



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 11, 2026

UN Endorses “World Court” Ruling Claiming All MUST Fight “Climate Change”

Reports about the death of “climate” alarmism have been greatly exaggerated. In fact, obeying United Nations “climate” decrees is now officially “international law.” At least that is what two key UN entities and more than 140 national governments would like humanity to believe.

In one of the most consequential developments yet for the global climate movement, the United Nations General Assembly voted to formally endorse and “operationalize” [a ruling by the International Court of Justice \(ICJ\) declaring that governments have a legal obligation](#) to combat climate change.



pcess609/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Supporters hailed the move as a historic victory for “climate justice.” Critics blasted it as a brazen assault on national sovereignty, self-government, affordable energy, and constitutional government.

The major UN move came even as U.S. President Donald Trump and his administration were stepping up their war on the “climate change” machine. But the U.S. government’s vigorous opposition was not enough to stop the UN’s power grab.

In one of its most breathtaking rulings, the ICJ — also known as the “World Court” or “World Supreme Court” — ruled last year that all governments have a legal duty to protect “human rights” and fight “global warming” by restricting emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂). Officially, it was “advisory.” But late last month, the governments of the world, acting through the UN, voted to give it real force.

Among other elements, the new resolution charges the UN boss with advancing “compliance” with the court’s controversial decision. It also purports to interfere with the sovereign authority of governments to set their own policies on issues such as energy, the environment, and even immigration, multiple governments warned.

The UN chief was enthusiastic about it, though. “The world’s highest court has spoken,” gushed UN Secretary-General António Guterres, a longtime Socialist Party operative. “Today, the General Assembly has answered.”

In a [statement](#) welcoming the General Assembly vote, Guterres described its resolution as “a powerful affirmation of international law, climate justice, science and the responsibility of states to protect people from the escalating climate crisis.”

Critics argued that the vote, which passed with 141 governments and tyrants in favor versus eight against and 28 abstentions, represents yet another brazen power grab by globalist forces. The UN General Assembly, or UNGA, has been [described by top UN officials as the “Parliament of Humanity.”](#)

The UN resolution seeks to transform the opinion of the so-called World Supreme Court into a de facto



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 11, 2026

legal weapon against national sovereignty, hydrocarbon energy, economic freedom, and, ultimately, human prosperity, opponents argued.

Trump Opposition to the UN Climate Play

Multiple critics have pointed out that this goes far beyond environmental policy. Instead, it is a frontal assault on self-government dressed up in the language of international law and human rights.

The legal foundation to criminally prosecute those who refuse to play along with the climate narrative is being laid down rapidly through these measures. Indeed, the resolution treats the ICJ opinion as “irrefutably authoritative and as setting out binding obligations on States,” [warned](#) U.S. officials.

Among those forcefully opposing the UN General Assembly measure was the Trump administration on behalf of the American people. U.S. taxpayers are by far the largest financiers of the UN, even though the outfit consistently works against the rights and interests of Americans.

“Throughout the negotiation of this resolution, the United States has been consistent in conveying our opposition to this initiative,” argued Ambassador Tammy Bruce, deputy U.S. representative to the UN. “The United States did not support seeking an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on climate change and has many concerns about the Court’s opinion.”

The [ICJ’s July 2025 opinion, spanning hundreds of pages, declared that governments have a “legal duty” under international law](#) to prevent “environmental harm” by slashing CO₂ emissions. Failure to do so, the court warned, could constitute an “internationally wrongful act.”

ICJ President Yuji Iwasawa painted an apocalyptic picture: Man-made global warming is supposedly an “existential problem of planetary proportions” imperiling “all forms of life.” States must “cooperate” to meet emission targets, phase out fossil fuels, and provide “climate justice” reparations to poorer nations, Iwasawa and other members of the court declared.

In comments delivered ahead of the UN General Assembly vote, Ambassador Bruce highlighted some of the problems the U.S. government saw with the resolution and the World Court ruling.

“In brief, this resolution is highly problematic in calling on States to comply with so-called ‘obligations’ that are based on non-binding conclusions of the Court on which UN Member States’ views diverge,” she said. “The resolution includes inappropriate political demands relating to fossil fuels and on other climate topics, and we believe there is no basis for the resolution’s mandate to the Secretary-General to report on the complex and nuanced legal issues addressed by the Court.”

Several other governments expressed similar concerns, Bruce said.

Specifically, the UN resolution and the ICJ opinion claim that all governments have obligations that would “impermissibly interfere with each States’ [sic] sovereign rights to regulate and manage its own energy policy,” Bruce continued. The UN resolution also pretends that “peoples,” rather than individuals, have “human rights,” she noted.

The “World Court” and Its Climate Ruling

As this magazine [reported last year](#), the ICJ climate case — pushed by Pacific island governments such as Vanuatu with heavy UN backing — was billed as the most significant ever before the court. One analyst said it was tantamount to putting the entire industrialized world on trial.

The ruling was designed from the outset to provide legal cover for the entire UN climate regime,



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 11, 2026

including the Paris Agreement, and to arm activists, NGOs, and foreign governments with tools to harass energy producers and sovereign nations, analysts observed.

“Failure of a state [government] to take appropriate action to protect the climate system ... may constitute an internationally wrongful act,” ICJ President Iwasawa said, making clear that the climate movement ultimately intends to use global “authorities” to impose its agenda on humanity by force.

The court echoed that view in its unanimous, 500-page opinion. “Failure of the state to take appropriate action to protect the climate system from [greenhouse gas] emissions including through fossil fuel production, fossil fuel consumption, the granting of fossil fuel exploration licenses, or the provision of fossil fuel subsidies may constitute an internationally wrongful act,” the court warned, a clear threat.

The International Court of Justice, headquartered in The Hague, is considered the principal judicial body of the UN. Its 15 judges are elected by the UN General Assembly and Security Council — bodies in which tyrannical regimes often hold equal sway with free nations.

Like the International Criminal Court, critics have long derided it as a “kangaroo” court. Among other concerns, analysts have noted its politicized rulings that advance globalist agendas over genuine justice. Key principles from the U.S. Constitution are notably absent.

In its climate ruling, the court leaned heavily on “customary international law,” the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Paris Agreement, and even nebulous “human rights” obligations. Trump has announced a U.S. withdrawal from many of those schemes, but globalist legal experts believe the ruling still applies under human rights.

Indeed, the UN’s top court asserted that a “clean, healthy, and sustainable environment” is a human right, a view echoed in the General Assembly resolution adopted on May 20. As such, states must curb emissions to comply with their supposed international human-rights obligations. Critics have long noted that the UN rejects the traditional U.S. and Christian understanding of God-given rights, instead promoting a Soviet-style view of revokable “rights” to government “services.”

The ruling has especially significant implications for Western nations. Wealthy nations, the ICJ suggested, bear heightened responsibilities for dealing with climate change. That should include taxpayer-funded financial support and potential liability for what it described as “transboundary harm.”

The opinion’s “advisory” nature is a fig leaf. While the ICJ lacks its own army, its rulings carry “moral authority” and are routinely weaponized in domestic courts, international negotiations, and activist litigation, as multiple UN officials pointed out before and after it was handed down.

The UNGA resolution amplifies this by welcoming the opinion and going even further, calling on states to “take all possible steps” to avoid climate harm, and keeping it on the agenda for future action. It also reinforces purported obligations under the Paris Agreement and paves the way for lawsuits, reparations claims, and pressure on holdouts like the Trump administration.

Critics Ridicule It All as Narrative Implodes

Ironically, the General Assembly decision came amid more and more bad news for proponents of the increasingly embattled man-made global-warming hypothesis. Polling shows most Americans reject the whole narrative, and even Democrats and the establishment media admit that talking about climate is a non-starter with U.S. voters.

A stunning new poll released just days after the UN vote showed most Americans reject the UN’s



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 11, 2026

climate hypothesis altogether. According to the survey [by Pew Research](#), only 48 percent of Americans even believe human emissions of carbon dioxide are causing “climate change.” About 22 percent believe the warming is natural, 17 percent are not sure what is causing it, and 12 percent do not even believe the planet is warming at all.

Among Republicans, just one in five believe human activities are causing global warming, Pew revealed. Almost 40 percent believe the warming is natural, and one in four do not even believe the globe is heating up. About three out of four Democrats, by contrast, believe human emissions of CO₂ are to blame for observed warming.

This partisan divide underscores a deeper truth, analysts said. The “climate crisis” narrative is less about science and more about ideology, power, and control. Republicans and skeptics, informed by decades of failed doomsday predictions — from the 1970s global-cooling scare to Al Gore’s ice-free Arctic prophecies — recognize the narrative for what it is. Democrats and globalists cling to it as a vehicle for wealth redistribution, central planning, and eroding national borders in favor of supranational governance.

But even Democrats and leftists are recognizing the political danger of peddling the alarmism. Indeed, *The New York Times*, among the most alarmist “news” outfits in America, recently ran an op-ed headlined “[Democrats Don’t Have to Campaign on Climate Change Anymore.](#)”

The piece, written by Syracuse University Environment Professor Matthew Huber, urged Democrats to stop talking about climate change if they want to win elections. While he encouraged them to keep pursuing climate policies, he said they must focus on regaining credibility with the working class to win elections — and the working class is apparently not buying the UN’s climate narrative.

Just weeks before the UN General Assembly vote, even the hyper-alarmist UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was forced to concede that its most alarmist scenarios were not grounded in reality. The outfit, long criticized for politicizing “science,” revised its modeling that had suggested temperature increases of 4 to 5 degrees by the end of the century. Those scenarios are now gone.

President Trump responded to the news on Truth Social with his characteristic style. “GOOD RIDDANCE! After 15 years of Dumocrats promising that ‘Climate Change’ is going to destroy the Planet, the United Nations TOP Climate Committee just admitted that its own projections (RCP8.5) were WRONG! WRONG! WRONG!” he said.

Trump and Experts Pushing Back

The Trump administration has been a wrecking ball to the climate movement. Indeed, it is withdrawing from numerous UN climate agreements, including the 1992 UNFCCC treaty that underpins the whole UN “climate regime.” Speaking to the UN, the president himself ridiculed the climate narrative as the greatest “con job” in human history.

The administration is also ending the domestic assault on CO₂, including many of the regulations on energy production. The Trump EPA is even reversing the Obama-era “endangerment finding” claiming that CO₂ — the gas exhaled by all living creatures — is “pollution” that must be regulated.

Legal experts and skeptics immediately pushed back on the UN’s climate ruling, too. Astrophysicist Dr. Willie Soon, a leading voice debunking climate alarmism, called the decision “a joke at a cosmic proportion.”



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 11, 2026

The court, he told *The New American*, demonstrates “zero understanding of climate science” while threatening America First policies under President Trump. “Since when has ICJ or the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change proved that rising gas of life can cause all the computer model-produced imaginary disasters?” asked Soon, who has published multiple peer-reviewed studies debunking the narrative on CO₂.

Climate Depot Publisher Marc Morano, often dubbed the top enemy of “climate action,” was equally blunt. “Facing the insurmountable collapse of their global climate agenda ... the UN ‘high court’ has ruled nations are compelled ... to comply or pay ‘reparations’ and fund ‘climate justice’ programs,” he told *TNA*. “Thank God for Donald Trump leading the global collapse of the UN climate bullcrap!”

Roots in Globalist Ideology

This push for a global “climate regime” to dictate policy to nations goes back decades. The UN’s climate apparatus — rooted in the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and subsequent frameworks — has always been about more than temperature. It is a vehicle for Fabian socialist dreams of world government, wealth transfers from developed to developing nations, and control over energy, the lifeblood of modern economies.

By demonizing human emissions of CO₂ as pollution, the UN and governments are able to regulate the “gas of life” (essential for plant photosynthesis) and literally all human activities. Of course, CO₂ comprises a tiny fraction of the atmosphere, with human contributions even smaller. Indeed, human emissions of CO₂ make up a fraction of one percent of all the “greenhouse” gases in the atmosphere.

The ICJ case itself originated from a UNGA request, with broad participation from nearly 100 governments and various organizations. Joe Biden’s administration, true to form, urged a strong ruling, framing climate change as a “gravest challenge” requiring global coordination.

Now, with Trump back in office dismantling these schemes domestically and eyeing exits from international entanglements, the globalists are doubling down through global judicial and assembly maneuvers.

Critics rightly point out the selective outrage. Communist China, the world’s top emitter by far, faces little real pressure as it continues building coal-fired power plants. Governments and tyrants ruling “developing nations” are still demanding trillions in “loss and damage” funding while building coal plants, too.

Meanwhile, Western nations are pressured to deindustrialize, accepting energy poverty in the name of climate virtue as jobs and production are shipped to China and other nations ruled by hostile tyrants. Clearly this is not about “science,” experts say. Instead, it has all the characteristics of a scam.

Implications for Sovereignty and Economy

Despite being based on largely discredited pseudoscience and models producing endless debunked predictions, the ICJ ruling and the subsequent UNGA resolution threaten profound consequences.

Among other measures, they could justify lawsuits against U.S. companies, increase pressure for phasing out reliable energy in the West, and even justify demands for “climate reparations” from Third World dictatorships.

Self-government and individual liberty are also under threat. Without serious action from U.S.



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 11, 2026

authorities, domestic courts may cite the ruling and the UNGA resolution, eroding the U.S. Constitution's supremacy. The same will happen across what was once known as "Christendom" and the "Free World."

Trump's agenda of pursuing American energy dominance, withdrawing from UN climate schemes, and slashing regulations directly counters this — for now. But, obviously, Trump will not be in office forever. Few of his climate policies have been enshrined in law. As such, a future president can and almost certainly will embrace the UN agenda going forward, at least if Congress does not act now.

Globally, the ICJ ruling and the UNGA resolution bolster support for upcoming UN climate summits, known as COPs. They are also likely to fuel ever-more draconian "Nationally Determined Contributions" (NDCs) under the Paris Agreement, framing them as binding obligations. Just last year, the UN climate summit adopted an agreement claiming humanity had already burned through four fifths of its "carbon budget."

Historical Parallels and the Path Forward

This is part of a long pattern. From the League of Nations to the UN's founding, internationalist bodies have sought to subordinate nations and people to international law. Supposed man-made climate change serves as the perfect pretext: invisible, global, urgent, never-ending, and requiring endless sacrifice from the productive West.

At least on this issue, President Trump appears to understand the stakes. What is left of the movement he built has clearly rejected the false choice between environmental stewardship and prosperity.

As even a brief overview of the evidence shows, true environmental protection flows from property rights, innovation, and human ingenuity — not top-down edicts from The Hague or UN headquarters in New York City.

But Trump's actions are not enough to stop this global agenda. Americans must demand that Congress reject any implementation of the ICJ ruling or the UNGA's resolution. The U.S. government should reaffirm non-recognition of ICJ jurisdiction, defund related UN programs, expose the science, and ultimately abandon the UN entirely. States can and should lead the way by prioritizing affordable energy and rejecting the abuse.

Still, the UNGA vote and ICJ opinion are symptoms of a much deeper problem: the erosion of national sovereignty in favor of unaccountable global governance. This latest salvo should serve as a powerful reminder of why vigilance against the climate-industrial complex and the forces of globalism remains essential. The gas of life is not the enemy; centralized power pretending to save the planet at the expense of liberty is.

It is true that the climate movement is under tremendous pressure. But the battle is far from over, as the ICJ and UNGA made clear with their latest moves. With public skepticism rising and a resolute president in office, the globalists' "legal" maneuvers may ultimately backfire, accelerating the very collapse of their narrative. But that will take work. Sovereignty, science, and sanity can still prevail — if Americans insist on it and get busy.

Related articles:

[Top UN "Court" Claims All Governments MUST Fight CO2](#)

[Top UN "Court" to Issue Landmark Ruling on "Climate Change"](#)



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 11, 2026

[UN Tax on Shipping to Fund Global Tyranny](#)

[Rigging the Climate Agenda](#)

[The COP29 Deal: Carbon Markets & Trillions in Reparations](#)

[UN Court "Orders" United States to Lift Some Sanctions on Iran](#)

[Justice Breyer's New Book Advocates Foreign Law in U.S. Courts](#)

[UN Court Seeks Prison Term for Journalist](#)

[UN Kangaroo Court Has U.S. Troops in Crosshairs](#)

[New UN "Pact for the Future" Turbocharges Globalism](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.