

The united states vs sioux nations of indians

Law



United States vs Sioux Nations of Indians

United States under the Treaty of Fort Laramie of 1868 claims that the Sioux Reservation together Black Hills was to be left out for Sioux Nation. Sioux also was allowed to hunt certain territories in exchange for subsistence rations. After submission of the claim, Sioux had to be compensated at least 17.5 million dollars as damages under the Indian Commission Act. These compensations were as a result of the surrendered land and the gold taken because of the trespass. The court still noted that if the acquisition of Black Hills was unconstitutional then Sioux would be granted the unpaid interest (Seelye, # 15).

The 1877 Act exercised the congress' power over Indian poverty and protected the tribal property which had been set aside by the Fort Laramie Treaty for Sioux. The treaty was concluded after the Powder River war of 1866 to 1867.

The decisions undertaken in this case include the following. The government promised to provide the Sioux with the necessary services and materials and subsistence rations for four years in order for them to become civilized farmers. United States also permitted this tribe to choose for themselves lands within the reservations for them to cultivate.

The government through the executive branch decided to do away with the Nation's treaty obligation of keeping safe the territory for Sioux. Besides, the court dismissed the earlier 448 U. S. 371 for lack of jurisdiction and without determining the merits of the Black Hills claim.

In reference to this situation, i would like to describe a related case. I had a friend whose land was unjustly grabbed by a company. The ideal situation was that this particular company had detected some land which was rich in <https://assignbuster.com/the-united-states-vs-sioux-nations-of-indians/>

oil. Following its admiration, the company had decided to negotiate for the same that it would partake the necessary legal procedures. Instead of doing that, the company which was notably found to be corruptive somehow instead paid huge amounts of money to the land authorities in order to gain the consent from both parties (Seelye, # 25).

The government through the lands authority on the contrarily did not protect the land and its owner. Instead it took advantage of the lots of money offered and corruptly gave out a tittle deed to the company. This situation is unfair because it is classified under the crime of land grabbing. To me, both the company and the land authorities are corrupt. They should have protected the property of this citizen and acquire it in a correct way. If i were the in the position of the lands authorities, i would shun from corruption and sue this particular company for its mistake. Besides this, i would ensure that proper land acquisition procedures are followed and protect the citizen from harassment. Strict penalties would be imposed on those who break laws relating to land acquisition and transfer of property. Companies and large organizations on the other hand should not use their resources unjustly because it jeopardizes the rights of the oppressed. This means that the poor cannot obtain justice and therefore transforms a society into a corruption zone.

Work cited

Seelye James. *Voices of the American Indian experience*. 2013. Greenwood. Print.