

DERAILING THE GREAT RESET

The truth of the matter is that you always know the right thing to do. The hard part is doing it.

-GENERAL NORMAN SCHWARZKOPF

BY ALL ACCOUNTS, THERE WAS NOTHING SPECIAL ABOUT THE train that left Zurich for Germany on April 9, 1917. As with the dozens of other train rides that occurred in the region, the machine's loud, powerful engine bellowed across Switzerland's beautiful landscape, featuring rolling hills, picturesque farmhouses, and the stunning Rhine Falls, one of Europe's largest waterfalls, as the train moved ever closer to its destination farther north.

Had you watched the train from afar, you would have thought nothing was out of the ordinary. For most bystanders, the speeding passenger train was likely a welcome departure to normalcy in an otherwise chaotic world. Although Switzerland in 1917 had managed to remain at peace, much of the rest of Europe was mired in a bloody "Great War".

By 1917, World War I had already taken the lives of millions of men, women, and children. On its own, Russia had suffered five million casualties. On all sides of the conflict, soldiers died in the most wretched of conditions—from chemical weapons or a bayonet to the chest in a frozen trench hundreds of miles from home. British soldiers died on the battle's first day alone.

But there were few soldiers on the Swiss train from Zurich, and just a few weapons of war. Many of its passengers were shabbily dressed and carried only the most basic of provisions: light clothing, blankets, books, for the long journey ahead, paper and ink for writing, and limited food rations consisting of sausage, cheese, bread rolls, and hard-boiled eggs.

The train, its destination, and its passengers appeared in almost every way to be normal, yet there was nothing commonplace about this fateful trip. It was, in fact, in the most meaningful sense, extraordinary and world changing. The fate of hundreds of millions of people would forever be altered by the work of its passengers, and millions of lives would be lost at the hands of the train's most profound and ruthless traveler: Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, a man better known today by his alias, Lenin.

Lenin, then in his mid-forties, had spent the better part of the previous two decades in exile, eventually settling in Switzerland with radicals who had been forced out of Russia and other European nations for attempting to spark an international, revolutionary socialist movement.

While in Switzerland, Lenin had spent his days feverishly writing. In 1916, he authored *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* and started one of his most

important books, *State and Revolution*-all while secretly working from across the continent to undermine the authority of Russia's czar, Nicholas II.

So in March 1917, when Lenin-who had in recent months grown disheartened and convinced that the global Marxist revolution he believed to be inevitable could be many years away-heard that Nicholas had abdicated the throne, he was nothing short of exhilarated. Czar Nicholas had been forced from power following a spontaneous revolution of the Russian people and soldiers, who had become disenfranchised over Nicholas's handling of World War I and disturbed by rumors of the growing influence in Russia's royal court of a bizarre Siberian mystic, Rasputin.

When word of the czar's removal reached Lenin, he and his fellow Marxists began to tirelessly work to find a way to return to Russia. The trip was, at that time, a monumental challenge because the nations surrounding Switzerland were still at war. In the weeks prior to Lenin's departure from Zurich, Lenin and some of his closest comrades became so desperate that they approached a most unlikely potential ally, Germany, hoping that a deal could be struck between the two parties.

The German government was no friend of Lenin or his socialist compatriots, but Germany officials were eventually persuaded to broker a deal with him. They would allow Lenin and thirty-one other socialist revolutionaries to travel in April through Germany on their way to Russia, but only if they agreed to work toward ending Russia's involvement in the war once they arrived home. It was a remarkable and unexpected conspiracy, one that would reshape world history.

With the help of anti-socialist German officials, Lenin returned to Russia a hero among those sympathetic to his Marxist views. Despite being a relatively small minority in Russia, the more radical Bolshevik socialists, led by Lenin, stormed the Winter Palace in Petrograd-now called Saint Petersburg-on the night of October 25, seizing power from the Russian provisional government. The provisional government was so weak and the skirmish so short that on the following morning, many citizens of Petrograd had no idea the revolution had occurred or that an entirely new nation was about to be created.

Soon thereafter Lenin's socialists took control of the Kremlin in Moscow. A secret police force, the Cheka, and prison camps were then established, and rival newspapers and political parties were eliminated.

The Bolsheviks renamed themselves "communists," both to help with branding outside of Russia, where the term "Bolshevik" was not well known, and to differentiate Lenin's revolutionaries from the other European socialists who had supported getting involved in World War I. They then negotiated a treaty with Germany to buy time while they waged a civil war in Russia with counterrevolutionary White Army forces.

World War I ended in 1918, but Russia's civil war would last until 1920, and the socialist Red Army would continue fighting in Eastern Europe into 1921, in the hope of ushering in a worldwide Marxist revolution.

On December 30, 1922, Lenin's socialists founded the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and over its sixty-nine year history, tens of millions of Russians and Eastern

Europeans would be murdered, exiled, or unjustly imprisoned by its ruthless government, all in the name of “equality.”

Although by 1917 a revolution in Russia was likely inevitable, a Marxist socialist revolution most certainly was not. Had the German government refused to conspire with Lenin to allow him and his comrades to travel through Germany on their way to Russia, it is entirely possible the Bolsheviks’ attempt to seize power would have been derailed, and perhaps today Lenin would be only a footnote in history.

CONSPIRACY THEORIES

Lenin’s historic train ride through Germany is important for a number of reasons, but perhaps the most overlooked is that it is proof that a well-timed conspiracy can bring about remarkable and dangerous change, even when such change seems highly improbable.

Americans often think the United States is too big to fail and that fringe political groups seeking revolutionary changes to our society and Constitution have little chance of success. But I am sure Czar Nicholas II felt the same way for much of his life, and I am willing to bet that most Russians at the start of 1917 did not believe that within just a few years, a band of relatively poor, shabbily dressed political exiles from Switzerland would be ruling with an iron fist over one of the world’s largest nations. Yet that is exactly what happened.

Of course, this does not mean that all or even most conspiracies should be taken seriously. In recent years, ridiculous conspiracy theories covering everything from fake moon landings to shape-shifting reptilians controlling the government have become popular among some groups of Americans. And although it is tempting to laugh away sweaty rants by tinfoil hat-wearing fat guys lamenting the rise of lizard people, conspiracy theories that are not grounded in truth, and the media’s decision to engage in the rampant dissemination of false information to achieve political goals, have become two of the biggest threats facing America today.

Because people do not know who to trust, we now live in a world of “alternative facts,” where seemingly everything is fake-fake news, fake outrage, fake accusations. Now they even sell “turkeys” made of tofu. Is anything real anymore?

As a result, Americans are deeply confused and incredibly skeptical of anything that does not fit into their re-existing set of beliefs. Trust in the media is embarrassingly low. Only one-third of self-identified Republicans and less than half of independents say they trust the media. Even among Democrats, who have a long list of left-leaning publications and television networks to choose from, trust in media is just 66 percent.

The world’s massive social media infrastructure and online publisher model have also contributed to the conspiracy theory pandemic. Most publishers and many authors earn much of their money by getting clicks on articles they produce, so the more outrageous the article, the more likely it is that the publisher and author will have a big payday. How many hundreds of millions of dollars did the media earn by churning out

literally thousands of Trump-Russia collusion stories, most of which ended up being based on false information? It is probably impossible to calculate, but I can say this for certain: they made a heck of a lot more money with the collusion narrative than they would have made without it. The truth didn't matter; the money did.

Conspiracy theories, dishonest media reports, and the deep political and social divisions that have resulted from them could end up being the final nail in America's coffin. If we can't even agree on whether the stories we see in the press are true, or even what "truth" means, how can we have honest conversations about complex issues like race, religion, foreign policy, artificial intelligence, or just about anything else that actually matters?

The confusion and tribalism that have resulted from this culture of disregarding carefully cultivated truths in favor of outrage and click bait have presented an unprecedented opportunity for supporters of the Great Reset, who use societal divisions and fear as cover for their attempts to alter nearly every part of our country. Anyone with the courage to stand up against them is labeled a conspiracy theorist and tossed aside as a lunatic. And because the mainstream press is so unwilling to expose the truth, tens of millions of Americans never hear well-documented, highly sourced facts that could shed a dramatic new light on nearly everything that they see in the news on a daily basis.

The media's constant catastrophizing and general lack of trust-worthiness, mixed with the profusion of conspiracy theories-both lizard people-level ones and your run-of-the-mill "Trump is a Russian agent" garbage-have left many honest people on both sides of the aisle thinking that every claim of conspiracy is false and usually the product of political forces working to get or keep their side in power. However, as we saw with Lenin's rise to power, there's a big difference between conspiracy theories and conspiracy facts, and knowing what that difference is could prove vital for America's survival.

CONSPIRACY FACTS

How can you know whether something is a fact in a world chock-full of misinformation? If you have been listening to my radio show or reading my books for a while, you probably already know what I am about to say: the absolutely most important rule to follow is that you must do your own homework. Do not believe something just because your favorite media personality or news outlet said it. Even well-meaning, honest people can make mistakes or misunderstand something they have seen, read, or heard.

Above all else, doing your own homework requires going directly to primary sources, whenever possible, and then examining quotes and data in the proper context. As you probably can imagine, I get a lot of suggestions, tips, and ideas for stories from listeners, friends, and generally top-notch reporters and sources. But you wouldn't believe how many hundreds of times I have heard that something is true only to find out later that when seen in context, that "jaw-dropping" quote or "incredible" piece of

evidence means something completely different from what many others had interpreted it to mean.

In addition to doing your own homework by going straight to the original sources, it is also vital that you spend time reading news and commentary from sources with which you do not agree, whether they be on the right or the left. People are often surprised to hear that I read the New York Times. Of course, there are a lot of opinion pieces and biased news articles in the Times that I do not agree with. You should never assume that what you're reading in any media outlet is true, without first verifying the information. With that said, the Times is still one of the world's most influential news outlets, and its staff has done some truly remarkable reporting over the years, so I am not going to throw the baby out with the bathwater, no matter how ugly the little guy is.

If you do your own homework, go straight to the original sources, and read everything you can get your hands on, I am confident you'll see that the warnings I have outlined throughout this book are real and that if we don't work together to stop the spread of the Great Reset, it will soon become our reality.

FIGHTING BACK

I know I often come off as a doom-and-gloom kind of person. Watching the news sixteen hours a day will do that to you. But the truth is, I am often filled with great hope for this nation's future.

People are living longer, healthier lives than ever before because of the wonders of capitalism. The internet has provided people with access to information that was hidden from view in generations past, when most families got their news and information from one of three network television stations and their local newspaper.

Prior to the coronavirus, America's economy was booming, thanks in large part to conservative principles like reducing regulations and taxes, and everyone-including African Americans, Hispanics, and women-was benefiting at levels we have never seen before. And perhaps most important, rising through the ranks is a new generation of young thinkers, speakers, and activists who I am confident will passionately advocate for individual liberty for decades to come, long after guys like me retire.

There are reasons to be hopeful, but there also plenty of reasons to be deeply concerned. When I look at what has happened in the United States over the past couple of years, I feel like a stranger in my own country. Rioting, looting, burned-down police stations, expenditures that are trillions of dollars more than we can afford, bailouts of billion-dollar corporations, tyrannical state governments-is this who we are now?

Americans are at a crossroads. We must make a choice. We have to decide whether we are going to go the way of China and twenty-first century fascism or pursue the promise of our forefathers, who bled on fields, deserts, beaches, and mountains-both at home and in faraway lands-trying to guarantee the continued existence of the grand experiment in human freedom.

The United States has faced challenges and crossroads before, and they have come in many forms. But I am not sure that the country has ever experienced anything quite like the Great Reset.

Never before have so many Americans been as eager as they are today to give away their freedom to global elites. Never before have so many powerful U.S. business interests worked with such vigor to betray their country in pursuit of a lucrative new crony deal. Never before have American politicians and activist groups so openly demanded that more power be given to the ruling class and been met by the media, Hollywood, and academic institutions with joy and excitement.

We have an important, world-changing opportunity to change course and embrace the principles of individual freedom and respect for all people, regardless of race, religion, or gender. But make no mistake about it, time is running out. If we fail now, our country might never recover. The forces at work are so powerful, well funded, and devoted to their cause that reversing the Reset might be virtually impossible if it is fully brought into existence.

Throughout the remainder of this chapter, I will discuss several strategies for derailing the Great Reset movement and in the process, stopping twenty-first century fascism and saving our republic. This list is not meant to be exhaustive, nor will it provide readers with all-encompassing information about each topic. It is, however, a good place to start and offers a solid foundation for building a movement to fight back against the Great Reset and other, similar movements pushed by elites, both now and in the future.

LIVE NOT BY LIES

The struggle against the Great Reset begins when you stand unwaveringly for the truth, no matter where it takes you. Don't allow the shackles of political loyalty to restrict you. Become a slave to the truth. Stand up against all those who would have you support or even tolerate lies.

The primary reason Germany succumbed to the Nazis in the wake of World War II is that there were too few good people willing to push back against the dishonest fearmongering and mythology propagated by Hitler and his supporters. Many of the German people had already forgotten the truths of their forefathers by the time men like Dietrich Bonhoeffer attempted to build a mass resistance movement against the Nazis.

We cannot wait for such a dire situation to act. We must earnestly, passionately, and peacefully resist now, before it's too late.

One of the best treatises ever written on the importance of the truth was by Soviet dissident Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. On February 12, 1974, one day before being exiled from the Soviet Union, Solzhenitsyn published a powerful essay titled "Live Not by Lies."

In this highly influential work, Solzhenitsyn identified the Communist government's most vulnerable point as its lies. He insisted that if the Russian people

could merely gather the will to reject “a daily participation in deceit,” the Communist Party’s stranglehold on society would not last.

And therein we find, neglected by us, the simplest, the most accessible key to our liberation: a personal non-participation in lies! Even if all is covered by lies, even if all is under their rule, let us resist in the smallest way: Let their rule hold not through me!

And this is the way to break out of the imaginary encirclement of our inertness, the easiest way for us and the most devastating for the lies. For when people renounce lies, lies simply cease to exist. Like parasites, they can only survive when attached to a person.

We are not called upon to step out onto the square and shout out the truth, to say out loud what we think-this is scary, we are not ready. But let us at least refuse to say what we do not think!

After inspiring the Soviet people to reject lies in their everyday lives, he then provided a blueprint for living as an “honest man,” one that could serve as a model for our own resistance against the ruling class. According to Solzhenitsyn, the honest man

Will not write, sign, nor publish in any way, a single line distorting, so far as he can see, the truth;

Will not utter such a line in private or in public conversation, nor read it from a crib sheet, nor speak it in the role of educator, canvasser, teacher, actor;

Will not in painting, sculpture, photograph, technology, or music depict, support, or broadcast a single false thought, a single distortion of the truth as he discerns it;

Will not cite in writing or in speech a single “guiding” quote for gratification, insurance, for his success at work, unless he fully shares the cited thought and believes that it fits the context precisely;

Will not be forced to a demonstration or a rally if it runs counter to his desire and his will; will not take up and raise a banner or slogan in which he does not fully believe;

Will not raise a hand in vote for a proposal which he does not sincerely support; will not vote openly or in secret ballot for a candidate whom he deems dubious or unworthy;

Will not be impelled to a meeting where a forced and distorted discussion is expected to take place;

Will at once walk out from a session, meeting, lecture, play, or film as soon as he hears the speaker utter a lie, ideological drivel, or shameless propaganda;

Will not subscribe to, nor buy in retail, newspaper or journal that distorts or hides the underlying facts.

Solzhenitsyn's plan for resistance was simple yet powerful. Not everyone has the courage to protest an authoritarian regime openly, but by refusing to participate in lies, the people could severely reduce the Communist Party's power and influence.

The same is true today. No matter who you are or how uncomfortable you feel with pushing back against the Great Reset openly, you don't have to participate in those particularly damning and dishonest parts of our society and economy. By refusing to be a part of elites' lies, you remove much of the power that the ruling class has over your life and the lives of your family members.

A UNITED FRONT

One of the most important ways we can stop the Great Reset is to educate the people in our lives about what is really going on. But that cannot happen unless we know how other people think and why they believe the things they do.

Reading and listening to what different media outlets are reporting is a great place to start, because it provides an important opportunity to learn how to communicate with friends, neighbors, and family members who rely on media sources you may not trust to get their news and commentary.

Further, many of the people with whom you discuss the Great Reset are not going to believe you if you start a conversation with crazy-sounding warnings about faraway European billionaires meeting in secret in Davos. But most of the people you know will be interested to hear about what's going on with their banks, plans to eliminate all gasoline-powered cars, radical "diversity" initiatives and racial employment quotas, ESG scores applied to their own personal investment accounts, and proposals for a federal jobs guarantee and universal basic income. The key to talking to others about the Great Reset is to find the issues they care about the most and start your conversation there.

The Great Reset is so much bigger than any one political party or ideological group. Conservatives cannot stop the Great Reset on their own. Neither can independents nor the liberals who truly care about protecting free speech and individual rights. We must work together by finding common ground upon which we can all stand firmly united, in the same way Americans of all political persuasions in the past have worked together to help those suffering in the wake of natural disasters and to fight against foreign threats and the racial bigotry of the Jim Crow-era South.

There are still many honest, kindhearted Americans on both sides of the political aisle who recognize the immense dangers posed by large tech companies, cancel culture, and massive, powerful, international corporations and financial institutions. Some of these people even work in Big Tech, Hollywood, and legacy media outlets. They do not want the Great Reset any more than I do. But few of us on the right have taken the steps necessary to reach out to them and to others on the left in order to develop a coalition capable of taking on the grave threats facing all of us.

For those of you skeptical of reaching across the aisle, consider that a December 2020 survey of likely voters conducted by Rasmussen Reports and the Heartland Institute found that the majority of voters reject the core concepts that serve as the foundation of the Great Reset.

When asked, “What should be the highest priority for business in the United States?” the overwhelming majority of respondents—a whopping 84 percent—said businesses should focus on earning profits, “providing good benefits and pay to employees,” or offering consumers “high quality products and services at the lowest prices.” Only 6 percent of respondents said “climate change” should be the highest priority, and just 3 percent answered with “using business resources to pursue social justice causes.”

Perhaps even more telling, when asked, “How influential should international institutions like the United Nations, World Economic Forum, and International Monetary Fund be in creating regulations governing United States businesses?” only 9 percent answered with “very influential.”

As these results show, many of the most important policies demanded by supporters of the Great Reset are wildly unpopular, and polling shows that the more Americans of every political persuasion learn about the Reset, the more they want nothing to do with it.

We must put aside our differences and focus on the principles that unite most Americans, and in the process end the toxic us-versus-them culture that pervades nearly every part of our society today—just as we have done innumerable times throughout American history. One of the most recent examples is the fight against the Obama administration's Common Core national curriculum standards. Had parents of every political persuasion not worked together to push back against that top-down approach to education, Common Core would have prevailed, and parents forever would have lost control over what their children learn. Also, most American children would have been taught to think that $2+7=$ big blue square.

Believe me, no one knows better than I do how difficult it is to put political differences aside, especially after everything that has happened over the past decade. But we are out of options. If we work together, it is possible to stop the Great Reset from taking hold in America. But if we allow our pride and partisanship to distract us from the greater threats at hand, our country will not survive the dark days ahead.

COMMUNITY FIRST

One of the defining characteristics of the modern era is that so few Americans know-and I mean really know-their neighbors. Think about it. How many of your ten closest neighbors can you name? (and no, “guy with the terrible toupee” and “woman with the yappy dog” don’t count) Do you know what your neighbors do for a living? Their hobbies? Skills? In a time of crisis, how many of your neighbors could you comfortably ask for help?

What about your local community? Do you know local law enforcement? Could you name your local sheriff, even if your life depended on it? (And someday it might.) How about local store owners? How often do you purchase goods and services from small businesses in town, as opposed to large corporate chains? Do you bank with one of the “big guys” like Chase, Bank of America, or Wells Fargo, or do you have accounts with local banks or credit unions?

Americans used to depend on their neighbors, local businesses, and churches, but now we rely almost entirely on gigantic corporations to fulfill our needs-even though we know that many of them couldn’t care less about our values, desires, or even consumer preferences. And as I’ve shown throughout this book, many large corporations and banks are selling out the American people in order to appease other elites, fill their coffers full of cash, and attain more power for themselves and their corrupt allies in government.

We cannot continue to hand our wealth over to people working to undermine everything we believe in, simply because Amazon’s two-day shipping is a convenient luxury. We need to learn about our neighbors and local community businesses and officials and then support them whenever possible.

You should try to limit your debt as much as possible, but if you do need a loan, borrow locally with a small regional bank or credit union. Meet your local bankers in person. Ask them questions about environmental, social, and governance scores, and find out how much of your money they keep locally on hand versus sending to other institutions or lending out. Find out what their relationship is to the Federal Reserve.

Discover which people in your town or city have essential skills like welding, plumbing, automotive repair, tech knowledge, and farming, and develop skills of your own that you can use to trade with others.

Reject money from the federal government at every opportunity, especially federal loans for college and business activities. Those dollars can and will be used against you-or at the very least, to control your behavior.

We also must become active members of our communities. Join the local school board or PTA. If your children don’t attend a local school, start a homeschooling association. If you’re religious, find a church and become an active member. Join a civic group, club, or other organization that will help you build local relationships. If your area doesn’t already have a farmers’ market, start one.

If you’re politically active, don’t spend all your time and money on congressional and presidential elections. Work with others to ensure that your local sheriff and district

attorney are committed to defending the Constitution. Learn about your state's attorney general. If he or she isn't fighting tirelessly to defend your liberties find someone who will. In the coming decades, state and local officials could be your biggest defenders.

I know that all of this is going to require a lot of work and that it would be much easier to continue living as we have for the past two decades. But make no mistake about it, Great Reset elites know that too. They are hoping for apathy and laziness, because if everyone takes the easiest route imaginable, elites' efforts will march on unimpeded, and they will get significantly richer and more powerful at our expense.

Living locally is not the easiest or cheapest thing to do, but it's one of the most important steps you can take to separate yourself from the corrupt Great Reset system that now dominates many of our lives.

REGULATORY CHANGES

Perhaps the quickest way to derail the Great Reset in the United States would be for the federal government to issue regulatory changes that would make it illegal for banks and financial institutions to make lending decisions based on anything other than financial concerns, a move that would gut the Great Reset's ESG system.

Interestingly, in the final weeks of the Trump presidency his administration's Office of the Comptroller of the Currency issued a rule aimed at doing just that, which it titled Fair Access to Financial Services. As Benjamin Zycher noted for Real Clear Markets, the rule required that:

large banks and federal savings associations make lending decisions based upon "individualized, quantitative risk-based analysis and management of customer risk." Translation: The lenders are not to make such decisions on the basis of the political unpopularity...of certain businesses, obvious examples of which are producers of fossil fuels or firearms, operators of for-profit colleges or private prisons, and payday lenders, and perhaps others engaged in entirely legal business activities.

Trump's Fair Access to Financial Services rule would have stopped much of the Great Reset from happening in the United States-or at the very least, would have made it much less likely to occur. I say "would have" because one of the first moves made by the Biden administration in early 2021 was to halt the rule's implementation.

Given Biden's affinity for the Great Reset, his decision to stop Trump's regulatory change should not come as a surprise. It is yet another clear signal that Biden plans to continue moving the ESG ball down the field as quickly as he can. However, this does not mean that a future administration-even a Democratic one-would be unwilling to reinstate the Fair Access to Financial Services rule. It wouldn't be a permanent solution, of course, because like all executive actions, the rule could easily be overturned again in the future, but it would be a good place to start.

A decision by Congress to codify such a rule into law would be a much better, longer-term strategy or stopping the Reset, but that isn't likely to occur until at least 2025.

DEFUND GLOBALISM

Although the United Nations has a long track record of attacking U.S. interests and allies, especially Israel, Americans continue to spend huge amounts of money supporting U.N. agencies. The United States pays for roughly one-fifth of the United Nations's total budget, about \$10 billion per year-the most, by far, of any country in the world. Much of the money distributed to the United Nations goes toward humanitarian efforts, a noble cause, but significant funding also ends up paying for other U.N. agencies like the World Health Organization. Instead of forking over this taxpayer money to be parceled out by U.N. bureaucrats, the United States should consider voluntarily allocating its funding to specific agencies like the World Food Program or other worthwhile endeavors.

Switching to a voluntary payment model would turn up the heat on the United Nations and its agencies. If additional U.S. funding were at stake, these agencies would be more likely to operate effectively and efficiently. For far too long, these agencies have been allowed to operate like the massive, bloated, ineffective global bureaucracies they are.

The United States should also demand a new, extensive audit of the United Nations-and I am not talking about some internal investigation from the U.N. Board of Auditors. We need a U.S.-led, bipartisan examination of how Americans' money is being spent. After all, as noted previously, Americans are footing one-fifth of the bill, so shouldn't they have the right to make sure the money is not being wasted on corruption, bridges to nowhere, or a third espresso machine for John Q. Globalist's office?

Further, rather than continue to passively bankroll ruling-class causes, the United States should demand that the United Nations reverse course on its many leftist campaigns or risk losing American funding for projects that don't provide direct humanitarian aid or clearly benefit U.S. national security. And the same threat should be made to other international organizations that are backing the Great Reset while also relying on the generosity of Americans, like the International Monetary Fund, which remains one of the biggest supporters of the Great Reset. According to a 2018 report, U.S. commitments to the IMF total \$155 billion, the largest of any of the IMF's 189 members.

If the United Nations and other international groups refuse to clean up their act, the United States should build more coalitions outside of the United Nations and its allies-ones not devoted to elitist principles and globalism and not riddled with corruption-and redirect funding to those groups instead. This endeavor would be costly and time-consuming, but it would almost certainly prove to be worth the effort.

A BALANCED BUDGET

Over the past two decades, the idea of a balanced federal budget has gone from being a reality to being a near impossibility. The U.S. national debt will almost certainly approach or surpass \$29 trillion by the time this book finds its way into your hands, and it could be as high as \$30 trillion, depending on just how many more government giveaways Congress approves over the next several months.

Americans have been desensitized to Congress's reckless spending, but I think that is because they have not been thinking about it in the proper context. As I discussed in chapter 4, the massive money printing operations that have occurred over the past twenty years not only pose grave economic risks like hyperinflation and economic stagnation but have become a tool with which supporters of the Great Reset can manipulate and control nearly every aspect of society—from the food you eat to the car you drive to the composition of your house. For that reason, modern monetary theory is, in so many ways, the heart of twenty-first century fascism.

Without modern monetary theory or some other similar system of massive money printing, the Great Reset and comparable schemes would be impossible or require severe violence, which has become much more difficult for governments to resort to in our modern age. This means that a balanced budget is important not only for maintaining economic security but also for ensuring that Americans remain free.

The primary problem is that Congress and presidents have few incentives to rein in spending. Other than a few voices of reason in Washington, D.C. most people in government—Democrats and Republicans alike—are much more interested in buying votes, appeasing special interests, and engaging in cronyism than in being fiscally responsible.

How can the American people force their government to act with fiscal restraint? Modern monetary theory is fascistic poison, and the only antidote is a balanced budget amendment or some other constitutional amendment that puts strict limits on spending.

You might be wondering, “Glenn, if we can’t even get members of Congress to pass a balanced budget—or on many occasions, any budget at all—how are we going to push them to pass a new amendment that would forever limit their spending powers?”

Great question. We can’t.

When it comes to controlling spending, Congress is likely a lost cause. The political advantages to endless money printing will always outweigh the long-term health of the economy and the possibility of a dangerous expansion of government. Fortunately, though, the American people do not need Congress to pass a balanced budget amendment.

The U.S. Constitution provides two ways to pass new amendments. The first, as I just alluded to, is through Congress. If two-thirds of both houses of Congress agree on a constitutional amendment—fat chance, I know—it will become law once three-fourths of the states, either by convention or by a vote in the state legislature, ratify the proposed amendment.

The second, lesser-known way to approve new amendments is through an Article V convention. According to Article V of the Constitution, if two-thirds of the states, currently thirty-four states, agree to call a convention for proposing amendments, state legislators can then take the role normally held by Congress and write new amendments to the Constitution. Once approved by the state legislatures, the proposed amendment must still be ratified by three-fourths of states.

At first glance, this might sound like an insurmountable hill for the American public to climb, but over the past few decades, a movement to call an Article V convention has gained significant traction throughout much of the country. You might be shocked to learn that, according to constitutional law scholar Robert Natelson, as of 2018, “at least 27 state legislatures have valid applications outstanding for a convention to propose a balanced budget amendment.” That’s just seven shy of the number required to call a convention.

Even more incredible, some constitutional historians and legal analysts, including Natelson, argue that the number of state applications could actually be as high as thirty-three, because “at least six states without BBA applications have outstanding applications calling for a plenary convention.” A plenary convention is a call for an open-ended amendments convention that is not restricted to a single issue, like a balanced budget amendment. Natelson and others say that history and legal precedent suggest that open-ended convention applications can be added to more-specific applications like those calling for a balanced budget, putting the country just a single state away from an amendments convention that could pass a federal budget requirement.

The passage of an amendment to control federal spending would render modern monetary theory useless and slow the rapid growth that the U.S. government has had during the past two decades. And the best part is, Congress could do very little to stop it if the states were to gain the required number of applications.

Some state lawmakers, including many conservatives in states that you would expect to be in favor of a balanced budget amendment, have opposed this important movement over concerns of a “runaway convention.” They fear that if there is an Article V convention, the entire Constitution could be rewritten in one fell swoop, giving the Far Left the opportunity it needs to finally cut down parts of the Constitution it has long opposed, such as the Second Amendment.

However, legal experts generally agree that such fears are unfounded. As the Convention of States organization notes, “Article V includes numerous safeguards that protect the U.S. Constitution and ensure that only widely approved amendments are adopted. The strongest safeguard? Any amendment proposed by the Convention goes through the exact same ratification process as amendments proposed by Congress. It must be approved by 38 states. That means if only 13 states vote no, the answer is no. It doesn’t get much safer than that!”

Although it has received little media attention, the balanced budget amendment movement has earned the support of countless well-respected current and former

conservative government officials like Senator Tom Coburn, Governor Scott Walker, and Senator Rand Paul.

Without a constitutional mandate to limit government spending, it seems highly unlikely, and perhaps even impossible, that future Congresses and presidential administrations would choose to restrain their spending to such great lengths that they would reverse the current trend toward modern monetary theory. That makes a balanced budget amendment an essential part of any plan to derail the Great Reset in the United States.

OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL REFORMS

Time for a history pop quiz. How many amendments to the U.S. Constitution were passed by Congress in 1789 as part of the Bill of Rights?

If you guessed ten, then congratulations; you clearly paid attention in your high school history class. Unfortunately for you, though, your high school history class was wrong. Congress actually approved twelve amendments to the Constitution in the Bill of Rights, but only ten were ratified by the required three-fourths of the states soon after the amendments were sent to the states, which is why most Americans think of the Bill of Rights as including only ten amendments.

The original Second Amendment had nothing to do with gun rights; rather, it concerned the compensation awarded to members of Congress. Although three-fourths of states did not initially agree to ratify this amendment, it would eventually receive ratification two hundred years later, in 1992, as the Twenty-Seventh Amendment.

The original First Amendment, often called “Article the First” by historians, has never been ratified by three-fourths of the states, but it came very close in the 1790s. Although very few Americans know anything about Article the First, had it been ratified, it would have had a remarkable impact on the future of the nation.

The purpose of Article the First was to ensure that the House of Representatives provided adequate representation for the citizens of the United States. The fear among many of the Founding Fathers was that Congress could someday transform into an oligarchy, in which a handful of the richest and most powerful would lord over a massive country of diverse people. (Sound familiar?)

To combat this problem, the Founders proposed putting limit on the population size of congressional districts, so that as America’s population grew, the House of Representatives would grow along with it. The big question facing the Founders, though, was, just how large should the cap be?

Following numerous debates on the issue, Congress settled on 40,000 Americans per district, but at the request of George Washington, who had earlier in 1789 began his first term as president, Congress reduced the cap to 30,000 per district. Washington’s concern was that House districts greater than 30,000 would be too large for

representatives to fairly represent. Incredibly, it was the only request Washington made at the convention to establish the Bill of Rights.

Under Article the First, the cap would, over time, increase until it topped out at one representative for every 50,000 people. But because Article the First was never ratified-likely because of a scribal error that would have made the amendment unworkable in the draft of the Bill of Rights submitted to the states in 1789-Congress was given the power to set its own caps on House representation.

Over time, members of the house realized that the fewer people in Congress, the more power each member would have. So over the course of the nineteenth century, the size of congressional districts steadily increased, until, in 1929, Congress passed the Permanent Apportionment Act, which fixed the total number of House members at 435. At present, the size of the House remains at 435, despite there being 200 million more Americans today than there were in 1929.

Because of Congress's unwillingness to expand the size of the House of Representatives, the average population of a House district is now greater than 750,000, more than twenty-four times larger than what George Washington had suggested in 1789. If the United States had adopted a correctly written Article the First, there would be roughly 6,600 representatives serving in the U.S. House today, transforming how Congress operates.

I know that the thought of sending six thousand more politicians to Washington, D.C., sounds like a gut-wrenching idea, but before dismissing the notion, consider the following reasons why, when it comes to the size of Congress, bigger might very well be better.

1. Adding thousands of members to the House would substantially shrink the size of the average congressional district. In numerous cases, small cities and individual neighborhoods in large cities would have their own member of Congress. This would make it much easier for regular folks to run for office.
2. Smaller district sizes would limit the impact of special interest groups and corporations without the need for laws controlling free speech, because it would not longer require a fortune to win elections. Running for the House would be comparable to trying to win a mayoral election in many small cities.
3. Smaller districts would allow citizens to more easily hold politicians accountable, not only because it would be less difficult for others to run for Congress but also because congressional representatives would, in a very literal sense, be neighbors with their constituents and thus less likely to screw them over every chance they got, as so many in Congress do today.
4. Because regular Americans, including many in the middle and working classes, would be given the opportunity to become members of Congress under Washington's model, it's far less likely Congress would ever be willing to adopt globalist proposals put forward by groups like the World Economic Forum and

international governing bodies, making international authoritarian movements like the Great Reset much less influential in the United States.

5. The Founding Fathers strongly believed that limiting the population size of congressional districts was important. It was only a century later, when corrupt politicians were running things, that a permanent cap on House representation was imposed on the American people. Who do you trust: George Washington or our power-hungry oligarchs in Congress?

Of course, ratifying a corrected Article the First, or passing an entirely new version of it and then ratifying it, would be very difficult to achieve outside of an Article V convention like the one described in this chapter, but either is possible if given enough time. And it's worth remembering that congressional representation can be changed at any time by law. With enough pressure from Americans, Congress could be forced to expand the size of the House without ever needing a new constitutional amendment.

Other constitutional amendments also could be used to reform Congress and limit the power of the ruling class in America, such as term limits for members of the House and Senate (an idea already supported by more than 80 percent of Americans), a strict limit on income taxes, and a repeal of the Seventeenth Amendment, which established the direct election of U.S. senators and, in the process, took from state legislatures their ability to check the power of the federal government.

EDUCATION FREEDOM

New constitutional amendments would, on their own, substantially move the country toward stopping the rise of authoritarianism and twenty-first century fascism, but in the long run the only way to slow the growing power of global elites is to reform America's education systems, which have over the past century been hijacked by establishment progressives. A necessary place to begin is with K-12 education.

There is no doubt that U.S. education is dominated by Democrat-leaning teachers. In 2017, the Education Week Research Center conducted a nationwide survey of 1,122 educators, including teachers, "school leaders," and "district leaders". Of those surveyed, only one-quarter identified as registered Republicans, about the same proportion who said they voted for Donald Trump in the 2016 general election. By comparison, 41 percent of educators said they identify as Democrats, and 50 percent claimed to have voted for Hillary Clinton in 2016.

Bias among teachers unions, which hold a massive amount of political power in national, state, and local elections, is even stronger. During the 2018 election cycle, teachers unions donated more than \$30 million to candidates and political or ideological organizations, with 96 percent of that money going to liberals. Further, about 97 percent of that \$43 million in donations made by teachers unions in the 2020 election cycle were given to Democrats and liberal groups. It doesn't get more overtly biased than that.

I have no doubt that many teachers affiliated with the Democratic Party are just as anti establishment and disinterested in the Great Reset as I am, but it is just as certain that a large segment of teachers-especially self-identified Democrats-are devoted to expanding international institutions promoting the values of ruling-class elites.

This bias undoubtedly spills over into the curriculum. Students are inundated with rhetoric about the “existential threat” of climate change, myths about free markets, and Howard Zinn lies about the history of America. These lessons are meant to turn our youth against the United States, the Bill of Rights, and capitalism-the economic system that has made America the world’s most powerful, prosperous nation and has liberated hundreds of millions of people from poverty, slavery, and tyranny.

The only way to ensure that America’s children are being taught the values that parents on the left and right want to pass along to their children is to empower parents with education savings accounts (ESAs) that would allow them to send their kids to any K-12 school of their choice, whether it be a public school, a private school, or a home school. Scholars have been advocating for such ESAs for decades, but cowardly politicians in both parties, fearing backlash from teachers unions, have largely failed to act, even though numerous surveys show that school choice programs are popular among virtually every demographic.

A survey of people likely to vote in the 2018 elections, published by the American Federation for Children and conducted by polling firm Beck Research (no relation), found overwhelming and bipartisan support for school choice. Three-quarters of all respondents said they favor education savings accounts, including 70 percent of Democrats, 78 percent of independents, 81 percent of Republicans, 87 percent of Hispanics, and 73 percent of African Americans.

Not only would giving parents education freedom be wildly popular across the political spectrum and allow parents to remove their kids from schools promoting elitist ideologies, but it would also dramatically improve educational outcomes and better prepare students for work or higher education.

In 2019, EdChoice, a nonpartisan think tank, reviewed more than 140 empirical studies of U.S. school choice programs and determined that the vast majority of the reports showed that parent satisfaction, civic values, and racial/ethnic integration all improved with the presence of school choice. Further, of the twenty-six studies examined that considered school choice’s effect on test scores in public schools, twenty-four revealed that school choice programs improve test scores, and only one showed that a school choice program had a negative effect on outcomes.

In light of all these figures, it is astounding that the ruling class has managed to keep parents from having access to school choice for as long as it has.

SAVING OUR REPUBLIC

If books could save the world, I would have saved it long ago—well, either me, Tom Clancy, or Sue Grafton. (My money is on Sue.) But books cannot save the world. Individuals and families can—people like you.

Even the Bible, the greatest, most influential book on the planet, is useless without people to preach and explain the gospel. As Paul wrote in the tenth chapter of Romans, “How, then, can they call on the one they have not believed in? And how can they believe in the one of whom they have not heard? And how can they hear without someone preaching to them? And how can anyone preach unless they are sent? As it is written: ‘How beautiful are the feet of those who bring good news!’” (vv. 14-15 NIV)—or in the case of the Great Reset, the bad news.

The forces behind the Great Reset are powerful. Some of the richest, most well-connected men and women on the planet are lining up to take away your freedom and to alter the American way of life forever. If we do not push back against them, they will succeed. No one can win this battle on their own. Not me, not you—no one. But if those of us who are committed to preserving the freedoms that Americans have long enjoyed devote themselves to the cause of liberty, we will not fail.

You might be thinking, “I have nothing to offer. These problems are so much bigger than I am. How can I make a difference?” If we’re going to survive the Great Reset and rebuild our country, we must change our way of thinking and our attitudes about the challenges ahead. We must find the strength to become happy warriors, and we can no longer allow ourselves to believe the big lie that there’s nothing we can do in our own personal lives to move the needle. You are not too small to help change the world.

The history of America has been shaped by ordinary men and women refusing to back down when forced to confront seemingly overwhelming odds. From sit-ins at segregated lunch counters to the beaches of Normandy, when Americans stand for the truth and against authoritarianism, they win.

I’ve seen this firsthand more times than I can count, but one of the most powerful experiences in my life occurred in the summer of 2021. When President Biden’s disastrous handling of the withdrawal of U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan led to a collapse of the Afghan government and a nationwide takeover by the Taliban, my audience raised more than \$30 million for the Nazarene Fund to rescue thousands of vulnerable Afghans, including numerous people marked for death. The Biden administration’s State Department not only left Americans and Afghans to die but inexplicably resisted our rescue efforts at every turn.

Government officials and massive corporations did not save those thousands of men, women, and children in Afghanistan; military veterans, devoted nonprofit workers, and everyday Americans watching and listening to my television and radio shows did. I can’t think of better proof for the claim that you don’t need to be a politician or the head of a multi billion-dollar corporation to make a real impact in the world.

As I noted at the start of this chapter, perhaps the most important thing anyone can do is to sound the alarm about the dangers of the Great Reset by talking to others about

these problems in relatable terms. In so many ways, you are better equipped to do that than people with gigantic microphones and large social media followings.

I know it is hard to believe, because I am such a likable guy, but there are a lot- and I mean, a lot-of people out there who don't exactly think highly of me, to say the least. (And since this is my book, I'm sticking with "the least.") But I am willing to bet there are many people who might not listen to me but know and respect you, people who will take seriously your opinions and warnings because they trust you.

This book offers a wealth of information that you can use to help show others how to recognize the Great Reset for what it really is-a globalist, authoritarian scheme to manipulate virtually every industrialized society on earth-but please do not stop learning about the twenty-first century brand of fascism promoted by supporters of the Great Reset when you close this book.

Take the time needed to do your own homework and conduct your own research into each of the ideas I have discussed here, and then make and share your discoveries with others. Find neighbors concerned that America is sliding toward authoritarianism and organize yourselves for the fight ahead. Stay informed by supporting pro-liberty voices, researchers, and investigative reporters like those who work with me daily at Blaze Media. Teach your children the values that built America into the remarkable place it is today: respect for others, honor, humility, compassion, a commitment to freedom for all people, and faith. Hold your elected representatives accountable when they fail to pursue those ideals.

After the U.S. Constitution was signed by members of Congress in 1787, Elizabeth Powel, a prominent society figure in Philadelphia and the wife of the city's mayor, asked Benjamin Franklin, "Well, Doctor, what have we got: a republic or a monarchy?" to which Franklin replied, "A republic-if you can keep it."

Let's keep our republic, by fighting back against the Great Reset and every other attempt by elites in America and abroad to seize our liberties in favor of their promises of benevolent rule and smiley-face fascism. We owe it to ourselves, to those who came before us, and to the generations of Americans not yet born, who will someday remember and thank us for not throwing away our freedoms-and their future.