

JOE BIDEN AND THE GREAT RESET OF AMERICA

Why should Russians have all the fun of remaking a world?

-STUART CHASE, AN ADVISER TO PRESIDENT FRANKLIN
ROOSEVELT, IN HIS BOOK *A Dew Deal*, 1932

THE FIRST FIFTY YEARS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY WERE filled with nearly unimaginable horror and despair. Twenty million people died in World War I, the “war to end all wars,” and another 21 million were wounded. As many as 100 million people perished during the 1918-1919 influenza outbreak. Seventy-five million people were killed during World War II, including millions of European Jews who were murdered during the Nazis’ Holocaust.

During the Dust Bowl and Great Depression, 15 million Americans were unemployed, and the United States faced unprecedented chaos in its financial industry. Nearly half of all U.S. banks failed. Segregation gripped the Southern United States, severely limiting the opportunities and rights of African Americans. The Titanic-the world’s first “unsinkable ship”-sank.

However, despite these grave tragedies, the United States endured-and in many respects, significantly progressed-offering periods of immense, positive economic and societal changes. The horse-driven carriage was replaced by the motor vehicle. Widespread access to electricity transformed America’s economy and dramatically improved living standards. The Wright brothers showed the world that humans could take flight. More than 15 million people emigrated to America’s shores from 1900 to 1915, helping to push the U.S. economy far beyond its global competitors and greatly expanding the country’s urban centers.

For better or worse, the period from 1900 to the end of World War II is best defined by one word: disruption. And as has always been the case in human history, whenever there is disruption, there is great opportunity for radical change. Or as they are fond of saying in America’s favorite television documentary series, *Game of Thrones*, “Chaos is a ladder.”

The rise of progressivism in the United States in the early twentieth century would not have been possible without the era’s tremendous disruption. Progressives knew this, and they took advantage. In the early days of the Progressive movement, leaders developed a playbook for remaking society by shifting power into the hands of elites, who would use centralized bureaucratic agencies, international organizations, and large businesses and financial institutions to enact their far-reaching reforms. Although

progressive elites' plan has gone through a variety of phases, it has remained mostly unchanged over the past one hundred years. The faces and some methods have evolved, to be sure, but the foundational goals and strategies are nearly identical to those established at the start of the Progressive Era.

One of the clearest articulations for progressives' plan for a new society was revealed in the 1940s by Stuart Chase, perhaps the most influential American economist of his time and a member of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's famous "brain trust". Chase is most famous in progressive and socialist circles today for developing the "New Deal" political slogan later adopted by FDR.

In the early 1940s, the Twentieth Century Fund, an influential organization devoted to promoting progressive causes, commissioned Chase to write a series of small books called *When the War Ends*. The purpose of the book series was to advocate for the advancement of a new society following the conclusion of World War II.

In the first book of the series, titled *The Road We Are Traveling*, published in 1942, Chase claims there is no hope of returning to a "system of free enterprise" at the conclusion of the war. Why? Because, according to Chase, "the basic conditions which made it a good and workable system for a century and more, have so changed that it has now become unworkable over great areas.

In its place, Chase believed, the global economy had already started the process of transforming into something entirely new, a "managerial revolution" that is "displacing the system of free enterprise, all over the world." Because this "revolution" had not yet been named, Chase called it simply "X."

Chase's vision for a novel economic model was not merely part of a proposed alteration of society; it was viewed by Chase and others as essential and even inevitable. In Chase's mind, the world was moving toward system X, whether Americans liked it or not, and although he acknowledged that some folks might be worried by such a change, Chase, like most elitist progressives of the period, believed everyone would be better off under a "managerial" state.

"Win, lose or draw," Chase wrote, "we can never return to the world of 1928, or even of 1939. This may alarm many Americans but it does not alarm me. The old world was not so perfect that a better one cannot be found."

In *The Road We Are Traveling*, Chase outlined the framework of that "better" world, much of which had already become the guiding principles of the Roosevelt administration prior to the start of World War II. In a subsection of his book, titled "Free Enterprise into 'X'," Chase listed eighteen characteristics of X:

- A strong, centralized government.
- An executive arm growing at the expense of the legislative and judicial arms. In some countries, power is consolidated in a dictator, issuing decrees.
- The control of banking, credit and security exchanges by the government.
- The underwriting of employment by the government, either through armaments or public works.

- The underwriting of social security by the government-old-age pensions, mothers' pensions, unemployment insurance, and the like.
- The underwriting of food, housing and medical care by the government. The United States is already experimenting with providing these essentials. Other nations are far along the road.
- The use of the deficit spending technique to finance these under-writings. The annually balanced budget has lost its old-time sanctity.
- The abandonment of gold in favor of managed currencies.
- The control of foreign trade by the government, with increasing emphasis on bilateral agreements and barter deals.
- The control of natural resources, with increasing emphasis on self-sufficiency.
- The control of energy sources-hydroelectric power, coal, petroleum, natural gas.
- The control of transportation-railway, highway, airway, waterway.
- The control of agricultural production.
- The control of labor organizations, often to the point of prohibiting strikes.
- The enlistment of young men and women in youth corps devoted to health, discipline, community service and ideologies consistent with those of the authorities. The CCC camps have just inaugurated military drill.
- Heavy taxation, with especial emphasis on the estates and incomes of the rich.
- Not much "taking over" of property or industries in the old socialistic sense. The formula appears to be control without ownership. It is interesting to recall that the same formula is used by the management of great corporations in depriving stockholders of power.
- The state control of communications and propaganda.

Chase is very clear that not every single part of X ought to be pursued in the manner in which it had been imposed outside of the United States. For example, it appears Chase was not an advocate of dictatorships, despite having acknowledged that some forms of system X included totalitarian rule. However, for Chase, system X was the future. "it is a question not of kind but of degree," he wrote.

Throughout the 1930s and 1940s, American progressive elites set out to implement their own version of system X, and to a large extent they were successful.

By the end of the Franklin Roosevelt administration, more federal social programs had been created than at any other time in U.S. history. Instead of relying primarily on a belief in the power of the free markets and individual choice, millions of Americans became dependent on the federal government's Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), Farm Security Administration (FSA), Resettlement Administration (RA), National Youth Administration (NYA), and countless other alphabet soup government bureaucracies.

Progressives also used the era's disruption to transform government and financial institutions. State legislatures lost their ability to elect U.S. senators. The size of the House of Representatives was permanently capped at 435, all but ensuring the creation and maintenance of a legislative oligarchy in Washington, D.C. Federal bureaucracies

seized more and more power from state and local governments. The Federal Reserve System was created, and federal officials began the process of ending the gold standard, paving the way for massive future government debt.

Progressives' vision for establishing a vast federal bureaucracy of "experts" to manage society was well on its way to becoming fully realized from 1900 to 1940, and then again during President Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society" reforms in the 1960s. Fortunately, push back from political opponents, several key losses in the Supreme Court, the conclusion of World War II, and most important, the rise of totalitarian communism in China and Russia thwarted progressives' plan to impose X-not entirely but enough to stop them from reaching their ultimate goal.

By the end of the Reagan administration in 1989, communism had largely been defeated, and the political and social winds had shifted back in favor of conservatism and limited government. Ronald Reagan's brilliant public relations strategy for defeating the Soviets-which focused on the fundamental differences between free, capitalistic societies and the brutal socialistic models used by regimes in places like the Soviet Union and Cuba-inspired a new generation to recognize and appreciate America's exceptional past and foundational goals.

For the most part, conservative values dominated the post-Soviet era, until, that is, President Barack Obama rose to power-which, as at the start of the Progressive Era, was largely the result of an ineffective Republican president and a government-created crisis, the financial system's collapse in 2008.

Like the end of FDR's reign, the final year of the Obama era was full of optimism for progressives. After decades of failing to recapture the momentum enjoyed during the days of FDR's New Deal and Lyndon Johnson's Great Society, President Obama managed to get the country moving back toward the vision of reshaping American society imagined by President Wilson, FDR, and influential intellectuals of the Progressive Era, like Stuart Chase.

In 2016, Hillary Clinton was well positioned to finish what Obama started, but then something happened, something remarkable-and I mean "remarkable" in nearly every sense of the word. Donald Trump, a reality television star and real estate mogul, was elected president of the United States, a feat he managed to accomplish by running on an "America First" platform that denounced most of the essential parts of system X. And whether you love him or loathe him, if you're fair-minded, you have to admit that there's a good chance that had the COVID-19 pandemic never occurred, Donald Trump would still be president today.

As I discussed at length in chapter 2, it was COVID-19 that provided global elites with another 'golden opportunity' to reset the world's economy and finish the job started by European and American elites in the Progressive Era. Today's Great Reset movement is attempting to write the final chapter of a story that began more than a century ago, not in 2020, as so many believe.

The Great Reset is nothing but a more perfected version of system X. Like Chase's framework, the Great Reset depends on a powerful, centralized government led

by large executive branch, government bureaucracies. Similarly, the Reset depends on the control of banking, credit, and security exchanges. It also involves huge social programs like those dreamed up by Chase. The Green New Deal and European Green Deal were even named after Chase and FDR's "New Deal" reforms.

The Great Reset also requires the use of "managed currencies." Without such a system, modern monetary theory, the fuel of the Great Reset machine, would be impossible.

Further, the Reset depends on "control of agricultural production," "transportation," and "energy sources," right in line with Chase's description of system X.

"Heavy taxation" is another shared component of system X and the Great Reset, as is system X's government "control without ownership"-the primary purpose of environmental, social, and governance metrics.

With all this in mind, it is clear that system X is the Great Reset, and the Great Reset is system X.

Understanding that the Great Reset is part of a much larger narrative is vital for many reasons, but perhaps the most important is that it reveals just how close we are to seeing our national sovereignty, right to self-determination, and protections for individual liberty slip away. Within the larger historical context, the movement for individual liberty is hanging on by a thread. We have been fighting this battle for more than a century, and we are now seemingly one breath away from catastrophe.

For those of you who still think that President Biden and America's other leaders in the Democratic and Republican Parties are working for you and they they would never let Great Reset elites transform the United States so they have even greater power over Main Street America, the remainder of this chapter is going to be a rough wake-up call.

President Biden might present himself as a Scranton-born, Corn Pop-fighting lunch pail-carrying champion of blue-collar America, but he and numerous members of his administration, as well as many of Biden's closest political allies outside of the white House, are as devoted to the globalist, corporatist principles of the Great Reset as anyone working at the World Economic Forum has ever been. And numerous members of Congress and key social and political leaders are right there with him. Their mission is to finish the implementation of system X under the Great Reset banner, and they will not stop until they succeed where so many others before them have fallen short.

Countless members of the press have argued that this is all just a wild conspiracy theory cooked up by the "far right" to scare you. Why should you believe Glenn Beck when the New York Times is portraying the Great Reset in a completely different light? Well, here's something you won't hear the New York Times say, especially when it comes to the Great Reset: Do not take my word for it. Do your own homework, and you will see that the Great Reset is all too real and that it is an overt power grab by the ruling class, one that might be impossible to fully reverse once it is in place.

The remainder of this chapter will present you with incontrovertible evidence, most of which comes from politically unbiased or left-leaning sources, that proves beyond any doubt that Joe Biden and other influential U.S. political leaders are working feverishly to impose the Great Reset. These evidences are not the only proof out there, but they are a good place to start. If you keep an open mind, use the original sources I provide throughout this chapter, and allow yourself to view the data objectively, I am confident you will see why I am so convinced that the Reset is on the verge of becoming a reality in America.

THE EVIDENCE, EXHIBIT A:

AL GORE AND ELITES' CLIMATE CHANGE "SOLUTIONS"

As I noted in chapter 1, Al Gore-the self-proclaimed savior of the world-called for the Great Reset in a June 2020 interview with NBC's TODAY television show, during which he tied huge "green" infrastructure plans to the coronavirus recovery.

"So, I think this is a time for a 'Great Reset,'" Gore said, after arguing in favor of electric cars and renewable energy sources like wind and solar. "We've got to fix a lot of these problems that have been allowed to fester for way too long. And the climate crisis is an opportunity to create tens of millions of new jobs, clean up the air, and reduce the death rate from pandemics, by the way, because the air pollution from burning fossil fuels heightens the death rates from coronavirus."

Gore, a close political ally of Joe Biden, has not only supported the Reset on television, he is also a member of the World Economic Forum's board of trustees.

Gore's well-funded Climate Reality Project has also worked closely with the WEF's Global Shapers youth activist organization over the past several years. The Climate Reality Project has trained more than 1,300 Global Shapers on best practices for engaging in climate and environmental activism.

Gore's involvement with the Global Shapers is extremely important, since the WEF announced in June 2020 that these youth activists will play a vital role at future Great Reset meetings. According to the WEF, there are now Global Shaper groups in four hundred cities, and it is not hard to imagine how these groups could be used to promote the Great Reset agenda in 2021 and beyond, under the guise of an urgent need to solve the climate change "crisis".

The blueprint for using youth engagement to support climate alarmism and socialist policies is already well established. Al Gore and other alarmists successfully piggybacked on the fame of Greta Thunberg to organize and promote massive rallies and "climate strikes" in 2019. In that year alone, millions of students participated in climate strikes around the world.

The Global Shapers and Climate Reality Project have extensive climate activist infrastructure that will allow them to quickly organize hundreds of thousands or even millions of people in support of a Great Reset. In November 2019, the Climate Reality Project hosted more than two thousand presentations in eighty-four countries and all

fifty U.S. states, reaching more than 119,000 people, as part of its “24 Hours of Reality” worldwide event.

Gore and other climate activists-including groups like Greenpeace International-are deeply tied to the Great Reset, but it is not because the Reset is the only, or even best, way to reduce carbon dioxide levels. As I discussed in chapter 3, even if you believe a climate crisis is happening as a result of human-created CO emissions, nuclear power and other forms of energy production now in development clearly offer a more realistic and environmentally friendly path toward phasing out the use of fossil fuels. The only reason elites like Gore so desperately want to expand the use of wind and solar power is because it would demand huge new public works projects, massive amounts of government funding, and an expansion of power for large corporations and financial institutions-all of which are strategies the ruling class has been using for more than a century to transform society, going back decades before anyone ever heard of “global warming.”

EXHIBIT B: JOHN KERRY

Al Gore is not the only prominent member of the ruling class or ally of Joe Biden to support the Great Reset. In addition to the long list of U.S. business leaders who have already stated publicly that they support the Great Reset, there is John Kerry-the Democrats’ 2004 presidential nominee, the former secretary of state during Barack Obama’s second term, and one of the least inspiring speakers on the face of the planet.

In a June 2020 interview with the World Economic Forum, Kerry confessed his love for the Reset and demanded a new “social contract” that would address “climate change and inequity”-a key talking point of the WEF’s Great Reset campaign.

“All the forces and pressures that were pushing us into crisis over the social contract are now exacerbated,” Kerry said. “And exacerbated at a time when the world is in many ways coming apart.”

“What we never did,” Kerry added, “was adequately address the social contract, the franchisement of human beings around the world, to be able to participate in things they can see with their smartphones everywhere but can’t participate in.”

Kerry then argued that the United States is too politically “gridlocked,” so it is going to be up to the World Economic Forum and its allies to promote the Reset on a global scale.

“This is a big moment,” Kerry said, according to WEF. “The World Economic Forum-the CEO capacity of the Forum-is really going to have to play a front and center role in refining the Great Reset to deal with climate change and inequity, all of which is being laid bare as a consequence of COVID-19”

Kerry mostly disappeared from the public spotlight after Donald Trump defeated Hillary Clinton in the 2016 presidential race, but beginning in 2020, Kerry managed to take on an increasingly important role within the Democratic Party.

In 2020, Kerry was named by Joe Biden and Bernie Sanders to co-chair one of their Unity Task Forces, which were given the responsibility of rewriting the platforms

of the Democratic Party and Biden's presidential campaign. Kerry served as co-chair of the Climate Change Task Force, alongside Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, just as the Great Reset movement was starting to gain steam.

As I mentioned earlier, Kerry is a close political ally of Biden, whom Kerry endorsed early in the 2020 race. In November 2020, as a reward for his loyalty, Biden named Kerry America's newest climate envoy for national security, a cabinet-level position the media often refers to as the "climate czar." It should come as no surprise, then, that some of the Great Reset's policy proposals and talking points managed to find their way into Biden's 2020 campaign platform, as I'll show in detail in exhibit C next.

EXHIBIT C: JOE BIDEN'S "BUILD BACK BETTER" PLAN AND ITS TIES TO THE GREAT RESET

Biden's "Build Back Better" plan-by the way, great name, Joe-is full of the World Economic Forum's policy ideas. For example, Biden's climate and energy "Build Back Better" plan aimed to "make a \$2 trillion accelerated investment, with a plan to deploy those resources over his first term, setting us on an irreversible course moving "ambitiously to generate clean, American-made electricity to achieve a carbon-pollution-free power sector by 2035.

According to Biden's website, the transition to "green" energy sources like wind and solar is necessary to stop the "existential threat of climate change."

"Transforming the U.S. electricity sector-and electrifying an increasing share of the economy-represents the biggest job creation and economic opportunity engine of the 21st century." Biden's campaign website claims. "These jobs include every kind of worker from scientists to construction workers to electricity generation workers to welders to engineers. Existing iron casting and steel fabrication plants will have new customers in the solar and wind industries."

These and many other parts of Biden's "Build Back better" campaign proposals would later become core pieces in President Biden's infrastructure legislation proposed in early 2021.

Boy, all this talk about massive climate infrastructure plans sure does sound familiar, doesn't it? Klaus Schwab would be so proud.

Biden's connection to Great Reset policies was made even clearer at a July 2020 campaign event in Pennsylvania, during which Biden pitched his \$700 billion jobs plan while calling for an end to the "era of shareholder capitalism"-a common Reset talking point.

"Let's make sure workers have power and a voice," Biden said. "It's way past time to put an end to the era of shareholder capitalism-the idea that the only responsibility a corporation has is to its shareholders. That's simply not true and it's an absolute farce. They have a responsibility to their workers, to their country. That isn't a new or radical notion." It is almost as though Biden were reading directly from a Great Reset press release written by Schwab himself.

In reality, forcing companies to put the collective before their customers and owners is absolutely a radical idea in a free society, but Joe is right that it is hardly new. The Great Reset's supporters have been loudly calling for the end of "shareholder capitalism" for a long time-in some cases for years, as I showed in detail in chapter 5.

Additionally, the very name Biden used for some of his campaign's largest jobs and energy plans-"Build Back Better"-is the exact title used for similar proposals and articles written by supporters or allies of the World Economic Forum and the Great Reset movement, with some of those writings going back several years.

In 2015, Raja Rehan Arshad, the lead disaster risk management specialist for the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR), authored an article for the World Economic Forum in which he wrote that following natural disasters, policymakers should restore "damaged houses, hospitals, schools, and other public infrastructure to more disaster-resilient standards," a plan that "is one aspect of the 'building back better' strategy."

In 2016, the World Bank and World Economic Forum published an article about climate change disasters titled "How Can We Reduce the Risk of Climate Disasters?" In the article, the author wrote, "The pressure for governments now is not to wait until a disaster strikes to 'build back better.' Instead, the urgent need is to build better now, and to thoroughly assess current risks to industrial infrastructure."

Following the emergence of the coronavirus pandemic in 2020, WEF writers published a flurry of articles citing "building back better"-or some variation of that slogan-prior to and after Biden's decision to ramp up the marketing of his "Build Back Better" plan as a key component of his 2020 campaign.

In March 2020, two marketing heads at WEF wrote, "Business leaders have pledged to contribute their skills, networks and resources to shape the COVID-19 recovery and build back better." The statement was made in an article published on WEF's website, under the subheading "Companies to Realizing a Great Reset of Capitalism."

In April 2020, Maria Mendiluce, the interim CEO of the We Mean Business coalition, wrote for the World Economic Forum, "As governments develop longer-term economic stimulus packages to combat the crisis, they must be designed around the core principle of building a stronger economy that ensures the long-term health and well-being of citizens, job creation, tackling climate change once and for all, and building a more resilient and inclusive society."

Mendiluce then wrote, "Business and government can and must work together at this extremely challenging time to lay the foundations to build back better. Concrete government policies that send a clear signal to business will help us rebuild from this devastating crisis in a way that delivers a healthy future for everyone, through greater resilience and a clear pathway to a zero carbon future."

In May 2020, the World Economic Forum posted a piece titled "'Building Back Better'-Here's How We Can Navigate the Risks We Face After COVID-19." In the article, writer Johnny Wood noted, "We have looked at ways to 'build back better' and

it's very clear that investing in greener economies is going to be a huge part of recovery efforts."

In June 2020, David Victor, chairman of the Global Agenda Council on Governance for Sustainability at the World Economic Forum-if ever there were a quintessential Orwellian job title, this is it-wrote an article for Yale's Environment 360 website titled "Building Back Better: Why Europe Must Lead a Global Green Recovery."

On July 13, 2020, just several days after Biden said it is time to "put an end to the era of shareholder capitalism" while pitching his "Build Back Better" jobs plan in Pennsylvania, Peter Bakker and John Elkington authored an article for the World Economic Forum titled "To Build Back Better, We Must Reinvent Capitalism, Here's How."

In the article, the authors wrote,

A true recover from COVID-19 will not be about putting things back together the way they were: we need to "build back better," to "reset," if we are to address the deep systemic vulnerabilities the pandemic has exposed. For businesses, building back better is about much more than corporate social responsibility: it is about truly aligning markets with the natural, social and economic systems on which they depend. It is about building real resilience, driving equitable and sustainable growth, and reinventing capitalism itself.

Having read the articles cited here, along with numerous others using very similar language, it is hard to imagine that Joe Biden-or whoever else was really calling the shots in Biden's campaign-was not deliberately aligning his talking points and policy proposals with the Great Reset movement, especially in light of Al Gore and John Kerry's clear-cut endorsements of the Great Reset and their connection to Biden.

EXHIBIT D: JOE BIDEN'S COZY RELATIONSHIPS WITH GREAT RESET LEADERS

The evidence does not stop at Biden's campaign. Biden also has close relationships with at least three World Economic Forum board members: Al Gore, David Rubenstein, and Laurence Fink, the chairman and CEO of BlackRock. And one of Vice President Kamala Harris's longtime supporters is the CEO of Salesforce, Marc Benioff, another WEF board member.

Further, my coauthor of this book, Justin Haskins, reported exclusively for the Blaze in October 2020 that additional "evidence of Biden's intimate relationship with great Reset advocates can be found in the launch of the Biden Institute, which is based at the University of Delaware."

"In 2017," Haskins continued, "when the Biden Institute first started, Biden said he wanted to model some of the new organization's activities after the World Economic

Forum, and he even met with the WEF's leader and the world's biggest advocate of the Great Reset, Klaus Schwab, to help develop a plan for the future of the Institute."

Joe Biden has apparently been taking advice from Schwab for years, so it really shouldn't surprise anyone that Biden has also been drinking from Klaus's Great Reset Kool-Aid. Speaking of, if Schwab ever decides to give up this whole evil genius, take-over-the-world career path he's been on for the past half century, starting a knock-off Kool-Aid brand called Klaus-Aid ought to be priority number one. The commercials showing Klaus busting through kid's walls to give sugary drinks and teach them about the evils of free markets would practically write themselves.

EXHIBIT E: JOHN KERRY'S HONEST MOMENT

But if all that evidence is still not enough to convince you of Biden's commitment to the Great Reset-and it should be; I mean, really, what's wrong with you?-consider the following smoking-gun proof that emerged just weeks after the mainstream press declared Biden the winner of the 2020 election.

At a panel discussion about the Great Reset hosted by the World Economic Forum in November 2020, John Kerry adamantly stated that Joe Biden and his administration will support the Great Reset, and he will do so with "greater speed and with greater intensity than a lot of people might imagine."

During the panel discussion, host Borge Brende-WEF's president-asked Kerry whether the World Economic Forum's members and other Great Reset supporters are "expecting too much too soon from the new president, or is he going to deliver first day on this (sic) topics?" to which Kerry responded, "The answer to your question, no, you're not expecting too much."

Kerry then added, "And yes, it (the Great Reset) will happen. And I think it will happen with greater speed and with greater intensity than a lot of people might imagine. In effect, the citizens of the United States have just done a Great Reset. we've done a Great Reset. And it was a record level of voting."

It doesn't get much clearer than that, folks.

EXHIBIT F: JOE BIDEN'S MAO AGENCY

Kerry's promise of a Biden-led American great Reset was not merely talk either. Since President Biden has entered the white House, he and his administration have imposed countless policies and proposed numerous more that fit perfectly in line with the Great Reset's goals, framework, and principles. For example, consider Biden's new Made in America Office-or as I like to call it, his MAO agency. (Sometimes they really do make it too easy, don't they?)

On the surface, the Made in America agency sounds like something that might have been created by the Trump administration-other than the agency's acronym, of course. Something tells me Donald Trump wouldn't want a supposedly pro-America bureaucratic agency named after a mass-murdering communist dictator.

The stated purpose of MAO is to require that government offices spend more of their budgets working with American companies, as opposed to purchasing goods and services from businesses located overseas. This sounds like a noble goal that most Americans can get behind, but the devil is in the details. When the White House announced the creation of MAO, it noted that the agency would not direct government agencies to do business with just any old U.S. company that offers the best product or service at the lowest price; rather, MAO would be used as a tool to advance the Biden administration's political and social agendas.

According to the White House, the order creating MAO "is deeply intertwined with the President's commitment to invest in American manufacturing, including clean energy and critical supply chains, grow good-paying union jobs, and advance racial equity. The federal government should buy from suppliers that are growing the sectors of the future and treating their workers with dignity and respect.

In other words, the MAO agency's mission is to make sure that the federal government buys only from the "good" companies, meaning those businesses that reflect the values of the Biden administration. This is unquestionably a Great Reset policy proposed by the World Economic Forum's Klaus Schwab, as well as other supporters of the Reset.

As I noted earlier in the book, in Schwab's article titled "Now Is the Time for a 'Great Reset,'" published in June 2020, he wrote,

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.

Biden's MAO agency is designed to do exactly what Schwab said is a core component of the Great Reset: ensure that government funds are funneled into the businesses committed to making the social and political changes desired by elites.

EXHIBIT G: "30 BY 30" LAND AND WATER PLAN

In one of his first acts as president, Joe Biden released an executive order, calling on government to conserve about 30 percent of all U.S. lands and waters by 2030, a program widely referred to as "30 by 30". According to the Washington Post, as of May 2021, "roughly 12 percent of U.S. land and 11 percent of its freshwater ecosystems enjoy some level of official protection."

That means if Biden is successful in ensuring that 30 percent of all U.S. lands and waters are conserved by 2030, it would more than double the amount of land conserved

in the United States, making this program one of the largest government takeovers in U.S. history.

Moving many forms of property ownership-not just land ownership-away from private individuals and farmers and into the hands of government and large corporations is viewed by many within the Great Reset movement as an imperative. In the minds of many Resetters, land under public or corporate ownership can more easily be conserved and/or utilized for the public good. Government laws can be crafted to slow or stop land use, and corporations can be discouraged or severely hindered from developing land through ESG systems. Many ESG scoring systems already include metrics for land use and consumption of resources.

It's not enough, according to many involved with the World Economic Forum and the Great Reset, to limit environmental harm; we must also "enhance ecosystems" by severely restricting and even reducing humans' existing land use.

In an article titled "What Is 'Nature Positive' and Why Is It the Key to Our Future?" published by WEF in June 2021, high-profile environmentalists and members of the World Economic Forum outlined their vision for a "nature positive" approach to policy making and corporate management.

In the past, the mantra among a growing number of inspired leaders has been to do less harm, to reduce impact and to tread lightly across our world. Of course, this mantra remains.

But now there is a new worldview gathering pace: "nature positive." This asks: What if we go beyond damage limitations? What if our economic activities not only minimize impact, but also enhance ecosystems?...

Nature positive is a disruptive idea. It forces us to think differently about our place in the world. It is a destination for humanity. It is a foundation for good governance, long-term stable societies and healthy economies. It is a philosophy that values our common future. And it is a new business model based on regeneration, resilience and recirculation-not destruction and pollution.

What exactly do these Great Resetters have in mind when they talk about "enhancing ecosystems?"

This means governments, cities and businesses need to know what to measure. Science-based targets for a nature positive trajectory are still under intense discussion. As of today, the proposed quantitative targets are as follows: zero loss of nature from 2020 onward, nature positive by 2030, and full recovery by 2050. An important step towards this is to aim to protect 30% of the land and ocean by 2030.

Wait, conserving 30 percent of land and oceans by 2030? You mean like a “30 by30” plan? Didn’t I just read something about that somewhere?

This movement within the Great Reset to limit property ownership and centralize control of property might also explain why Reset-affiliated investment firms are buying up as much property as they can get their hands on. Fox News reported in June 2021, citing additional reporting by the Wall Street Journal, that “BlackRock-led by billionaire Laurence Fink-is purchasing entire neighborhoods and converting single-family homes into rentals; while in cities like Houston, investors like Fink account for one-quarter of the home purchasers.

BlackRock is one of the world’s powerful investment management companies, and as I mentioned earlier in this chapter and in chapter 5, its billionaire leader Laurence Fink is an ally of Joe Biden and serves as a member of the World Economic Forum’s board of directors. Other Great Reset-linked businesses and financial institutions have also taken part in the buying spree, including JPMorgan Chase.

Although not all people affiliated with the World Economic Forum believe that the results of this shift would be wholly positive, many do think it is an unavoidable part of elites’ new economy and that the reduction of private ownership would be a mostly good development.

Danish member of Parliament Ida Auken was asked by the World Economic Forum to provide a prediction for 2030, to which Auken responded with an article titled “Welcome to 2030. I Own Nothing, Have No Privacy, and Life Has Never Been Better.”

In the article,Auken wrote that in her vision of 2030,

I don’t own anything. I don’t own a car. I don’t own a house. I don’t own any appliances or any clothes.

It might seem odd to you, but it makes perfect sense for us in this city (in 2030). Everything you considered a product, has now become a service. We have access to transportation, accommodation, food and all the things we need in our daily lives. One by one all these things became free, so it ended up not making sense for us to own much.

One in a while I get annoyed about the fact that I have no real privacy (in 2030). Nowhere I can go and not be registered. I know that, somewhere, everything I do, think and dream of is recorded. I just hope that nobody will use it against me.

All in all, it is a good life. Much better than the path we were on, where it became so clear that we could not continue with the same model of growth. We had all these terrible things happening: lifestyle diseases, climate change, the refugee crisis, environmental degradation, completely congested cities, water pollution, air pollution, social unrest and unemployment. We lost way too many people before we realised that we could do things differently.

Well, we know that the folks at the World Economic Forum think an existence in which regular people own almost nothing and have “no real privacy” is “all in all...a good life,” but is that the world you want to leave for your children and grandchildren? I know it’s not the one I want to leave for mine, and I’m willing to bet many of you reading this book agree.

EXHIBIT H: BIDEN KILLS TRUMP’S “FAIR Access” RULE

In President Trump’s final days in office, his administration released what would have been an incredibly important regulation, one that had the potential to stop some of the most dangerous parts of the Great Reset in their tracks.

Trump’s Fair Access Rule would have made it difficult-and in many cases, impossible-for banks to discriminate against legal businesses on the basis of the type of industry they are in, thus forcing banking institutions to focus solely on financial matters. According to the rule, “banks should conduct risk assessment of individual customers, rather than make broad-based decisions affecting whole categories or classes of customers when provisioning access to services, capital, and credit.”

In practice, the rule would have made it difficult for a bank to for example, deny a gun-store owner access to a loan solely because the bank’s leaders didn’t think legal gun ownership was good for America. Similarly, a bank would not have been permitted to deny an oil company a loan because of concerns over CO2 emissions.

Although the rule had been approved by the Trump administration's Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, it had not gone into effect when Biden entered the White House, so the Biden administration killed the regulation before it could be fully implemented.

If Trump’s Fair Access Rule had been imposed, it’s unlikely the Great Reset would be gaining so much ground today within much of the banking industry, because one of the most powerful devices in the Great Reset toolbox-the use of ESG scores and other, similar metrics by banks to determine access to credit-would have been unavailable.

Biden knew how vital the Fair Access Rule would have been in slowing the great Reset, so-unsurprisingly-he crushed it before it could take effect.

EXHIBIT I: CONGRESS FLIRTS WITH ESG

Nothing would advance the Great Reset agenda more than a new law that mandates ESG standards and reporting. In June 2021, Congress moved a step closer to imposing far-reaching ESG rules with the passage of the ESG Disclosure Simplification Act of 2021 in the U.S. House of Representatives.

According to a report by the National Law Review, the bill (which has still not been reviewed by the Senate as of this writing, in September 2021) would “require the Securities and exchange Commission (‘SEC’), for the first time to define, in regulations,

‘ESG metrics,’ for the purpose of guiding required corporate disclosures under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Securities Act of 1933, as amended.”

The National Law Review further noted that if the bill were to pass into law, then “in consent solicitation or proxy statements, issuers would be required to include ‘(a) a clear description of the views of the issuer about the link between ESG metrics and the long-term business strategy of the issuer; and (b) a description of any process the issuer uses to determine the impact of ESG metrics on the long-term business strategy of the issuer.’”

The legislation also would establish a Sustainable Finance Advisory Committee, which would be required to submit to the SEC within 180 days after its initial meeting “a report with recommendations on what ESG metrics issuers should be required to disclose.”

The language of the bill states that the Sustainable Finance Advisory Committee’s report would need to “(i) identif(y) the challenges and opportunities for investors associated with sustainable finance; and (ii) recommend policy changes to facilitate the flow of capital towards sustainable investments, in particular environmentally sustainable investments.”

The ESG Disclosure Simplification Act also would allow the SEC to “incorporate any internationally recognized, independent, multi-stakeholder environmental, social, and governance disclosure standards,” including any standards created by the European Union, World Economic Forum, or United Nations.

Although the bill is not likely to pass in the U.S. Senate with the current composition of Congress, its passage in the House and the support it received from the Biden administration should serve as a slap in the face to any doubters who think ESG mandates are not a priority for many in Washington. A wide-ranging ESG system is on the verge of becoming law in the United States—even though most Americans still have no idea what ESG metrics are.

EXHIBIT J: CALLS FOR A CREDIT SCORE TAKEOVER

In addition to attempting to pass sweeping ESG mandates, many members of Congress and nonprofit advocacy groups have called for the federal government to take over individual credit scoring, a move some prominent activists are already suggesting could be used to help Congress and federal bureaucracies reshape society. Think of it as a government-provided personal ESG score.

At the time of this writing, personal credit scores are developed by three non-government credit bureaus, Equifax, TransUnion, and Experian, each of which creates a unique FICO score for individuals. Credit scores are based entirely on financial information that helps banks and other institutions determine how much risk is associated with various financial arrangements made with a potential customer or lender.

The popular finance/economics website The Balance notes, “Traditionally, the FICO score is the most popular score used for important loans like home and auto loans.

No matter what score you use, most models are looking for a way to predict how likely you are to pay your bills on time.”

The Balance further explains, “The FICO credit score looks at how much debt you have, how you’ve repaid in the past, and more. Scores range from 300 and 850 and are made up of the following components:” credit mix (10 percent), payment history (35 percent), current debt (30 percent), length of credit history (15 percent), and new credit (10 percent).

Many members of Congress and supporters of the Great Reset want to alter the existing credit score system so it can be used to redistribute wealth and power. One of the most popular proposals involves creating a government-run credit agency-the Public Credit Registry-that would be responsible for issuing “fair” credit scores to consumers. It would be housed under the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the brainchild of Senator Elizabeth Warren from Massachusetts.

Many of those in Congress advocating for putting government in charge of individual credit scores have said that the existing credit scoring agencies are too dysfunctional to be trusted and that a government agency would be more effective and fairer in its approach-because, you know, when you’re faced with a large, irresponsible, inefficient bureaucratic system, the first group of people you turn to in order to fix the problem is the federal government, right?

Others, however, have been a little more honest about their motives. At a hearing about the possibility of overhauling the existing credit system, held in June 2021 by the U.S. House Committee on Financial Services, Representative Maxine Waters, the chair of the committee, said that the current model needs to be deconstructed because “for far too long, our credit reporting system has kept people of color and low-income persons from access to capital to start a small business; access to mortgage loans to become homeowners; and access to credit to meet financial emergencies.”

As her statement makes clear, in Water’s view, credit scoring reforms should center on social justice, not merely financial concerns.

At the same hearing, Chi Chi Wu, an attorney at the National Consumer Law Center, advocated for the passage of legislation creating a federal credit scoring agency, and she specifically noted that one of the benefits would be that the new agency would give novel tools to government to fix social and economic problems.

“While public agencies are not perfect, at least they would not have profit-making as their top priority,” Wu said at the hearing, “They would be responsive to public pressure and government oversight. They could also be charged with developing credit scoring models to reduce the yawning racial and economic inequality in this country.”

Reducing “yawning racial and economic inequality” makes for a good sound bite on CNN, but the ramifications of putting the federal government in charge of credit scoring decisions would be far-reaching and deeply troubling, especially if the agency tasked with creating and managing scores is empowered with the authority to “fix” society’s ills.

A Public Credit Registry could, for example, ensure that some races get lower-interest car loans than more “privileged” races.” Asians and whites already have enough cars,” PCR bureaucrats could reason, “so let’s make sure other racial groups get the best rates.”

Similarly, a Public Credit Registry could effectively deny access to loans for some successful business owners. After all, they already have enough wealth, don’t they? Let’s give other people a chance.

“Oh, and you want a mortgage for a new home that you have been saving up for, for a decade? Sorry, we already have enough homeowners of your race in your zip code. We need greater racial equity, so you are going to have to get by with a rock-bottom credit score and sky-high mortgage rates.”

These hypotheticals might sound extreme, but what else could Chi Chi possibly have had in mind when she said a government credit agency could develop “credit scoring models to reduce the yawning racial and economic inequality in this country”?

The current credit scoring industry could be improved. No doubt about that. But putting a politically motivated government bureaucracy in charge of credit scoring would create far more problems than it would solve-unless, of course, you want a total reset of the current economic system and social contract. If that’s your goal, then Chi Chi’s call for a government credit score makes a whole lot of sense.

EXHIBIT K: BUILDING BACK BETTER AT THE G7

In most years, watching meetings of the G7-a group of world leaders hailing from Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States-is about as interesting as watching half-blurred reruns of traffic court on public-access television. But the 2021 meeting of the G7, the first such meeting featuring President Biden, caught my attention when Biden announced he and his G7 pals had agreed to launch a global infrastructure development plan that seemed nearly identical to numerous proposals I had previously heard ooze out of the mouth of Klaus Schwab and other Great Reset advocates. Biden called the initiative Build Back Better World. (Sound familiar?)

According to a statement by the White House, “Through B3W (Build Back Better World), the G7 and other like-minded partners will coordinate in mobilizing private-sector capital in four areas of focus-climate, health and health security, digital technology, and gender equity and equality-with catalytic investments from our respective development finance institutions.”

Huh. Those “areas of focus” sound eerily similar to the goals set forth by just about every single Great Reset document ever published.

The Build Back Better World plan, which the White House estimates will lead to “hundreds of billions of dollars of infrastructure investment,” would not simply provide run-of-the-mill investments in roads and bridges. No, the White House says the investments will be “values-driven” and “carried out in a transparent and sustainable manner-financially, environmentally, and socially.” They will also, of course, be focused

on battling climate change and “achieving the goals of the Paris Climate Agreement.” (ESG, anyone?)

I could write a few more paragraphs further outlining how the Build Back Better World plan is overtly connected to Great Reset goals, but if you can't see that by now, you really haven't been paying attention.

COULD THE GREAT RESET REALLY HAPPEN IN AMERICA?

Toward the end of my detailed look at the Great Reset in chapter 5, I included a modified version of a question that I hear all the time from listeners and readers: “Can the Great Reset really happen in America, of all places?”

It is an important question. The United States is not China or Europe—at least not yet—so just because there are some troubling developments occurring on the other side of the world does not necessarily mean Americans are going to be forced to deal with the same problems. Despite all our issues and the near-fundamental transformation of American society that has occurred in recent years, the United States has not totally lost its soul. If it had, I wouldn't have bothered with writing this book.

But when you add up all the evidence I've outlined throughout this chapter and in chapter 5—Biden's policy platforms and statements, Bidens' “Build Back Better” slogan, the massive ESG infrastructure that has already been put into place in America's banks and large corporations, attempts to have government take over America's credit scoring system, the commitments made by more than two hundred major financial institutions around the world to support ESG systems, calls in Congress for ESG mandates, the more than \$100 trillion in support from investors associated with the Principles for Responsible Investment, the G7's powerful figures like Al Gore, John Kerry, and leaders of a seemingly endless list of activist groups, international organizations, and billion-dollar corporations in the United States—it's hard to see how any reasonable person could deny that the Great Reset has already gained significant momentum in America.

The most important question we can ask ourselves, then, is not whether the Great Reset is possible or even desired by many in the ruling class. Nor is it whether the Great Reset would be harmful to markets or individual liberty. The answers to those questions have already been determined, as this chapter and my others have proven. Rather the essential question, the one that will define the next century of American history, is, What can we do to stop it?

That vital question is the subject of this book's next and final chapter.