July 31, 2018

U. S. Department of State
Office of Information Programs and Services
A/GIS/IPS/RL
SA-2, Suite 8100
Washington, D. C. 20522-0208
Fax: (202) 261-8579

Re: Request Under Freedom of Information Act
(Expedited Processing & Fee Waiver/Limitation Requested)

To Whom It May Concern:

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”)1 submit this Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) request (the “Request”) for records pertaining to the Trump administration’s decision to withdraw from the U.N. Human Rights Council.

I. Background

On June 19th, 2018, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Nikki Haley announced the U.S.’ withdrawal from the U.N. Human Rights Council. Ambassador Haley claimed that the Human Rights Council has become a “protector of human rights abusers and a cesspool of political bias”2, due to the continued membership of nations with very poor human rights records—many of which the United States has strained political relations with (i.e., Venezuela, Iran, Cuba, and China)—as well as ‘Item 7,’ the standing agenda item at Human

1 The American Civil Liberties Union Foundation is a 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(3) organization that provides legal representation free of charge to individuals and organizations in civil rights and civil liberties cases, educates the public about civil rights and civil liberties issues across the country, directly lobbies legislators, and mobilizes the American Civil Liberties Union’s members to lobby their legislators. The American Civil Liberties Union is a separate non-profit, 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(4) membership organization that educates the public about the civil liberties implications of pending and proposed state and federal legislation, provides analysis of pending and proposed legislation, directly lobbies legislators, and mobilizes its members to lobby their legislators.

Rights Council meetings concerning human rights violations in “Palestine and other occupied Arab territories.” The Trump administration’s recent withdrawal from the Human Rights Council raises serious concerns about the United States’ engagement in the international human rights system. The United States is the first nation to voluntarily withdraw from the Human Rights Council and, according to The New York Times, one of only four nations in the world that does not participate in the Human Rights Council proceedings. Congressmen Jim McGovern (D-MA) and Randy Hultgren (R-IL), Co-Chairs of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, both expressed dismay at the United States’ decision, stating “…the United States can best defend universal rights by working to strengthen the Council from within rather than by disengaging.” Ambassador Haley also accused leading human rights groups of failing to support the United States’ attempts to reform the Human Rights Council. Ambassador Haley’s letter to the Human Rights Watch contained allegations that “efforts to block negotiations and thwart reform were a contributing factor in the U.S. decision to withdraw from the Council.”

Two days after the United States withdrew from the Human Rights Council, Ambassador Haley responded to a congressional letter urging the current Administration to address the findings from the UN Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights’ report, released in June 2018, on the United States. The report highlighted the lack of affordable medical and dental care in West Virginia; environmental pollution and extreme poverty related to Puerto Rico’s status as a U.S. territory; inadequate sanitation in the Alabama Black Belt; and the crises of homelessness and pre-trial detention in California. Other issues covered in the report include voter suppression and

---


disenfranchisement, public policies that criminalize the poor, discriminatory drug policies, and the lack of basic social protections for the poorest Americans, including Indigenous Americans living on reservations.\(^8\)

In response to the congressional letter calling for a response to the UN Special Rapporteur’s report and recommendations, Ambassador Haley stated that it is “...patently ridiculous for the United Nations to examine poverty in America.”\(^9\) In addition to her comments, Ambassador Haley published an article in the National Review on July 9, 2018 elaborating on her critique of the UN Special Rapporteur’s report. Ambassador Haley’s article claims that the Special Rapporteur’s investigation of extreme poverty was politically motivated and that the findings misconstrued poverty in the United States.\(^10\) The Administration’s sentiments run contrary to evidence that the United States has the highest rate of income inequality among Western countries, with over 40 million people—including 13 million children—living in poverty.\(^11\)

The United States is a founding member of the United Nations\(^12\) and signatory to several human rights treaties. As such, it is obligated to uphold the U.N. Charter and protect fundamental freedoms and human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This FOIA seeks information surrounding the United States’ decision to withdraw from the Human Rights Council and its implications on cooperation with the Human Rights Council’s appointed independent experts, special procedures, and other related mechanisms or activities associated with the Council.

To provide the American public with information about the Trump administration’s positions concerning the United States’ working relationships with international human rights bodies—information that is crucial to the public given the United States’ historic involvement with and support for international

---


\(^12\) Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice. Aug. 8, 1945.
treaties and organizations—the ACLU seeks such information through this FOIA request.

II. Requested Records

The ACLU seeks the following records created on or between June 6, 2017, to the Present:

(1) Memoranda, procedures, policies, directives, guidance, talking points or guidelines for State Department staff on the United States’ participation in the U.N. Human Rights Council, including records concerning the UN Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights’ report on the United States released on June 1st, 2018; and,

(2) Memoranda, procedures, policies, directives, guidance, or guidelines for State Department staff, including any communication with the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of National Intelligence, or their respective designees, about the federal government’s intent to review, abrogate, or maintain membership in the Human Rights Council, and the implications of such on future cooperation with the Human Rights Council’s appointed independent experts, special procedures, and other related mechanisms or activities associated with the Council.

With respect to the form of production, see 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B), the ACLU requests that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. Alternatively, the ACLU requests that the records be provided electronically in a text-searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best image quality in the agency’s possession, and that the records be provided in separate, Bates-stamped files.

III. Application for Expedited Processing

The ACLU requests expedited processing pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E). There is a “compelling need” for these records, as defined in the statute, because the information requested is “urgently” needed by an organization primarily engaged in disseminating information “to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II).

---

13 See also 22 C.F.R. § 171.11(f); 6 C.F.R. 5.5(e); 28 C.F.R. 16.5(e).
A. The ACLU is an organization primarily engaged in disseminating information in order to inform the public about actual or alleged government activity.

The ACLU is “primarily engaged in disseminating information” within the meaning of the statute. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II). Obtaining information about government activity, analyzing that information, and widely publishing and disseminating that information to the press and public are critical and substantial components of the ACLU’s work and are among its primary activities. See ACLU v. DOJ, 321 F. Supp. 2d 24, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group that “gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn the raw material into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience” to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”).

The ACLU regularly publishes STAND, a print magazine that reports on and analyzes civil liberties-related current events. The magazine is disseminated to over 980,000 people. The ACLU also publishes regular updates and alerts via email to over 3.1 million subscribers (both ACLU members and non-members). These updates are additionally broadcast to over 3.8 million social media followers. The magazine as well as the email and social-media alerts often include descriptions and analysis of information obtained through FOIA requests.

The ACLU also regularly issues press releases to call attention to documents obtained through FOIA requests, as well as other breaking news.

---

14 See also 22 C.F.R. § 171.11(f)(2); 6 C.F.R. 5.5(e)(1)(ii); 28 C.F.R. 16.5(e)(1)(ii).

15 Courts have found that the ACLU as well as other organizations with similar missions that engage in information-dissemination activities similar to the ACLU are “primarily engaged in disseminating information.” See, e.g., Leadership Conference on Civil Rights v. Gonzales, 404 F. Supp. 2d 246, 260 (D.D.C. 2005); ACLU, 321 F. Supp. 2d at 29 n.5; Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. v. DOD, 241 F. Supp. 2d 5, 11 (D.D.C. 2003).

and ACLU attorneys are interviewed frequently for news stories about documents released through ACLU FOIA requests.\(^{17}\)

Similarly, the ACLU publishes reports about government conduct and civil liberties issues based on its analysis of information derived from various sources, including information obtained from the government through FOIA requests. This material is broadly circulated to the public and widely available to everyone for no cost or, sometimes, for a small fee. ACLU national projects regularly publish and disseminate reports that include a description and analysis of government documents obtained through FOIA requests.\(^{18}\) The ACLU also regularly publishes books, “know your rights” materials, fact sheets, and educational brochures and pamphlets designed to educate the public about civil liberties issues and government policies that implicate civil rights and liberties.

The ACLU publishes a widely read blog where original editorial content reporting on and analyzing civil rights and civil liberties news is posted daily. See https://www.aclu.org/blog. The ACLU creates and disseminates original editorial and educational content on civil rights and civil liberties news through multi-media projects, including videos, podcasts, and interactive features. See


The ACLU website includes many features on information obtained through the FOIA.\(^19\) For example, the ACLU’s “Predator Drones FOIA” webpage, https://www.aclu.org/national-security/predator-drones-foia, contains commentary about the ACLU’s FOIA request, press releases, analysis of the FOIA documents, numerous blog posts on the issue, documents related to litigation over the FOIA request, frequently asked questions about targeted killing, and links to the documents themselves. Similarly, the ACLU maintains an online “Torture Database,” a compilation of over 100,000 pages of FOIA documents that allows researchers and the public to conduct sophisticated searches of FOIA documents relating to government policies on rendition, detention, and interrogation.\(^20\)

The ACLU has also published a number of charts and explanatory materials that collect, summarize, and analyze information it has obtained.


through the FOIA. For example, through compilation and analysis of information gathered from various sources—including information obtained from the government through FOIA requests—the ACLU created an original chart that provides the public and news media with a comprehensive summary index of Bush-era Office of Legal Counsel memos relating to interrogation, detention, rendition, and surveillance.\footnote{Index of Bush-Era OLC Memoranda Relating to Interrogation, Detention, Rendition and/or Surveillance, ACLU (Mar. 5, 2009), https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/safefree/olcmemos_2009_0305.pdf.} Similarly, the ACLU produced an analysis of documents released in response to a FOIA request about the TSA’s behavior detection program\footnote{Bad Trip: Debunking the TSA’s ‘Behavior Detection’ Program, ACLU (2017), https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/field_document/dem17-tsa_detection_report-v02.pdf.}; a summary of documents released in response to a FOIA request related to the FISA Amendments Act\footnote{Summary of FISA Amendments Act FOIA Documents Released on November 29, 2010, ACLU, https://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/natsec/faafoia20101129/20101129Summary.pdf.}; a chart of original statistics about the Defense Department’s use of National Security Letters based on its own analysis of records obtained through FOIA requests\footnote{Statistics on NSL’s Produced by Department of Defense, ACLU, https://www.aclu.org/other/statistics-nsls-produced-dod.}; and an analysis of documents obtained through FOIA requests about FBI surveillance flights over Baltimore.\footnote{Nathan Freed Wessler, FBI Documents Reveal New Information on Baltimore Surveillance Flights (Oct. 30, 2015, 8:00 AM), https://www.aclu.org/blog/free-future/fbi-documents-reveal-new-information-baltimore-surveillance-flights.}

The ACLU plans to analyze, publish, and disseminate to the public the information gathered through this Request. The records requested are not sought for commercial use and the requesters plan to disseminate the information disclosed as a result of this Request to the public at no cost.

\textbf{B. The records sought are urgently needed to inform the public about actual or alleged government activity.}

These records are urgently needed to inform the public about actual or alleged government activity. \textit{See} 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II).\footnote{See also 22 C.F.R. § 171.11(f)(2); 6 C.F.R. 5.5(e)(1)(ii); 28 C.F.R. 16.5(e)(1)(ii).} Specifically, the requested records relate to any plans by the Trump administration to curtail the United States’ participation in the international human rights system by eliminating its participation in the U.N. Human Rights Council. As discussed in Part I, \textit{supra}, cutting the United States’ role in international organizations, treaties, or forums could significantly affect overseas security and domestic accountability, and are the subject of widespread public controversy and media
attention. The records sought relate to a matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in U.S. foreign affairs.

Given the foregoing, the ACLU has satisfied the requirements for expedited processing of this Request.

**IV. Application for Waiver or Limitation of Fees**

The ACLU requests a waiver of document search, review, and duplication fees on the grounds that disclosure of the requested records is in the public interest and because disclosure is “likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). The ACLU also requests a waiver of search fees on the grounds that the ACLU qualifies as a “representative of the news media” and the records are not sought for commercial use. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II).

**A. The Request is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the ACLU.**

As discussed above, credible media and other investigative accounts underscore the substantial public interest in the records sought through this Request. Given the ongoing and widespread media attention to this issue, the records sought will significantly contribute to public understanding of an issue of profound public importance. Because little specific information is publicly available regarding the implications of the U.S. withdraw from the Human Rights Council on the United States’ cooperation with international human rights forums, the records sought are certain to contribute significantly to the public’s understanding of the compatibility of domestic policy with international human rights standards.

The ACLU is not filing this Request to further its commercial interest. As described above, any information disclosed by the ACLU as a result of this FOIA Request will be available to the public at no cost. Thus, a fee waiver would fulfill Congress’s legislative intent in amending FOIA. See Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossotti, 326 F.3d 1309, 1312 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (“Congress amended FOIA to ensure that it be liberally construed in favor of waivers for noncommercial requesters.”) (quotation marks omitted)).

---

27 Supra note 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, and accompanying text.

28 See Id.

29 See also 22 C.F.R. § 171.16(a); 6 C.F.R. 5.11(k)(1)(i)-(ii); 28 C.F.R. 16.10(k)(1)(i)-(ii).
B. The ACLU is a representative of the news media and the records are not sought for commercial use.

The ACLU also requests a waiver of search fees on the grounds that the ACLU qualifies as a “representative of the news media” and the records are not sought for commercial use. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). The ACLU meets the statutory and regulatory definitions of a “representative of the news media” because it is an “entity that gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn the raw materials into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(III); see also Nat’l Sec. Archive v. DOD, 880 F.2d 1381, 1387 (D.C. Cir. 1989) (finding that an organization that gathers information, exercises editorial discretion in selecting and organizing documents, “devises indices and finding aids,” and “distributes the resulting work to the public” is a “representative of the news media” for purposes of the FOIA); Serv. Women’s Action Network v. DOD, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282 (D. Conn. 2012) (requesters, including ACLU, were representatives of the news media and thus qualified for fee waivers for FOIA requests to the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs); ACLU of Wash. v. DOJ, No. C09–0642RSL, 2011 WL 887731, at *10 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 10, 2011) (finding that the ACLU of Washington is an entity that “gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn the raw materials into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience”); ACLU, 321 F. Supp. 2d at 30 n.5 (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). The ACLU is therefore a “representative of the news media” for the same reasons it is “primarily engaged in the dissemination of information.”

Furthermore, courts have found other organizations whose mission, function, publishing, and public education activities are similar in kind to the ACLU’s to be “representatives of the news media” as well. See, e.g., Cause of Action v. IRS, 125 F. Supp. 3d 145 (D.C. Cir. 2015); Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr., 241 F. Supp. 2d at 10–15 (finding non-profit public interest group that disseminated an electronic newsletter and published books was a “representative of the news media” for purposes of the FOIA); Nat’l Sec. Archive, 880 F.2d at 1387; Judicial Watch, Inc. v. DOJ, 133 F. Supp. 2d 52, 53–54 (D.D.C. 2000) (finding Judicial Watch, self-described as a “public interest law firm,” a news media requester).32

30 See also 22 C.F.R. §171.16 (a)(iii); 6 C.F.R. 5.11(k)(2)(iii); 28 C.F.R. 16.10(k)(2)(iii).
31 See also 22 C.F.R. § 171.14(b)(5)(ii)(C); 6 C.F.R. 5.11(b)(6); 28 C.F.R. 16.10(b)(6).
32 Courts have found these organizations to be “representatives of the news media” even though they engage in litigation and lobbying activities beyond their dissemination of information / public education activities. See, e.g., Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr., 241 F. Supp. 2d 5; Nat’l Sec. Archive, 880 F.2d at 1387; see also Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, 404 F. Supp. 2d at 260; Judicial Watch, Inc., 133 F. Supp. 2d at 53–54.
On account of these factors, fees associated with responding to FOIA requests are regularly waived for the ACLU as a “representative of the news media.” As was true in those instances, the ACLU meets the requirements for a fee waiver here.

* * *

Pursuant to applicable statutes and regulations, the ACLU expects a determination regarding expedited processing within 10 days. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(ii)(I); 22 C.F.R. § 171.11(f)(4); 6 C.F.R. 5.5(e)(4); 28 C.F.R. 16.5(e)(4).

If the Request is denied in whole or in part, the ACLU asks that you justify all deletions by reference to specific exemptions to FOIA. The ACLU expects the release of all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material. The ACLU reserves the right to appeal a decision to withhold any information or deny a waiver of fees.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. Please furnish the applicable records to:

Jamil Dakwar  
American Civil Liberties Union  
125 Broad Street—18th Floor  
New York, New York 10004  
T: 212.549.2500  
F: 212.549.2654  
jdakwar@aclu.org

I affirm that the information provided supporting the request for expedited processing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(vi).

33 In May 2017, CBP granted a fee-waiver request regarding a FOIA request for documents related to electronic device searches at the border. In May 2016, the FBI granted a fee-waiver request regarding a FOIA request issued to the DOJ for documents related to Countering Violent Extremism Programs. In April 2013, the National Security Division of the DOJ granted a fee-waiver request with respect to a request for documents related to the FISA Amendments Act. Also in April 2013, the DOJ granted a fee-waiver request regarding a FOIA request for documents related to “national security letters” issued under the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. In August 2013, the FBI granted the fee-waiver request related to the same FOIA request issued to the DOJ. In June 2011, the DOJ National Security Division granted a fee waiver to the ACLU with respect to a request for documents relating to the interpretation and implementation of a section of the PATRIOT Act. In March 2009, the State Department granted a fee waiver to the ACLU with regard to a FOIA request for documents relating to the detention, interrogation, treatment, or prosecution of suspected terrorists.
Respectfully,

Jamil Dakwar
American Civil Liberties Union
Foundation
125 Broad Street—18th Floor
New York, New York 10004
T: 212.549.2500
F: 212.549.2654
jdakwar@aclu.org