

Brazil

COP30 climate circus begins, but alarmism is increasingly less credible

CREATION

06_11_2025



**Riccardo
Cascioli**



The usual winter circus of the climate conference — a concentration of catastrophist alarms and senseless solutions — opens today in Belém, Brazil, starting with a two-day summit of heads of state and which will last a fortnight. However, an important novelty

precedes it this year: amidst the various fear-mongering studies designed to prepare for climate change, came a [lengthy article by the billionaire philanthropist Bill Gates](#) which offers a counter-argument: the world is not going to end because of climate change, and it is better to invest in alleviating poverty. This is the crux of his message, which the *Bussola* has [previously covered](#).

Although it was addressed to the participants of COP30 (the 30th Conference of the Parties, i.e. the 198 countries that have ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFCCC), it will be difficult for Bill Gates' message to be immediately received. Suffice it to say that, in an [interview with the British newspaper The Guardian](#) last week, the UN Secretary-General, António Guterres, stated that 'we have failed to meet the target of not exceeding a 1.5 °C temperature increase within the next few years, and this will have devastating consequences'. It is absolutely essential to change course in order to limit this overshoot as much as possible and avoid other points of no return, such as the Amazon. We must achieve a drastic reduction in emissions as soon as possible."

However, behind maximalist declarations and painted disaster scenarios, reality looms large, and Bill Gates' change constitutes the first breach in the wall of ecological ideology, which is destined to collapse further in the near future. This is not least because, in recent years, Gates has been one of the biggest financiers of the climate change cause, with personal investments totalling almost 8 billion dollars, in addition to 1.5 billion dollars from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, largely in support of the energy transition, with the remainder going towards the development of zero-emission technologies.

Nonetheless, we should not get too excited about this Bill Gates 'conversion'.

For two reasons: firstly, although his message — no more catastrophism and prioritising development — is positive, the Microsoft founder is still far from telling the whole truth. Secondly, he is stating common sense things a few decades too late. I published my first denunciation of environmentalist and climate change ideology in 2004 — 21 years ago — in a book called *Le bugie degli ambientalisti*, (*The Lies of Environmentalists*) published by Piemme. This leaves the well-founded doubt that it is a matter of political and economic gain.

Regarding the first point, while Bill Gates renounces catastrophism, he still considers climate change a serious problem for which solutions must be found. However, the fact that the climate is constantly changing is not a new problem; it is simply the nature of the planet, and it has always been this way since before humans appeared. There is also

no evidence of an increase in extreme weather events in recent years; such events have always occurred, with some — like hurricanes — occurring at regular intervals. The real problem — and here Gates finally acknowledges this, at least in part — is underdevelopment, which has always been the case.

Only developed civilisations are able to defend themselves effectively against atmospheric events, as well as earthquakes and disease. We did not have to wait for Hurricane Melissa to sweep across the coasts of Jamaica, Cuba and Haiti, causing 49 deaths and widespread destruction, to realise that its impact would be much more limited on American shores, where citizens are better protected by warning systems, infrastructure and housing. This has always been the case.

Therefore, to say that it makes more sense to focus on improving living conditions than reducing carbon emissions is as trite as saying that, in a storm, it is better to carry an umbrella than invest all one's savings in obscure technologies to prevent rain. Yet, over the years, those who have dared to state these simple facts have been ostracised, insulted and labelled as 'deniers' (a pattern later replicated with the Coronavirus emergency).

Moreover, in his writing, Gates continues to consider climate change a serious problem and argues for the need for the fastest possible energy transition. Yet he forgets that it is precisely the demonisation of fossil fuels that hinders the development of poor countries and causes the economic crisis in European countries. The truth is that development requires an abundance of cheap energy, yet the current energy transition is producing a proportional decrease in available, increasingly expensive energy.

Given Bill Gates' substantial investments in renewable energy projects, his insistence on the energy transition is understandable, yet he now acknowledges the limitations of focusing solely on carbon emissions. Instead, he says, the focus must be on technological development.

This brings us to the second point. Bill Gates' philanthropy, as well as that of various other American billionaires, always follows societal interests and projects. Therefore, judgement of reality is always filtered by these interests and projects, which is why certain obvious realities are only realised decades later.

For example, Richard Lindzen, a prominent atmospheric physicist who is highly critical of climate catastrophism, believes that Gates has changed his mind for

specific reasons: 'If Microsoft intends to continue developing artificial intelligence (AI), they will require a vast amount of energy; in other words, the climate agenda would be disastrous for Microsoft. That is why he has become more cautious'.

Lindzen's hypothesis is based on concrete facts. AI is an energy-intensive industry whose consumption is growing so rapidly that it is estimated that, by 2030, the centres collecting AI data could consume up to 20 per cent of all global electricity. Furthermore, 25 per cent of Bill Gates' personal capital is invested in Microsoft shares, a company with a vital need for that energy.

This does not preclude the possibility of other motivations behind Gates' change of heart, which remains welcome.

However, it is important to recognise that global policies are influenced by the interests of elites who can impact governments, the media, and public opinion. Therefore, we should not rely on these gurus to understand the reality in which we live.