



PO BOX 9576  
Washington, D.C. 20016  
[info@velvetrevolution.us](mailto:info@velvetrevolution.us)

May 18, 2009

**Office of Bar Counsel**  
Board on Professional Responsibility  
District of Columbia Court of Appeals  
515 5th Street NW  
Building A, Suite 117  
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Complaint against Douglas J. Feith

Dear Sir or Madam:

#### **NOTICE OF COMPLAINT**

Velvet Revolution (“VR”), a Washington, D.C. based non-profit with a network of more than 150 organizations representing over a million members nationwide, including in the District of Columbia, herein lodges a complaint against Douglas J. Feith, former Undersecretary of Defense for Policy; [dfbeth@verizon.net](mailto:dfbeth@verizon.net), 301-320-2476, currently an active member of the DC Bar. VR requests the *Board on Professional Responsibility, District of Columbia Court of Appeals* take immediate disciplinary action against Mr. Feith for violations of the *D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct*.

#### **SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT**

Douglas J. Feith breached his legal duty and violated the *D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct* by advocating for immoral and unethical “extended” or “enhanced” interrogation techniques (amounting to torture), and other policies that resulted in clear violations of U.S. and international law.

Specifically, Mr. Feith, ignored over two centuries of legal precedents, fell short of the “good faith” imperative, and approved detainee interrogation outside of accepted and legal norms, thereby providing the false cover of claimed legality for those who then engaged in acts and policies that, in fact, violated the following laws, both in letter and spirit:

- 1) The United Nations Convention Against Torture (UNCAT), Articles 1, 2, 3 and 16 (ratified in October 1994) implemented by Sections 2340-2340A of title 18 of the United States Code.
- 2) The Geneva Conventions, Article 3, (ratified in August 1955)”

- 3) The Eighth Amendment against “cruel and unusual punishment”
- 4) The “Separation of Powers” constructs and imperatives of the U.S. Constitution
- 5) The United States Criminal Code, Title 18, Prohibitions Against Torture (18 USC 2340A) and War Crimes (18 USC 2441)

As the “law of the land,” these legal protections and dictates, were, and are clear. Rather than offering a “good faith” analysis of the applicable law, Mr. Feith supported contrary memoranda<sup>[1]</sup> and joined administration deliberations at the highest level to advance legal arguments that led directly to detainee abuses, and evidence suggests, deaths at overseas U.S. military facilities<sup>[2]</sup>. In so doing Mr. Feith impeded the administration of justice and violated the U.S. Constitution, the Geneva Convention, the Convention against Torture, the U.S. Criminal Code and several *D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct*. Mr. Feith did not act in “good faith” but rather in a manner that was prejudicial, incompetent and clearly immoral.

Therefore, VR calls upon the Board on Professional Responsibility, District of Columbia Court of Appeals to act immediately to disbar Mr. Feith for conduct that is a travesty of justice and an affront to the rule of law and the standards of professional legal and ethical conduct.

Further, because the evidence points to violation of numerous laws, VR believes that disbarment will complement steps toward open hearings in Congress and criminal investigations by an independent counsel appointed by the Department of Justice.

## **APPLICABLE LAW PROHIBITING TORTURE**

### **The U.S. Constitution -- The Supreme Law of the Land**

As the initial U.S. report to the *UN Convention against Torture* wrote:

“...the protections of the right to life and liberty, personal freedom and physical integrity found in the Fourth, Fifth and Eighth Amendments to the United States Constitution provide a nationwide standard of treatment beneath which no governmental entity may fall.” [49., p. 13, Initial Report submitted by the United States to the *Convention against Torture* in 1999 (CAT/C/28/Add.5)]

U.S. citizens are guaranteed these protections. Jose Padilla is one example of a U.S. citizen who was held without charge for several years, and subject to the extreme interrogation techniques advocated by Mr. Feith. Citizens of other countries are similarly protected when in United States custody. The Eighth Amendment specifically prohibits cruel and unusual punishment.

### **The Geneva Convention (1949)**

Common Article 3 of the *Geneva Conventions* broadly prohibits "violence to life and

person," and specifically prohibits "mutilation, cruel treatment and torture" including "outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment". These terms include "other forms of cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment."

***The drafters of common Article 3 avoided a detailed list of prohibited acts in order to ensure that it had the broadest possible reach, leaving no loophole.***

[<http://www.amnestyusa.org/war-on-terror/reports-statements-and-issue-briefs/torture-and-the-law/page.do?id=1107981>]

The **Army Field Manual** on detainee treatment and interrogation is predicated on the Geneva Convention and specifically requires humane treatment of prisoners and detainees. Exhibit B

### **UN Convention Against Torture (1994)**

Adopted by the United Nations in 1984, the Convention requires states to take effective measures to prevent torture within their borders. The United States ratified the Convention against Torture in October 1994 and it entered into force for the United States on November 20, 1994. To date there are over 146 nations that are party to the convention.

Article 2(2) of the Convention states that:

***"No exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification of torture."***

### ***Hamdan v. Rumsfeld (2002) -- Due Process and Legal Protections***

The Supreme Court in *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*, 548 U.S. 557 (2006) held that the Geneva Conventions are applicable to accused members of al-Qaeda. Thus, due process protections apply to all detainees in U.S. custody, and those in military prisons (Guantanamo, Abu Grahیب, Bagram), as well as so-called "black sites" in Poland, Diego Garcia and elsewhere.

### **US Criminal Code**

#### **TITLE 18 § 2340A. Torture**

(a) Offense.— Whoever outside the United States commits or attempts to commit torture shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, and if death results to any person from conduct prohibited by this subsection, shall be punished by death or imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

(b) Jurisdiction.— There is jurisdiction over the activity prohibited in subsection (a) if—  
(1) the alleged offender is a national of the United States; or

(2) the alleged offender is present in the United States, irrespective of the nationality of the victim or alleged offender.

(c) Conspiracy.— A person who conspires to commit an offense under this section shall be subject to the same penalties (other than the penalty of death) as the penalties prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of the conspiracy.

#### TITLE 18 § 2441. **War crimes**

(a) Offense.— Whoever, whether inside or outside the United States, commits a war crime, in any of the circumstances described in subsection (b), shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for life or any term of years, or both, and if death results to the victim, shall also be subject to the penalty of death.

(b) Circumstances.— The circumstances referred to in subsection (a) are that the person committing such war crime or the victim of such war crime is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States or a national of the United States (as defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act).

(c) Definition.— As used in this section the term “war crime” means any conduct—  
(1) defined as a grave breach in any of the international conventions signed at Geneva 12 August 1949, or any protocol to such convention to which the United States is a party;  
(2) prohibited by Article 23, 25, 27, or 28 of the Annex to the Hague Convention IV, Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land, signed 18 October 1907;  
(3) which constitutes a grave breach of common Article 3 (as defined in subsection (d)) when committed in the context of and in association with an armed conflict not of an international character;

#### **CASE FOR DISBARMENT -- District of Columbia (D.C.) Rules of Professional Conduct**

The case for Mr. Feith’s disbarment is simple and clear. Above all, a lawyer must demonstrate respect for the rule of law, the legal system, and over two centuries of legal precedent. Mr. Feith did not.

In his position as a senior government policy attorney, Mr. Feith advocated a new legal policy that regarded due process of any kind as an undue burden and denied terror suspects both the rights of criminal defendants and the rights of prisoners of war. He approved brutal interrogation techniques that amounted to torture.

Mr. Feith’s conduct is so far outside the bounds of legal practice that it falls under *D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct, Scope* (p. 4), which reads, **“The Rules do not exhaust the moral and ethical considerations that should inform a lawyer, for no worthwhile human activity can be completely defined by legal rules.”**

Mr. Feith’s legal advocacy denied due process rights to detainees, and countenanced gross, violent and degrading treatment that was in no way moral or ethical, by any

objective measure. This alone is ground for disbarment.

**Rule 3.1 B (Meritorious Claims and Contentions, p. 100)** calls for lawyers “to inform themselves about the facts of their clients’ cases and the applicable law” Further it clarifies that legal claims are frivolous if the lawyer is “unable either to make a good-faith argument on the merits of the action taken or to support the action taken by a good-faith argument for an extension, modification, or reversal of existing law.” Mr. Feith is documented as having supported a policy of extreme interrogation in which detainees are denied due process and subject to interrogations that inflict “severe pain or suffering,” “physical or mental.” Mr. Feith’s failure to assemble any counter arguments does not represent application of “good faith,” and was thus “frivolous.”

**Rule 1.2 (e) (Scope of Representation)** reads, “A lawyer shall not counsel a client to engage, or assist a client, in conduct that the lawyer knows is criminal or fraudulent, but a lawyer may discuss the legal consequences of any proposed course of conduct with a client and may counsel or assist a client to make a good-faith effort to determine the validity, scope, meaning, or application of the law.”

The record shows that Mr. Feith approved of interrogation techniques, in violation of the Convention against Torture, and the Geneva Convention. By doing so, Mr. Feith violated Rule 1.2 (e). A “**good faith**” analysis called for a discussion of applicable U.S. and international law bearing on questions of interrogation and due process.

Rather than accept the definition of torture<sup>[3]</sup> as clearly defined by international law, Mr. Feith, by his participation in preparation of “Haynes Memo,” ignored or attempted to skirt around it altogether where it reads that the most aggressive “Category III techniques may be legally available”

Douglas Feith demonstrated disregard for well-established rule of law, violating both the letter and spirit of the U.S. Constitution and the treaties that the U.S. had signed and ratified. Mr. Feith’s advocacy of so-called “enhanced interrogation techniques” was not presented in “good faith” and was clearly unethical and immoral. Further his participation in deliberations early in the post 9/11 period suggests he was party to unlawful conspiracy subverting the Supreme Law of the Land.<sup>[4]</sup>

Therefore, VR calls upon the *Board on Professional Responsibility, District of Columbia Court of Appeals* to take disciplinary action against Mr. Feith.

## **KEY DOCUMENTS IN EVIDENCE**

In order to build the case for disciplinary action against Douglas Feith, Jay Bybee, John Yoo, and other lawyers advocating for, and defining so-called “enhanced interrogation” and to examine the origins of the legal advocacy, it is necessary to review an extensive body of evidence and investigative reporting and analysis, including the following documents/articles:

- 1) Memoranda prepared by lawyers in the Bush Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel (OLC). [[http://www.aclu.org/safefree/general/olc\\_memos.html](http://www.aclu.org/safefree/general/olc_memos.html)]
- 2) The Senate Armed Services Committee Investigation (SASCI) *See*, Attachment B, Senate Armed Services Inquiry Into the Treatment of Detainees in U.S. Custody, released December 2008 (SASCI), pg. xxviii. Exhibit K  
<http://levin.senate.gov/newsroom/release.cfm?id=305735>  
<http://levin.senate.gov/newsroom/supporting/2008/Detainees.121108.pdf>
- 3) Memo released by the Senate Intelligence Committee  
<http://intelligence.senate.gov/pdfs/olcopinon.pdf>
- 4) The Red Cross Report on Detainee Treatment, Exhibit J.
- 5) Investigative Reporting:
  - a. *The Dark Side: The Inside Story of How the War on Terror Turned into a War on American Ideals*
  - b. "Report: Abusive tactics used to seek Iraq-al Qaida link"; Jonathan S. Landay, *McClatchy Newspapers* -- Tue, Apr. 21, 2009

1) The **OLC memoranda** offered the patina of legal sanction to the use of techniques such as waterboarding, hypothermia, stress positions, extensive sleep deprivation and confinement with stinging insects to exploit prisoner phobias.

The memos, by carefully defining parameters, clearly demonstrate that the authors of the memos were deeply engaged in the application of torture techniques, not merely giving abstract legal counsel.

2) The **Senate Armed Services Committee report** provided a detailed chronology of the process of formulation of policy respecting the treatment of prisoners, with a special focus on the introduction of torture techniques.

Senior officials in the U.S. government decided to use some of these harsh techniques against detainees based on deeply flawed interpretations of U.S. and international law.

[Levin, McCain Release Executive Summary and Conclusions of Report on Treatment of Detainees in U.S. Custody, December 11, 2008]

3) The **Senate Intelligence Committee memo** details the steps leading to issuance of the OLC memos and identified the Justice Department lawyers and others involved in the process. The memo details a systematic authorized program for the mistreatment and torture of persons denied rights of due process. [Letter from Attorney General Eric Holder, Jr. to Senator John. D. Rockefeller IV of the SSCI forwarding declassified narrative, (April 17, 2009).]

4) The **Red Cross Report On Detainee Treatment** was prepared from interviews with a number of detainees and others. In short, it confirms that the types of torture techniques advocated by the attorney we have complained about here were in fact used against many detainees. These techniques included suffocation by water, prolonged stress standing, beatings by use of a collar, beating and kicking, confinement in a box, prolonged nudity, sleep deprivation, continuous loud noises, exposure to cold temperature and cold water, threats, forced shaving, and deprivation of food. Exhibit J

5) In **testimony at a Senate hearing** on May 13, 2009, Former State Department counselor Philip Zelikow told a committee panel that Bush administration officials engaged in a 'collective failure' with regard to the detention and interrogation of suspected terrorists. He asserted that the torture memos were unsound because "the lawyers involved ... did not welcome peer review and indeed would shut down challenges even inside the government." Georgetown University law professor David Luban testified that the Justice Department torture memos constituted "an ethical train wreck" because they violated constitutional, statutory and international law.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/05/13/AR2009051301281.html>

**6) Investigation Reporting/Biographies:** Select reporting from credible sources further suggests that following the attacks of 9/11/01 a host of controversial and illegal policies were advanced persistently and systematically by a small group of lawyers to serve narrow policy goals and political ambitions, with a primary aim of vastly amplifying the power of the Presidency, in direct threat to the system of checks and balances elucidated in the U.S. Constitution.

## ENDNOTES

[1] See the November 27, 2002 "Action memo" (or Haynes memo) from Stephen G. Haynes to Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld:  
[http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Haynes\\_Memo\\_of\\_Nov\\_27,\\_2002](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Haynes_Memo_of_Nov_27,_2002). Haynes wrote:

"I have discussed this with the Deputy, Doug Feith, and General Myers. I believe that all join in my recommendation" [to authorize several categories of techniques.]

At the bottom of the memo, Feith is cc'ed by the acronym of his job title, USD(P), or undersecretary of defense for policy. Exhibit I

See Memorandum from Assistant Attorney General Jay S. Bybee to The White House Counsel on the status of Taliban Forces under Article 4 of the Third Geneva Convention of 1949.

<http://news.findlaw.com/hdocs/docs/torture/bybee20702mem.html>

See *ProPublica's* comprehensive list of legal memoranda on controversial Bush policies regarding detentions, interrogations and warrantless wiretapping.  
<http://www.propublica.org/special/missing-memos>.

A detailed listing of torture related legal memoranda is available here:  
<http://www.aclu.org/safefree/torture/torturefoia.html> Exhibit A

The most recently declassified memos from Yoo's *Office of Legal Counsel* can be found here: [http://www.aclu.org/safefree/general/olc\\_memos.html](http://www.aclu.org/safefree/general/olc_memos.html) Exhibits N and O

[2] Unredacted Church Report Documents (Previously Classified) (2/11/2009)

<http://www.aclu.org/safefree/torture/38710lgl20090211.html>

<http://www.aclu.org/torturefoia/released/021109.html>

These reports from the Criminal Investigation Division of the Dept. of Justice detail the deaths of a number of detainees at Bagram Air Force Base in Afghanistan and at prisons in Iraq. Thus far, 21 homicides have been confirmed, eight of which resulted from abusive interrogation techniques.

[3] The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1984 and entered into force on June 26, 1987.

It defines torture as any act by which: "severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental; is intentionally inflicted on a person; for such purposes as":

- a) obtaining from him/her or a third person information or a confession
- b) punishing him/her for an act s/he or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed
- c) intimidating or coercing him/her or a third person,
- d) or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind;

When such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity.\*

<http://www.amnestyusa.org/war-on-terror/reports-statements-and-issue-briefs/torture-and-the-law/page.do?id=1107981>

The Convention Against Torture is implemented by Sections 2340-2340A of title 18 of the United States Code.

[4] Mayer, Jane; *The Dark Side: The Inside Story of How the War on Terror Turned into a War on American Ideals*, Doubleday, 2008.



Yoo, John C.; *War by Other Means: An Insider's Account of the War on Terror*, Atlantic Monthly Press, 2006.

Mayer sources "hard-line law-and-order stalwarts in the criminal justice system" to describe how beginning on 9/11/01 a group who called themselves the "War Council" worked to upend the American system of law and checks and balances in order to exercise a new legal paradigm for Executive Power.

Douglas Feith operated on the periphery of the "War Council" through a Working Group at the Pentagon that included Michael Haynes, one of five members of the War Council led by the Vice-President Chief of Staff David Addington. The Council worked methodically to vastly expand presidential authority ("not limited by any laws") in which the president "had the power to override existing laws that Congress had specifically designed to curb him."

Mayer's account was in part based on John Yoo's 2006 book, *War by Other Means*, which revealed a larger circle of lawyers who met regularly in order to advance an entirely unprecedented new legal regime.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kevin Zeese', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Kevin Zeese  
Attorney at Law  
301-996-6582