

RELEASE IN PART  
B6

---

**From:** Sullivan, Jacob J <SullivanJJ@state.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 31, 2013 11:42 PM  
**To:** H  
**Subject:** Re: CFR speech

The un compelling quality of the first CFR speech is painful.

Sandy's point is that the first speech was highly conventional (and a bit pedestrian). This one was cutting edge.

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

**From:** H [mailto:HDR22@clintonemail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 31, 2013 11:36 PM  
**To:** Sullivan, Jacob J  
**Subject:** Re: CFR speech

Are the "transformative effects" painful?

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

**From:** Sullivan, Jacob J [mailto:SullivanJJ@state.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 31, 2013 11:34 PM Eastern Standard Time  
**To:** H  
**Subject:** Re: CFR speech

Oh, I know the specifics all too painfully well!

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

**From:** H [mailto:HDR22@clintonemail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 31, 2013 11:27 PM  
**To:** Sullivan, Jacob J  
**Subject:** Fw: CFR speech

Interesting. Can you have somebody call him for specifics?

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

**From:** Samuel Berger [mailto: ]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 31, 2013 10:50 PM Eastern Standard Time  
**To:** H; H2  
**Subject:** CFR speech

Awesome. Reread your first CFR speech 3 years ago -- evolution reflects the transformative effect you have had on US foreign policy/DOS over these four years.

Sandy

B6