

THE GREAT RESET: BUILDING A TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY FASCISM MACHINE

First of all, we have to have the definition of “Reset” correctly. “Reset,” we can think of it in terms of sort of pushing a button and going back to the way things were....The normal was a crisis. The normal was itself not working.

-JOHN KERRY, SPEAKING AT A WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM EVENT TITLED “REDESIGNING SOCIAL CONTRACTS IN CRISIS,” JUNE 24, 2020

AN INTERNATIONAL CONSPIRACY BETWEEN POWERFUL bankers, business leaders, and government officials; secret meetings in the Swiss Alps; and calls for a “new world order”—the Great Reset is one henchman-with-an-eye-patch away from being a great plot for the next James Bond movie. (Which, by the way, means that when Hollywood inevitably makes a blockbuster Reset film, the role of Glenn Beck will be played by Daniel Craig. Makes perfect sense to me, but not so much to my wife.)

In previous chapters, I have shown how the Great Reset would be fueled (modern monetary theory), how the conditions have come about that make the Reset possible (the coronavirus pandemic), and what the justification is for the destruction of the current world economic system (claims of an “existential” climate change crisis). But to this point, I have deliberately avoided explaining the specific policy changes that Great Reset supporters have in mind when they talk about their plans for the future, and there is a good reason for that: parts of the Great Reset are complicated—very complicated.

Unlike conservative political figures like Ted Cruz and Rand Paul, or left-leaning politicians like Bernie Sanders and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez,

who typically have no problem telling the American people exactly where they stand on the issues, those who favor the Great Reset often shroud their plans using coded language, largely unknown economic theories, and incredibly complex charts and diagrams that make whatever the heck that guy in *A Beautiful Mind*, was sketching look like a children's maze on the back of a Denny's kid's menu.

Making matters worse, the Great Reset's biggest backers have deliberately chosen to use terminology that sounds appealing to many supporters of free markets-like "capitalism," "investments," and "stakeholders"-while meaning something every different from what many of us think of when we hear these ideas discussed in the United States.

Of course, at times the Great Reset movement could not be clearer. When advocates of the Reset say, 'To achieve a better outcome, the world must act jointly and swiftly to revamp all aspects of our societies and economies, from education to social contracts and working conditions,' they mean it. Likewise, when they say, 'We need a 'Great Reset' of capitalism,' they mean that too. And when they say, 'We are completely rethinking the tools of economic policy,' they are not lying.

But as shocking as these and many other Great Reset-related statements are, they do not come even remotely close to painting the truly horrifying transformation of the world that the Great Reset movement has in mind when it talks about building its new global society. And although you will not hear Great Resetters openly calling for authoritarianism, the Great Reset is clearly a new kind of soft authoritarianism that is not too far off from the merging of markets, corporatism, authoritarianism, collectivism, and modern technology that has been embraced by the Communist Party of China in recent decades.

Its confusing terminology and vague language are what make the Great Reset so dangerous-and frankly, brilliant. Openly calling for a takeover of the global economy by the ruling class would immediately alienate 90 percent of the general population, but by tying in the Green New Deal, a government jobs guarantee, and a host of other large social welfare programs, they have managed to win over some progressives and socialists who care deeply about those issues. And by painting the movement as a pro-business, pro-capitalism plan to improve the economy, they have managed to win over some establishment political figures on the right.

But at its core, the Great Reset is not truly pro-socialism, and it's not pro-capitalism either—it's just a re-branding of the same old tired ideas that elites have pushed a million times before: “Give us more power, and we promise we'll take care of you and fix the world's ills. Let us manage more of the economy, and we promise, you'll all be wealthier for it. Give us the authority to punish the “bad guys” in society, and we'll save the planet from annihilation.”

I admit that the Great Reset is a little cleverer (is that even a word, Mr. Editor?) than some of the schemes that the ruling class have trotted out before, but in the end, no matter what label the elitist snake oil salesman slaps on the front of the bottle, it is still poison he's trying to sell you. Or as former Texas governor Ann Richards once said, “You can put lipstick on a hog and call it Monique, but it is still a pig.” And make no mistake about it, the Great Reset is a pig—a big, fat, trough-licking pig.

The trick to stopping the Great Reset, then, is knowing how to recognize the poison and then how to keep our friends, family, and neighbors from guzzling it down. So what exactly is the Great Reset, and how do global elites plan to impose it on the entire world?

THE ROAD TO SERFDOM

The first thing you need to know about the Great Reset is that, at least at the time of this writing, there is no official Great Reset manual, framework, or agreement that all Great Reset advocates have signed up for. It is possible such a platform will be released when the World Economic Forum holds its next annual meeting, but currently you cannot go to one single place and see everything that the Reset entails.

The Great Reset has often been presented one component at a time, as though you are given a puzzle with all the pieces and the theme but without a picture of what it would look like completed. The obscurity of the final picture is, I believe, deliberate. It is much harder for people who would otherwise be deeply concerned about the Great Reset to spend too much time worrying about it, because it takes a lot of effort just to figure out what the reset really is. Luckily for you, my research team and I have spent months putting all the Great Reset pieces together so you do not have to.

The best place to find information about the Great Reset is on the website of the World Economic Forum (WEF). As I have noted throughout this book, the World Economic Forum is one of the leaders of the Great Reset movement. It hosts a large archive of articles, interviews, podcasts, and videos about the Reset—much of which features academics, business and government leaders, and activists from around the world, including America.

In an article published on June 3, 2020, on WEF’s website, World Economic Forum founder and executive chairman Klaus Schwab discusses, in broad but relatively clear terms, some of the main goals of the Great Reset. “There are many reasons to pursue a Great Reset,” Schwab wrote, “but the most urgent is COVID-19. Having already led to hundreds of thousands of deaths, the pandemic represents one of the worst public-health crises in recent history. And, with casualties still mounting in many parts of the world, it is far from over.

Schwab then cites climate change, income inequality, and other “crises” as key justifications for a ‘Great Reset’ of capitalism” and then he explains, ‘Left unaddressed, these crises...will deepen and leave the world even less sustainable, less equal, and more fragile. Incremental measures and ad hoc fixes will not suffice to prevent this scenario. We must build entirely new foundations for our economic and social systems.”

Schwab says there are ‘three main components” to the Great Reset “agenda.” One is mostly uncontroversial: “to harness the innovations of the Fourth Industrial Revolution to support the public good, especially by addressing health and social challenges. During the COVID-19 crisis, companies, universities, and others have joined forces to develop diagnostics, therapeutics, and possible vaccines; establish testing centers; create mechanisms for tracing infections; and deliver telemedicine. Imagine what could be possible if similar concerted efforts were made in every sector.”

There are few people in the Western world who believe that technological advancements won’t play a key role in future economic development, and some of the innovations Schwab cites, such as telemedicine, are something I have been talking about for many years. Unfortunately, here in America it took a pandemic to convince many in government to loosen regulations and make key reforms so that telemedicine and similar services made possible by recent technological achievements are available to everyone. I guess talking to your doctor through applications like

Skype was just too much innovation for bureaucrats to handle. Don't you just love government?

The other two components Schwab outlines is where the real fun begins. According to Schwab,

The first (component of the Great Reset) would steer the market toward fairer outcomes. To this end, governments should improve coordination (for example, in tax, regulatory, and fiscal policy), upgrade trade arrangements, and create the conditions for a ‘stakeholder economy.’ At a time of diminishing tax bases and soaring public debt, governments have a powerful incentive to pursue such action.

Moreover, governments should implement long-overdue reforms that promote more equitable outcomes. Depending on the country, these may include changes to wealth taxes, the withdrawal of fossil-fuel subsidies, and new rules governing intellectual property, trade, and competition.

Okay, now you might be thinking, “Glenn, this sounds like your standard progressive tax-and-spend platform, but you promised me so much more. Where’s this big ‘reset’ of society you’ve been talking so much about?”

Hang with me, because we are going to get there soon. For now, I just want you to remember that Schwab has said that the great Reset would “steer the market toward fairer outcomes,” “create the conditions for a ‘stakeholder economy,’” and “implement long-overdue reforms that promote more equitable outcomes.” All of these ideas are going to get fleshed out in a lot more detail later in this chapter, but you can already see that Schwab’s ideas require dramatically altering the global economy and empowering someone—we’ll find out who that someone is soon—with the authority to redistribute wealth and power. It is also important to remember that Schwab, who is really just one of many important Great Reset advocates, is especially interested in something called a “stakeholder economy,” a concept that is vital for understanding the full weight of the Great Reset.

Later in the same article, Schwab explains that another major component of the Great Reset agenda is to “ensure that investments advance shared goals, such as equality and sustainability.” He continues:

Here, the large-scale spending programs that many governments are implementing represent a major opportunity for progress. The European Commission, for one, has unveiled plans for a €750 billion (\$826 billion) recovery fund. The US, China, and Japan also have ambitious economic-stimulus plans.

Rather than using these funds, as well as investments from private entities and pension funds, to fill cracks in the old system, we should use them to create a new one that is more resilient, equitable, and sustainable in the long run. This means, for example, building “green” urban infrastructure and creating incentives for industries to improve their track record on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) metrics.

The new system Schwab is referring to is a total reworking of the way people think about businesses and how to evaluate them. Rather than focus on profits, private property rights, supply, and demand from consumers—the cornerstones of free market economies—Schwab wants to develop a system based largely on “environmental, social, and governance (ESG) metrics,” which, as we’ll explore later, is another, much more complex way of suggesting that companies should be rewarded for working toward achieving social justice goals, like fighting climate change, addressing racial inequity, and removing Aunt Jemima from syrup bottles.

This does not mean, however, that the Great Reset is a socialist system. It is easy to fall into that trap—I did many times in the year leading up to this book’s release. The Great Reset is fundamentally about shifting wealth and power into the hands of elites, as you’ll see later in the chapter. All this “social justice” stuff that Schwab and other Resetters like to talk about is just a smoke-and-mirror show. In the end, the Great Reset machine could be used to pursue any goals the ruling class deems important.

As I warned you about earlier, in Schwab’s article he is deliberately being very vague, but there are already several reasons to be alarmed.

First, Schwab wants to reset capitalism and create a new system. Second, that new system would be focused on equality of outcomes—not equality under the law—a goal rejected by all market-based economies. And although Schwab does not say it in the passage quoted here, we will discover elsewhere that the “equality” Schwab wants isn’t just among people within a

nation but between nations as well. The Great Reset is, without a doubt, an internationalist movement.

Third, Schwab wants national governments and central banks to spend massive amounts of money-money they do not have-to make his proposed changes. Schwab says elsewhere in the article that this will “require stronger and more effective governments.”

EXPANDING SOCIAL PROGRAMS

In a variety of articles, speeches, presentations, interviews, and videos, Great Reset supporters make it abundantly clear that their plan for building a more “equitable” society requires large, government-funded socialist or progressive programs, which would be paid for by increasing taxes on the wealthy and businesses, as well as through the printing of money by central banks like the Federal Reserve in the United States.

Gita Gopinath, the chief economist at the international Monetary Fund, said during an interview with WEF promoting the Great Reset, “I believe it’s very important for countries to recognize there are essential services that need to be provided in terms of healthcare, education, good governance and a social safety that cannot be compromised on.”

Sharan Burrow, the general secretary of the international Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), also supports the Great Reset. During a similar interview, Burrow said, “I can see how we could use this opportunity to design a better world, but we need both national and multilateral institutions to make it work.”

Later Burrow added, “We must ensure this design is inclusive of universal social protection. The world could fund it right now-and yet 70% of the world’s population has no social protection. It must be respectful of public services rather than simply trying to profit from them.”

here Burrow is not clear by what she means by “universal social protection,” which is not a term you often hear in the United States. However, on the website of the International Trade Union Confederation, which claims to represent two hundred million workers in 163 countries, the organization spells out in detail what Burrow was referring to. In a June 2020 campaign brief titled “A Global Social Protection Fund Is Possible,” the ITUC writes, “The Covid-19 pandemic has brutally exposed the fault lines of

the global divide between those that have universal social protection, including health and income support, and those that don't."

ITUC later explains,

Social protection is essential for human security and social justice. It is a foundation for peaceful societies committed to building shared prosperity. It creates the basis for economic development and builds resilience against personal, national or global shocks.

A social protection floor includes basic income security including cash transfers where necessary; pensions for the elderly; disability benefits; unemployment benefits and support; maternity protection; and child benefits among other nationally identified needs.

In addition and equally important, universal access to essential social services-including health, education, water, sanitation and housing-is vital.

Providing the entire world's population with a litany of government-funded social programs? I would love to see the price tag on that one. No doubt it would make the \$94 trillion Green New Deal in America look like an off-brand can of tomatoes on the discount shelf at Dollar General.

The stated purpose of the Great Reset's proposed expansion of government "social protection" is to promote left-wing goals. Kristalina Georgieva, the managing director of the International Monetary Fund, said in a June 2020 address about the Great Reset that any economic recovery must focus on "fairer growth."

"We know that-if left to its own devices-this pandemic is going to deepen inequality," Georgieva said. "That has happened in prior pandemics.

"We can avoid this if we concentrate on investing in people-in the social fabric of our societies, in access to opportunities, in education for all, and in the expansion of social programs so we take care of the most vulnerable people," Georgieva added. "Then we can have a world that is better for everyone."

In the same talk, Georgieva then explained that the creation of the government-run health care system in the United Kingdom following World War II serves as an important "example from the past" of how governments can use crises to enact progressive reforms.

“I want to conclude with an example from the past,” she said. “William Beveridge, in the midst of the Second World War, put forward his famous report in 1942 in which he projected how U.K. should address what he called the ‘five giant evils.’ That famous ‘Beveridge Report’ led to a better country after the war-including the creation of the National Health Service that is saving so many lives today in the U.K.”

Of course, Georgieva left out how the National Health Service has for decades been poorly managed, underfunded, and associated with rationing and long wait times. According to the New York times-a publication that often promotes left-wing causes like single-payer health care-”Denying lifesaving care to conserve public resources is nothing new for Britain’s National Health Service.

“In expensive treatments for cancer and other diseases, the health service officially limits what it will spend to postpone a death: 30,000 pounds, or about \$37,000, for each year of full ‘quality’ life provided to a patient,” the Times reported. (In case you were ever wondering how much you mean to the government, the United Kingdom’s bureaucrats went through the trouble of assigning a specific value to your life. How thoughtful of them.)

In addition to calls for expanding “universal social protection” through government-run or government-managed health care and education programs, individual Great Resetters and others aligned with the World Economic Forum have also demanded a variety of large government programs that may or may not be part of a final Great Reset platform that could be released in 2022.

Guy Standing, a professor in development studies at the University of London and nominee for the Most Literal Name Ever award, authored an article in April 2020 for the World Economic Forum titled “Coronavirus Has Shown Us Why We Urgently Need to Make a Basic Income a Reality.” In the article, Standing argues that “in this pandemic, the economy will not survive without (a) quasi-universal” basic income program.

Standing is not alone in demanding new basic income programs. In April 2020, Kanni Wignaraja, assistant secretary-general of the United Nations, and Balazs Horvath, chief economist for the Asia-Pacific group at the U.N. Development Programme, argued that the COVID-19 pandemic has made it apparent that it is now “time to add a new element to the policy

packages that governments are introducing, one we know but have abandoned: Universal Basic Income (UBI). It is needed as part of the package that will help us to get out of this yawning pit.”

It is impossible to say what additional multi-trillion-dollar government social programs will be dreamed up at the World Economic Forum’s various Great Reset meetings in the years to come. But based on the other parts of the Great Reset platform, I think it’s a safe bet, to say the least, that they would expand the power and influence of government bureaucrats and the ruling class.

Before we move on, I want to once again stress the importance of resisting the urge to view the Great Reset as a socialist or even progressive framework. There are socialist and progressive elements to the plan, as I have just pointed out, but we have also already encountered what should be a big red flag: throughout this book, I’ve noted repeatedly that corporations, bankers, and some of the world’s wealthiest people have proudly stood behind the Great Reset. Does anyone really believe that these Wall Street cutthroats and billionaire entrepreneurs have suddenly become card-carrying members of the Democratic Socialists of America? Of course they haven’t.

The real reason there are so many corporate and financial industry interests lining up to promote the Great Reset is because of money and power—the true driving force behind the Reset. We are going to get into that topic in a lot more detail later in the chapter, but it is important to keep this point in mind as we navigate our way through this complex issue. The progressive and socialist elements to the Reset are merely there to win support from some groups on the left while simultaneously expanding the power of elites. The ruling class has not, no matter what they say, had a real come-to-Bernie moment—which probably explains why you typically won’t find Sanders at Davos cocktail parties.

A GLOBAL GREEN NEW DEAL

As I explained at length in chapter 3, the most important long-term justification used by supporters of the Great Reset is that it is necessary for saving humanity from the “existential crisis” posed by climate change.

In that chapter, I noted that Schwab has argued, “We only have one planet and we know that climate change could be the next global disaster

with even more dramatic consequences for humankind. We have to decarbonize the economy in the short window still remaining and bring our thinking and behavior once more into harmony with nature.”

How exactly do Klaus and friends aim to bring Americans “into harmony with nature”? By imposing an expansive, never-before-attempted, global Green New Deal that would wipe out the use of most fossil fuels and replace conventional energy with wind, solar, and other earth-destroying “green” energy sources.

Martina Larkin, a member of the Executive Committee at the World Economic Forum, wrote in May 2020 that the “Green Deal must be at the heart of the COVID-19 recovery” in Europe. According to Larkin:

A new forecast by climate experts at the Global Carbon Project predicts that carbon dioxide emissions could fall by the largest amount since the Second World War due to the impact of COVID-19 on economic activity. This means carbon output could fall by more than 5% year-on-year, which is the first dip since a 1.4% reduction following the 2008 financial crisis.

However, as economic activity resumes and countries and companies develop recovery strategies, we need to fast-track the structural changes towards a fossil-free economy. The European Green Deal could be the opportunity to leap-frog in this ambition...

Achieving this trans-formative agenda and making Europe a leader in the global climate transition requires a massive mobilization of public and private investments. The Commission estimates that reaching the net-zero 2050 target requires at least €1 trillion of public and private investment over the next decade.

However, as Larkin knows well, most European nations, just like the United States, do not have any cash available for all the “public and private investment” needed to build billions of solar panels. They are running huge deficits. So how do they plan to pay for the Green New Deal? By printing money, of course, in line with the principles of Stephanie Kelton and other modern monetary theorists. There simply is no feasible way to pay for plans this ambitious without a monetary framework that would allow for absurdly high levels of government deficit spending.

Larkin and Schwab are not the only Great Reset supporters who have called for massive “green” infrastructure plans as part of a COVID-19 recovery. Just about everyone I could find who supports the Great Reset also backs some version of the Green New Deal, both in Europe and elsewhere, and many began attempting to link the pandemic to “green” infrastructure proposals in the earliest days of the coronavirus crisis.

In March 2020, the World Economic Forum published an article titled “Could COVID-19 Give Rise to a Greener Global Future?” The article was written by two academics and the co-president of the Club of Rome, a powerful nonprofit organization most famous for its 1972 book *The Limits to growth*, which predicted that modern civilization may not survive the twenty-first century because of resource depletion. According to the authors of the March article, the only way to save the planet is to use the COVID-19 pandemic to rebuild the global economy using policies such as the Green New Deal.

They wrote,

The coronavirus pandemic is a wake-up call to stop exceeding the planet's limits. After all, deforestation, biodiversity loss, and climate change all make pandemics more likely...Government that succeed in containing epidemics all tacitly follow the same mantra: “Follow the science and prepare for the future.” But we can do much better. Rather than simply reacting to disasters, we can use the science to design economies that will mitigate the threats of climate change, biodiversity loss, and pandemics. We must start investing in what matters, by laying the foundation for a green, circular economy that is anchored in nature-based solutions and geared toward the public good.

They then called on lawmakers to redirect public funding linked to fossil fuels “toward green infrastructure, reforestation, and investments in a more circular, shared, regenerative, low-carbon economy.”

At the June 2020 World Economic Forum virtual meeting, Antonio Guterres, the secretary-general of the United Nations, said the Great Reset should be used to build economies that are more “sustainable,” a term often used by Great Resetters as a stand-in for “green” energy. Guterres also called

for economies to become more “resilient in the face of...climate change and the many other global changes we face.”

What Larkin, Guterres, and Schwab don’t mention, however, is that financial institutions, investors, and corporations would amass untold trillions of dollars if the Green New Deal were to become a reality and spread globally. More on that a little later.

GLOBAL “COOPERATION”

If you are wondering how all of this can be achieved on a grand scale without increasing the power of global governing bodies like the United Nations, then you are not alone. Although Great Resetters never say that they want to abandon all notions of national sovereignty in favor of world government, they do make it clear that greatly empowering international organizations like the United Nations will be necessary under a Great Reset model.

Schwab admits that the “level of cooperation and ambition this (the Great Reset) implies is unprecedented,” but, he says, “it is not some impossible dream.” It simply will require “global cooperation” on a gigantic scale.

This global pandemic has also demonstrated again how inter-connected we are,” Schwab said. “We have to restore a functioning system of smart global cooperation structured to address the challenges of the next 50 years. The Great Reset will require us to integrate all stakeholders of global society into a community of common interest, purpose and action.”

I hate to sound like a “conspiracy theorist” again, but a “global...community of common interest, purpose and action” sounds an awful lot like Schwab is suggesting we put international governing bodies in charge of the world economy, doesn’t it?

Feike Sijbesma is a member of the board of trustees at the World Economic Forum and the co-chair of the Global Center on Adaptation (GCA). He is a little clearer about the Great Reset’s intention to usher in a glorious new era of enhancing global government—or at the very least, a high degree of global “cooperation” that would “change” societies around the world.

According to Sijbesma,

The Great Reset) requires improving global multilateral cooperation and aligning both the recovery of our economies and priorities of societies. For the Great Reset to succeed, we have to change the way we do business and manage health, nature, the environment, and societal issues at the same time.

Despite the unprecedented impact and global spread, there was little cooperation between countries. In many aspects, it was everyone for themselves when buying ventilators, face masks, tests, and more. As healthcare for governments is a domestic issue, countries did not explore unilateral joint approaches and solutions. Let's hope this was not the litmus test for other cross-border crises like climate change. Only via collaboration between countries, can we address such issues.

THE “STAKEHOLDER ECONOMY”

It is easy to look at the long list of left-wing government programs appearing earlier in the chapter and think that this is all that Resetters have in mind when they talk about pushing the reset button on the global economy, but the truth is, as crazy as it might sound, the trillions of dollars in new spending, total destruction of the world's existing energy industry, and creation of countless social programs like universal basic income and government-managed health care are not the most important parts of the Reset or even part of the foundation of the plan.

At the beginning of this chapter, I cited Klaus Schwab's broad outline for the Great Reset, and at the time, I told you that his call to “steer the market toward fairer outcomes” by, in part, creating “the conditions for a ‘stakeholder economy’” was something you should take note of, because it plays a pivotal role in grasping just how big the Great Reset transformation would be. Now that you have a better understanding of some of the more overtly socialistic elements of the Great Reset, let's turn our attention to what Schwab and many others in the Great Reset movement mean by building a “stakeholder economy.”

At first, the idea of a stakeholder economy, also commonly referred to as stakeholder capitalism, sounds pretty darn innocuous, even boring. After all, the whole idea of government and business officials caring about “stakeholders”—a term that normally means “one who is involved in or

affected by a course of action-does not sound very radical. But if you start to dig deeper into the Great Reset pit, you will quickly see that “stakeholder capitalism” represents a dramatic departure from our common understanding of market-based economics.

Stakeholder capitalism is an economic system in which companies are effectively required to put social justice causes and/or the goals of elites—which, of course, vary wildly depending on the parties involved—before profits, supply and demand, the desires of consumers, and other market forces that normally direct capitalist systems, which don’t forget, have created the most prosperous, healthy, safe societies humankind has ever known. Our more traditional understanding of capitalism is often called “shareholder capitalism” by Great Resetters, because they say it prioritizes the interests of the wider community.

After calling for “a change in capitalism,” Feike Sijbesma explained in an article for the World Economic Forum that under the Great Reset, “the (economic) focus should shift from short-term and profit-only to longer-term, incorporating value creation for people and the planet, moving from shareholder value to stakeholder interests.”

Schwab, who has long advocated for stakeholder capitalism, said in January 2020, “Business has now to fully embrace stakeholder capitalism, which means not only maximizing profits, but use their capabilities and resources in cooperation with governments and civil society to address the key issues of this decade. They have to actively contribute to a more cohesive and sustainable world.

Sijbesma further explained that the principles that must be embraced by companies in a stakeholder capitalist system focus on a “longer-term economic strategy” that is “anchored in addressing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)” produced by the United Nations.

When Great Resetters talk about shifting to a stakeholder model, they typically mean one centered on U.N. SDGs, so it is important to understand what the Sustainable Development Goals involve and why Great Reset promoters are so interested in them.

The Sustainable Development Goals were created at a meeting of the United Nations in September 2015. The SDGs, which serve as a successor to the United Nation’s Agenda 21 sustainable development plan—yes, that

Agenda 21-represent commitments made inequalities within and among countries; to build peaceful, just and inclusive societies; to protect human rights and promote gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls; and to ensure the lasting protection of the planet and its natural resources"-and, all by 2030. If you ever hear anyone talk about "Agenda 2030," it's almost certainly in reference to the United Nation's Sustainable Development Goals.

According to the United Nations, this "collective journey" is "accepted by all countries and is applicable to all, taking into account different national realities, capacities and levels of development and respecting national policies and priorities."

In their commitment to the Sustainable Development Goals, member nations said they imagined" a world free of poverty, hunger, disease and want, where all life can thrive." They also said,

We envisage a world free of fear and violence. A world with universal literacy. A world with equitable and universal access to quality education at all levels, to health care and social protection, where physical, mental and social well-being are assured....A world where human habitats are safe, resilient and sustainable and where there is universal access to affordable, reliable and sustainable energy....A world of universal respect for human rights and human dignity, the rule of law, justice, equality and non-discrimination; of respect for race, ethnicity and cultural diversity; and of equal opportunity permitting the full realization of human potential and contributing to shared prosperity.

They further committed to a world in which every country enjoys sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and decent work for all. A world in which consumption and production patterns and use of all natural resources-from air to land, from rivers, lakes and aquifers to oceans and seas-are sustainable. One in which democracy, good governance and the rule of law as well as an enabling environment at national and international levels, are essential for a sustainable development, including sustained and inclusive economic growth, social development, environmental protection and the eradication of poverty and hunger. One in which humanity lives in harmony with nature and in which wildlife and other living species are protected.

I get their desire to aim high, but creating “a world free of...want”? You know, I want a unicorn and clouds made of cotton candy. Is the United Nations promising these things too? Fat dads like me love cotton candy clouds and demand to know.

I realize all of this sounds like your standard pie-in-the-sky globalism from the United Nations, and that is because that is exactly what the Sustainable Development Goals are. But this does not mean they are meaningless. They certainly have a lot of value to supporter of the Great Reset, who want to use these goals as a springboard to control economic activity while making their corporate friends filthy rich. But how exactly would that work?

Schwab and other Great Reset supporters want to transforms the current global economy into one in which every company focuses more on advancing SDGs, or whatever else the ruling class deems important, than on profits. In December 2019, Schwab and the World Economic Forum released its Davos Manifesto 2020, which outlines some of the core values of a new stakeholder economy.

In a stakeholder economy, the manifesto notes, “the purpose of a company is to engage all its stakeholders in shared and sustained value creation. In creating such value, a company serves not only its shareholders, but all its stakeholders—employees, customers, suppliers, local communities and society at large.

Or put in much clearer terms, in a stakeholder capitalist system, companies should first serve the collective according to the demands of the ruling class in government, not their customers and owners. Stakeholder capitalism is just another way of saying “collectivist capitalism,” which really is not capitalism at all.

To many Americans, perhaps even some reading this book, this concept might not sound all that worrisome. You might be thinking, “Okay, so under the Great Reset, companies would have to factor in other consideration in addition to profits. So what?”

Before dismissing my concerns, stop and think for a minute about the implications of this idea. A “profit-driven” model for business ensures that companies put the consumer first. Under this system, individuals dictate the products and services that are produced, by voting with their dollars. Companies that want to survive listen to the demands of their customers and

even try to anticipate them. But in a stakeholder system, individuals are replaced by an elite group of Bond villain wannabes in the ruling class. They dictate which products and services are produced and who ought to be hired to provide them to customers-not you, the individual.

UNDERSTANDING ESG

How can the Great Reset overlords know which companies are properly pursuing the “right” goals? To help push businesses in the direction the elites in society deem best, the World Economic Forum, business leaders, financial institutions, activists, and government officials from around the world have developed environmental, social, and governance (ESG) metrics that can help companies, investors, governments, and the public know who the “good” businesses are and which scoundrel companies are interested only in turning a profit, developing new products, and hiring more employees. I mean, there is nothing worse than a company looking to hire more employees and earn a profit in a marketplace, right?

Although there are several versions of these ESG metrics available today, the metrics promoted by the World Economic Forum and the International Business Council, a group created by wEF in 2001, are perhaps positioned best to become the international standard in the coming years.

The final draft of the WEF metrics, titled *Measuring Stakeholder Capitalism: Toward Common Metrics and Consistent Reporting Sustainable Value Creation*, was released in September 2020 and prepared in collaboration with experts from Bank of America and the “Big Four” accounting firms: Deloitte, KPMG, PricewaterhouseCoopers, and Ernst & Young, all of which are worth tens of billions of dollars and widely considered to be the most influential and powerful firms in the world-you know, real down-to-earth people who know what life is like for the average, everyday worker.

The World Economic Forum’s ESG standards include twenty-one “core metrics” and thirty-four “expanded metrics.” Together they allow auditors to develop a comprehensive ESG score that can be used to determine whether a company is in line with the demands of the ruling class.

The standards are divided into four “pillars”: Principles of Governance, Planer, People, and Prosperity. Although some of the core metrics that compose each pillar are reasonable and even advisable-like closely tracking

“incidents of corruption confirmed during the current year but related to previous years”-many others are clearly designed to advance social justice causes favored mostly by those on the left.

In the Principles of Governance pillar, WEF suggests that companies be scored based on the “membership of under-represented social groups” serving in a company’s governing body, as well as those leaders” competencies relating to economic, environmental standards.

The People pillar is full of woke ideology, including an ESG measure for the “percentage of employees per employee category, by age group, gender and other indicators of diversity (e.g. ethnicity),”as well as pro-labor union measures such as the “percentage of active workforce covered under collective bargaining agreements.”

Let’s stop for a second and think about what the World Economic Forum’s ESG model would look like in the real world. Under WEF’s standards, a company with relatively larger profits, high employee and customer satisfaction, and high-quality products and services-a company that would universally be considered well managed under a free market system-could be rated lower than a company in the same industry that is less efficient and has fewer profits and worse products and services but has the right ratio of Asian-to-Black workers, low carbon dioxide emissions in their supply chain, and the “ideal” number of transgender members on the board of directors.

Now, let’s get one thing out of the way right from the start: private businesses should have the right to engage in any number of silly, stupid, wasteful, noble, kind, compassionate, or ridiculous causes or to hold themselves to standards that I think are foolish or counterproductive. As far as I am concerned, if businesses want to create an ESG system that rewards corporations that give raises only to workers who like the color green or that pay salaries ending in odd numbers or that are owned by people named Glenn, then I’m fine with that. Investors, employees, and consumers should have the right to decide who they want to do business with, and if people want to spend their time and money doing business with only the wokiest of woke companies, then that should be their right.

But for the most part, that system has always existed in every market economy. Nothing has stopped consumers from buying from only those

companies that choose to embrace their ideals, and nothing has stopped investors from investing in them.

So what do Klaus Schwab and the other Great Reset elites have in mind when they say they want to advance the ESG model, tear down the existing “shareholder capitalism” system, and replace it with an economy focused on stakeholders?

The answer is almost certainly twofold: the transformation could be brought on by either government mandates or the use of monetary incentives made possible by newly printed cash from central banks. Under the first option, governments around the world could start building stricter regulatory schemes that directly or indirectly force businesses to focus on improving ESG scores, rather than profits, in order to continue operating in certain nations or regions or to continue being a publicly traded corporation. Some governments have already started putting into place regulations that force companies to “act responsibly” and in line with the concerns of elites.

As World Economic Forum project specialist Elisabeth Andvig noted in a May 2020 WEF article calling for a Great Reset.

Legal and societal pressures on businesses operating around the world are rapidly evolving. There is a call for efforts to better align the activities of corporations with society’s drive to build a more inclusive, equitable and sustainable economy....The implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Agenda 2030 will depend on positive contributions from the private sector, through responsible business conduct and responsible investments....Doing the right thing is about more than just complying with the law. However, legal obligations are increasingly requiring companies to act responsibly.

In some cases, American investors and businesses themselves are begging for regulatory agencies to use their powers to impose social justice and environmental causes. In July 2020, a group of more than three dozen large investors, activists, nonprofits, pension funds, and former politicians—which together manage nearly \$1 trillion in assets—sent a letter to the Federal Reserve (America’s central bank), the Securities and Exchange Commission, and other regulatory bodies asking them to impose rules that would supposedly help stop climate change.

According to the New York Times, the letter read, in part, “The climate crisis poses a systemic threat to financial markets and the real economy, with significant disruptive consequences on asset valuations and our nation’s economic stability.”

The Times further reported, “That financial threat, combined with the physical risks posed by climate change, may create ‘disastrous impacts the likes of which we haven’t seen before,’ the letter says. It urges the Fed, the Securities and Exchange Commission and other agencies to explicitly integrate climate change across your mandates.”

These investors are asking the U.S. government to do everything in its power to force other companies to adopt their woke causes, bringing to mind the old statistic slogan “Ideas so good, they are mandatory.”

Similarly, according to the World Economic Forum, Ma Jun, the chairman of the China Green Finance Committee and an avid supporter of the Great Reset, has called for the Reset to include “tighter reporting and regulation for companies,” to ensure they are working harder to advance environmental goals.

Regulatory agencies in the United States are listening. In March 2021, Perkins Coie, a highly influential international law firm, reported,

Over the past few weeks, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission has taken several actions that put climate change front and center, reflecting the importance to many investors of climate change related disclosures.

In early February, the SEC announced the addition of Satyam Khanna as a senior policy adviser charged with coordinating and overseeing efforts related to climate and other environmental, social, and governance (ESG) issues. Mr. Khanna is the first ever senior policy adviser for ESG issues at the SEC. Since then, the SEC has announced a rapid series of additional initiatives...

President Biden’s nominee to be the next SEC chair, Gary Gensler, said during his confirmation hearing that investors want more information about climate risks and that disclosure requirements should be grounded in what reasonable investors find material. If confirmed, Mr. Gensler indicated to the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing,

and Urban Affairs, he would likely pursue rule-making around climate risk disclosures and perhaps other ESG topics.

Additionally, in August 2021, Bloomberg writer Bill Dudley outlined some of the radical developments underway at the U.S. Federal Reserve, led by Chair Jay Powell, who is eagerly working to build a regulatory framework that can be used to push banks and the companies they do business with to adopt climate and energy policies favored by the Left.

Powell and the Fed's Board of Governors created two new entities—the Financial Stability Climate Committee, to focus on the broader financial system, and the Supervision Climate Committee, to focus on individual institutions. This matters because it means top officials are committed to regularly evaluating and responding to the threat (of climate change). They're already working to ensure that banks embed climate change in their business decisions—analyzing exposures, identifying concentrations of risk and considering how to manage them over time.

The recent developments at the SEC and Federal Reserve are vital because they will serve as the foundation for future Great Reset economic transformations in the United States, by providing lawmakers in Washington with tools needed to push companies toward full ESG adoption. And they are already acting as a warning to American businesses that future regulatory changes are just around the corner.

But as troubling as things are in America, the situation is much worse in Europe, where many political figures have been working for years to make ESG standards mandatory for all large businesses and many small businesses. As my coauthor, Justin Haskins, reported in June 2021, “In March, the Parliament of the European Union passed a resolution that seeks to require nearly all of the EU’s largest companies—and many smaller businesses, too—to adopt and prioritize ESG metrics. And especially important for U.S. businesses and consumers, the resolution would further require that EU companies only work with those who share the European Union’s environmental, social and governance standards.

In a report about the European ESG resolution, international law firm Shearman & Sterling noted, “If adopted, all EU Member States will be

required to implement the Directive into their national laws. This will result in substantive due diligence requirements being imposed on companies, whether based in the EU or selling their products and services into the EU, across their entire value chain, with potential sanctions for non-compliance.

Understanding what European Union officials mean by “value chain” is extremely important. In their resolution, “value chain” is defined as “all activities, operations, business relationships and investment chains of an undertaking and includes entities with which the undertaking has a direct or indirect business relationship, upstream and downstream, and which either: (a) supply products, parts of products or services that contribute to the undertaking’s own products or services, or (b) receive products or services from the undertaking.”

That means if the E.U. resolution were to become law-and as of the time of this writing, that is looking more and more likely-all U.S. businesses having any “direct or indirect” relationship with an E.U. business, “upstream and downstream”, would be forced to operate under some or all of Europe’s proposed ESG system.

Now, it’s not true that all Great Resetters are calling for the use of regulations to impose ESG standards on private companies, at least not in every situation. In some cases, they talk about adopting ESG voluntarily. In 2019, Schwab encouraged businesses to adopt stakeholder capitalist principles voluntarily, so that they can “move beyond their legal obligations and uphold their duty to society.”

This is where the second method for creating a stakeholder economic system comes into play. Rather than use regulations to impose environmental, social, and governance standards on companies, some Great Resetters want to use massive government and central bank spending programs to push companies toward adopting ESG standards, a move that looks eerily similar to proposals backed by people like modern monetary theorist Stephanie Kelton, who has long suggested that the best way to “progress” society is to not only expand the power of government but also print trillions of dollars and tie social justice strings to the money.

Pursing modern monetary theory principles like those supported by Kelton would make it unnecessary to completely dismantle private property ownership. Government and central banks would become the biggest and most important “consumers” in the marketplace, which, of course, would not

and could not function as a true market because of the out-sized power and influence of government and central bank spending programs.

“ALIGNING INCENTIVES”

Say, for example, government funding makes up 20 percent of a business’s income, directly or indirectly. On many issues, that business is going to be far more interested in keeping the government happy than focused on pleasing individual consumers, and this perversion would only get worse as the government raises its level of involvement. Eventually, individual consumers would become nothing more than an afterthought.

As I mentioned at the start of this chapter, this strategy was clearly stated in Klaus Schwab’s article outlining his “main components” of the Great Reset, published in June 2020.

The second component of a Great Reset agenda would ensure that investments advance shared goals, such as equality and sustainability....Rather than using these funds, as well as investments from private entities and pension funds, to fill cracks in the old system, we should use them to create a new one that is more resilient, equitable, and sustainable in the long run. This means, for example, building “green” urban infrastructure and creating incentives for industries to improve their track record on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) metrics.

Another, much less misleading word for the “incentives” Klaus speaks about here is “coercion.” And if enough money is tied to ESG metrics, that coercion could effectively become necessary to businesses in order for them to survive, especially if it is coupled with all the new taxes and regulations Schwab and other Great Resetters also support.

Additionally, it is important to note that Great Resetters do not always use the words “environmental, social, and governance metrics” when they are referring to building their new stakeholder economy but instead use terms like “sustainable investment” and “reallocating incentives” to convey the same radical idea.

Writing for WEF and Project Syndicate in July 2020, Tolullah Oni, a physician and researcher at the University of Cambridge said, “Although several global philanthropic initiatives have sought to improve urban health and resilience, undoubtedly with positive results, today’s flawed systems need more fundamental disruption. Simply put, the world needs a new Marshall Plan for planetary health-akin to a New Deal for a post-pandemic recovery.”

According to Oni, this new “Marshall Plan” would “serve as a global guide, aligning incentives and shifting default behaviors toward the shared goal of sustainable healthy urban development. It will require the agreement and participation of national and local governments, private developers, investors, and multilateral organizations, which will take time.”

“Aligning incentives and shifting default behaviors” is another way of saying “bribing businesses to do what we think is in the best interests of the collective,” in line with ESG goals.

This is exactly what Great Reset supporter Sharan Burrow, the general secretary of the International Trade Union Confederation, had in mind when she said during an interview about the Great Reset, “We need to design policies to align with investment in people and the environment. But above all, the longer-term perspective is about re-balancing economies.”

Burrow elaborated further in the interview, saying, “We want an end to the profit-at-all-costs mentality, because if we don’t build an economic future within a sustainable framework in which we are respectful of our planetary boundaries, and the need to change our energy and technology systems, then we will not have a living planet for human beings.”

This is the same sort of thinking used by the French government in 2020 when crafting COVID-19 relief packages for airlines suffering under government lock downs. As reported by the Guardian in April 2020, “Some governments are seeking to attach strings to rescue plans. France’s minister for ecological transition, Elisabeth Borne, insisted Air France was not getting a ‘blank cheque.’ The government has set ‘ecological commitments,’ she said, including a 50% reduction in carbon emissions on domestic flights by 2024, as well as investing in more fuel-efficient planes.”

Many financial institutions have already laid the groundwork for punishing companies that will not go along with the Great Reset’s mandates. In February 2021, Bank of America, citing its “long-standing support for the

Paris Climate Agreement,” issued a press release announcing that it had “outlined initial steps to achieve its goal of net zero greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in its financing activities, operations and supply chain before 2050.”

The press release further noted, “Bank of America continues to actively engage with its clients to help accelerate their own transitions to net zero, and it plans to establish interim science based emissions targets for high-emitting portfolios, including energy and power. In addition, Bank of America released its broader 2030 operational and supply chain goals as part of a holistic commitment to environmental sustainability.”

Notice that Bank of America’s “goal of net zero greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions” applies not only to the company’s “operations and supply chain,” which means that everyone who does business with Bank of America would have to go along with its goals in order to keep BoA as a customer, but also to the bank’s “financing activities,” which is another way of saying, “If you don’t go ‘green,’ we’re not going to give your business a loan.”

In the same press release, Bank of America also touted the close relationship its CEO, Brian Moynihan, has with the World Economic Forum and his involvement with the development of WEF’s ESG metrics. And then it included this creepy quote from Bank of America vice chairman Anne Finucane, who, according to the press release, “leads the company’s environmental, social, and governance, sustainable finance, capital deployment, and public policy efforts”: “It is critical that we leverage all parts of our business-beyond our direct operations-in order to accelerate the transition to a net zero global economy. We recognize that this will be no easy task, but we believe our commitment will help spur the growth of zero carbon energy and power solutions, sustainable transportation and agriculture, and other sector transformations, while generating more-climate resilient and equitable opportunities for our future.”

Boy, that sounds awfully similar to the sort of thing one might hear while attending a Great Reset meeting in Davos. Again, pay special attention to what Bank of America is saying here. Its plan is to “leverage all parts of our business-beyond our direct operations-in order to accelerate the transition to a net zero global economy.” In other words, the plan is to push the world toward elites’ goal of a global economy that has net zero carbon dioxide

emissions, whether the world wants it or not, by using the full weight and power of one of the wealthiest, most influential banks on earth.

Bank of America is hardly the only private financial institutions pushing ESG standards and green energy mandates. In March 2021, Jane Fraser—the CEO of Citi, a bank worth more than \$200 billion—published an article on the company’s website titled “Citi’s Commitment to Net Zero by 2050.”

In the article, Fraser declared, “The climate crisis is among the top critical challenges facing our global society and economy today and there is an urgent need for collective action. We believe that global financial institutions like Citi have the opportunity—and the responsibility—to play a leading role in helping drive the transition to a net zero global economy and make good on the promise of the Paris Agreement.”

How exactly does Fraser envision Citi “helping drive the transition to a net zero global economy”?

After bragging about the various actions Citi has taken to reduce its own carbon footprint and to facilitate financing for “low-carbon solutions,” Fraser wrote, “Our ESG agenda can’t just be a separate layer that sits above what we do day-to-day. Our commitments to closing the gender pay gap, to advancing racial equity, and to pioneering the green agenda have demonstrated that this is good for business and not at odds with it. And we will continue to be part of the solution to these challenges and enable others to do so as well.

“Net zero means rethinking our business and helping our clients rethink theirs,” Fraser added. “For banks, what some don’t realize is that net zero includes not just our own operations but also our core business impacts,” including the bank’s financing activities.

YEARS IN THE MAKING

It is not a coincidence that the announcement from Citi’s CEO about the bank’s commitment to shift toward a model that will eventually limit financing opportunities to businesses that fit into its ESG framework came within a month of Bank of America issuing a nearly identical promise. Thanks to a swift shove from government, the world’s financial institutions have been moving in this direction for many years.

As Iain Murray, the vice president for strategy and a senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, reported back in 2014 for the Blaze.

Firearm sellers, pawn shops, payday lenders, and even porn stars around the nation have recently found their bank accounts canceled despite years of good relationships with their banks.

When pressed, the banks say that it is because of heightened regulatory supervision of “high risk” industries. This has been traced back to a shadowy Obama administration program launched in 2013 called “Operation Choke Point”....Operation Choke Point is a Department of Justice-led initiative aimed at “choking off” the financial oxygen of potential financial fraudsters who use Third Party Payment Processors (TPPPs) to process payments. It does this based on a 2011 guidance document from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) on how banks should manage their relationships with TPPPs that deal with industries that might present “reputational risk” to the bank. Until recently, that guidance contained a list of about 30 “high risk” industries, including ammunition, drug paraphernalia, pornography, home-based charities, and many others.

Once the public found out about Operation Choke Point, the backlash caused the leadership at the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to withdraw its list of “high-risk” industries. But as Murray noted, Operation Choke Point continued, “though in a slightly different guise.” He explained,

The underlying guidance about “reputational risk” remains unchanged. All the government has done is remove examples of what might constitute such risk from its websites. As a result, banks now have to judge for themselves what constitutes the sort of reputational risk that could trigger a federal subpoena.

Meanwhile, Justice Department attorneys are using their own judgment about reputational risk to serve as a basis for whom to investigate. If today’s focus is on payday lenders, who is to say, for example, that pornography will not be the next industry to come under the spotlight?...What about a coal company, when so many are now

convinced that coal pollutes the planet and the nation should move toward “renewable” energy?

Although Operation Choke Point was eventually disbanded by the Trump administration in 2017, a clear signal had been sent to banks and other financial institutions: don’t do business with industries disfavored by many in the federal government.

Around the same time that 195 countries signed the Paris Climate Agreement in 2015, thereby committing to dramatically reduce their carbon dioxide emissions, banks and financial institutions around the world—with Operation Choke Point and other, similar policies in mind—begin to shift their focus heavily toward concerns over climate change and how they could better position their businesses in a post-Paris Agreement world.

It started with the development of the Partnership for Carbon Accounting Financials (PCAF) in 2015. PCAF members—which include “commercial banks, development banks, asset owners/managers, insurance companies, etc.”—collaborate “to develop and implement greenhouse gas (GHG) accounting in their organizations”, as well as to help spur discussions on “climate change and the role of the financial institution to facilitate the transition towards a low-carbon society.”

PCAF-compliant financial institutions numbered more than one hundred as of March 2021 and included many of the largest institutions in America, such as Bank of America, Citi, Morgan Stanley, and TD Bank.

Following the signing of the Paris Agreement, banks and financial institutions worked together to further develop and expand rules, regulations, and guidelines to transform their industry, culminating in the formation in 2019 of the U.N. Principles for Responsible Banking (PRB), “the first-ever global sustainability framework for the banking industry.”

PRB signatories “commit to align their business strategy and practice with the Sustainable Development Goals and the goals of the Paris Climate Agreement”—or put more simply, signatories agree to stop financing any business that refuses to adopt elites’ climate change mandates. As of September 2020, more than 190 banks had agreed to the Principles for Responsible Banking and these signatories “look after the business of more than 1.6 billion customers worldwide and represent around 40% of global banking assets.

However, fear of government mandates is not the only thing banks and financial institutions have had in mind when building their Great Reset ESG frameworks. Perhaps most important of all is the promise of cold, hard cash.

THE PAYOFF

It is important to understand that the most corrupt-and terrifying-elements of the Great Reset also help explain why so many business leaders and financial institutions have agreed to promote this movement. Many have gone beyond mere promotion and even helped develop some of its primary components. This includes presidents and CEOs from Microsoft, Bank of America, Mastercard, BP, and other highly influential businesses and investment firms.

The crony corporatists running these multi-billion-dollar companies have seen the writing on the wall: governments around the world are increasingly pushing for “green” mandates and sustainable development, as well as restrictions on speech-whether businesses and their customers like it or not. Plus, central banks are literally printing trillions of dollars that governments are directing toward the causes they favor, including many focused on social justice. If you were running a business, especially a large multinational corporation, it would be stupid not to do everything in your power to get your hands on some of that “free” cash, right?

It is also worth noting that many investors and businesses are not waiting around for what they believe to be the inevitable rise of ESG standards and increased government action. Investors and large corporations do not merely plan twelve months into the future; they plan twelve years into the future. Instead of utilizing a potentially catastrophic wait-and-see approach, they are adopting policies now with the hope that it will put them in the good graces of the money printing overlords in central banks and governments across the planet, including the United States.

Nowhere has this been made clearer than in the presentations and articles posted to the website of the Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI) group, one of the world’s most influential advocates for adopting ESG standards. In 2005, the United Nations brought together a group of twenty influential investors from twelve countries, as well as seventy experts from the investment industry, to develop the Principles for Responsible Investment.

According to PRI, “The six Principles for Responsible Investment are a voluntary and aspirational set of investment principles that offer a menu of possible actions for incorporating ESG issues into investment practice. The Principles were developed by investors, for investors. In implementing them, signatories contribute to developing a more sustainable global financial system.

When PRI officially launched in 2006, there were a total of one hundred signatories. Today there are more than three thousand, and together they control more than \$100 trillion in assets. (Yes, you read that correctly-\$100 trillion).

Although PRI is officially independent, it continues to work very closely with the United Nations and other Great Reset allies, and even though it’s a purely voluntary association, it openly acknowledges that it fully expects governments to demand in the near future many of the so-called sustainable principles that it supports. Even more important, PRI’s investors are convinced that governments and central banks will soon start shoveling even more cash into the coffers of all those businesses that agree to sign on to the Great Reset agenda.

You do not need to be a genius to see that the Principles for Responsible Investment group is more concerned with finding ways to profit off cronyism and government mandates than with fighting climate change or battling income inequality.

In a section of PRI’s website titled “What Is the Inevitable Policy Response?” PRI states that “it is inevitable that governments will be forced to act more decisively than they have so far” on the issue of climate change.

“The question for investors now is not if governments will act,” PRI claims, “but when they will do so, what policies they will use and where the impact will be felt. The IPR (Inevitable Policy Response) project forecasts a response by 2025 that will be forceful, abrupt, and disorderly because of the delay.”

PRI then goes on to encourage its investors to focus on putting money into companies, projects, and other investments that are closely aligned with “green” energy. Why? Is it because PRI is full of people desperate to win the love and affection of Bernie Sanders and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez? No. It is because green energy projects are where the government-printed, modern

monetary theory money will be under Joe Biden and many other government administrations around the world over the next several years.

THE “BIG THREE”

It is tempting to think that government is the primary driver of corporations’ move toward ESG and other woke causes, and it has undoubtedly played a significant role. However, perhaps the biggest reason so many corporations have agreed to adopt Great Reset principles in recent years is because of the voting power and influence of large Wall Street investment management companies, not the authority of government agencies.

In the previous section, I explained that investors are promoting ES in part because they believe government regulations and spending programs are moving in that direction, and they don’t want to be left behind when the Great Reset is fully in place. Corporations looking to attract new investors and raise their stock prices are reworking their business models to please these investors. But that’s only part of the story. In many cases, corporations are effectively being forced to change by powerful investment groups. How can investment management firms coerce companies to enact radical new corporate policies, including ESG scoring systems? By owning so much stock that they can alter corporate policies through shareholder resolutions or even replace corporate board members who refuse to go along with the Great Reset.

The consolidation of stock ownership in the hands of a small group of investment management companies is a relatively new and exceedingly dangerous development. The three largest stock index fund managers-Black Rock, Vanguard, and State Street Global Advisers-have quadrupled their average combined stake in S&P 500 companies over the past two decades.

According to research by Lucian Bebchuk, a professor at Harvard Law School, and Scott Hirst, an associate professor at the Boston University School of Law, the average ownership stake of the “Big Three” investment firms was 5.2 percent in 1998. In 2017, it was 20.5 percent. Even more important, the Big Three “collectively cast an average of about 25% of the votes at S&P 500 companies.” That means when the Big Three firms demand that corporate America jumps, most CEOs can respond only with, “How high?”.

This consolidation of voting power is likely to get worse in the coming years. Bebchuk and Hirst believe “that the Big Three could well cast as much as 40% of the votes in S&P 500 companies within two decades.” If that were to occur, three Wall Street firms, working in conjunction with a relatively small group of other shareholders, could effectively control nearly all of corporate America.

Although the influence of the Big Three has yet to reach the 40 percent mark, many corporations today are effectively controlled by a combination of the ten investment groups and financial institutions with the most assets under management. Collectively, the total assets controlled by the “Big Ten” investment groups—a list that includes goliaths like JP Morgan Chase, Fidelity, and Goldman Sachs—are worth more than \$34 trillion. To put that into perspective, Americans spent \$12.5 trillion on goods and services in 2020, and the total U.S. GDP in 2020 was less than \$21 trillion.

Many of the largest asset managers are deeply involved in the ESG movement, and some have openly supported the Great Reset. For example, Laurence Fink, the CEO of Black Rock, is on the board of directors at the World Economic Forum and is a vocal proponent of the Reset.

State Street Global Advisers—the folks who installed the Fearless Girl statue across from Wall Street’s bull statue as a publicity stunt in 2017—launched a widespread campaign in 2017 to force companies to have more women on their board of directors. The move was part of the company’s strong commitment to ESG standards. In 2018, the publication Institutional Investor reported State Street expanded the policy and said it “will vote against the entire slate of board members on the nominating committee of any company not meeting its gender diversity criteria.”

According to the Institutional Investor, as of 2018, “State Street says that more than 300 companies have added a female board director in response to its demands, and that another 28 have pledged to do so.”

Additionally, it is important to note that every one of the ten largest asset managers has signed the Principles for Responsible Investment.

As is often the case, if you want to truly understand why big corporations or large government agencies act the way they do follow the money.

SHIFTING STANDARDS

Even if you happen to believe that banks and investment management groups should be shoving other businesses toward green energy and other environmental causes, it's important to remember the fluid nature of ESG standards. As I discussed earlier, many of the metrics in ESG systems revolve around environmental causes, but this does not mean that is where they end.

ESG elites have begun to add metrics that punish businesses who work with some weapons manufacturers. How long before firearm manufacturers and sellers lose access to business loans or other services because banks are worried about their precious ESG scores falling by a point or two? How long before fast-food giants and soda manufacturers are deemed "too dangerous" for the public health? Once the full ESG system imagined by Great Resetters is firmly in place, no business or industry will be able to survive the ire of the ruling-class elites who run it. Even individual politicians could be targeted.

In 2021, Americans witnessed some of the earliest attempts by banks to use their power to punish specific political figures in the United States. According to a report by Bloomberg.com, officials at Deutsche Bank and New York-based Signature Bank said in January 2021 they will no longer do business with Donald Trump, despite both banks' long-standing relationships with the Trump family and its businesses. According to the banks, the decision was based on political matters, not financial concerns.

Even more stunning, Bloomberg.com further reported that Signature Bank announced it "will not do business in the future with any members of Congress who voted to disregard the electoral college," referring to members of the U.S. House and Senate who questioned the validity of the 2020 presidential races in several states after evidence emerged pointing to the possibility of voter fraud.

Other industries and large corporations have also engaged in the targeting of individuals. Shortly after the January 6, 2021, riots at the U.S. Capitol, book publisher Simon & Schuster announced the cancellation of Senator Josh Hawley's book "The Tyranny of Big Tech." In Simon & Schuster's announcement, they vaguely alluded to Hawley's demands for investigations into potential voter fraud occurring during the 2020 presidential election as the primary reason for the cancellation. Simon & Schuster also suggested that by demanding election investigations, Hawley helped to encourage the riots-a ludicrous assertion.

Even more troubling, courts will likely do very little to stop ESG's infringement of individual liberties, because ESG standards don't necessarily need to be controlled by government directly. So whenever international elites wanted to manipulate society, silence political opponents, or engage in otherwise horrifying, tyrannical behavior, all they would have to do under an ESG system would be to add another metric or two to the global ESG framework, and they could effectively nullify free speech (an issue I discuss more extensively later on), the right to keep and bear arms, or a number of other constitutionally protected rights. And this all could be accomplished without the consent of the American people.

YOUR VERY OWN ESG SCORE

Some might be tempted to think, "Yeah, well, I'm not a politician, gun rights group, or oil company, so I've got nothing to worry about." But that's a huge mistake. If banks and other financial institutions can target well-funded special interest groups, President Trump, and sitting members of Congress, some of the most powerful and influential people in the world, what makes you believe they would think twice about debanking, silencing, or punishing you, regardless of your political views, if you belong to a political group, club, organization, association, religion, or business considered to be standing in the way of elites' goals?

The framework for providing ESG scores to Main Street Americans-not just big companies-has already been built. You might have investment accounts that have received ESG scores without your even knowing about it.

In March 2021, a friend of mine who works for a think tank and is well acquainted with the Great Reset-let's call him Chris-reached out to my staff after he discovered that his account with Merrill Lynch, one of the world's largest investment services companies (and a subsidiary of Bank of America), had been given an ESG score. The score had been formulated by examining the ESG scores of the various companies Chris had invested in.

Now, Chris is just a regular guy with a 401(k) retirement account. He's young and doesn't have an investment portfolio overflowing with cash. He's a regular, hardworking guy-probably very similar investments to be given an ESG score, and he wasn't happy-to say the least-to find that his ESG score was an abysmal 4.7 out of 10. (What a degenerate!) But Merrill Lynch gave

him an ESG score anyway, and because they are such nice people over there, they also offered guidance on how Chris could improve his account's ESG score in the future.

Are you getting nervous yet? You should be.

In full disclosure, my research team has been contacted by a very large financial institution that wasn't happy with the warnings about ESG scores that I have issued on my radio and television shows. The bank, which I will not name here because the conversation was off the record, controls hundreds of billions of dollars in assets. Now, the financial institution's main complaint was not that my reporting on ESG scores has been factually inaccurate but rather that my fears about ESG scores are overblown. In conversations with my staff, bank officials insisted that they were not forcing individual investors to do anything based on an account's ESG score. And that is true—for now.

But the most terrifying part of the Great Reset's ESG system is not what they are doing today (although there's plenty there to worry about, to be sure); it's what could be done with these ESG scores and other, similar metrics in the future. The framework to manipulate and control the economy is being built now. Much of it has been in place for years, and we did not even know it.

A huge number of the world's largest, wealthiest corporations have already bought into the ESG system. They have employees who spend most of their days conducting internal audits related specifically to ESG scoring. CEOs from all over the world are regularly working with groups like the World Economic Forum to refine and expand ESG scores.

The SEC, as we've already shown, is now getting involved in ESG reporting and beginning the process of issuing ESG-related regulations. S&P Global, the organization that produces the S&P 500 and Dow Jones Industrial Average stock indexes, now even has an S&P 500 ESG stock index.

Investment companies like Merrill Lynch have started providing individual investors, even people with relatively small accounts, with ESG scores based on the stocks and index funds they have invested in.

Bank of America, Citi, and other large banks have said that they are going to use their considerable wealth and power "to accelerate the transition to a net zero global economy," in part by requiring their "financing activities, operations and supply chain" to go "green".

President Trump, special interest groups, and members of Congress have been banned from doing business with some banks and retailers because of their political views.

Politicians and pundits, some of whom have millions of followers, have been banned or censored on social media platforms-a problem we will discuss at length in the next section-for speaking out about the possibility of election fraud or for questioning the justification given by elites for stopping people from attending church services in the midst of a pandemic, while also encouraging protesters to take to the streets by the tens of thousands to demand social justice.

China has already developed and started to roll out a social credit system that includes “a set of databases and initiatives that monitor and assess the trustworthiness of individuals, companies and government entities.” According to the South China Morning Post, “Each entry”-meaning a human being-”is given a social credit score, with reward for those who have a high rating and punishments for those with low scores.”

Businesses in China are also subjected to a credit scoring system. “Business entities, including foreign businesses in China, are subject to a corporate credit system, tracking information such as tax payments, bank loan repayments and employment disputes,” the Morning Post also reported.

And who are the key people in charge of running China’s social credit system? Government bureaucrats and banks.

According to the Morning Post, “The databases are managed by China’s economic planner, the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC), the People’s Bank of China (PBOC) and the country’s court system.”

Does any of this sound familiar to you? It’s almost as though Klaus Schwab took his ESG playbook directly from China-or that China took Schwab’s ideas, which have been around for more than fifty years, and put them into action long before anyone in America had ever heard of environmental, social, and governance metrics.

In our modern world-which is full of authoritarian power grabs, a growing divide between ruling-class elites and everyone else, endless money printing, “golden opportunity” pandemics, a dishonest media, and the emergence of an authoritarian China as a global superpower-you would have to be certifiably insane if you weren’t at least a little concerned about the

possibility of every regular Joe and Jane in America receiving a score measuring how closely their investment decisions align with those of the ruling class.

BIG TECH TYRANTS

Much of the Great Reset is focused on economic changes, but it would be a mistake to think that Resetters are not interested in making expansive alterations to other parts of society as well. As WEF head Klaus Schwab wrote in June 2020, “To achieve a better outcome, the world must act jointly and swiftly to revamp all aspects of our societies and economies, from education to social contracts and working conditions.”

But what exactly do Schwab and other Resetters have in mind when they make these far-reaching statements? At the very least, it includes left-wing idea about enhancing “social justice,” as countless articles published on the World Economic Forum’s website illustrate.

In October 2020, David Sangokoya, the head of the WEF’s Civil Society Communities and Social Justice Initiatives, authored an article titled “Social Justice, Inclusion and Sustainable Development Need a ‘Great Reset.’ Here Are 3 Key Steps We can Take.”

In the article, Sangokoya summarizes the findings of a September 2020 WEF meeting of “more than 3,800 leaders from Government, business and civil society” called the Sustainable Development Impact Summit. According to Sangokoya, “Sessions (held at the summit) on social justice were of significant interest to business leaders navigating the ramifications of the pandemic and how to define their stakeholder responsibilities to social justice and sustainability.”

Sangokoya then describes the “three key takeaways” from the summit “on driving a Great Reset in social justice, inclusion and sustainable development impact,” including this one: “Widespread environmental crises and global Black Lives Matter protests have sparked palpable restlessness for change. There is a need to accelerate both sustainability and social justice agenda-from both employees and consumers.”

Of course, over the past few years, we’ve learned that one of the ways corporations can “accelerate” social justice agendas is to stifle the free speech of anyone who stands in the way of the Great Reset-or any other cause

embraced by elites, for that matter. That's why the Great Reset agenda includes the WEF's Global Alliance for Responsible Media. (They never seem to run out of new Orwellian names for their little authoritarian clubs, do they?)

The purpose of the Global Alliance for Responsible Media is to partner corporations and advertisers with publishers and platforms to "do more to address harmful and misleading media environments; and to develop and deliver against a concrete set of actions, processes and protocols for protecting brands."

According to WEF, among the perceived "problems" publishers and platforms need to do more to address are 'bullying' "hate speech," and "disinformation," all of which are words regularly used by elites to unfairly smear, well, just about anyone who does not agree with their vision for the world.

Some European countries have already started requiring social media companies to restrict free speech. In May 2020, CNN reported, "The French parliament passed a controversial hate speech law...that would fine social media companies if they fail to remove certain illegal content within 24 hours-and in some cases as little as one hour."

CNN further reported, "The new regulation calls for the tech platforms to remove hateful comments-based on race, religion, sexual orientation, gender or disability, as well as sexual harassment-within 24 hours after they are flagged by users."

Companies that fail to comply with the twenty-four-hour rule would be fined as much as \$1.36 million per violation, but there would be "no fines if platforms prematurely remove content that's later deemed acceptable."

The law was based on similar legislation already in place in Germany, the Network Enforcement Act, which mandates that social media companies "remove hate speech and fake news within 24 hours of it being flagged, or face penalties of up to roughly \$60 million," according to CNN. "They also must publish reports every six months detailing the number of complaints of illegal content they have received."

Courts struck down much of the French law in June 2020 for violating the country's constitution, but that has not stopped some affiliated with the World Economic Forum from continuing to promote similar mandates.

WEF continues to display on its website a March 2018 article titled “How Technology Can Be Used to Combat Online Hate Speech,” authored by La Trobe University lecturer Andre Oboler. In the article, Oboler suggested that “government should follow the lead of Germany in imposing financial penalties on major social media companies if they fail to reduce the volume of abusive content on their platforms.

Oboler further said that “we must develop ways of correctly identifying and measuring the amount of abusive content being posted and removed to ensure that companies are complying.”

Although it is unlikely such a law would survive a challenge in the U.S. Supreme Court, it is vital to remember that a model like the one proposed by supporters of the Great Reset would work around the free speech protections guaranteed by the First Amendment, because it would not mandate that companies do anything to stop free speech; it would just heavily coerce them into eliminating speech, until they effectively have no choice but to act in line with the demands of the ruling class.

It is not hard to imagine how Great Reset ideas about limiting speech, especially when coupled with the other Great Reset initiatives previously discussed, could result in an unprecedented and dangerous assault on speech in the United States. This is especially true for conservatives and other free speech advocates, who are already experiencing the earliest stages of the Left’s digital purge of freethinkers, conservative voices, and even some political figures.

In the wake of the riots at the U.S. Capitol building in January 2021, which occurred following a rally promoted by President Trump, a long list of social media companies banned Trump from using their services, including Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, and Twitter. But social media platforms did not stop at President Trump himself. An unprecedented wave of social media bans soon followed that spread well beyond Trump.

As the Federalist’s Joy Pullmann noted in a January 2021 column, “The purge wasn’t at all limited to Trump himself. It’s also pursuing his supporters. YouTube banned all videos discussing voter fraud. Reddit shut down its Donald Trump subreddit. On Jan. 8, Facebook shut down the walkaway campaign that shared the stories of people who left the Democratic Party to vote for Trump, and banned every one of the group’s owners from using Facebook.”

Facebook also permanently banned clothing retailer PatrioticMe from advertising any of its products on its platform, apparently for violating some unknown Facebook “community standard.” To give you a sense of some of the dangerous products offered by PatrioticMe, read the following description of the site by one reporter covering the ban: “The apparel sold by PatrioticMe has, well, an obvious patriotic flair. These are shirts adorned with red, white, and blue or an outline of the United States. Hoodies with the American flag. Hats you could proudly wear to your Fourth of July cookout and every other day too, just because you love America.”

According to the same reporter, “A portion of every sale (made on PatrioticMe) is donated to the “Tunnel to Towers Foundation, a charity founded to honor the sacrifice of New York City firefighter Stephen Siller, who gave his life to save others as a first responder on Sept. 11, 2001. Tunnel to Towers provides mortgage-free smart homes to veterans or first responders with catastrophic injuries suffered in the line of duty or to gold star families with surviving spouses and young children.”

Wow, what a bunch of monsters. I sure am glad Facebook is cracking down on the sale of all those violence-inducing “hoodies with the American flag” that are helping veterans and first responders gain access to mortgage-free homes.

Then there was AR15.com, “the biggest gun forum in the world.” AR15.com committed the unspeakable crime of letting law-abiding Americans talk online about firearms and gun ownership-a constitutionally protected, God-given right, by the way. Hosting company GoDaddy suddenly terminated access to the website in January 2021 for allegedly violating GoDaddy’s terms of service, without initially providing any detailed explanation for the decision or the ability to appeal. But as bad as these attacks on speech were, they pale in comparison to the shocking treatment of Parler, an online social media platform similar to Twitter.

In 2018, after years of social media companies deplatforming, mistreating, and unfairly targeting conservatives, including many of the people who work for my media company, Blaze Media, John Matze and Jared Thomson launched a new platform, Parler. Unlike establishment social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter, Parler promised to protect users’ privacy and promote free speech by allowing voices from all walks of life to share their political, religious, or ideological views without fear of

being punished by Big Tech or its flawed algorithms. Rather than rely on unaccountable speech police at companies like Google and Facebook, Parler empowered users with a wealth of tools to customize their experience on the platform.

Contrary to what you will read in the dishonest mainstream media outlets, Parler was not a “conservative” social media platform. Anyone could join, and many people who were not conservative did.

Parler’s rise to prominence was nothing short of amazing. After initially numbering only thousands of users, Parler’s user list skyrocketed into the millions within just two years of its launch. In July 2020, Parler reported 2.8 million users, and by early November 2020, the app reported 8 million users. In the week following the 2020 election alone, “Parler gained more than 2.5 million users, putting it at the top of Apple’s App Store list of free apps.”

By the end of November, the number of users on Parler hit 10 million, and at the conclusion of 2020, the app’s user base was on track to hit 20 million in 2021. Countless media outlets, politicians, and radio hosts had joined in 2020-myself included. On Apple’s iOS app store, the application used by every single iPhone user in the world to download new applications for their phone, Parler had recorded a whopping 8.1 million new installs in 2020, making it the tenth most downloaded social media application in the store over the course of a year.

Parler was well on its way to becoming a real competitor to establishment social media giants at the start of 2021, with some analysts anticipating that the value of the company could soon be \$1 billion or more. But all of that soon changed. The New York Times recorded the incredible chain of events in a January 13 news report-see, I told you I read the New York Times-which note, “By Saturday morning, Apple listed Parler as the No. 1 free app for its iPhones. But, by Saturday night, Parler was suddenly fighting for its life.

The Times further reported, “First, Apple and Google removed the app from their app stores because they said it had not sufficiently policed its users’ posts, allowing too many that encouraged violence and crime. Then, late Saturday, Amazon told Parler it would boot the company from its web-hosting service on Sunday night because of repeated violations of Amazon’s rules.

“Amazon’s move meant that Parler’s entire platform would soon go offline unless it was able to find a new hosting service on Sunday.” the Times added.

The Sunday deadline came and went, and as expected, Amazon shut Parler down. Parler initially anticipated that it could quickly shift its operations to an Amazon competitor, but one web hosting service after another refused Parler’s business, and it was not long before other third-party vendors and businesses also banned Parler from using their services.

Within just one week of the moves by Apple, Google, and Amazon—three of the wealthiest, most powerful companies on the planet, all of which are run by people hostile to conservatism—Parler’s CEO announced that one of the only services the platform still had up and running was its company email account.

The justification used by Big Tech to attack the country’s most popular social media outlet guaranteeing free political speech is that Parler had not done enough to remove posts considered dangerous by Amazon, Apple, and Google. The legacy media was quick to the aid of these tech tyrants, insisting—often without providing any evidence—that Parler had become a bastion of hate and extremism.

Contrary to the unfair characterizations of Parler appearing in many biased media outlets, Parler did not and does not now allow users to post literally anything they want. Parler’s terms of service prohibit all sorts of material considered harmful to the platform’s community. In a July 2020 article for the left-leaning online publication, The Conversation, academic Audry Courty reviewed Parler’s terms of service and community standards and found that “a closer look at its user agreement suggests it moderates content the same way as any platform, maybe even more.”

Courty also noted,

Parler’s community guidelines prohibit a range of content including spam, terrorism, unsolicited ads, defamation, blackmail, bribery and criminal behavior.

Although there are no explicit rules against hate speech, there are policies against “fighting words” and “threats of harm.” This includes “a threat of or advocating for violation against an individual or group.”

There are rules against content that is obscene, sexual or “lacks serious literary, artistic, political and scientific value.” For example, visuals of genitalia, female nipples, or fecal matter are barred from Parler.”

Courty’s analysis is generally in line with other reports by media about Parler that were published throughout 2020. Numerous media outlets went out of their way to talk about how even though Parler’s marketing campaign presented the platform as a free speech haven, Parler also frequently moderated content considered extremely offensive or violent. Some critics of Parler even suggested the platform was hypocritical for doing so.

Newsweek published an article titled ‘Parler, the Ted Cruz Approved ‘Free Speech’ App, Is Already Banning Users.’ Fortune.com posted an article in July 2020 titled “conservative Social Media Darling Parler Discovers That Free speech I Messy.” The Washington Post published a piece called “The Conservative Alternative to Twitter Wants to Be a Place for Free Speech for All. It Turns Out, Rules Still Apply.”

It was not until Parler’s popularity soared to even greater heights that the platform suddenly became, in the eyes of the media, an ultra-violent website that must be closed down because, according to the press, only radical extremists use it.

In addition to being misleading and/or factually incorrect, many of the criticisms leveled against Parler in 2021 were wildly hypocritical. It is true that there were (and probably still are) some vile, disgusting, and violent posts on Parler. And I do believe Parler should have done more to remove such content, and to do it more quickly. Parler officials themselves admitted that they had a backlog of thousands of complaints at the time Amazon took the site down.

However, it is also true that Facebook, Twitter, and Google regularly hosted equally vile, disgusting, and violent rhetoric. And no one knows that better than I do-well, no one except for Donald Trump. My family and I have been subject to tens of thousands of threats, personal attacks, and foul insults over the years through social media platforms. And that’s just counting the mean stuff my producer Stu has written about me.

I have not seen a shred of evidence to suggest that Facebook and Twitter have permanently banned all the users who posted this material about

me, my staff, and my family, much of which, I'm sure, violates their community standards. (And I know for a fact that Stu is still allowed to post his nonsensical rantings all over the internet.)

Facebook, Google, and Twitter have also routinely been used by violent groups to stage riots and events meant to cause destruction and impose fear—including groups associated with the January 2021 Capitol Hill riot. Further, there is no denying that social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook have in some cases gone out of their way to protect accounts controlled by truly dangerous political or social leaders.

Take for example, the Twitter account of Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the supreme dictator-eh, I mean “supreme leader”—of Iran, a country that has for decades violated human rights, supported terrorism, destabilized the Middle East, and even waged a stealth war against the United States. While accounts and tweets from conservatives were being banned by Twitter’s thought police in 2020 and 2021, Khamenei’s account and its many violent tweets remained intact, including one from 2018 that reads, “Our stance against Israel is the same stance we have always taken. #Israel is a malignant cancerous tumor in the West Asian region that has to be removed and eradicated; it is possible and it will happen.”

How many of Twitter’s standards do you think Khamenei violated with that whopper? Or perhaps calling for the genocide of a historically abused religious and ethnic group does not mean much to Twitter? I suppose it is true Khamenei could be worse in the eyes of the social media speech police—at least he didn’t vote for Donald Trump, right?

Further, twitter continues to allow radicals like Louis Farrakkhan and Chinese propagandists to regularly spew false information to their huge social media followings. And Twitter and other social media giants have also refused to warn readers when pundits spread demonstrably false information and conspiracy theories about “Russian collusion,” including claims that were widely debunked years ago.

They have also chosen not to silence politicians who have openly called for people to harass government officials in the Trump administration and conservative public figures, not have they banned users who openly sympathized with the rioters who burned and looted cities throughout the summer of 2020.

In 2018, Congresswoman Maxine Waters told her supporters, “If you see anybody from that Cabinet (in the Trump administration) in a restaurant, in a department store, at a gasoline station, you push back on them, and you tell them they’re not welcome anymore, anywhere?”

That sure sounds like Representative Waters is inciting criminal activity, doesn’t it? Yet Twitter continues to allow Maxine to engage with her 1.6 million followers on its platform on a daily basis.

CNN host Chris Cuomo—the brother of Andrew Cuomo, everyone’s least favorite *Sopranos* character and one of the worst governors in American history—said in the midst of a period of widespread rioting and looting in the summer of 2020, “And please, show me where it says protesters are supposed to be polite and peaceful. Because I can show you that outraged citizens are what made the country what she is and led to any major milestone. To be honest, this is not a tranquil time.”

Yet Chris Cuomo is still able to communicate with his 2.1 million Twitter followers every single day.

In waging its war on Parler, big Tech could not have been clearer: If you are a free speech-friendly platform that tries to limit violent speech but struggles, like all social media companies, to root out every single vile post, you deserve to be destroyed. But if you are a media outlet or platform that allows or promotes dangerous, reckless, or misleading information but generally still favors and you deserve special legal protections that allow Big Tech investors to earn billions of dollars and amass unprecedented amount of power.

Welcome to the start of the Great Reset, ladies and gentle men.

Some Americans on the left and even some libertarians on the right argue that Americans should not be concerned about digital crackdowns on speech. We are frequently told, “Private companies can do whatever they want to control speech on their platforms. It’s the free market.” But the truth is, there is nothing “free” about Big Tech’s actions, and there won’t be anything “free market” about a Great Reset ESG system that awards woke companies for stifling speech. Companies will merely be acting to stay on the good side of government and big financial institutions, as many do now, because that is where the money will be in a world dominated by ESG scores and modern monetary theorists like Stephanie Kelton.

When confronted with arguments alleging that anyone who stands against Big Tech tyrants is working against free market capitalism, it is important to remember that corporations-whether they be massive online retailers or social media giants like Facebook-are themselves the products of government. Not only are corporations subject to countless regulations governing their behavior, but they are also made possible only by special laws that do not exist in a marketplace free of government interference.

Big corporations do not pay the same tax rates as individuals, operate under many of the same rules as individuals, or face the same legal liabilities as individuals. And that is especially true of numerous large technology companies, which in countless cases are able to exist only because federal law allows them to avoid lawsuits when users post illegal or defamatory content on their platforms.

Thee used to be a time when even many elites understood that corporations should not have unlimited power. Consider the following quote from the opinion issued in 1946 by the Supreme Court in *Marsh v. Alabama*, a case in which the court determined that a private corporation could not prohibit a Jehovah's Witness from distributing materials in a company-owned town, because the ban was in violation of the First Amendment.

“Ownership does not always mean absolute dominion,” wrote Hugo Black, a justice appointed by one of the twentieth century’s most progressive presidents, Franklin Roosevelt. “The more an owner, for his advantage, opens up his property for use by the public in general, the more do his rights become circumscribed by the statutory and constitutional rights of those who use it. Thus, the owners of privately held bridges, ferries, turnpikes and railroads may not operate them as freely as a farmer does his farm.”

Make no mistake about it, large corporations ought to be given a great deal of authority over their products, services, and property, but it should never be forgotten that corporations are not divine institutions fully endowed with inalienable rights but rather the creations of government that exist to offer to the public-everyone in the public-goods and services. There is no reason why they should have the power to silence political or religious speech, and Americans who are demanding that corporations be required to promote individual rights as a condition of having access to special legal protections ought not to feel even slightly ashamed for doing so.

IT CAN'T HAPPEN HERE-WAIT, CAN IT?

When I talk to others bout the Great Reset, I am often met at first with a healthy dose of skepticism. Not only is all that “stakeholder capitalist” language misleading and confusing, but many people also have difficulty accepting that something like the Reset really could happen in America. This is, after all, the home of the largest, most powerful financial markets on the planet, the world’s most profitable companies, and the biggest and best economic engine humankind has ever seen. “Yeah, Glenn, we get it. Those Europeans love big government systems and elitism, and they have cozied up to fascism before. But America is not Europe. What are you so worried about?”

Well, in addition to snakes-I really hate snakes-I am worried that many of the leaders of the biggest institutions in the world, from the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund to multi-billion-dollar corporations on Wall Street, have started adopting many of the Great Reset’s principles and promoting its expansion. And many of the people involved are American and have already started to promote the Reset in the United States.

According to a report by KPMG, thousands of companies, located in more than fifty countries, already have ESG systems in place, including 82 percent of large companies in the United States. Further, American financial institutions predict the ESG scores of small and medium sized companies around the world, including countless companies that have never once submitted ESG data or reports. That means if you do not turn an ESG report in to Mood’s, it might invent one for you, whether you like it or not.

Most important, although it has not received nearly enough media attention-shocking, I know-many politicians, activists, and bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., support the Great Reset’s policies and are deeply committed to making them a reality, even if they do not typically use the “Great Reset” slogan on the campaign trail or in the halls of Congress. And first among them is none other than President Joe Biden.

The Biden administration and its allies are not merely calling for Great Reset policies; they have already started to put in place the policy and regulatory framework necessary to make the Reset a reality. And they have done so at a speed that, at the end of the Trump administration, almost no one thought was possible.

How exactly are the Biden administration and other elites planning on altering American society in line with Great Reset principles? That is the subject of my next chapter.