

From: Jake Sullivan <[redacted]> on behalf of Jake Sullivan
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 9:20 PM
To: Schwerin, Daniel B
Cc: Sullivan, Jacob J
Subject: Re: Steve Mull comments on Iran section

RELEASE IN PART
B5, B6

B6

that sounds like the right approach.

On Fri, Mar 19, 2010 at 9:12 PM, Schwerin, Daniel B <SchwerinDB@state.gov> wrote:

Almost ready on new draft. [redacted] Maybe when I send you can forward to Burns and ask for his comments.

B5

From: Jake Sullivan [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 9:07 PM
To: Schwerin, Daniel B
Cc: Sullivan, Jacob J
Subject: Re: Steve Mull comments on Iran section

B6

hard to say. i think you should ask bill burns what he thinks.

On Fri, Mar 19, 2010 at 8:06 PM, Schwerin, Daniel B <SchwerinDB@state.gov> wrote:

Did you look through this? [redacted]

B5

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

From: Schwerin, Daniel B

Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 6:05 PM

To: 'Jake.Sullivan@[redacted]'; 'huma@clintonemail.com'

Subject: Steve Mull comments on Iran section

B6

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

From: Mull, Stephen D

Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 6:03 PM

To: Schwerin, Daniel B

Subject: FW: AIPAC draft -- v3

Hi Dan, with apologies for the delay, here are my mark ups of the Iran section. I don't envy you the challenge of drafting this speech.

B5

I've also suggested a few other tweaks in the text to clarify some things, and have added some language in the last para of the Iran section to address Jack's excellent point.

Please let me know if you need more.

Steve

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

From: Schwerin, Daniel B

Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 2:43 PM

To: Mull, Stephen D

Subject: FW: AIPAC draft -- v3

Steve, am eager to hear your thoughts on this draft. Also, Jack Lew just sent me this question about the Iran section:

B5

What are your thoughts on how best to address?

Thanks

Dan