

RELEASE IN  
PART B6

**From:** H <hrod17@clintonemail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 7, 2011 6:33 AM  
**To:** 'JilotyLC@state.gov'  
**Subject:** Fw: a few thoughts for the weekend shows tomorrow

Pls print.

**From:** H  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 02, 2011 03:37 PM  
**To:** H  
**Subject:** Fw: a few thoughts for the weekend shows tomorrow

B6

**From:** Anne-Marie Slaughter [mailto: ]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 26, 2011 03:07 PM  
**To:** H  
**Cc:** Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>; Sullivan, Jacob J <SullivanJJ@state.gov>; Abedin, Huma <AbedinH@state.gov>  
**Subject:** a few thoughts for the weekend shows tomorrow

I am at the Brussels Forum – great panel yesterday with Cathy Ashton and Jeanne Shaheen – and have been doing lots of public and private discussions explaining our Libya policy. 5 points that might be helpful as you think about formulating responses for tomorrow

1. Reject that dichotomy b/w interests and values (e.g. any questions that assume our “interests” in Libya/ME (oil, CT intelligence, stability, etc) were trumped by our “values” (democratic principles, human rights, etc). Nat security strat and everything you have done makes clear that standing for our values *is* in our interests, it’s the only way to get real stability based on consent of governed and govt that serve the interests of their citizens. Competition is b/w different interests (this also rebuts the “emotional women motivated by values v. hard-headed men motivated by interests narrative)
2. 2005 Council on Foreign Relations report by Madeleine and Vin Weber on Promoting Democracy in the Middle East called for “evolution rather than revolution,” pointing out that the chaos of revolution cd be counter-productive. To adapt that frmwk today, you can say that in some countries there have been revolutions; in others, like Morocco, there has been evolution. We strongly push (and have pushed) all governments in the direction of steady evolution toward accountable, transparent, democratic governments that serve the interests of their people.
3. Protests, by definition, are better at defining what people do not want than what they do. There is a time for protest, but also a time for participation in positive reform where the government is willing to engage sincerely in a process of reform.
4. Much of what the Obama Administration has been doing has been precisely focused on the conditions of people’s lives in societies across the ME and around the world – a major shift (Cathy Ashton described it as “revolutionary”) to make development a real pillar of foreign policy, empowering women, Internet freedom (w/o which these protests would not have succeeded), supporting civil society, public-private partnerships for investment, 21<sup>st</sup> c statecraft. We’ve only been at it for 2 years, but these policies speak directly to the issues animating the protesters
5. Letting NATO lead fits exactly w/ the Obama Administration’s vision of a strong and effective international order – again see the National Security Strategy and your own architecture of cooperation – in which many different nations take responsibility for enforcing international obligations, starting w/ their own neighborhoods. E.g., this

is not a position we created for this crisis b/c we are over-extended, politically cautious, etc. It is completely consistent w/ principles we have been articulating for two years, but now have a chance to put into practice. It's messy, sure, but far better than complaining about the Europeans not spending enough on defense or being willing to use force.

Hope some of this is helpful.

All best,

AM