Return to search (/podesta-emails/)

View email | View source

Re: Follow up the HRC idea re; foundation

From:jbenenson@bsgco.com

To: gruncom@aol.com

CC: re47@hillaryclinton.com, john.podesta@gmail.com, jpalmieri@hillaryclinton.com,

Jim.Margolis@gmmb.com, bfallon@hillaryclinton.com, kschake@hillaryclinton.com more

Date: 2015-04-30 01:37

Subject: Re: Follow up the HRC idea re; foundation

Agree with Jen.
Also tend to agree with her going before him. Anything other than her taking quid pro quo of the table, included what would say first, won't take questions about her actions off the table.

Joel Benenson
Benenson Strategy Group

On Apr 29, 2015, at 11:15 PM, Mandy Grunwald <gruncom@aol.com<mailto:gruncom@aol.com>> wrote:

Why do you think she needs to do this before WJC?

Mandy Grunwald
Grunwald Communications
202 973-9400

On Apr 29, 2015, at 11:12 PM, Robby Mook <re47@hillaryclinton.com<mailto:re47@hillaryclinton.com>> wrote:

Ditto with John. Would need to be prepared for more...but would be fantastic to limit to one.

On Wed, Apr 29, 2015 at 11:11 PM, John Podesta <john.podesta@gmail.com<mailto:john.podesta@gmail.com>> wrote:

Fine with the proposed way of handling what she says, but hard setting to take only one question.

On Apr 29, 2015 8:02 PM, "Jennifer Palmieri"
<jpalmieri@hillaryclinton.com<mailto:jpalmieri@hillaryclinton.com>> wrote:
First, thanks to all for the marathon session today, I thought we got
a lot of good work done.

Second, I wanted to follow up on HRC idea of doing the video. Having
thought about it and talked to Craig and Maura about it - I don't
think it is good idea for her to do. There aren't great answers and
in many cases not her place to answer them.

But I think it does make sense for her to publicly state that she
never did anything at state to help a donor. Philippe has been a
proponent of this. She could frame it this way:

1) very proud of Clinton foundation work.
2) think people donate to it bc they want to support good works.
3) if anyone did ever give money in hopes of influencing something
State did - they are foolish bc she never did that and never would.
SOS makes life and death decisions and those kinds of political
considerations don't come into play.

At least this way she will have taken off the table any notion that

there was a quid pro quo - even if some donors may have had bad intentions.

If we did this, think we should do before WJC interview airs on Monday. Which may mean that tomorrow is the last chance we have will she will be in front of the press (they wont be at fundraisers but will prob be outside them so she could take a q).

What do others think?
Sent from my iPhone

Top

WL Research Community - user contributed research based on documents published by WikiLeaks.

(https://our.wikileaks.org)

Tor is an encrypted anonymising network that makes it harder to intercept internet communications, or see where communications are coming from or going to.

(https://www.torproject.org/)

Tails is a live operating system, that you can start on almost any computer from a DVD, USB stick, or SD card. It aims at preserving your privacy and anonymity.

(https://tails.boum.org/)

The Courage Foundation is an international organisation that supports those who risk life or liberty to make significant contributions to the historical record.

(https://www.couragefound.org/)

Bitcoin uses peer-to-peer technology to operate with no central authority or banks; managing transactions and the issuing of bitcoins is carried out collectively by the network.

(https://www.bitcoin.org/)

(https://www.facebook.com/wikileaks) (https://twitter.com/wikileaks)