

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. fax	Bobbie Greene to Veronica Hearst re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	n.d.	P6/b(6)
002. fax	Bobbie Greene to Veronica Hearst re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	n.d.	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Bobbie Greene
OA/Box Number: 15627

FOLDER TITLE:

Veronica Hearst

2012-0872-S

rc949

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. fax	Bobbie Greene to Veronica Hearst re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	n.d.	P6/b(6)
----------	--	------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Bobbie Greene
OA/Box Number: 15627

FOLDER TITLE:

Veronica Hearst

2012-0872-S

rc949

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Office of the First Lady


Ph: (202) 456-6266

Fax: (202) 456-6244

To:

Veronica Hearst

Phone N



[001]

Fax No.:

From:

Bobbie Guenz

No. of pages (including cover): 3

Comments:

I think you'll enjoy
this. Other info we discussed
will follow later in the day.
Thanks, as always, for
your helping hands.

All Best,

Bobbie

When a Sport Becomes a Shirt

By Richard Dooling

OMAHA
Is it real Polo or Ralph's Polo? That is the concern of the clothing company Polo Ralph Lauren, which is seeking to block Polo magazine from using the name Polo. ... Polo Ralph Lauren started the legal wrangling last fall by sending a letter to Polo magazine, expressing concern that the revamping of the 23-year-old publication of the United States Polo Association from a narrow, horsey publication to an upscale, life style magazine would cause people to view it as a product of the luxury designer.
— New York Times, May 18, 1998

The author of this column has obtained special permission from the magistrate to reprint the above excerpt. The news item predated the recent temporary restraining order (T.R.O.) issued by the court forbidding any reprinting or use of the name in question (hereinafter referred to as Pxxx) while litigation is pending. Because this article is being written after the issuance of said T.R.O., the author will abide by its terms and refrain from using the name Pxxx.

Ralph Lauren's lawyers also have moved zealously to protect their client's trademark in other cases where

Richard Dooling, a lawyer, is the author, most recently, of "Brain Storm."

use of the Pxxx name in items associated with an "upscale life style" could confuse the consumer.

A New York Federal district court has enjoined the pianist Emanuel Ax and the New York Philharmonic from performing Chopin's polonaises until the marquee and the programs can be revised to refer to the musical compositions simply as "naises."

The Department of Education has advised school districts that the 13th-century Venetian traveler and adventurer, formerly known as Marco Pxxx, should simply be referred to as "Marco." Marco was the first European introduced to the "upscale life style" at the court of Kublai Khan,

Ralph Lauren usurps Webster.

and the Pxxx name could easily cause modern consumers to conclude that Ralph Lauren had accompanied Marco on his medieval expeditions to China. Worse, people might assume that Ralph had designed the atrocious outfits worn by the upscale Mongolians featured in the illustrated editions of the book "The Travels of Marco Pxxx."

Scientists have agreed to change the name of polonium, the radioactive element discovered by the upscale celebrities Pierre and Marie Curie, to

lacrosse-nium. Chemists have also revised the periodic table of elements to get rid of polonium's symbol, Po, and have selected a non-alphanumeric symbol to stand for the element formerly known as polonium. The artist formerly known as Prince is now said to be considering a lawsuit.

Rather than change the name of the Prince of Wales's favorite sport, the Royal Family has agreed to pay a licensing fee every time the name Pxxx appears in print within 15 words of a Royal Family member's name. Alternatively, the House of Lords has proposed that henceforth the sport be publicly referred to as Pony Croquet for Snooty Toffs.

The organization formerly known as the United States Pxxx Association has re-formed itself into two separate Associations. The Association for members with an upscale life style hereafter shall be referred to as the United States Horse-Hockey Association. The Association for lower-class, ill-bred sorts of members may still be called the United States Pxxx Association, but only by lower-class, ill-bred members, who may use the Pxxx name without causing people to view Pxxx as a product of Ralph Lauren.

Just before heading into court, Pxxx magazine made one last attempt at settling its dispute by offering a written apology for its use of the name Pxxx. Whereupon Ralph Lauren's lawyers sought to enjoin use of the word apxxxgy, especially when used by attorneys with upscale life styles. □

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1998
The New York Times

Abroad at Home
ANTHONY LEWIS

The Grand Inquisitor

If Kenneth Starr has his way, any American who consults a lawyer from now on will face the possibility that after his or her death the lawyer will be forced to testify about the conversation in Federal criminal proceedings. The confidential character of the lawyer-client relationship will end.

That is the position taken by Mr. Starr in a case being argued in the Supreme Court today. He wants to see three pages of handwritten notes taken by a Washington lawyer, James Hamilton, when Vincent Foster Jr. came to see him in 1993. Mr. Foster, assistant White House counsel, was suffering from severe depression. Nine days later he committed suicide.

No Federal prosecutor before Mr. Starr has made that claim. A divided U.S. Court of Appeals held in this case that the lawyer-client privilege could be overridden if a trial judge found that a lawyer's evidence about a deceased client was likely to be substantial and unavailable elsewhere. But Mr. Starr, unsatisfied with that balancing of interests, asks the Supreme Court to hold that the privilege always ends with death.

In support of that extreme position he makes an even more extreme argument. The only person who would be troubled by the prospect of discussions with a lawyer being disclosed after death, he says, is someone who plans to commit perjury. The legal argument against forced disclosure, he says in his brief, "is acrid with the odor of presumed perjury."

But a truthful person may want to speak in confidence to a lawyer. The criminal law is so full of traps for the unwary these days that anyone even tangentially concerned would be a fool not to. The discussion may well include the client's suspicions about others that he would not want published after his death. And he might care about his own posthumous reputation.

Fear of later disclosure may lead an honest person to keep things back from a lawyer — to be less than candid. The lawyer-client privilege is rooted deeply in our law precisely because it encourages the client to speak candidly and enables the lawyer to give meaningful advice.

The argument that only perjurers would want the privilege to continue after death is reminiscent of one made by the Red-baiters of the 1950's. Senator Joe McCarthy and others called anyone who invoked the privilege against forced self-incrimination a "Fifth Amendment Communist." It took a staunch conservative, Dean Er-

win N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School, to explain that the privilege was there to protect the innocent as well as the guilty.

Mr. Starr's position in the Foster privilege case is not a solitary example of extremism. As independent counsel he has repeatedly pressed at and beyond the edge of appropriate prosecutorial behavior.

One tactic he uses is to call people before the grand jury again and again. Betty Currie, President Clinton's secretary, is one victim of that practice, which reeks of abuse.

Then there is the notorious treatment of Susan McDougal. After she served 18 months in prison for civil contempt for refusing, she says, to testify as Mr. Starr wanted, he paraded

Mr. Starr at the extreme.

her in chains one more time and had her indicted for criminal contempt.

Most troublesome of all is Mr. Starr's penchant for imagining, and investigating, plots against his inquiry. A man who urged prosecution of Linda Tripp for violating Maryland law when she tape-recorded her telephone conversations with Monica Lewinsky was called before Mr. Starr's grand jury. So was a Pentagon official, to be questioned about the disclosure that Ms. Tripp had omitted from a Pentagon security form the fact that she was once arrested for grand larceny.

Anyone who resists Mr. Starr's overreaching is likely to be denounced for delaying the investigation or obstructing justice. Too much of the press voices such criticism, unable to see the dangers of a prosecutor with no restraints of time or money.

Mr. Starr wants to win: to bring down President Clinton. That obsession led him last week to the folly of telling the Supreme Court that the country urgently needed expedited review of another of his cases: a threadbare claim. The Court, one institution that does not dance to his tune, said no.

The point, now as in the McCarthy days, is to remember the larger interest: our interest in liberty and privacy. It is not just Bill Clinton who will lose if Kenneth Starr truncates the lawyer-client privilege. We all will. □

The New York Times

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1998

When a Sport Becomes a Shirt

By Richard Dooling

IS it real Polo or Ralph's Polo? That is the concern of the clothing company Polo Ralph Lauren, which is seeking to block Polo magazine from using the name Polo. ... Polo Ralph Lauren started the legal wrangling last fall by sending a letter to Polo magazine, expressing concern that the revamping of the 23-year-old publication of the United States Polo Association from a narrow, horsey publication to an upscale, life style magazine would cause people to view it as a product of the luxury designer.

— New York Times, May 18, 1998

The author of this column has obtained special permission from the magistrate to reprint the above excerpt. The news item predated the recent temporary restraining order (T.R.O.) issued by the court forbidding any reprinting or use of the name in question (hereinafter referred to as Pxxx) while litigation is pending. Because this article is being written after the issuance of said T.R.O., the author will abide by its terms and refrain from using the name Pxxx. Ralph Lauren's lawyers also have moved zealously to protect their client's trademark in other cases where

Richard Dooling, a lawyer, is the author, most recently, of "Brain Storm."

use of the Pxxx name in items associated with an "upscale life style" could confuse the consumer.

A New York Federal district court has enjoined the pianist Emanuel Ax and the New York Philharmonic from performing Chopin's polonaises until the marquee and the program can be revised to refer to the musical compositions simply as "naises."

The Department of Education has advised school districts that the 13th-century Venetian traveler and adventurer, formerly known as Marco Pxxx, should simply be referred to as "Marco." Marco was the first European introduced to the "upscale life style" at the court of Kublai Khan,

Ralph Lauren usurps Webster.

and the Pxxx name could easily cause modern consumers to conclude that Ralph Lauren had accompanied Marco on his medieval expeditions to China. Worse, people might assume that Ralph had designed the atrocious outfits worn by the upscale Mongolians featured in the illustrated editions of the book "The Travels of Marco Pxxx."

Scientists have agreed to change the name of polonium, the radioactive element discovered by the upscale celebrities Pierre and Marie Curie, to

lacrosse-nium. Chemists have also revised the periodic table of elements to get rid of polonium's symbol, Po, and have selected a non-alphanumeric symbol to stand for the element formerly known as polonium. The artist formerly known as Prince is now said to be considering a lawsuit.

Rather than change the name of the Prince of Wales's favorite sport, the Royal Family has agreed to pay a licensing fee every time the name Pxxx appears in print within 15 words of a Royal Family member's name. Alternatively, the House of Lords has proposed that henceforth the sport be publicly referred to as Pony Croquet for Snooty Toffs.

The organization formerly known as the United States Pxxx Association has re-formed itself into two separate Associations. The Association for members with an upscale life style hereafter shall be referred to as the United States Horse-Hockey Association. The Association for lower-class, ill-bred sorts of members may still be called the United States Pxxx Association, but only by lower-class, ill-bred members, who may use the Pxxx name without causing people to view Pxxx as a product of Ralph Lauren.

Just before heading into court, Pxxx magazine made one last attempt at settling its dispute by offering a written apology for its use of the name Pxxx. Whereupon Ralph Lauren's lawyers sought to enjoin use of the word apxxxgy, especially when used by attorneys with upscale life styles.

Abroad at Home

ANTHONY LEWIS

The Grand Inquisitor

If Kenneth Starr has his way, any American who consults a lawyer from now on will face the possibility that after his or her death the lawyer will be forced to testify about the conversation in Federal criminal proceedings. The confidential character of the lawyer-client relationship will end.

That is the position taken by Mr. Starr in a case being argued in the Supreme Court today. He wants to see three pages of handwritten notes taken by a Washington lawyer, James Hamilton, when Vincent Foster Jr. came to see him in 1993. Mr. Foster, assistant White House counsel, was suffering from severe depression. Nine days later he committed suicide.

No Federal prosecutor before Mr. Starr has made that claim. A divided U.S. Court of Appeals held in this case that the lawyer-client privilege could be overridden if a trial judge found that a lawyer's evidence about a deceased client was likely to be substantial and unavailable elsewhere. But Mr. Starr, unsatisfied with that balancing of interests, asks the Supreme Court to hold that the privilege always ends with death.

In support of that extreme position he makes an even more extreme argument. The only person who would be troubled by the prospect of discussions with a lawyer being disclosed after death, he says, is someone who plans to commit perjury. The legal argument against forced disclosure, he says in his brief, "is acrid with the odor of presumed perjury."

But a truthful person may want to speak in confidence to a lawyer. The criminal law is so full of traps for the unwary these days that anyone even tangentially concerned would be a fool not to. The discussion may well include the client's suspicions about others that he would not want published after his death. And he might care about his own posthumous reputation.

Fear of later disclosure may lead an honest person to keep things back from a lawyer — to be less than candid. The lawyer-client privilege is rooted deeply in our law precisely because it encourages the client to speak candidly and enables the lawyer to give meaningful advice.

The argument that only perjurers would want the privilege to continue after death is reminiscent of one made by the Red-baiters of the 1950's. Senator Joe McCarthy and others called anyone who invoked the privilege against forced self-incrimination a "Fifth Amendment Communist." It took a staunch conservative, Dean Er-

win N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School, to explain that the privilege was there to protect the innocent as well as the guilty.

Mr. Starr's position in the Foster privilege case is not a solitary example of extremism. As independent counsel he has repeatedly pressed at and beyond the edge of appropriate prosecutorial behavior.

One tactic he uses is to call people before the grand jury again and again. Betty Currie, President Clinton's secretary, is one victim of that practice, which reeks of abuse.

Then there is the notorious treatment of Susan McDougal. After she served 18 months in prison for civil contempt for refusing, she says, to testify as Mr. Starr wanted, he parad-

Mr. Starr at the extreme.

ed her in chains one more time and had her indicted for criminal contempt.

Most troublesome of all is Mr. Starr's penchant for imagining, and investigating, plots against his inquiry. A man who urged prosecution of Linda Tripp for violating Maryland law when she tape-recorded her telephone conversations with Monica Lewinsky was called before Mr. Starr's grand jury. So was a Pentagon official, to be questioned about the disclosure that Ms. Tripp had omitted from a Pentagon security form the fact that she was once arrested for grand larceny.

Anyone who resists Mr. Starr's overreaching is likely to be denounced for delaying the investigation or obstructing justice. Too much of the press voices such criticism, unable to see the dangers of a prosecutor with no restraints of time or money.

Mr. Starr wants to win: to bring down President Clinton. That obsession led him last week to the folly of telling the Supreme Court that the country urgently needed expedited review of another of his cases: a threadbare claim. The Court, one institution that does not dance to his tune, said no.

The point, now as in the McCarthy days, is to remember the larger interest: our interest in liberty and privacy. It is not just Bill Clinton who will lose if Kenneth Starr truncates the lawyer-client privilege. We all will. □

The New York Times

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1998

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

002. fax	Bobbie Greene to Veronica Hearst re: phone number [partial] (1 page)	n.d.	P6/b(6)
----------	--	------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
First Lady's Office
Bobbie Greene
OA/Box Number: 15627

FOLDER TITLE:

Veronica Hearst

2012-0872-S

rc949

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Office of the First Lady

Ph: (202) 456-6266

Fax: (202) 456-6244

To: Vernon Hunt

P:

P6(b)(6)

[002]

F:

P6(b)(6)

From:

Robbie Greene

No. of pages (including cover): _____

Comments: I'm very excited by the
description of the Wharton Garden. It
sounds wonderful for so many
different reasons, not the least of
which is the link between the
landscape architect (one of the
earliest & most prestigious women in the
profession) and the Rockefeller Family!!
The cost also seems within reason.
Good luck & let me know
how you do.

I've asked Julie Mason in our
Press Office to call you to discuss
the itinerary so you can work with
your media contacts.

Thanks for the helping hand!
All best, Robbie