

**RELEASE IN  
PART B6**

**From:** H <hrod17@clintonemail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 26, 2013 6:06 AM  
**To:** 'monica.hanley' [redacted]  
**Subject:** Fw: Fwd: My take on HRC

Pls print.

**From:** Cheryl Mills [mailto:[redacted]]  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 26, 2013 05:01 AM Eastern Standard Time  
**To:** H  
**Subject:** Fwd: My take on HRC

Thought you might find this interesting.

cdm

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Mills, Cheryl D" <[vmillsCD@state.gov](mailto:vmillsCD@state.gov)>  
**Date:** January 25, 2013, 5:56:34 PM EST  
**To:** Cheryl Mills [redacted]  
**Subject:** FW: My take on HRC

**From:** Sullivan, Jacob J  
**Sent:** Friday, January 25, 2013 12:33 PM  
**To:** Mills, Cheryl D; Reines, Philippe I  
**Subject:** My take on HRC

This is how I answered questions about how she just did the soft stuff.

**QUESTION:** One of the things that some people have said about this particular Secretary is – and they've said it, I think, in a slightly snarky way, is that she's spent a lot of time involved in cookstove initiatives and gender violence and these types of things, like what Aaron Miller calls planetary humanism, and that that was all swell, but really a Secretary of State ought to be just hammering away on deals and peace talks in Iran and core issues and that these things, in effect, what do they really amount to.

**SENIOR STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL:** Look, it's a fundamentally different perspective on what the nature of power is in the 21st century and how you apply American leadership to solve problems. And I would submit to you that that school of thought is outdated. It's simply outdated for the types of problems and the interconnectedness among the problems that we face today. The Secretary elevates development as a core pillar of American power, not because she thinks it's just a nice thing to do. It's because she believes fundamentally that driving economic growth in the developing world has huge impacts for U.S. interests, security and economic.

She drives economic statecraft because she believes that the longevity of American power is fundamentally going to be about a rules-based order that we're protecting that reflects our principles and preferences. She focuses on technology as a core driver of change in the world and as a tool we can use in our diplomacy because literally the biggest geopolitical shift we saw in our four years had a lot to do with technology and civil society and the material conditions of people's lives, that being the Arab Spring.

And she focuses on women because, for as much as some want to say that's a marginal issue, it's hard to see how 50+1 percent of the world and their role in it is anything other than a central factor in progress towards essentially every goal that the United States cares about in the world.

And it's interesting; she maps on basically countries that mistreat their women or exclude their women or marginalize their women and countries that we have problems with --

**QUESTION:** And it's an almost perfect overlap?

**SENIOR STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL:** It's a pretty good overlap. It's a pretty good overlap. And countries that -- whose future success as they kind of chart either a path towards sustained growth or potential disruption, countries like India and China, a lot of whether they make it or don't make it is going to be dependent on how they deal with gender policy in their countries. And you've seen this most poignantly with the gang rape business in India, but you can see it in a thousand other ways.

So I spent the first year here feeling somewhat defensive about this issue --

**QUESTION:** Right, sure.

**SENIOR STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL:** -- because people would come say, "What about real foreign policy, the real stuff, not this marginal stuff?" And it's just been interesting to watch how the titanic shifts in power and the drivers of human progress all lie in the areas that the Secretary is trying to steer American diplomacy toward. And a lot of the traditional things that are the historic metrics by which you judge secretaries of state are still important but are less fundamental to whether the world 50 years from now continues to reflect America's principles, values, preferences, and whether we have more friends and fewer enemies.

And so that's why when I said there are sort three levels of her legacy and the third level is in some ways the most diffuse but the most important, it's that her recognition of that and her practice of diplomacy in that way makes her profoundly different than anyone who came before here, but I think it will make her prophetic, because that's how we're going to continue to lead in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**QUESTION:** And that's what -- I wanted to circle back to that third list of things you talked about because I wondered whether this isn't another way of saying, "How do you effectively project influence and protect American interests in a world of declining relative American power?" I mean, is she basically -- did she basically figure out how to be Secretary of State at a time when the U.S. is not as powerful as it used to be?

**SENIOR STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL:** I don't think she sees it that way. I think she sees it that if we simply apply the same tools of power that we applied before, they weren't going to be as effective. But the United States has unique capacities that are perfectly suited for the world we live in today. We are the only country in the world that can convene and connect countries to solve problems in any meaningful way. We're the only country that has the network of alliances and partnerships and relationships, the global presence, to do that. We're the country that has the technological innovation, the entrepreneurship, principles, and sort of way of doing business that everybody else wants to emulate. If you kind of go down the list of things that the United States has to offer today that can have a profound impact on how other countries both relate to us and work with us to solve problems, it's actually a pretty impressive description of American power.

The problem is it's different from the old days and the old ways that we used to apply power. So I don't think she sees it as declining American power. I think what she sees it as is we've got to seize the things we are good at and leverage them in service of global problem solving with us at the center of the solving. And there's no other country that can do that besides the United States. In many ways, her way of thinking about this decline issue is, okay, name the other country that comes even close to the U.S. or that could step in to fill our shoes in doing the kinds of things that we do. It would be impossible to identify that country.

So I think this is what frustrates her about the decline narrative is that it is a static view rather than a dynamic view of what the application of American power can look like, and that you got a lot of people in the national security community who are resistant to seeing the new tools of American diplomacy as real instruments of power and not just these kind of soft things that are interesting and nice but not particularly relevant. I think the quote about planetary humanism I think is like that is – it just, to me, it kind of smacks of the Flat Earth Society a little bit.