

RELEASE IN FULL

---

**From:** Sullivan, Jacob J <SullivanJJ@state.gov>  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 14, 2010 6:40 AM  
**To:** H  
**Subject:** Fw: postscript to last night/ preview of call

See below from Daniel.

What's so crazy is that they roundly rejected the first moratorium in large measure because it excluded Jerusalem and now they are saying the difference is that this one clearly excludes Jerusalem!

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

**From:** Rubinstein, Daniel H  
**To:** Feltman, Jeffrey D; Hale, David M; Walles, Jacob; Sullivan, Jacob J  
**Sent:** Sun Nov 14 06:09:54 2010  
**Subject:** postscript to last night/ preview of call

as can be expected, huge amount of media reports and speculation, some accurate, some not

explicit exclusion of JRSM reverberating very, very hard as it appears in all the reports and statements, and has been seized on by P's

i have gone over the same ground today as yesterday/last night, including emphasis on what our senior levels assess re: sufficiency to proceed

she will likely hear about the significant difficulty the "blunt" explicit exclusion (vice a fuzzier approach) presents to proceeding back to negotiations during her call. if she doesn't, DH and I are certain to hear it tomorrow

don't want to beat a dead horse, but don't want her to be surprised either