



Climate as a birth risk: The UN invents a new “fault line”

October 12, 2026 7-minute read by [Dr. Peter F. Mayer](#)

A few days before the next major climate summit, a new "crisis" is conjured up that no one had previously considered. This time it doesn't affect polar bears or coral reefs – this time it's pregnant women and newborns.

UN climate chief *Simon Stiell* declared a "new fault line in the global climate crisis" in Fiji, and the message is as dramatic as it is familiar: more money is needed. The speech took place on October 5, 2026, in Nadi, Fiji, as part of the [pre-COP meeting](#) ahead of the actual COP31 summit, which will be held in Antalya, Turkey, in November ([full text of the UNFCCC speech](#)).

The central “evidence” is a survey [by the Wellcome commissioned](#) Trust and by *Censuswide* – 1,000 obstetricians, midwives and nurses in five countries on five continents. conducted

The figures presented by Stiell:

- **73%** of respondents stated that heat-related cases or complications in pregnant women had increased in the last five years.
- **76%** reported the same for the health of fetuses and newborns.
- **98%** want to have cared for a pregnant woman whose health they believe was affected by heat.
- **81%** are worried that it will get worse.
- **92%** demand more training and resources

In addition, [a second report](#) from *Plan International* entitled *Change Her Forecast* from the *State of the World's Girls 2026* series stated that climate disasters would promote child marriages and teenage pregnancies because they would cause health systems and schools to collapse.

And then came the real point – the solution: more climate finance. Stiell demanded the disbursement of the tripling of adaptation financing agreed upon in Belém and the mobilization of \$1.3 trillion annually for developing countries.

The method: Perception becomes science

A closer look reveals a familiar pattern. The "new data" presented here as proof of a global health crisis is actually an opinion poll. It didn't measure whether heat causes premature births. It asked whether doctors and midwives *believe* it does. These are two completely different things.

This is the good old *perception study*, put through the communications department's meat grinder until it lands in agency reports as a "study" with percentages. The core message then becomes: "Almost all respondents had cared for a pregnant woman whose health they believed was affected by the heat." Read carefully: " *their opinion* ." That's an expectation, not a measurement.

The survey was also conducted by *Censuswide* – a commercial market research company working on behalf of *Wellcome*. *Wellcome*, in turn, is one of the largest funders of global health governance and closely linked to the WHO. Whoever pays the bill defines the questions. That's how contract research works.

The underlying message: The guilty parties are in the West.

The real point of the speech is not a medical finding, but a political attribution. Stiell speaks of "small islands – and other nations who did practically nothing to create this climate crisis." The blame is placed wholesale on the G20 countries, "overwhelmingly in G20 economies."

And then the crucial sentence that explains the whole event:

"The tripling of adjustment financing agreed at COP30 in Belém must be implemented."

Climate policy has become a redistribution mechanism that constantly seeks new justifications. First it was sea levels and coral reefs. Now it's childbirth. Tomorrow it will be something else.

The 1.3 trillion: Who pays, who collects – and why it's exactly as intended.

The money **doesn't** come from "the West" and **doesn't** go to "poor countries." It comes from Western taxpayers and a significant portion of it ends up back with Western corporations, consultants, and financial structures – via governments and NGOs in developing countries as intermediaries.

This isn't redistribution from north to south. This is a sluice gate that takes public money from the middle class and spits it out again at the top.

The payment chain – who really pays

The 1.3 trillion is not a donation. It is a commitment that is to come from public funds. Specifically:

- **National taxpayers** in Germany, France, UK, Canada, Japan, USA – via climate finance budgets, development banks and tax-funded contributions
- **Green bonds and national debt** – that means the bill ends up as interest payments for the next generation.
- **Private capital mobilization** – here, private money is “leveraged” with public guarantees, which means: losses are socialized, profits are privatized.

The crucial point: It's public money from lower and middle-income groups. The real wealth – the billionaires, the large funds, the corporations – isn't taxed, but rather invited through an incentive structure. They don't have to pay. They're allowed to earn.

This is redistribution from the bottom to the top in its purest form: The burden lies with those who work and pay taxes. The opportunities lie with those who have capital.

Who actually receives the money

The money formally flows to "developing countries"—but it doesn't flow as cash into the hands of villages. It flows through a system, and this system is almost exclusively staffed by Western actors.

1. The Big Consulting Firms: When a country plans adaptation projects, McKinsey, BCG, Deloitte, PwC, and the major engineering firms come in. They write the strategies, the feasibility studies, and the monitoring frameworks. These are high-priced services paid for from the climate finance fund. The money leaves the donor country to flow back to a donor company.

2. The multilateral banks— the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the African Development Bank—manage the funds, charge administrative fees, and issue loans (not grants). A large portion of "climate finance" is credit, not a gift. This means that developing countries take on debt to finance adaptation—and later pay it back, with interest, to the same institutions. This is not a transfer. This is a business transaction.

3. The green technology and energy sector – solar parks, wind farms, battery storage, power grids, electrolyzers – the equipment comes almost exclusively from Western and Chinese manufacturers. An adaptation or energy transition project in Africa is largely a contract for Western suppliers. This "aid" guarantees sales for their own industries.

4. The NGO and Governance Industry: A significant portion of the funds flows into capacity building, training, workshops, gender consulting, and monitoring and reporting systems. This includes salaries, travel expenses, and office rents – predominantly for staff from the Global North. The infamous "consulting bubble."

5. The Financial Sector According to Stiell, the 1.3 trillion euros are to be mobilized "with the whole financial system." This means: structured financial products, insurance, derivatives, rating fees, emissions trading. An entire industry that profits from managing the flow of money without ever building a single power plant.

The perpetual motion machine of climate bureaucracy

What is created here is a **closed cycle** :

1. Taxpayers pay into national climate funds
2. The funds go to multilateral banks and programs.
3. These organizations grant loans and contracts to developing countries.
4. Developing countries use this money to purchase services and technology.
5. A large portion of the money flows back to Western companies, consultants, and financial institutions.
6. Developing countries are left with debt.
7. At the next summit, it will be determined that the need is even greater.
8. And the demand is increased – to 1.3 trillion, then more

This is not a development mechanism. This is a self-service store with a moral license. Every step in the cycle has its own stakeholders who have a vested interest in keeping the cycle going.

What really causes birth risks

Here, a genuine and serious issue – the health of mothers and newborns – is being politically exploited. And in doing so, the elephant in the room is being ignored.

The real, well-documented threats to pregnancies in developing countries are poverty, inadequate sanitation, lack of clean energy, hunger, and chronic environmental toxins. Those without refrigeration don't suffer because "the climate" is changing, but because the infrastructure is lacking. And this infrastructure is often lacking because for decades, development aid has flowed into advisory boards, NGO apparatuses, and summit tourism instead of power plants, clinics, and water pipes.

Added to this are burdens that are systematically ignored in such reports: industrial chemicals, heavy metals, PFAS, and microplastics, which accumulate in the body and have been proven to impair reproductive health. These chronic burdens are real, measurable, and are downplayed by the same institutional world that now blames the heat.