our specific contexts and the cultural values Indigenous peoples hold. Given what we know of historic Indigenous social and political structures, we can preliminarily suggest that socialism is a better cultural fit for modern Indigenous political institutions. What is more, the premises on which Marxism are built are consistent with Indigenous peoples’ historic experiences. Therefore, because we accept that we must adopt political and economic theories of governance from the west alongside our own, historic traditions; and because we realize on preliminary analysis that socialism is more consistent with our values and past practices, we can conclude that we should develop texts and theories of governance and economic development that bridge Indigenous perspectives with ideological foundations of Marxism and socialism, or what some today are calling communism. Although there is a lot of “friction” or contradiction between, the different economic orientations and scales of development of many tribal communities organized into governments, the seeds for a loose form of socialism are actually contained within the neoliberal alternatives described above. By “loose,” we mean flexible, contingent, adjusted to circumstance, and non-dogmatic. Although there is an immediate contradiction in the existing approach of environmental justice organizations, these things could end up much differently than they began. With a little critique, prodding, and self-awareness, indigenous programs crafted in the spirit of sustainability, but harnessing the productive systems that have been forged in the history of capitalist development, can also be shaped into a unique form of socialist relations within tribal peoples that prevents the worst impacts of capitalism. We are all well aware that global capitalism has brought us to the brink of planetary disaster, But indigenous forms of resistance provide for us an opportunity to think about new forms of socialism that emphasize existing relationships tribal people have with one another, and have historically had, in their subsistence ways of life. There are more specific ways we can describe the possibilities of socialism on the Navajo Nation. This requires that we think optimistically about the potential role that indigenous peoples can play in envisioning truly sustainable alternatives to capitalism.

# --AT: Kashmir Model

**No Kashmir escalation**

**Modi 5** (S K freelance writer, contributor to Indian newspapers, and published author, 2/18/05, “India and Pakistan: The Unsolvable Conflict,” Global Politician, [**http://www.globalpolitician.com/2348-india**](http://www.globalpolitician.com/2348-india), ken)

That the people of India aren't overly obsessed with the idea of retrieving the Pakistan-controlled part of Kashmir became clear soon after the Kargil war -Atal Behari Vajpayee won the general elections in the later part of 99, in spite of accusations of intelligence failure and having wilted under the US pressure. Nevertheless, this should not be construed to imply that Indians do not care about the Pakistan-controlled part of Kashmir at all. If any government is able to retrieve that land, diplomatically or by force, at some point of time in future, longevity of that government would be assured for at least a decade or may be even more. The reality on the ground is that the problem of Kashmir is basically unsolvable. It simply has to be lived with. Then the question that arises is, if the problem is so unsolvable, why do India and Pakistan keep initiating talks every now and then? Talks help politicians on both the sides, though the reasons are different. Pakistani leaders welcome dialogues because the talks, the negotiations and the summits are seen by the masses as an attempt to gain control over Kashmir. The people of Pakistan are generally secure in their belief that their leaders dare not concede anything concrete to India in any round of talks. Whenever peace efforts are on, the need for stealth declines, providing a much needed breather to the government for paying attention to mundane issues like economic development. For periodic recesses and reliefs, and for the sake of its global image, Pakistan doesn't mind going through mindless mirth. India too has its own reasons for continuing, and even initiating, dialogue every now and then. Perhaps the most important is the minority vote. When Pakistan is not talking, it has to keep the levels of violence in Kashmir at high levels. The option of crushing that violence with physical force is considered undesirable by Indian governments because India has a sizable Muslim population. A no-nonsense approach towards terrorists and militants operating in Kashmir implies some losses of innocent lives also and that means alienating the Indian Muslims. Therefore, most Indian prime ministers consider it expedient to keep some sort of dialogue going. While global image is as important for India as it is for Pakistan, there is an added complication in case of India. Somehow, every Indian prime minister has had the dream of achieving immortality in history by crafting a lasting solution for peace on its northern borders. And the dream has never been limited to solving the problem of (violence in) Kashmir - every single prime minister of India has tried to achieve the status of a global statesman, a phenomenon which can perhaps now be called the Bush Syndrome, though it would be only fair to state that had 9/11 not happened, perhaps President Bush wouldn't have been as concerned about freedom and liberty in every part of the world as he has been. The personal ambitions of Indian prime ministers have, more often than not, blurred the view, resulting in India generally offering and conceding more than what is needed. The process started from the first prime minister Mr Jawaharlal Nehru and has continued uninterrupted since then. What the people of India want is plain and simple peace. They are not bothered about retrieving the Pakistan occupied part of Kashmir, though they surely do not want to lose one square inch of the Indian part of Kashmir. All they want is that there should be no violence in Kashmir and they should be able to travel to the heavenly valley that Kashmir is, for their holidays. Kashmir should earn economic growth through tourism, rather than frequent injections of fiscal help from the central government, a large part of which invariably gets embezzled by the local politicians.