

[Return to search \(/podesta-emails/\)](#)

[View email](#)

[View source](#)

Re: Elizabeth Warren

From: Cheryl . mill s@gmail . com

To: dschweri n@hrcoffi ce. com

Date: 2015-01-08 02:40

Subject: Re: Elizabeth Warren

can anyone say goldberg?

On Wed, Jan 7, 2015 at 11:38 PM, Dan Schweri n

<dschweri n@hrcoffi ce. com>

wrote:

> Dan Gelson, the Warren aide I met with yesterday, emailed about this

> story and said "found the WSJ's write-up if you've seen it to be

> extraordinarily aggressive on their part. She didn't say

anythi ng about
> economi c metri cs (along the lines we di scussed yesterday)
that she hasn' t
> been sayi ng for years, never criti cized the Secretary by
name or even in a
> veiled way, etc. -- they took a lot of liberties with their
i nterpretati on.
> "
>
>
> From: Cheryl Mills <cheryl.mills@gmail.com>
> Date: Wednesday, January 7, 2015 at 11:36 PM
> To: Jake Sullivan <Jake.Sullivan@gmail.com>, Dan
<dschwerin@hrcoffi ce.com>,
> Robby Mook <robbymook@gmail.com>, John Podesta
<john.podesta@gmail.com>,
> Philippe Reines <pi r@hrcoffi ce.com>, Nick Merrill
<nmerrill@hrcoffi ce.com>
> Subj ect: Fwd: FW: Elizabeth Warren
>
>
> ----- Forwarded message -----
> From: Lynn Forester de Rothschild <lynn@elrothschild.com>
> Date: Wed, Jan 7, 2015 at 7:15 PM
> Subj ect: FW: Elizabeth Warren
> To: "Cheryl Mills (cheryl.mills@gmail.com)"
<cheryl.mills@gmail.com>
>
>
>
>
> I think this blog overstates what Warren was doing, but we
need to craft

> the economic message for Hillary so that Warren's common
inaccurate

> conclusions are addressed. Xoxo Lynn

>

>

>

>

> <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2015/01/07/warren-throws-four-punches-at-the-clintons/>

>

>

>

> Sen. *Elizabeth Warren* professes that she is not running
for president,

> but her Wednesday speech to a major labor conference is
loaded with

> not-terribly-veiled references to *Hillary Clinton* and
attacks on *Bill

> Clinton*'s record as president.

>

> The Massachusetts Democrat's prepared remarks to the
AFL-CIO's National

> Summit on Wages in Washington are a lesson in progressive
economic theory.

> In this retelling, landmark free trade deals and banking
deregulation boost

> the fortunes of the wealthy at the expense of the poor and
middle class.

>

> Criticism of the Clintons is threaded throughout Ms.
Warren's remarks.

> Most comes in the form of a liberal critique of Mr.
Clinton's economic

> record, but there is one significant shot at Mrs. Clinton as well.

>

> Of course, Ms. Warren has insisted she isn't running for president but has

> couched it in the present tense, most recently *last month when she

> refused to rule out a run during an interview with NPR*

> <<http://blogs.wsj.com/washington/2014/12/15/elizabeth-warren-again-i-am-not-running-for-president/>>

> .

>

> Washington Wire found at least four instances in Ms. Warren's Wednesday

> speech in which she takes political shots at the Clintons.

>

> *The Wal-Mart

> <<http://online.wsj.com/public/quotes/main.html?type=djn&symbol=WMT>> WMT +1.48%

> <<http://blogs.wsj.com/public/quotes/main.html?type=djn&symbol=WMT?mod=inlineTicker>> dog-whistle*:

> "Corporate profits and GDP are up. But if you work at Wal-Mart, and you are

> paid so little that you still need food stamps to put groceries on the

> table, what does more money in stockholders' pockets and an uptick in GDP

> do for you?"

>

> Wal-Mart is a regular bogeyman for Big Labor, but it is also a

> particularly tough attack for Mrs. Clinton to echo, since she served on the

> retailer's board of directors for six years when her husband was the

> Arkansas governor. The tie was regularly brought up by supporters of Mrs.

> Clinton's opponents during the 2008 presidential primary campaign and

> remains well remembered in Iowa, where *several Democrats raised it

> unprompted during interviews last week*

> <<http://www.wsj.com/articles/top-iowa-democrats-slow-to-rally-around-hillary-clinton-1420418121>>

> .

>

> "Even though they don't exist anymore, her connections to Wal-Mart, those

> don't sit well," said Jennifer Herrington, the Democratic Party chairwoman

> in Page County. "People still talk about it. The sense is that not much has

> really changed."

>

> *Bill Clinton was just as bad as the Republicans*: "Pretty much the whole

> Republican Party - and, if we're going to be honest, too many Democrats -

> talked about the evils of 'big government' and called for deregulation. It

> sounded good, but it was really about tying the hands of regulators and

> turning loose big banks and giant international corporations to do whatever

> they wanted to do."

>

> Part of the Hillary Clinton argument is that her husband's presidency

> presided over the economic growth of the 1990s. But here Ms. Warren takes

> direct aim at Mr. Clinton's record on deregulation and harkens back to his *1996

> State of the Union address and its signature line*

> <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=53091>>, "The era of big

> government is over."

>

> *NAFTA was a bad deal*: "Look at the choices Washington has made, the

> choices that have left America's middle class in a deep hole... The choice to

> sign trade pacts and tax deals that let subsidized manufacturers around the

> globe sell here in America while good American jobs get shipped overseas."

>

> Labor has long been sour on free-trade agreements, and Mr. Obama during

> the 2008 campaign said he would renegotiate it, though that never happened. *Mrs.

> Clinton at the time also said she would seek a better NAFTA deal with

> Canada and Mexico*

> <http://www.wsj.com/news/articles/SB120459602445109371?mod=rss_Politics_And_Policy&mg=reno64-wsj> ,

> but it becomes politically difficult for her to offer substantive critiques

> of her husband's White House record.

>
> *Mr. Clinton wasn't good for the middle class*: "So who got
the increase
> in income over the last 32 years? One hundred percent of it
went to the top
> 1%. All of the new money earned in this economy over the
past generation --
> all that growth in the GDP -- went to the top. All of it."
>
> Here Ms. Warren makes a potent argument that Mr. Clinton -
and by
> association, Mrs. Clinton - had the same results for the
middle class as
> Republican presidents. By tying the records of the Reagan,
Clinton, Obama
> and two Bush administrations together, Ms. Warren paints
herself as the
> outside-the-system crusader her supporters want her to be.
>
>



Top



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>)