

RELEASE IN PART
B6

From: H <hrod17@clintonemail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 18, 2010 9:15 AM
To: 'millscd@state.gov'; 'cheryl.mills' [redacted]
Subject: Fw: Personal - a personal favor

B6

Fyi

----- Original Message -----

From: Lanny J. Davis [redacted]
To: H
Sent: Sat Sep 18 09:06:51 2010
Subject: Re: Personal - a personal favor

Thanks. Thanks. But don't do anything that might have even slightest bad optics.
Lan

----- Original Message -----

From: H <HDR22@clintonemail.com>
To: Lanny J. Davis
Cc: 'cheryl.mills' [redacted] millscd@state.gov' <millscd@state.gov>
Sent: Sat Sep 18 08:03:37 2010
Subject: Re: Personal - a personal favor

Lanny--

It sounds like it will be a terrific article. I'm forwarding your email to Cheryl so she can check w the ethics lawyers and get you an answer. All best, H

----- Original Message -----

From: Lanny J. Davis [redacted]
To: H
Sent: Fri Sep 17 21:26:58 2010
Subject: Personal - a personal favor

My dear friend Hillary:

I hate to email you too much – and to ask you for any favors. I feel as if I am taking advantage of a great privilege that you allow me to send you a personal email every so often. But this is a favor that I fully understand for 100 reasons might not be appropriate or comfortable for you to say yes to.

The American Lawyer is doing a Cover Story (ugh!) about my new law firm, “Lanny J. Davis & Associates” – about my finally hanging up my own shingle after all these years and at a ripe young age, with a 12 year-old and a 5 year-old to pay college tuition for to I can't even state the age I will be in writing when I write my last tuition check.

I am quite concerned even though the reporter for the American Lawyer, David Levine, seems to be a nice young man (which makes me even more concerned – sometimes the nicest ones can burn you the worst. (You, of all people, should know!))

I have given David Levine, the American Lawyer reporter, a list of friends, business, personal, and political, to call. I fully anticipate there will be personal and professional mean-spirited shots at me in the story – that is inevitable – especially from those attorneys who still don't accept that what I do is unusual as well as the hateful rightwing (and perhaps even more from the left, who don't like my "Purple Nation" approach and my effort to help make bad countries better!!!).

To try to balance the cheap shots, I have asked a variety of people from Ds and Rs and in between to talk to the reporter about me. Ted Olsen did and said great things. So did Mike McCurry and Karl Rove (!!!). Even President Clinton and President Bush, I am told, may weigh in with nice written statements about their old friend from Yale days. And believe it or not, even Senator McCain called the reporter personally on his cell phone to tell him how much he appreciated my bipartisan "Purple Nation" approach to politics (inspired, of course, by my friend the great former Junior Senator from New York, Hillary Clinton, whom my friend Lindsey Graham once told me was the nicest and most effective person in the U.S. Senate!).

My message that I hope gets reflected in the article is that I and my law firm offer unique multi-disciplinary capabilities in law, media and politics: first, traditional legal advice and litigation, which allows me to get all the facts, good and bad, under the crucial protection of attorney-client privilege; media experience, understanding that reporters need facts and you have to fight to get them to focus on facts, not innuendo, win the trust, so that they will give the person for whom I am advocating a break and actually try to be fair and accurate; and finally, politics and legislative strategies, which often helps clients solve litigation solutions where the courts are not working. You can see where the shots may come from – lawyers who feel threatened by my unusual multi-disciplinary approach; public relations firms, who don't think lawyers should talk to the media; and lobbyists, who think they should be left alone and not be bothered about being careful with the facts when approaching an elected official.

So my question to you, good friend Hillary, is:

Would you be willing to talk personally to the reporter? I assume the answer will no – since I can see that that might be inappropriate. And if that is your answer, I completely understand.

So my second question is, if the first one is no: Would you be willing to have Philippe or Cheryl issue a statement to the reporter, David Levine, on your behalf about your opinion of my professional skills and/or our friendship over the years?

Please please please – note there are "three pleases": Do not be bashful or concerned about saying no to my request. As you can see, I have a number of people who have talked to the reporter or, in the case of President Clinton and President Bush, who may be giving written statements.

I wasn't even going to ask you for that reason since I didn't want you to feel badly if you have to say no. But then again. The honest to goodness truth is, : Aside from Carolyn, my four children, and my immediate family, I consider you to be the best friend and the best person I have met in my long life. You know that from the dedication and appreciation of you I have always felt and expressed to you over four decades. So that is why your comments would mean a lot to me, even if just a written statement.

BUT: one more please (#4) – if it feels inappropriate to you as Secretary of State or for any other reason to be in a quote about me on a personal or professional level, I fully understand.

Thanks for just considering this, my good friend Hillary. If the answer is yes, just tell me know by return email (or have someone call my assistant, Maddie Melendez, [REDACTED] who the reporter should contact at your office, and when. Unfortunately the deadline is within the next two weeks.

B6

Best and warmest regards,

Lanny