

RELEASE IN PART
B6

From: H <hrod17@clintonemail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2009 5:40 AM
To: 'millscd@state.gov'
Subject: Re: 2-pager

I agree. Can you talk--i have a matter of some urgency.

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

From: Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>
To: H
Sent: Tue Apr 28 05:28:02 2009
Subject: Fw: 2-pager

See comments on AMS document I left on you chair today.

Jim and tom F comments in email below.

Cdm

From: Jim Kennedy [redacted]
To: Tom Freedman [redacted]
Cc: Mills, Cheryl D
Sent: Mon Apr 27 21:38:56 2009
Subject: Re: 2-pager

B6

i like virtually everything in the two-pager, and I do agree with Tom on the notion of elevating the "national interest" and security elements of this, both because those have become part of her "brand," and also to help flesh it out in a way that both gives it the widest reach, and also protects it from attack.

some ways to consider doing that might be to just ensure that the overarching description of it "call out" the national interest/security reasoning at work - something like "America has the opportunity and the responsibility to lead in the creation of a network of principled partnerships that will serve our national interest, enhance our security and build the capacity of people and nations to solve global problems and give everyone more power to reach their potential."

(i inserted "network" of principled partnerships because i think it kind of alludes to both the diversity of the kinds of partnerships as well as to the influence of technology on building them...not a "must have" but just a thought....in the same vein, i don't know whether there might be an advantage in alluding to a network of "pragmatic and principled partnerships" or "practical and principled partnerships" just to ensure it's got that pragmatism aspect of it sharply inserted).

On Mon, Apr 27, 2009 at 3:05 PM, Tom Freedman <[redacted]> wrote:

B6

I like the substance and I might consider if there are ways to communicate, or more strongly affirm, some elements that would be important for audiences to hear, including that this is an approach of leadership, self-interest, and values. The values I mean are things like security, stability and building opportunity. Those pieces are in here, but the notion should be clear that we are not ceding leadership, we are leading by building alliances and partnerships. And we will always stand for what is right and the right to defend ourselves and our allies, but we are fighting as we always have for shared values. Make sense? Tom

From: Mills, Cheryl D [mailto:MillsCD@state.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2009 1:37 PM
To: Jim Kennedy; Tom Freedman
Subject: FW: 2-pager

See attached

From: Slaughter, Anne-Marie
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2009 12:14 PM
To: Mills, Cheryl D; Sullivan, Jacob J
Subject: 2-pager

I tried out "principled partnership" on her this morning and she likes it – I really think we're almost there. Pse let me know whether I can distribute this more widely for tomorrow's mtg.