



Indian Affairs - Office of Public Affairs

**Media Contact:** Office of the Secretary

**For Immediate Release:** June 8, 1979

[Print PDF](#)

The Department of the Interior today released the attached letter from Attorney General Griffin B. Bell to Secretary Cecil D. Andrus concerning the legal principles governing the conduct of the Department of Justice in litigation for the purpose of protecting Indian property rights secured by statutes and treaties.

Honorable Cecil D. Andrus

Secretary of Interior

Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

As you know, the Department of Justice has long represented the United States in litigation for the purpose of protecting Indian property rights secured by statutes or treaties. This has been and will continue to be an important function of this Department, and I would like to set forth my understanding of the legal principles governing its conduct.

In fulfillment of the special relationship contemplated in the Constitution between the Federal Government and the Indian tribes, the Congress has enacted numerous laws and the Senate has ratified numerous treaties for the benefit and protection of Indian tribes and individuals, their property and their way of life. Where these measures require implementation by the Executive Branch, the administrative responsibility typically resides with the Secretary of the Interior. 43 U.S.C. § 1457 (10). The Attorney General is in turn responsible for the conduct, on behalf of the United States, of litigation arising under these statutes and treaties. This obligation in Indian cases is but one aspect --albeit an important one -- of the Attorney General's statutory responsibility for the conduct of litigation in which the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party or is interested. 28 U.S.C. §§ 516, 519.

The Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General perform, their duties here, as in all other areas, under the superintendence of the President. We are the President's agents in fulfilling his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. Where a particular statute, treaty, or Executive Order manifests a purpose to benefit all Indians or a tribe or individual Indians or to protect their property, it is the obligation of the responsible Executive Branch officials to give full effect to that purpose. In your role as Secretary of the Interior, you are charged with administering most of the laws and treaties applying to Indians and are often in a policy formulating role with regard thereto. And where litigation is concerned, it is the duty of the Attorney General to ensure that the interest of the United States in accomplishing the congressional or executive purpose is fully presented in court.

The Executive and Judicial Branches have inferred in many laws extending federal protection to Indian property rights the intent that the Executive act as a fiduciary in administering and enforcing these measures. , Where applicable law imposes such standards of care, faithful execution of the law of course requires the Executive to adhere to those standards. Thus, it in no way diminishes the central

importance of our respective functions to acknowledge that they find their source in specific statutes, treaties, and Executive Orders or to recognize that they are to be performed with the same faithfulness to legislative and executive purpose as are the obligations devolving upon this branch of the federal establishment generally.

A significant portion of the litigation with which we are here concerned relates to property rights reserved to a tribe by treaty or in the creation of a reservation or property which Congress has directed be held in trust, managed, or restricted for the benefit of a tribe or individual Indian. When the Attorney General brings an action on behalf of the United States against private individuals or public bodies to protect these rights from encroachment, he vindicates not only the property interests of the tribe or individual Indian, as they may appear under law to the United States, but also the important governmental interest in ensuring that rights guaranteed to Indians under federal laws and treaties are fully effective.

There is no disabling conflict between the performance of these duties and the obligations of the Federal Government to all the people of the Nation. The functional thesis upon which our form of Government is premised --the Separation of Powers --pre-supposes that the people as a whole benefit when the Executive Branch enforces the laws enacted, and protects Indian property rights recognized in treaty commitments ratified, by a coordinate branch. The fact that an identifiable class realizes tangible benefits from litigation brought by the Federal Government does not distinguish Indian cases from many civil rights, labor, and other cases. Just as we go to court to enforce the laws designed to protect minorities from discrimination or disenfranchisement by the majority, we must litigate when necessary to protect rights secured to Indians without reference to whether any present majority of the citizenry would profit from, or otherwise embrace, that action.

It is important to emphasize, however, that the Attorney General is attorney for the United States in these cases, not a particular tribe or individual Indians. Thus, in a case involving property held in trust for a tribe, the Attorney General is attorney for the United States as "trustee," not the "beneficiary." He is not obliged to adopt any position favored by a tribe in a particular case, but must instead make his own independent evaluation of the law and facts in determining whether a proposed claim or defense, or argument in support thereof, is sufficiently meritorious to warrant its presentation. This is the same function the Attorney General performs in all cases involving the United States; it is a function that arises from a duty both to the courts and to all those against whom the Government brings its considerable litigating resources.

The litigating position adopted by the Attorney General on behalf of the United States may affect your administrative and policy-making functions. Accordingly, with respect to all litigation in which the Attorney General represents the United States in protecting Indian property rights secured by statutes or treaties, this Department would expect to receive --and would most carefully consider --the advice of your Department, possessing as it does the primary policy responsibility in Indian matters.

Where there are other statutory obligations imposed on the Executive in a particular case aside from those affecting Indians, faithful execution of the laws require the Attorney General to resolve these competing or overlapping interests to arrive at a single position of the United States. In arriving at a single position, however, we must also take into account the rule of construction now firmly established that Congress' actions toward Indians are to be interpreted in light of the special relationship and special responsibilities of the government toward the Indians.

And, finally, the President's duty faithfully to execute existing law does not preclude him from recommending legislative changes in fulfillment of his constitutional duty to propose to the Congress measures he believes necessary and expedient. These measures may --indeed must --be framed with the interest of the Nation as a whole in mind. In so doing, the President has the constitutional authority to call on either of us for our views on legislation to change existing law notwithstanding the duty to execute that law as it now stands.

I look forward to close cooperation between our two Departments in these matters.

---

<https://www.bia.gov/as-ia/opa/online-press-release/letter-attorney-general-legal-principles-litigation-indian-property>