

A Gift to Bin Laden

Obama's "rebuke to the terrorists" is actually what the terrorists have demanded

By Steven J. Allen

Summary: After terrorists attacked Paris, some security experts called for the postponement of the world conference on "climate change" that was to be held in that city a few days later. But President Obama said the conference, and the treaty then being negotiated, would serve as a "rebuke" to the terrorists. Now it's clear that the opposite is true: Global Warming theory is a major component of Islamofascist ideology. Osama bin Laden himself, in a letter "to the American people" left behind when he was killed, called on Americans to conduct "a great revolution . . . to free Barack Husayn [Obama] so he can implement the change you seek . . . to save humanity from the harmful gases that threaten its destiny."

The recent terrorist assault on Brussels was preceded by a related assault on Paris. On November 13, terrorists killed 130 people in a series of coordinated attacks in Paris and its northern suburb, Saint-Denis. The terrorists were from the Islamic State (ISIS), a spinoff of Al Qaeda.

The 2015 U.N. Climate Change Conference, at which officials were to finalize an international agreement on Global Warming, was scheduled to begin in Paris 17 days later. Some suggested postponing the meeting, but President Obama would have none of that: "What a powerful rebuke to the terrorists it will be," he said, "when the world stands as one and shows that we will not be deterred from building a better future for our children."

The conference went forward as planned and, as its final product, produced a world climate reparations program of the sort that had been demanded by Al Qaeda's late founder, Osama bin Laden.

A powerful rebuke to the terrorists, indeed!



In documents he left behind, Osama bin Laden supported a "revolution" to help President Obama fight "climate change," which the terrorist called "a tangible fact."

The root of terror

Some persons in the West claim Global Warming causes terrorism like the Paris attacks. ISIS supporters have a different view, of course. They believe they're fighting for God. They believe that, as a prelude to the ultimate battle between Christians and Muslims, they have re-established the caliphate (a government to which all Muslims owe allegiance, ruled by a successor to, and descendant of, Muhammad), in the region that includes Dabiq—the Islamic counterpart to Armageddon—where a Muslim victory over the Christians will mark the beginning of the end of the world. This idea is so central to ISIS ideology that the organization named its online magazine *Dabiq*.

According to the Left's rhetoric, ISIS supporters are ignorant about their own beliefs; they may think they're Muslims, but they're not, as the President and a former Secretary of State keep claiming. (President Obama: "Now let's make two things clear: ISIL [ISIS] is not Islamic. No religion condones the killing of innocents, and the vast majority of ISIL's victims have been

Muslim. And ISIL is certainly not a state." And Secretary Clinton declared, "Muslims are peaceful and tolerant people and have nothing whatsoever to do with terrorism.")

So, in the view of self-styled Progressives, ISIS supporters are confused about their identity. They just *think* they're fulfilling ancient prophecies and conquering the planet.

Unconfused is Prince Charles who, a few days after the Paris attacks, addressed the issue, as reported by Reuters:

Britain's Prince Charles has pointed to the world's failure to tackle climate change as a root cause of the civil war

April 2016

A Gift to Bin Laden
Page 1

Green Notes
Page 6

in Syria, terrorism and the consequent refugee crisis engulfing Europe. The heir to the British throne is due to give a keynote speech at the opening of a global climate summit in Paris next week where 118 leaders will gather to try to nail down a deal to limit rising greenhouse gas emissions. . . .

Asked in the interview, which Sky [News] said was filmed three weeks ago, whether there was direct link between climate change, conflict and terrorism, Charles said: “Absolutely.” “We never deal with the underlying root cause which regrettably is what we’re doing to our natural environment,” he said, noting that far greater problems lay ahead if climate change was not addressed immediately.

Also unconfused is Senator Bernie Sanders, who brought it up in the debates. From *PolitiFact*:

The Democratic debate in Iowa began with a moment of silence for the victims of the Paris terror attacks before pivoting to a discussion on how to address terrorism.

Bernie Sanders, who vowed to “rid our planet” of ISIS in his opening statement, also said at a previous debate that the greatest threat to national security is climate change. A day after the terrorist attacks, did he, asked moderator John Dickerson, still believe that? “Absolutely. In fact, climate change is directly related to the growth of terrorism,” Sanders said on Nov. 14. “If we do not get our act together and listen

Editor: Steven J. Allen

Publisher: Scott Walter

Address: 1513 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1480

Phone: (202) 483-6900

E-mail: sallen@CapitalResearch.org

Website: CapitalResearch.org

Green Watch is published by Capital Research Center, a non-partisan education and research organization classified by the IRS as a 501(c)(3) public charity. Reprints are available for \$2.50 prepaid to Capital Research Center.

to what the scientists say, you’re gonna see countries all over the world—this is what the CIA says—they’re going to be struggling over limited amounts of water, limited amounts of land to grow their crops, and you’re going to see all kinds of international conflict.”

A day later on CBS’ *Face the Nation*, Sanders doubled down on his statement, elaborating, “When people migrate into cities and they don’t have jobs, there’s going to be a lot more instability, a lot more unemployment, and people will be subject to the types of propaganda that al-Qaida and ISIS are using right now.”

Then there’s one of the Left’s favorite scientists, Bill Nye, who is a “scientist” by virtue of having played “The Science Guy” on a children’s program. (Got questions about dinosaurs? I’m sure Barney is available to answer them.) Here’s a *Huffington Post* report:

President Obama made headlines Monday when he said during his remarks at COP21 that the climate change conference taking place in Paris is an “act of defiance” against terrorists who attacked the city earlier this month. Later on the same day, Bill Nye took that link a step further, explaining to HuffPost Live that the brutality in Paris was “a result of climate change.”

“You can make a very reasonable argument that climate change is not that indirectly related to terrorism,” said Nye, who discusses global warming at length in his new book *Unstoppable*. “This is just the start of things. The more we let [climate change] go on, the more trouble there’s going to be.”

Nye’s reasoning hinges on a water shortage in Syria, which researchers have blamed on climate change. As Nye explained, the shortage has stunted farming and pushed young people to look for work in more densely populated areas.

“Young people have gone to big cities looking for work. There’s not enough work for everybody, so the disaffected youths, as we say—the young people who don’t believe in the system, believe the system has failed, don’t be-

lieve in the economy—are more easily engaged and more easily recruited by terrorist organizations, and then they end up part way around the world in Paris shooting people,” Nye said.

For the record, even many Warmers admit that the change in earth’s temperatures since the Little Ice Age (a period that ended in the first half of the 19th Century) has been too small to cause major disruptions, and that it is impossible to link any current weather patterns to human activity rather than to naturally occurring patterns.

Man-made “climate change” doesn’t cause terrorism. But the idea of catastrophic, man-made climate change gives the terrorists ammunition for their campaign against the relatively free countries of the West.

Resenting the West

Warmism (i.e., “climate change” ideology) is one of the bases for the resentment that fuels anti-American extremism. The idea is that the Western countries, the U.S. in particular, have gotten rich by unfairly exploiting the poor countries; that that exploitation has changed the climate to the poor countries’ detriment; and that the “developing world” is owed reparations by the “developed world.”

That’s why Warmism is part of the school curriculum in countries like the Dominican Republic, South Africa, Vietnam, Kenya, and Mauritius, as well as in self-hating Western countries like France and Germany. Consider this argument by Warmist writer Catherine Rampell in the *Washington Post*:

Take Emmy-Noether-Schule, an 800-student secondary school in east Berlin I visited recently. Educators there consider climate change so pressing that they integrate it into just about every class you can think of (including, when the instructor is so inclined, Latin). About a quarter of the content in the 10th-grade English textbook, for example, is about threats to planet Earth. That means when kids learn to use the conditional mood in English, their grammar exercises rely on sentences like this: “If we don’t do something about global warming, more polar ice will start to melt.”

Likewise, in an 11th-grade geography class dedicated entirely to sustainability, students write poetry about klimawandel (climate change). My favorite couplet, from an ode by student Hannah Carsted: “The water level rises/ The fish are in a crisis.”

The worldwide propaganda campaign by the Warmists has been astonishingly successful. It gives governments in poor countries a ready-made excuse for failing to improve their peoples’ living standards, and justifies their demands for money and other resources from wealthier countries.

Last July, the Islamic Foundation for Ecology and Environmental Sciences tied the issue directly to religion:

Human beings could cause the ending of life on the planet, says a group of Islamic scholars—and countries round the world, particularly the rich ones, must face up to their responsibilities. Climate change, they say, is induced by human beings: “As we are woven into the fabric of the natural world, its gifts are for us to savour—but we have abused these gifts to the extent that climate change is upon us.” The views of the scholars—some of the strongest yet expressed on climate from within the Muslim community—are contained in a draft declaration on climate change to be launched officially at a major Islamic symposium in Istanbul in mid-August. Allah, says the declaration, created the world in *mizan* (balance), but through *fasad* (corruption), human beings have caused climate change, together with a range of negative effects on the environment that include deforestation, the destruction of biodiversity, and pollution of the oceans and of water systems.

Demands for reparations are to be fulfilled through the Green Climate Fund, to which you, as a taxpayer, will “contribute.” Here’s how the fund was described by three environmentalist professors in the Washington newspaper *The Hill*:

This fund will help developing countries build resilience to climate-related disasters and reduce the carbon pollution that drives climate change. Our contribution to the Green Climate

Fund is an investment, and the return is stability for vulnerable countries facing a changing value of climate-related assistance to poor countries. Former President George H.W. Bush negotiated the original United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1992 and created the Global Environment Facility, the first international fund to support climate change assistance to developing countries. Former President George W. Bush, along with other Group of Eight leaders, created the Climate Investment Funds in 2008. The Climate Investment Funds were explicitly intended as the pilot for a larger, future fund, and they are slated to sunset as the Green Climate Fund becomes operational.

Why would there be such widespread, bipartisan support for funding climate-related assistance overseas? Because it is in our national interest. When poor, vulnerable countries pursue climate-resilient growth, they are better able to cope with extreme weather events and experience fewer disasters. And when emerging economies build out more clean energy infrastructure, we all avoid the worst of climate change in the first place. The result is a more secure and stable world, benefiting our nation and all countries.

Prior to the Paris “climate change” summit, the *Washington Times* editorialized:

In December, nearly 200 nations will meet in Paris to complete details of the globalists’ holy grail: the Green Climate Fund, which they expect to collect \$100 billion a year from developed nations by 2020 to help wean the worldwide victims of unrestrained development of fossil fuels. This will be the most successful robbery since the Jesse James gang made life miserable for the railroads of Missouri. . . .

The schemes to punish the purveyors of greenhouse gases from fossil fuel are fraught with fraud. Russia and Ukraine are suspected of selling bogus credits for 600 million tons worth of carbon-dioxide emissions on the European Union Emissions Trading System, according to the Stockholm Environment Institute. Europe’s cap-

and-trade system obligates electric utilities to either reduce their emissions or purchase credits from other producers. Verification of reductions has been lax, enabling companies to falsely claim clean-energy progress and sell their credits. Fraudsters have hacked the EU’s online emissions marketplace, and in 2011 collected \$41 million in undeserved credits.

If Europe’s dodgy carbon taxing scheme provides a juicy target for chicanery, the U.N.’s \$100 billion Green Climate Fund is likely to attract more treasure hunters than seekers of the crown jewels of England. U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has a hard time keeping a straight face dispensing high-minded nonsense to hector nations to chip in.

Foreign aid, it is said, is taking from poor people in rich countries and giving to rich people in poor countries.

CNS News reported on the fund:

The GCF is the core of a 2009 agreement by Obama and other leaders to raise—from 2020 onwards—\$100 billion each year from public and private sources to help developing countries deal with climate change. As of early November, 38 countries have pledged a total of \$10.2 billion for the GCF, with Obama’s pledge of \$3 billion accounting for 29 percent of the total. The next biggest pledges have come from Japan (\$1.5 bn), Britain (\$1.2 bn) and Germany (\$1.003 bn). Broader climate finance mobilized from public and private sources so far has been estimated at \$62 billion, according to a recent OECD study. The U.N. Environmental Program has argued that \$100 billion a year will not be nearly enough to help the world to adapt to global warming.

At least we can count on those tight-fisted Republicans to block the fund. No, not really.

In a victory for the Obama administration, the spending package released by congressional leaders on Wednesday [December 16, 2015] won’t block American financial contributions to an international climate fund for poorer nations.

The bill, greens and Democrats say, doesn't explicitly appropriate funding for President Obama's pledged contribution to the Green Climate Fund (GCF). But since the legislation doesn't formally block money for the GCF either, Obama is expected to be able to use current discretionary funding streams to send American money to it. "Based on what we have reviewed so far, there are no restrictions on our ability to make good on the president's pledge to contribute to the Green Climate Fund," White House press secretary Josh Earnest said on Wednesday.

The GFC is a pot of public and private money designed to help poorer nations prepare for climate change. Obama pledged last year to spend \$3 billion on the fund by 2020, and he asked Congress to appropriate up to \$500 million for it in 2016.

Terrorists' wish list

What, you may ask, does this have to do with Osama bin Laden? Just this sort of reparations program was a major goal of the Al Qaeda founder, as he stated clearly and repeatedly in the months before his death.

Bin Laden, killed by U.S. Special Forces during a raid on his compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan, left behind a letter "to the American people," calling on Americans to launch "a great revolution" that would give President Obama the wherewithal to save humanity from Global Warming.

It would be "a great revolution for freedom: not to free Iraq from Saddam Hussein but to free the White House and to free Barack Husayn so he can implement the change you seek. It does not only include improvement of your economic situation and ensure your security, but more importantly, helps him in making a rational decision to save humanity from the harmful gases that threaten its destiny." ("Husayn" is an alternate spelling of the President's middle name, Hussein.)

In January 2010, bin Laden declared:

This is a message to the whole world about those who cause climate change and its dangers—intentionally or unintentionally—and what we must do.

Talk of climate change isn't extrava-

gant speculation: it is a tangible fact which is not diminished by its being muddled by some greedy heads of major corporations. The effects of global warming have spread to all continents of the world. Drought, desertification and sands are advancing on one front, while on another front, torrential floods and huge storms the likes of which only used to be seen once every few decades now reoccur every few years. That's in addition to the islands which are quietly and calmly sinking under the waters of the oceans. And the pattern is accelerating, and reports by organizations dealing with the affairs of displaced people estimate the displacement of as many as a billion humans during the next four decades as a result of this.

I am not about to talk here about partial solutions which merely lessen the harmful effects of global warming. Rather, I am going to talk about looking for a solution to the crisis at its roots. In front of the world are the records which show the huge numbers of victims of climate change, some of whom died of hunger and others of whom died of drowning.

In the same year in which [James E.] Hansen, NASA's senior expert, confirmed the seriousness of global warming, 140,000 died and 24 million were displaced in floods in Bangladesh alone; and the caravan of victims of climate change hasn't stopped since, so those behind it must be identified and a way of dealing with them specified. All industrialized countries, especially the major ones, bear responsibility for the global warming crisis, except that most of them have called on each other to commit to the Kyoto Protocol and have agreed to reduce emissions of harmful gases. However, Bush Junior—and prior to him, Congress—rejected this agreement in order to please the major corporations. . . .

Hansen spoke out and warned Americans about the seriousness of global warming in 1988, but they didn't respond to him. As for conferences, the Kyoto conference [on climate change] took place at the end of the last century, but they didn't respond to it. And as

for demonstrations, not even the largest of them—much less the smaller ones—were able to deter them from their greed and tyranny.

. . . The policies of the world today are not being steered with the power of superior intellects to serve the interest of the people; but rather, with the power of the motivation and greed of oil-robbers and warmongers, the beasts of predatory capitalism. Noam Chomsky was right when he pointed to a similarity between American policies and the policies of Mafia gangs. So they are the real terrorists, and drastic and decisive solutions are required to restrain and subdue them: restrain them from their sin and subdue their savagery . . .

Bin Laden followed up nine months later with a tape in which he complained about food shortages, particularly in Muslim countries, caused by Global Warming. Noting that there were now more victims of climate change than of war, he called for a "huge transformation" in the delivery of relief. CNN reported on bin Laden's remarks that he "said the effects of climate change need to be studied in populated areas near rivers and valleys in Muslim nations, and cited what happened recently when flooding hit the Saudi city of Jeddah. He mentioned the need for other projects to tackle famine, poverty, and disaster relief."

In response to bin Laden's remarks, the *Washington Times* editorialized:

[Bin Laden said] "All of the industrialized countries, especially the big ones, bear responsibility for the global-warming crisis." That line easily could have been written by Al Gore.

In 2007, bin Laden warned that "all of mankind is in danger because of the global warming resulting to a large degree from the emissions of the factories of the major corporations," and that this was causing "the death and displacement of millions of human beings because of that, especially in Africa." As early as 2002, in a letter to the American people, bin Laden explained that one of the reasons he was waging war on the United States was that Americans "have destroyed nature with your industrial waste and

gases more than any other nation in history." In other words, the World Trade Center's Twin Towers were brought down because America lacked adequate carbon emission controls.

According to documents recovered from his hideout in Abbottabad, Pakistan, where he was killed, bin Laden remained interested in the issue until his last days, admonishing a deputy to pay more attention to how climate change might affect Somalia. One message included this: "Attached is a report about climate change, especially the floods in Pakistan. Please send to Al-Jazeera." That's the left-wing, Qatar-backed news service.

Commenting on bin Laden's position on the climate change issue, *Foreign Affairs* magazine managed to work in insults at both Global Warming skeptics and so-called fundamentalists (a term that leftists use as a general insult directed at religious people without regard to the actual definition of the term): "It may seem surprising that one of the most extreme fundamentalist groups in the world is more open minded about science than some in the United States, but it is not actually all that shocking, considering that for centuries, the Islamic world was a wellspring of scientific and technological achievement." [That's not actually true. As professor Rodney Stark of Baylor University wrote, "the sophisticated culture so often attributed to Muslims (more often referred to as 'Arabic' culture) was actually the culture of the conquered people—the Judeo-Christian Greek culture of Byzantium, the remarkable learning of heretical Christian groups such as the Copts and the Nestorians, extensive knowledge from Zoroastrian (Mazdean) Persia, and the great mathematical achievements of the Hindus. . . . For example, the 'earliest scientific book in the language of Islam' was a 'treatise on medicine by a Syrian Christian priest in Alexandria, translated into Arabic by a Persian Jewish physician.'"]

In a similar vein to the *Foreign Affairs* comments, blogger Scott Sutton posted last May that bin Laden's comments "sound like progressive lines of thought on climate change—or at least in line with scientific consensus. One might think that those [would be] positions held by, say, the chairman of the U.S. Senate Environment

and Public Works Committee," who was then Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-Okla.). "Could it be that a murderous terrorist clinging to fundamentalist religious ideals was more progressive when it came to climate change than the U.S. senator that heads the Environment and Public Works Committee?"

Another blogger, Chris Graham: "Your average Republican will tell you climate change is bunk. Osama bin Laden, otherwise stuck in the sixth century, conceded the 21st century reality. . . . Bin Laden wasn't trying to win election in Fox News America."

In one document discovered after bin Laden's death, a letter marking Ramadan, he referred to "climate changes" as a judgment from Allah. "The [Western] secularists maintain that these are natural disasters we must confront. In other words, they are saying, we are able to stand up to Allah and confront His judgment . . ."

Bin Laden spoke of the obligation of the West and of Muslim countries to come to the aid of the poor harmed by the changes, among which he included groundwater depletion. Countries could divert funds from their defense budgets to climate change disaster relief, he mused. And he suggested the creation of "a distinct relief organization," an arm of Al Qaeda to distribute aid.

Indeed, as noted by VICE News:

Bin Laden's concern with climate change in the "Islamic World" tracks a stark reality: Many of the nations that are most vulnerable to a warming world are also home to huge Muslim populations, according to the Notre Dame Global Adaptation Index (ND-GAIN). The index not only looks at nations' risk of natural disaster, but also their "readiness to actually take on new investments and [their] readiness to adapt" to climate change, says Joyce Coffee, a managing director at ND-GAIN.

"The index points out relative risk, as well as opportunity," Joyce told VICE News. She added that the degree of climate exposure for each nation is based on their economic, social, and governmental stability, in addition to their geography. Flood-prone, majority Muslim nations like Pakistan and

Bangladesh are nearer to the bottom of the ND-GAIN. Bin Laden's references to flooding in Pakistan were a response to destructive monsoons in 2010, which the World Meteorological Organization attributed to higher temperatures in the Atlantic Ocean. . . .

Bin Laden wrote that his hypothetical relief organization should study how flood-prone Muslim communities could adapt.

Yemen, Sudan, and Chad, three nations at the bottom of the ND-GAIN's list—with Chad dead last among countries where data was available—were also explicitly mentioned by bin Laden. All three currently face some potent mix of cataclysmic drought, water shortages, famine, population increase, and civil societies under collapse from war and faltering economies.

The implication is that any worldwide "climate change relief" effort would benefit Muslim nations disproportionately. Luckily, we U.S. taxpayers will be on the hook for that Green Climate Fund, so that's taken care of.

You're welcome, Osama.

Dr. Steven J. Allen (JD, PhD) is editor of Green Watch.

GW

The Capital Research Center is a watchdog over politicians, bureaucrats, and special interests in Washington, D.C., and in all 50 states.

Please consider contributing to CRC, to help us in our important work.

And please remember CRC in your will and estate planning.

**Scott Walter
President**

GreenNotes

Officials at the **Justice Department** have discussed the possibility of pursuing civil actions against those who question **Obama administration** claims on “climate change,” **U.S. Attorney General Loretta Lynch** revealed at a **Senate Judiciary Committee** hearing last month. Egged on by anti-science **Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse** (D-R.I.), Lynch said she had “referred it to the **FBI** to consider whether or not it meets the criteria for which” federal law enforcement could take action.

Lynch is not the only official suggesting governmental power be used to silence opposition. A coalition of 17 attorneys general who call themselves “**AGs United for Clean Power**” has threatened to go after persons they denigrate as “deniers.” The AG group includes 15 state attorneys general (**California, Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington** state), plus the AGs of the **District of Columbia** and the **Virgin Islands**. Standing next to New York AG **Eric Schneiderman** throughout the press conference announcing the coalition: **Al Gore**.

Global Warming can't come fast enough for some people. According to the medical journal **The Lancet**, half of one percent of deaths worldwide result from heat (heat stroke, dehydration, cardiac deaths, etc.), while about 14 times as many deaths worldwide (seven percent) are related to cold (hypothermia, increased blood pressure from low temperatures, etc.). In the U.S., about 9,000 die from heat each year and 144,000 from cold—a ratio of 16 to 1.

Warren Buffett, an Obama supporter who favors administration policy on the ground that Global Warming fears *might* be justified, wrote his shareholders that “Up to now, climate change has not produced more frequent nor more costly hurricanes nor other weather-related events covered by insurance. . . . As a citizen, you may understandably find climate change keeping you up nights. As a homeowner in a low-lying area, you may wish to consider moving. But when you are thinking only as a shareholder of a major insurer, climate change should not be on your list of worries.”

“According to a new study, scientists’ claims that coral reefs are doomed by ocean acidification are overplayed,” **Melanie Phillips** noted in the **Times of London**. “An ‘inherent bias’ in scientific journals, says the editor of **ICES Journal of Marine Science**, has excluded research showing marine creatures are not being damaged. Instead, he says, many studies have used flawed methods by subjecting such creatures to sudden increases in carbon dioxide that would never happen in real life.”

This problem of bias goes far beyond a single study. In fact, the credibility of published scientific studies is collapsing. Phillips wrote: “Psychology, neuroscience, physics and other scientific areas have been convulsed by revelations of dodgy research. **Richard Horton**, editor-in-chief of **The Lancet**, has written bleakly: ‘The case against science is straightforward: much of the scientific literature, perhaps half, may simply be untrue.’” One reason is that cash-strapped universities, competing for money and talent, exert huge pressure on academics to publish more and more to meet the box-ticking criteria set by grant-funding bodies. Corners are being cut and mistakes being made. . . . In 1998 **Fiona Godlee**, editor of the **British Medical Journal**, sent an article containing eight deliberate mistakes to more than 200 of the **BMJ**'s regular reviewers. Not one picked out all the mistakes. On average, they reported fewer than two; some did not spot any. . . . The cornerstone of scientific authority rests on the notion that replicating an experiment will produce the same result. If replication fails, the research is deemed flawed. . . . Yet an official at **America's National Institutes of Health** has said researchers would find it hard to reproduce at least three-quarters of all published biomedical findings. A 2005 study by **John Ioannidis**, an epidemiologist at **Stanford University**, said the majority of published research findings were probably false.”

On a lighter note: An April 4 article in the **Washington Post** detailed the Obama administration's latest claims on Global Warming: “More deaths from extreme heat. Longer allergy seasons. Increasingly polluted air and water. Diseases transmitted by mosquitoes and ticks spreading farther and faster. Those are among the health risks that could be exacerbated by global warming in coming decades, the Obama administration warned in a new report Monday. The study, more than 300 pages long and several years in the making, focuses on what the **White House** has described as one of the gravest threats to the nation: major health problems associated with climate change . . . the potential for worsening air quality to trigger thousands more premature deaths from respiratory problems . . . an uptick in annual deaths from crushing heat waves . . . mental health problems that can result from extreme weather events such as hurricanes and floods . . . the fact that rising carbon dioxide in the atmosphere can lower the nutritional value of some crops.” And if that's not enough to scare you, there's this: “While every American could be affected, administration officials said Monday, the brunt of the harm is most likely to fall disproportionately on the most vulnerable populations, such as pregnant women, children, the poor, the elderly, minorities, immigrants and people with disabilities.” The article appeared three days too late to be an **April Fools'** joke, and, as far as we can determine, was not *meant* to be funny.