

RELEASE IN PART  
B5,B6

**From:** Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 10, 2009 8:05 PM  
**To:** H  
**Subject:** Fw: Broder cover story in Sunday NYT

**From:** Todd Stern [redacted]  
**To:** Sullivan, Jacob J; Abedin, Huma; Mills, Cheryl D  
**Cc:** Stern, Todd D (S/SECC); 'Todd Stern' [redacted]  
**Sent:** Mon Aug 10 18:40:42 2009  
**Subject:** Broder cover story in Sunday NYT

The Sunday *NYT* led with an excellent piece about the national security threat posed by climate change, as analyzed by Pentagon and intelligence experts. The draft email below is something I am planning to send to key people [redacted] to try to spur them to seize this opportunity to drive what I think could be a potentially game-changing message with game-changing messengers.

This is something that HRC should be very interested in, since she pushed for this kind of analysis as a Senator. Here's what Broder says in his article about that:

"The Department of Defense's assessment of the security issue came about after prodding by Congress to include climate issues in its strategic plans – specifically, in 2008 budget authorizations by Hillary Rodham Clinton and John W. Warner, then senators."

Here's text of the email I'm going to send today:

- I think that the lead story by Jon Broder in the Sunday *New York Times* (Aug. 9) presents a game changing opportunity with respect to the argument we put forward for the Waxman-Markey bill and ultimately for any international agreement that we might conclude.
- So far, our argument for energy/climate legislation has basically had three main elements – green jobs and growth; independence from foreign oil; and averting the dangers of climate change. But the first has been by far the dominant chord, while relatively little is said about climate change.
- I have thought for some time that we need to be pressing a companion argument – that the status quo is simply not sustainable (in light of the manifest dangers of climate change). In effect, that those who oppose the bill must be driven to say what they would do instead, rather than being free to attack as if simply doing nothing – maintaining the status quo – were sustainable.
- The *NYT* article provides an opening to deliver that message in a far more compelling way, with compelling messengers. What it says, quite clearly, is that the Pentagon and intelligence agencies are now recognizing that climate change represents a serious national security threat. The first two sentences make the case:
  - "The changing global climate will pose profound strategic challenges to the United States in coming decades, raising the prospect of military intervention to deal with the effects of violent storms, drought, mass migration and pandemics, military and intelligence analysts say. Such climate-induced crises could

topple governments, feed terrorist movements or destabilize entire regions, say the analysts, experts at the Pentagon and intelligence agencies who for the first time are taking a serious look at the national security implications of climate change.”

And again:

“An exercise at the National Defense University...last December explored the potential impact of a flood in Bangladesh that sent hundreds of thousands of refugees streaming into neighboring India, touching off religious conflict, the spread of contagious diseases and vast damage to infrastructure. ‘It gets real complicated real quickly’, said Amanda J. Dory, a deputy assistant secretary of defense for strategy...”

- I understand the hesitation about making the pure environmental argument in light of polling research. But it seems to me to change the game if the people saying that we have a serious climate change problem that demands action now are leaders of our military and intelligence establishments, warning that a failure to act is going to endanger American national security. This is like the old EF Hutton campaign: when leaders like this talk (and testify, etc.) people will listen in a completely different way – assuming we do it right, and manage a sustained effort that goes all the way up to the President.
- In my view this is an opportunity that we should seize.
- One last separate point: I think the other note that we need to strike much harder, when the time is right, is that we will go full speed ahead through the EPA if Congress refuses to act. The message should be that this is not at all what we want to do, but we’ll do it if Congress leaves us no choice, because the problem is just too serious to permit inaction. To quote a moderate Senator on our side whom I was talking with about a month ago: if the choice is between a bill and nothing, the bill will fail; if the choice is between the bill and something worse from EPA, the bill might succeed.

Hopefully, you can show this note to HRC. Many thanks guys. Hope you get a little rest soon!