ORIGINAL PAPER

DOI: 10.26794/2220-6469-2025-19-3-17-26
UDC 669.1.012.7'313(045)
JEL Q54

CC BY 4.0

Donald Trump's Climate Wars

S.A. Roginko, S.N. Silvestrov
[a] Institute of Europe, RAS, Moscow, Russian Federation;
[a,b] Financial University under the Government of Russian Federation, Moscow, Russian Federation

ABSTRACT

Relevance. The paper analyses the initiatives of the new US administration on the US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and the revision of national climate policy. **Method.** The authors examine the main decisions of the Trump administration and unveils the impact of these decisions on the positions of the leading players in global climate policy. **Results.** Fundamentally, new issues have been identified, such as the dismantling of structures and initiatives that ensured the climate policy of the previous administration, the systemic impact on all components of the ESG agenda, and the termination of all US foreign policy initiatives and climate programs. **Scientific novelty.** A forecast is given of the possible directions of the greatest activity of the United States, tied to the climate agenda and recommendations have been developed on Russia's position in the field of climate diplomacy in the context of recent changes in US climate policy.

Keywords: greenhouse gas emissions; climate policy; Paris Agreement; existential threat; climate agenda; institutional and legal basis; ESG-agenda; United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

For citation: **Roginko S.A., Silvestrov S.N. Donald Trump's climate wars. *The World of the New Economy*. 2025;19(3):17-26. DOI: 10.26794/2220-6469-2025-19-3-17-26**

© Roginko S.A., Silvestrov S.N., 2025

The repeated US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, as well as Donald Trump's second term in office, and his decision to pursue the policy aimed to develop the oil sector at the expense of green energy were easily predictable political events. Thus, the newly elected president lived up to expectations: his statement 'Drill, baby, drill!' has become a meme, and immediately afterwards, the share prices of leading oilfield services companies Schlumberger Ltd and Halliburton Company rocketed to new highs [1].

Although Trump's political maneuver largely resembles his withdrawal from the Paris Agreement during his first presidency, there is no complete analogy between these situations in 2017 and 2025: they are just worlds apart.

The first and foremost reason is the following: the White House has to operate in an extremely toxic environment generated by the Biden administration. During the latter's presidency, global climate change was declared an existential threat, and the climate agenda was positioned at the forefront of the US domestic and foreign policy and security as well, it has received ultra-high status and priority compared to other areas of US administration activity. This priority status was reinforced by appropriate organisational and managerial decisions: the entire state apparatus was thoroughly so to say "permeated" with climate-related vertical and horizontal power structures, as well as the climate-related functions of existing structures and new formations, including methods of coordinating the activity of departments.

American Climatic Jaggernaut

At the same time, two independent entities were set up to coordinate domestic and foreign climate policy. The first one was operating with the newly established "superstructure" of the Climate Policy Office. The head of the second entity is the Special Presidential Envoy for Climate John Kerry, a key player who has a whole staff of employees in the White House, however, actually, the support was provided by the National Security Council with its long-established channels and procedures for coordinating specialised agencies.

Not surprisingly, the former Secretary of State John Kerry took this position: he is well known for his status and political experience, as well as for his strong commitment. Back in 2019, he launched the World War Zero coalition, which attracted many politicians and media personalities, such as Bill Clinton, Jimmy Carter, Madeleine Albright, Arnold Schwarzenegger, Sting, Leonardo DiCaprio and other celebrities. The mission of this coalition was to combat the global climate change, and the method was the mass climate agenda indoctrination of activists all over the world.

The concept of a "global war on climate" has mirrored in the style and content of decisions taken by the Biden administration, as well as in the composition of the departments, which included all the security agencies: the US National Intelligence Agency, the Defense Department, the Committee of Joint Chiefs of Staff and the US Department of Homeland Security.

As to the US foreign policy related to the global climate change, the wording of Biden's executive order was unambiguous: "Climate change is the central component of the US foreign policy and national security".[1] Specifically, it was mandatory that federal departments and agencies engaged in international activities were required to submit their respective strategies and plans on this subject to the President.

As we can judge, the aforementioned strategy was put into practice for specific purposes unrelated to the preservation of the planet. In this particular instance, the United States mainly focused on the control over the global economy, taking no interest in the strategy of national governments, including the administration of development priorities, regulatory frameworks, norms and rules of corporate conduct and governance. This also includes the ESG-DEI[2] bundle of mechanisms.

How was this supposed to be possible? The programme-targeted management approach of the USA was implemented. Besides, as a foundation, they used the principles outlined in the US International Climate Finance Plan.[3] All departments involved in the US foreign policy and finance were supposed to participate. In particular, the State Department was required

---

[1] URL: https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/27/executive-order-on-tacklingthe-climate-crisis-at-home-and-abroad/); (https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/administration/seniorleadership/brian-deese

[2] Environmental, Social, Governance & Diversity, Equity, Inclusion.

[3] URL: https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/U.S.-International-Climate-Finance-Plan-4.22.21-Updated-Spacing.pdf

to "leverage its significant diplomatic resources and foreign assistance to obtain a greater support from governments and civil society leaders, private sector representatives, and other stakeholders",[4] as well as to "focus on the effective implementation of the Paris Agreement". The primary objective of the strategy was to establish a universal, global vector for "decarbonisation and conservation of global warming within the limit of 1.5 °C".[5]

There is a strikingly remarkable discrepancy between the stated global warming limit (1.5 °C) and the goals of the Paris Agreement, which set the limit at 2 °C. This is evidently a manipulative tactic employed from the repertoire of climate alarmism: it is used to reinforce pressure on nations to relinquish organic fuels. This assertion is confirmed by the document, which enlists the international bureaucratic structures with which the State Department is obliged to collaborate, special focus is on the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) and the International Energy Agency, well known as preeminent global advocates for renewable energy.

A particular emphasis was focused on the staffing project: the State Department was instructed to "expand diplomatic capacity and expertise in the field of climate change, including the creation of new climate-related positions in for this US embassies".[6] The plan also envisaged a comprehensive ideological indoctrination in the spirit of climate alarmism: all foreign policy officials indiscriminately were to undergo special training. The State Department received significant resources allocated to work with "employees engaged in targeted diplomatic interaction".[7] The intended meaning of this explicit terminology is quite apparent.

It is a well-known truth: "Warfare needs three fundamental elements: money, money and, once again, money". Consequently, the initiative of the Biden's administration received unprecedented financial support for the so-called "the zero world war". In accordance with documents, this involved "participation of over twenty US agencies, each with distinct instruments, mandates, and competencies. Enhancing their coordination will be imperative to ensure that the United States optimises its resource to make the objective realistic of achieving net-zero emissions by 2050 and maintaining warming limit below 1.5 °C".[8]

Global Climatic Dictatorship

The United States established its first most important instruments of global financial influence: international development banks (the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, etc.). As it was declared, the main task for them was to restructure their policies to the climate priorities of the Biden administration. The US Treasury was envisaged to instruct the executive directors of multilateral development banks in which the United States is a shareholder to ensure financial support of the campaign against climate change in partnership with other shareholders. In this regard, the executive directors were supposed to encourage the adoption of more ambitious targets in this area, as well as to terminate formally financial support for the use of carbon-intensive energy sources based on fossil fuels at the international level.[9]

The global struggle against climate change necessitates the support for developing countries as they endeavour to fulfill and enhance their existing commitments in this field, provide the integration of reductions of greenhouse gas emission and foster climate change resilience into the long-term strategic frameworks. However, in view that the commitments undertaken by developing countries do not encompass emission reductions, this suggests a potential for a covert revision of the fundamental principles of the Paris Agreement (as was evidenced by the absence of temperature limits). Concurrently, preparatory measures for the alteration of commitments were authorised to the relevant parties within the respective countries, using climate finance as a decoy. Evidently, these actions were in line with the interests of the USA.

It is equally important the pivotal role of the US Agency for International Development (USAID) in

[4] URL: https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/U.S.-International-Climate-Finance-Plan-4.22.21-Updated-Spacing.pdf

[5] Ibid.

[6] URL: https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/U.S.-International-Climate-Finance-Plan-4.22.21-Updated-Spacing.pdf

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

promoting American interests on the global arena. The Agency is responsible for more than half of all US foreign aid, the amount that is the most substantial in absolute monetary terms on a global scale. The functionality of this "soft power" instrument and the US influence of foreign policy has undergone a comprehensive "reprogramming" to align with the objectives of the climate agenda. The new strategy required that the Agency incorporate climate priorities into all its programmes, encourage other countries to adapt to climate change and to adopt transition to renewable energy sources. To achieve these objectives, the budget of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) was strongly increased and additional personnel was hired. The anticipated outcome of such pressure is that sovereign countries make more ambitious emission reduction commitments.

Thus, by 2023, the budget of the Agency had reached 43 billion USD, so, it shoulders the financial activity of the Biden administration related to foreign climate policy. USAID spent enormous amounts of money to recruit allies, primarily from among small developing countries to secure the requisite votes in the context of global climate negotiations within the framework of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement. It deployed arger-scale training and grant programmes to directly impact on the climate policies of countries worldwide, and generate a properly indoctrinated "human asset" among the leadership of the state apparatus and relevant climate non-governmental organisations.

USAID did not end up with these goals expanding the list of objectives and aiming to restructure global finance the way that would align it with the climate policy objectives of the Democratic Party. For this strategy, they launched a set of programmes and structures, namely:

- The USAID Climate Finance Investment Network for climate-related projects;
- The USAID Adaptation Financing Window;
- The USAID Climate Finance Development Accelerator;
- The Amazon Gender Equality Fund for Climate Change.

The ambitious set of goals for these structures included in particular a significant investment of 250 million USD in the USAID Climate Finance Accelerator, with the objective of attracting 2.5 billion USD in public and private climate investments by the year 2030. The overall goal of the Agency was to mobilise 150 billion USD to "combat climate change" by the year 2030.[10]

The US International Development Finance Corporation (DFC) was another financial pillar of Biden's foreign climate policy. The initiative was launched during Trump's inaugural term as the US president, when he expressed concern regarding the magnitude of Chinese investment on an international scale and criticised the obvious inability of US finance institutions to effectively compete with Chinese activities. The Corporation was designed originally as a risk management instrument for development initiatives of private sector-led companies. However, the Biden administration redeployed it towards alternative objectives. Thus, by 2023, the US international plan of financing the policy against climate change stipulated its necessity of increasing the share of climate-related investments to a minimum one third of the total.[11]

Trump Strikes Back

The Trump administration intends to abolish and completely undermine institutional and legal basis of the entire deeply layered structure of "climate bureaucracy" built by Biden's decrees. As many expected, Trump signed an Executive Order on the US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement in the first day of his presidency. In his inaugural address, he promised that he shut down Biden's "Green New Deal". Besides, he canceled the US International Finance Plan on Climate Change.

Under the influence of Elon Musk, Trump also took an unprecedented measure: the dissolution of USAID. Apparently, he understood that the process of transformation of the US "soft power" instrument into a tool of the climate lobby had gone too far.

In addition to that, the US Ambassador to the United Nations received the presidential order to promptly send an official document and notify the UN Secretary-General about the US withdrawal from the Paris

---

[10] URL: https://www.climatelinks.org/sites/default/files/asset/document/2024–10/Climate%20Finance%20Partnerships.pdf

[11] URL: https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/U.S.-International-Climate-Finance-Plan-22.21-Updated-Spacing.pdf.

Agreement, as well as from any agreement, pact or similar commitments made in accordance with The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The order also declared the withdrawal from the Agreement would come into force straight away upon notification.

Besides, the order terminated or cancelled any intended financial commitment made by the USA under the UNFCCC, although it was not announced any withdrawal from the UNFCCC.

Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement also means that the United States breaks its promise to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 50–52 per cent by the end of the decade compared to the level of the year 2005. In addition, Trump promised to cancel a few federal measures aimed to fulfill the obligations specified in the Agreement. He commented the issue that thus, the United States "will save over a trillion dollars."

Thus, President Trump avoids his unlucky experience of 2017. In accordance with the regulations, a request for withdrawal from the Paris Agreement cannot be submitted earlier than three years after the date of its entry into force (November 4, 2016). One more year needs to be accounted to this period for granting approval to the request. As a result, the USA formally withdrew from the Agreement on November 4, 2020, the day after the presidential election won by Joseph Biden.

This ambiguous situation enabled many US states and municipal authorities to disregard directives of the federal government and wage their own climate policies, including their own regulations of greenhouse gas emissions. Specifically, in 2017, thirty states and many US cities preserved their loyalty to the objectives of the Paris Agreement.

This time, Trump is determined to prevent such a self-opposition, besides the current situation is significantly much more favourable for the new administration. The three-year period has passed long enough since the Agreement came into force. The only remaining formal requirement in Article 28 stipulates that any withdrawal shall take effect one year after the date the depositary received the notification. However, Trump has actually ignored this regulation when he declared that the United States would withdraw from the Agreement right away upon sending the aforementioned notification.

ESG In Question

However, the issue has become more comprehensive, in view of the role of the climate agenda for the state and in business, including the ESG format, for which it has become a backbone in current years alongside the DEI ideology. The ESG principles, which combine climate dogmatism with the dictatorship of minorities, have become the ideal tool for the "deep state" to control the entire corporate world. This situation does not obviously fit well with President Trump's declared "common sense revolution", which implies a return to the traditional role of the state.

The nexus of ESG-DEI has completely saturated global business, instilling it with its rules and regulations, so that confronting such deeply layered entities seems to be a very difficult challenge. However, without resolution of this issue, the US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement will be taken on an international scale as a pointless gesture, and Trump's policies will be assessed as a number of declarations, which lack effectiveness.

Another problem is that in current years the universally acknowledged 'trendsetter' in the ESG agenda in the corporate world has been the mega-holding company BlackRock. The latter has supplied a biased personnel to Biden's cabinet and the US government in accordance with the traditional American practice of "revolving doors" (rotation of executives between public sector and private sector roles). BlackRock representatives have taken key roles in the Biden administration, and they operated there not just as lobbyists, but as influential figures in shaping rules and parameters of the game in so-called "climate cabinet".

The ESG agenda adopted by the holding company has allowed establishing a notable presence in global politics: it has become the primary consultant of the European Commission on the integration of ESG issues within the framework of financial regulations. In fact, this arrangement provided BlackRock a dominant controlling position within the European financial system, as the holding corporation was entrusted with the responsibility to administer its restructuring in accordance with ESG priorities.

The company exercised its many-tentacle tactics on government policy and directly made an influence on corporate strategy through its role in and over the head of the American government. In conjunction with other mega-holdings, including Vanguard and State Street, it initiated the involvement of US industrial companies in climate initiatives such as Climate Action 100+ and the Net Zero Asset Managers Initiative, whose objectives were far from compatible with the interests of the real sector.

This contradicted Trump's established priorities, so he made an online speech of European ESG regulation at the Davos Forum on January 23, 2025. Not by chance, Trump's criticism of the European bureaucratic regulations was orchestrated by a pertinent remark of another US participant of the online panel discussion in Davos — Stephen A. Schwarzman, Chairman, CEO and Co-Founder of Blackstone: "A lot of the European business people have expressed enormous frustration with the regulatory regime in the EU".[12]

President Trump criticised European realities and then presented his ultimatums. In March 2025, the US embassy in Paris dispatched correspondence to a group of French companies, requiring their immediate cessation of their DEI policies. In March 2025, the US embassy dispatched correspondence to a group of French companies, demanding the immediate cessation of their DEI policies. The issue was starkly challenged: the entities were required to terminate immediately their DEI programmes, otherwise they would be removed from the federal government's list of suppliers, facing the prospect of non-payment even for existing contracts. The companies were requested to complete a designated form and confirm their adherence to the provisions of US law. If they agree, the US administration would enable the transfer of funds.

The Figaro newspaper observed that the Trump administration had been waging a ruthless warfare on DEI programmes, and that the consequences are already reaching far across the Atlantic Ocean [2]. Events unfolded rapidly in the USA: the next day after Trump's inauguration, an executive order was issued against "illegal" DEI policies. The US corporations faced a complicated situation, as they had previously regarded ESG as mandatory and even quite unassailable.

The executive order with a meaningful title "Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity" placed federal contractors under the obligation to certify that they "do not engage in unlawful discrimination, including unlawful DEI".[13] Government agencies received instructions to compile a list of national corporations, large non-profit, other private sector entities, foundations, and professional associations and universities for investigation of violations of this particular law. Regarding DEI programmes in the public sector, the federal government and the armed forces, Trump has adopted the directive for immediate termination of the programmes, as well as closure and elimination of all associated offices and positions.

The activity of mega-holdings to engage industrial corporations in climate initiatives that prove to be commercially disadvantageous were not forgotten too: the Republicans deployed immediately its initial retaliatory action following the election, even prior to Trump's inauguration. A block of American states, headed by Texas, initiated legal action against BlackRock Inc., Vanguard Group Inc., and State Street Corp. These corporations were indicted for violating antitrust laws through the manipulation of electricity prices by means of investment strategies.

Ken Paxton, Attorney General of Texas, along with his counterparts from ten other US states, made a challenging declaration: financial managers of mega-holdings jointly with members of climate change groups engaged a campaign to exert pressure on coal producers, compelling them to curtail their production. Consequently, due to the lawsuit filed in a Federal Court in Texas, residents of Texas and other states were compelled to pay higher electricity bills due to local power shortages [3].

The US major corporations seemed to have responded to the Republican Party's call to action, withdrawing from international climate initiatives such as Climate Action 100+, the Net Zero Asset Managers Initiative etc. These initiatives, including the Glasgow Financial Alliance for Net Zero (GFANZ), gradually move under the auspices of the Bloomberg group. Notably, Mark Carney headed GFANZ and previously was the Chairman of the

[12] URL: https://rollcall.com/factbase/trump/transcript/donald-trump-speech-virtual-world-economic-forum-january-23–2025/

[13] URL: https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/ending-illegal-discrimination-and-restoring-merit-based-opportunity/

Board of Directors of Bloomberg Inc. and the Governor of the Bank of England, until his appointment as Prime Minister of Canada on March 14, 2025. This means the possibility of a transfer of patronage over the agenda to British governing structures.

A notable manifestation of rejection of the ESG agenda in the USA was the stance adopted by Institutional Investor, a US entity that grants awards of acknowledgement for outstanding achievements among financial analysts in the Wall Street sector. In 2024, the ESG category declared no winner and from 2025 onwards, the annual analyst rankings abolished this category. Coming back to Paris Agreement, what was the reaction of the global community about Trump's decision, and the implications for the future of this global climate agreement?

Reaction of Major Global Players

A spectrum of opinions ranged from negative to positive. In particular, Argentine President Javier Milei has stated that his country would possibly consider following the suite of the United States to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. He recommended the statement that global warming "has nothing to do with human presence", and pointed out that climate change is "linked to the planet's natural temperature cycles".[14] Milei's statement was announced immediately after Argentina declared its withdrawal from the World Health Organization, following the suite of the United States as well. However, there might be a temporary challenge for Argentina to compromise relations with its closest neighbor, Brazil, which will host the next UN Climate Conference in November 2025. Anyway, this circumstance does not prevent Milei from returning to this issue after the completion of the UN Climate Conference.

The statements of many other players have altered in tone, ranging from expressions of politically correct regrets (China, EU) or even complaints (African group of countries) with criticism of a lack of common sense (Brazil) and covert threats to interact with American actors over the head of the federal government (UK, Canada). It is worth paying attention to the response of some distinguished individuals, such as Kim Darroch, former British ambassador to the US, and John Ashton, Special Representative for Climate Change at the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office (2006–2012): "We must collaborate with individuals in the USA and other countries who comprehend the necessity of concluding the fossil fuel era with utmost urgency" [4].

It is not hard to predict how Donald Trump would react to such a stance of Britain to influence US domestic policy, since he has repeatedly claimed that he expected that Europe would jump to make large-scale purchases of American oil and LNG [5]. Hypothetically, this standpoint articulated by senior British politicians who retired and still live in their memories links to realities that prevailed during the period of 2017–2020. That was the time period of "protracted" withdrawal of the United States from the Agreement, which offered substantial autonomy to individual states and market participants who openly expressed dismal views over the American administration. The current circumstances would unlikely allow them to do so, due to the defeat of "the climate establishment" inflicted by Trump.

It would be probably beneficial for Trump's supporters to express gratitude to their British opponents for their honesty in declaring the true objective of the so-called struggle for the climate ("bring an end to the fossil fuel era as soon as possible"). This clearly brings them on opposite sides of the barricade with Trump and his concept of energy dominance.

Nevertheless, it would be unwise to underestimate high-ranking British retirees, who follow traditional way to express any idea only with greenlight approval from the authority above. Moreover, Ed Miliband, the Secretary of State for Energy Security echoed their statements in a more diplomatic way. Being a supporter of the "net zero" concept, he declared in the House of Lords that he would "try to find common ground" with Trump, and that the "national interest" of the United States still lies in tackling the climate crisis [4].

We do not focus on how Trump may react to the statement of the British minister, who claimed that he knew better, than the Americans temselves, what were the national interests of the USA. What is more important, that the reaction of Great Britain to Trump's decision turned out to be the most harsh and aggressive: the UK openly threatens the USA with war on their own turf by the actors committed to the climate agenda.

[14] URL: https://www.batimes.com.ar/news/argentina/milei-says-hes-considering-taking-argentina-out-of-paris-agreement.phtml

What does this mean for the global climate negotiations? As far as we can judge, the policy of the US president have compelled the UK to adopt a leadership role (even conceptually) in the climate agenda, which it usually avoided. However, if we take into account the transition of global climate initiatives under British control, then it is evident that this issue encompasses a broader scope.

Such decisions could be a forced step in a complicated situation: the US decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement signals a significant shift in the balance of power in global climate negotiations. The USA was the major participant in the group of the most aggressive advocates of tough national commitments to reduce emissions and abandon organic fuels. It also has the greatest resources, qualified personnel, "soft power" structures and, consequently, the most powerful opportunities to influence the negotiation process. This indicated during the Biden's presidency, when capabilities of the American "climate establishment" were unspooled to the full swing, in conjunction with the resources of the European Union and the United Kingdom, and this enabled to obtain unprecedented results. In particular, the UN and its structures were determined as the primary global lobbyists for the climate agenda, with the UN Secretary-General António Guterres designated as the global front man for this agenda. These efforts resulted to the destructive terminology regarding organic fuels at the UN Climate Conferences in Glasgow (2021) and Dubai (2023).

The reaction of the UK and global climate lobby was not limited to verbal statements: they deployed such tried and tested methods as announcing novel, alarmist predictions that threatened humanity with unprecedented disasters due to climate change. In particular, experts from British-controlled Australia predicted that a 4 °C warming would result in an average 40 per cent decrease in wellbeing for a median person. In March 2025, economists from the Climate Risk and Response Institute at the University of New South Wales (UNSW) claimed that all previous economic models had underestimated the impact of global warming. They further stated that if global temperatures rose by 4 °C, average GDP per capita would decrease not by 11 per cent (as previously stated), but by as much as 40 per cent [6].

However, some experts in Australia consider such forecast optimistic: for example, Mark Lawrence, professor of the University of Adelaide, believes "the economic consequences [of climate change] could be even worse". Australian scientists also devote particular attention to oppose the common point of view that not everyone will lose out from global warming, namely, that Russia, Canada and the countries of Northern Europe may benefit from it. Thus, Timothy Neal from the University of New South Wales claims that all countries suffer damage, so that, cold regions will not benefit, since "global economy is deeply interconnected by trade" [6]. The reader is welcomed to assess the level of such argumentation.

The international bureaucracy, embodied by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), did not hesitate to intervene. In March 2025, they released a report with predictably alarming figures of the global losses resulting from the "climate crisis" and the expected positive outlook for the global economy if trillions of Dollars allocated to fight against it. According to this report, in the current century, a failure to curb the "climate crisis" would result the loss of a third of global GDP. However, a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions could lead to an increase of global GDP by the end of the next decade. At the same time, if by 2050 large-scale investments to be deployed, the indicator of GDP in the most developed economies will become 60 per cent higher than in 2025, and it will be even 124 per cent higher in the lower-income countries [7].

Obviously, Trump's team had been seriously preparing for this conceptual assault long time ahead, and they responded immediately. Even during his first presidential term, Trump pointed out his intention to sort out with funding of a closely-knit group of climate alarmists in science, who had been pressuring their opponents for many years in the spirit of cancel culture. Retribution inevitably returned to the alarmists like a boomerang at the beginning of 2025, when the US administration ordered to cease providing support for scientific research in the USA and abroad that contained the terms "climate", "DEI" and "climate crisis" [8].

As to the UN structures, the complaints lodged against them are more serious, as they require fundamental reorganisation. Trump declared, that the

United Nations should realign its core focus with its "fundamental purpose": namely, the maintenance of international peace and security. The US administration used to express its stance on the irrelevance of a particular issue for the UN, when it withdrew from corresponding multilateral agreements or when it terminated their financing [9]. It is easy to figure out the fate of these structures predestined by the United States, if we recall Trump's decisions on the UNFCCC, including American participation and funding.

It is complicated to predict whether such tactics will be extended to other players, which are dependent on the USA, due to the extremely high level of uncertainty in world politics in general, and, above all, in military and political stability.

CONCLUSION

1. The US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement is the "tip of the iceberg": it presupposes a whole set of lesser-known measures by the Trump administration to purge the state apparatus, the political class and the business elite of supporters of climate alarmism. Nowadays, they dismantle the structures, management procedures and regulations formerly integrated within the entire state apparatus, the upper echelons of major corporations and financial institutions under the Biden's administration.

2. In the foreign policy, this trend leads to dissolution of entities and cancellation of initiatives launched during the Biden's administration, including the Climate Finance Plan, USAID etc., aimed mainly at enhancing the climate ambitions of the countries participating in the Paris Agreement.

3. It could be asserted, that the most authoritative participant drops out from the global climate negotiation process, which has created a whole arsenal of pressure tools for this purpose and has forced sovereign countries to agree to ambitious plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This factor reduces risks for Russia in adoption of additional commitments under the Paris Agreement, which may be against the interests of national development. Concurrently, the lack of American support significantly reduces the EU's potential for "enhancing climate ambitions."

4. The changing situation in the near future will inevitably make an impact on the wording of the UNFCCC, its general statements will most likely prevail over specific figures. It is hardly possible that the European Union and the United Kingdom will be capable of achieving a comparable outcome, similar to that of the 28th UN Climate Change Conference held in Dubai in 2023, which many regarded as the danger sign for fossil fuels within the near future. This provides with an opportunity for BRICS to make their voice heard in the upcoming climate negotiations, including the rejection of the most unacceptable formulations for the Alliance and the Global South.

5. The US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement does not indicate a rejection of the UNFCCC. It is quite probable that the Trump's team will resort to this mechanism for influencing the negotiation process as soon as a loyal group of negotiators is formed who support the values of the US administration. The priorities and tactics of this group will become evident at the upcoming UN Climate Conference in Brazil scheduled for November 2025.

6. For now, one can only guess in the general terms what ideological underpinnings the Trump's team is preparing to replace the climate agenda. However, since the USA used to impose its internal priorities on the global arena, it is possible to foresee a reversion to the classical concept of sustainable development in the form, that existed in the late 1980s, before the introduction of the climate component, which eventually took a leading place in it and has actually replaced it in recent years.

7. The replacement of the terminology "ESG" with "sustainability" in the vocabularies of American politicians and businessmen in recent days suggests that the substitution of the concept of "ecology" with "climate" is coming to a close. Hopefully in the not near future, a "common sense revolution" will occur in this area, with the tasks of protecting and preserving the environment being presented in the classical sense. However, this will not exclude the need for energy conservation and energy efficiency previously linked to the climate agenda.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The article is based on the results of research carried out qt the expense of the budgetary funds under the state assignment of the Financial University.

REFERENCES

1. Gelsi S. Energy stocks ignite as Trump declares, 'Drill, baby, drill'. MarketWatch. Jan. 21, 2025. URL: https://www.marketwatch.com/story/energy-stocks-ignite-at-trump-declares-drill-baby-drill-3d04bfe6
2. Garcin-Berson W., Mediavilla L. Politique anti-discrimination: Le Figaro s'est procuré la lettre envoyée par l'administration Trump à des entreprises françaises. Le Figaro. 28 mars 2025. URL: https://www.lefigaro.fr/societes/politique-anti-discrimination-le-figaro-s-est-procure-la-lettre-envoyee-par-l-administration-trump-a-des-entreprises-francaises-20250328
3. Kishan S. BlackRock, vanguard accused of antitrust violations by Texas. Bloomberg. Nov. 27, 2024. URL: https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2024–11–27/blackrock-vanguard-accused-of-violating-antitrust-law-by-texas
4. Harvey F. How the world has responded to Trump's Paris climate agreement withdrawal. The Guardian. Jan. 24, 2025. URL: https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2025/jan/24/paris-climate-agreement-withdrawal-trump-world-response-us
5. Mackrael K., Kirby J. Trump warns Europe to buy more U.S. oil and gas or face tariffs. *The Wall Street Journal*. Dec. 20, 2024. URL: https://www.wsj.com/economy/trade/trump-warns-europe-to-buy-more-u-s-oil-and-gas-or-face-tariffs-1bc4d16b
6. Readfearn G. Average person will be 40% poorer if world warms by 4C, new research shows. The Guardian. Apr. 01, 2025. URL: https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2025/apr/01/average-person-will-be-40-poorer-if-world-warms-by-4c-new-research-shows
7. Harvey F. Tackling climate crisis will increase economic growth, OECD research finds. The Guardian. Mar. 26, 2025. URL: https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2025/mar/26/tackling-climate-crisis-will-increase-economic-growth-oecd-research-finds
8. Milman O. Outcry as Trump withdraws support for research that mentions 'climate'. The Guardian. Feb. 21, 2025. URL: https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2025/feb/21/trump-scientific-research-climate
9. Gowan R. Trump is trying to remake the United Nations. *Foreign Policy*. Mar. 03, 2025. URL: https://foreignpolicy.com/2025/03/03/trump-united-nations-multilateralism-diplomacy/?utm_content=gifting&tpcc=gifting_article&gifting_article=dHJ1bXAtdW5pdGVkLW5hdGlvbnMtbXVsdGlsYXRlcmFsaXNtLWRpcGxvbWFjeQ==&pid=PNIN 6wSF3rd6ba8

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Sergey A. Roginko — PhD Sci. (Econ.), Head, Center of Environment & Development, Institute of Europe, RAS, Moscow, Russian Federation
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2094-9259
roginko@bk.ru
Corresponding author:
roginko@bk.ru

Sergey N. Silvestrov — Dr. Sci. (Econ.), Professor of the Department of World Economy and International Finance, Director of the Institute of Economic Policy and Economic Security Problems, Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russian Federation
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7678-1283
SSilvestrov@fa.ru

Conflicts of Interest Statement: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

The article was received on 05.05.2025; revised on 20.05.2025 and accepted for publication on 10.06.2025.
The authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.