



Who Really Funds the Climate Agenda?

By [Mark Keenan](#)

Global Research, July 17, 2026

Region: [Europe, USA](#)
 Theme: [Environment](#)



Across Europe and the United States, climate policy has become one of the most influential drivers of public policy, affecting energy, finance, agriculture, transport, housing and industry.

Behind this transformation lies a vast network of philanthropic foundations, non-governmental organisations, think tanks, financial institutions and advocacy groups that has helped shape both public opinion and political decision-making. This raises an important question: who built and financed this extensive climate-policy system?

Most people assume climate policy emerges through the normal democratic process.

Scientists publish research, governments consult experts, legislators debate proposals, and elected representatives decide the direction of public policy. Yet across both Europe and the United States, a vast network of philanthropic foundations, non-governmental organisations, think tanks, advocacy groups, and financial institutions also plays an important role in shaping climate policy and public opinion.

Lobbying itself is neither unusual nor inherently improper. What deserves closer examination is the scale, funding, and influence of the organisations promoting today's climate agenda—and where their funding originates.

One organisation that has attracted increasing attention is the European Climate Foundation (ECF), established in 2008 and headquartered in The Hague. Although headquartered in Europe, many of the Foundation's largest financial supporters are major American philanthropic organisations, illustrating the increasingly transatlantic nature of climate advocacy.

Dutch science journalist Marcel Crok recently examined the Foundation's role in European climate policy, arguing that it has become one of Europe's most influential climate-focused philanthropic organisations while remaining largely unknown outside specialist circles. His investigation raises important questions about how modern climate advocacy is financed and organised.

According to publicly available information cited by Crok, the ECF received approximately €275 million in funding during 2023. Among the listed supporters are several major American philanthropic organisations, including Bloomberg Philanthropies, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, alongside a number of European charitable foundations.

Grant recipients include research organisations, environmental NGOs, legal advocacy groups, communications initiatives, and media projects. Crok notes that organisations such as Carbon Brief, the European Environment Bureau, and CAN Europe have received ECF support, while Carbon Brief publicly discloses such funding as part of its transparency policy.

None of this information is hidden. It is available through annual reports, grant disclosures, and tax filings. Yet relatively little public attention has focused on how these philanthropic networks operate collectively or the extent to which they may influence climate policy and public debate on both sides of the Atlantic.

Climate policy today extends far beyond climate science. Across both Europe and the United States it increasingly influences industrial strategy, financial regulation, banking, agriculture, transport, housing, taxation, and long-term investment decisions. Governments now work alongside NGOs, philanthropic foundations, research institutes, financial institutions, and private-sector organisations in developing climate and energy policy.

The 2022 Inflation Reduction Act alone originally included [an estimated \\$369 billion in energy-security and climate-related programs](#), including grant funding and tax incentives, increasing the importance of understanding the organisations that help shape climate policy debates.

Climate Finance and the Banking Sector

One example of this wider funding ecosystem is its growing connection with the international financial sector. Over the past decade, major American and international banks, asset managers and multinational corporations have become increasingly involved in developing climate-related financial frameworks.

In December 2015 the Financial Stability Board established the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) which represents



In December 2016, the Financial Stability Board established the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), which represents \$118 trillion of assets globally[1]. The taskforce brings together representatives from many of the world's largest financial institutions and corporations to develop climate-risk reporting standards. Over subsequent years, climate-related disclosure rapidly became embedded within investment management, Wall Street, banking regulation and corporate governance.

Critics, however, contend that they have also accelerated the financialisation of climate policy, embedding net-zero objectives within banking, investment and corporate decision-making.

When the world's largest banks, corporations, and institutions, all align to push a climate change agenda that, in my view, is not supported by robust empirical evidence, one can see there is another agenda going on behind the scenes. This climate agenda tries to convince the public to make sacrifices and to accept significant economic and social changes under the emotive guise of "saving our planet." Meanwhile, corporations, financial institutions and investment funds stand to benefit financially, and political institutions implement worldwide technocratic policy systems under the banner of combatting man-made CO₂-induced climate change. Ultimately, critics argue that this agenda aligns with the objectives of UN Agenda 2030 while creating, or potentially creating, trillions of dollars in new financial opportunities for major banks and investment firms.

As a former science adviser at the UK Department of Energy and Climate Change, and one of more than 2,000 scientists and academics who have signed the Clintel World Climate Declaration, I believe this close relationship between climate policy and financial institutions deserves far greater public scrutiny. The Clintel declaration argues that CO₂ is not the dominant driver of climate and that natural variability plays a much larger role than is commonly acknowledged.

The Role of Rockefeller Family Foundations

The Rockefeller family's support for climate initiatives has also attracted particular attention. How the Rockefeller banking dynasty became leading advocates of the global warming agenda is described in a report titled *The Rockefeller Way: The Family's Covert 'Climate Change' Plan* published by The Energy & Environmental Legal Institute in December 2016. An article published by the institute[2] states:

"In their Sustainable Development Program Review, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund boasts of being one of the first major global warming activists... Their highly complex integration of hedge funds, interlocking boards positions, and non-profit organizations has steered public policy on these issues and provided them with foreknowledge of emerging markets and access to the developing worlds' natural resources..."

The Climate Scenario Behind a Decade of Alarmism is No Longer Considered Plausible

Another important development has received surprisingly little public attention. The developers of the next generation of official climate scenarios have concluded that the highest-emissions pathways, including RCP 8.5 and SSP5-8.5, are no longer considered plausible representations of likely future development. Because these scenarios influenced thousands of studies, policy recommendations and media reports, this shift has important implications. I examine the issue in detail in my earlier article, [The Climate Scenario That Changed the World — And Is Now Being Quietly Dropped](#).

A broader question concerns the underlying assumptions built into today's climate models. Is carbon dioxide truly the dominant driver of climate, as argued by the UN IPCC, and can current models isolate its influence with the degree of precision implied by modern attribution studies? Many scientists and researchers—including the more than 2,000 signatories of the Clintel World Climate Declaration—[argue that CO₂ is not the dominant driver of climate](#) and that natural variability plays a much larger role than is commonly acknowledged.

Conclusion

Supporters argue that funding of net-zero initiatives accelerates action on an urgent global challenge. Critics contend that concentrated philanthropic funding amplifies particular policy perspectives while making alternative viewpoints less visible within public debate.

Regardless of one's view of climate science, organisations spending hundreds of millions of dollars and euros to influence public opinion and public policy deserve greater transparency and public scrutiny. Whether in Europe or the United States, citizens have a right to know who is shaping climate policy, how it is being funded, and whether competing scientific perspectives are receiving a fair hearing.

These issues are examined in greater detail in the 2026 edition of my book [Climate CO₂ Hoax: How Bankers Hijacked the Real Environment Movement](#). Its purpose is to distinguish genuine environmental concerns from claims that, in my view, are not supported by robust empirical evidence.

*

Click the share button below to email/forward this article. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [X](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost Global Research articles with proper attribution.

Mark Keenan is a former United Nations technical expert and an independent writer on science, technology, political economy and human freedom. He is the author of [Climate CO₂ Hoax](#), [The AI Illusion](#), [The Debt Machine](#), and [Demonic Economics](#). His books and articles are available at [Reality Books](#) and on Substack at [markgerardkeenansubstack.com](#).

He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Notes

[1] Source: https://data.parliament.uk/DepositedPapers/Files/DEP2019-0718/Green_Finance_Strategy.pdf

[2] Source: <https://www.globalresearch.ca/rockefeller-family-covert-climate-change-plan/5678775>

Global Research is a reader-funded media. We do not accept any funding from corporations or governments. Help us stay afloat. Click the image below to make a one-time or recurring donation.



The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © Mark Keenan, Global Research, 2026

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)



Articles by:
Mark Keenan

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.
For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca

[Global Research News](#)
[I-BOOKS SERIES](#)
[Countries Index](#)
[Most Popular](#)
[Links](#)
[Contact](#)
[Membership](#)
[Online Store](#)

Themes

[US NATO War Agenda](#)
[Global Economy](#)
[Crimes against Humanity](#)
[Militarization and WMD](#)
[Law and Justice](#)
[Police State & Civil Rights](#)
[History](#)
[9/11 & 'War on Terrorism'](#)
[Media Disinformation](#)

Geographic Regions

[Militarization and WMD](#)
[Oil and Energy](#)
[Police State & Civil Rights](#)
[Religion](#)
[Poverty & Social Inequality](#)
[Science and Medicine](#)
[United Nations](#)
[US NATO War Agenda](#)
[Women's Rights](#)



[Privacy Policy](#)

Copyright © 2005-2026 GlobalResearch.ca