

Climate Change

In the media I hear different reasons for the climate in the weather reports. They have climatologist and meteorologist telling us about climate change and how it is affecting our daily lives. They warn of rain, tornados, and heat waves destroying the land. Rising oceans and the earth heating up, San Francisco even spent millions painting a blue line in the city where the ocean will raise to. In the 70s they told us the earth was cooling and we could be in an ice age by the 80s, when it didn't happen it became the earth heating up and we would not survive the 90s. when that didn't happen it became climate change. Recently they reported on a weather station we will have a higher-than-normal hurricane season and hurricanes hitting our coastline. We are told that the earth is affected by all the pollutants we are putting into the atmosphere. Every night on the news the weather person says the temperature and relates it to the recorded highs and lows, usually saying we are 10 degrees higher than where we should be, or lower than we should be, indicating we are in trouble. I noticed many record lows were in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Record heats and dry of the dust bowl era. I can't help to think those are just averages they give us and over history we have had years of drought and of floods.

The United States is really about the lowest pollutant of all the countries, Russia, China, India being the highest in levels of pollution. If the United States goes completely green, then our economy will fail while theirs grow. Carbon neutral energy is not consistent. Solar and wind are intermittent and are the lowest producers of energy, not to mention that most of the solar panels and wind turbines are made in China, or the parts that make them up. I recently read a book titled, Unsettled, what climate science tells us, what it doesn't, and why it matters, by Steven E. Koonin former Undersecretary for Science, U.S. Department of Energy. In this book he shows and explains the data collected by different agencies on climate. The oceans aren't raising, and the earth is not hotter.

The Bible tells us all we need to know, and climate change is in the Bible and what the causes are.

Leviticus 26:3 states, "If ye walk in My statutes, and keep My commandments, and do them; Then I will give you rain in due season, and the land shall yield her increase and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit."

The United States used to be the "breadbasket" of the world. It was the highest producer of goods and services. Today we have outsourced ourselves into being dependent on other countries, as China, India, Russia, to name a few. The United States has stopped serving God. They have taken the commandments out of public view, stopped prayer in schools, allow abortions of the living child, locked us from gathering during COVID, and even the congress took "one nation under God" out of the pledge during their convention. We have been warned.

Leviticus 26:14, "But if ye will not hearken unto Me, and will not do all these commandments; And ye shall despise My statutes, or if your soul abhor My judgements, so that ye will not do all My commandments, but that ye break My covenant: I also will do

this unto you; I will even appoint over you terror, consumption, and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart: and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it.”

Most of the climate change is about government control leading to a “New World Order”.

From The Hill on economics,

Introducing the 'Great Reset,' world leaders' radical plan to transform the economy

BY JUSTIN HASKINS, OPINION CONTRIBUTOR — 06/25/20 11:00 AM EDT

For decades, progressives have attempted to use climate change to justify liberal policy changes. But their latest attempt – a new proposal called the “Great Reset” – is the most ambitious and radical plan the world has seen in more than a generation.

At a virtual meeting earlier in June hosted by the World Economic Forum, some of the planet’s most powerful business leaders, government officials and activists announced a proposal to “reset” the global economy. Instead of traditional capitalism, the high-profile group said the world should adopt more socialistic policies, such as wealth taxes, additional regulations and massive Green New Deal-like government programs.

“Every country, from the United States to China, must participate, and every industry, from oil and gas to tech, must be transformed,” wrote Klaus Schwab, the founder and executive chairman of the World Economic Forum, in an article published on WEF’s website. “In short, we need a ‘Great Reset’ of capitalism.”

Schwab also said that “all aspects of our societies and economies” must be “revamped,” “from education to social contracts and working conditions.”

It goes on to say,

You might be wondering how these leaders plan to convince the world to completely alter its economy over the long run, since the COVID-19 pandemic most assuredly won’t remain a crisis forever. The answer is that they’ve already identified another “crisis” that will require expansive government intervention: Climate change.

The great reset, from World Economic Forum

The Covid-19 crisis, and the political, economic and social disruptions it has caused, is fundamentally changing the traditional context for decision-making. The inconsistencies, inadequacies and contradictions of multiple systems –from

health and financial to energy and education – are more exposed than ever amidst a global context of concern for lives, livelihoods and the planet. Leaders find themselves at a historic crossroads, managing short-term pressures against medium- and long-term uncertainties.

As we enter a unique window of opportunity to shape the recovery, this initiative will offer insights to help inform all those determining the future state of global relations, the direction of national economies, the priorities of societies, the nature of business models and the management of a global commons. Drawing from the vision and vast expertise of the leaders engaged across the Forum’s communities, the Great Reset initiative has a set of dimensions to build a new social contract that honours the dignity of every human being.

Limited family size for Green New Deal and save the planet,

From Faithwire

By [Tré Goins-Phillips](#)
Editor

October 5, 2021

A Democratic member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives has introduced legislation to mandate vasectomies for men after they father three children or reach age 40, “whichever comes first.”

From Israel 365 News Nov 3, 2021 on gender and religion,

PROFESSOR SUGGESTS TRANSGENDER PRONOUNS FOR GOD
BY ADAM ELIYAHU BERKOWITZ | OCT 5, 2021 | BIBLICAL NEWS

Silk began by citing a *New York Times* article written by linguistics professor John McWhorter who advocated using the plural pronoun as an “all-purpose third-person-singular pronoun.” McWhorter’s suggestion was intended for use as a solution in settings in which neutering pronouns was required by politically correct social pressure. Silk suggested that applying this rule to references to God was preferable for the same social reason.

“In contrast to human beings, it has long been accepted that God is not gendered, at least within the main Abrahamic theological tradition,” Silk wrote. “A phrase such as “God the Father” should be treated as a metaphor — and for those concerned about the embedded misogyny of the tradition, to say nothing of post-binary folks — a deeply problematic one.”

“As a result, we have been faced liturgically as well as theologically with the imperative of gender-neutral language, which means being obliged to repeat the word “God” where a gendered pronoun would normally be used and to have recourse to the unattractive neologism “Godself” lest, God forbid, we find ourselves saying Himself.”

Education From Study.com

Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT): Theory, Research & Strategies

Culturally responsive teaching, or CRT, involves focusing on students' cultural backgrounds to help them learn. Discover the theory, characteristics, research, and strategies of CRT, then explore its use in the classroom. *Updated: 10/08/2021*

Culture, or the ethnic or social group one is from, can have an impact on learning. For example, some studies have shown that African American students and European American students approach questions from the teacher differently. Because their respective cultures view questioning slightly differently, the students respond differently in the classroom.

Let's look closer at one way to approach the intersection of culture and learning: culturally responsive teaching, or CRT.

Culturally responsive teaching, or CRT, is a way of teaching that focuses on student's cultural experiences. For example, remember how we said that studies have shown that black and white students have cultural differences in the way that they respond to questions from the teacher? If the teacher is white, she might not understand that her black students have a different cultural understanding than she does.

But culturally responsive teaching focuses on making sure that all teachers understand the cultural background that their students come from. That way, when some students respond to questions one way and other students respond in another way, the teacher can support all of them and understand that they aren't wrong, just different.

So, back to Jeanie's question: should she try to make Jonathan think more like she does? For example, when she's teaching math, she teaches students how to solve problems one way. But Jonathan does math a different way, one that his parents taught him because that's how they learned in the old country. He gets the same answer, but just a different way.

CRT would encourage Jeanie to understand Jonathan and his viewpoint and not to try to make him more like her. Instead, she can appreciate that he approaches things differently because of his culture and encourage him to continue to be true to who he is.

Characteristics

One of the benefits of CRT is that it can be used across all disciplines. Whether Jeanie is teaching elementary school math or graduate school poetry, she can use CRT to help her reach her students and encourage them to learn.

From Education Week.

Janel George is an adjunct professor at Georgetown University's McCourt School of Public Policy, where she teaches a course on racial inequality in K-12 public education. She has worked in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives as legislative counsel and for several nonprofits.

The concept of critical race theory, or CRT, has recently been vilified by politicians as a “radical,” “un-American,” and “racially divisive” concept. Several states have even banned schools from teaching critical race theory, with more states debating doing the same. For example, if I taught at a public university in Idaho rather than in Washington, recent legislation would prohibit me from applying a CRT lens in my classroom.

To be clear, [CRT is not itself a substantive course or workshop](#); it is a practice. It is an approach or lens through which an educator can help students examine the role of race and racism in American society. It originated in the legal academy—I first learned about it as a law student—and has since been adopted in other fields in higher education.

In the K-12 classroom, CRT can be an approach to help students understand how racism has endured past the civil rights era through systems, laws, and policies—and how those same systems, laws, and policies can be transformed. But the vocal opposition to critical race theory—coming from predominantly white states and school districts—will undoubtedly have a chilling effect on its use in the K-12 classroom.

In the course about racial inequality in K-12 public education that I designed and teach for graduate public-policy students, CRT is a valuable framework for helping students identify how law and policy can either entrench or eradicate historic racial inequities in education.

Like many academic theories, CRT is complex and constantly evolving. However, it can be characterized by a few tenets, which challenge many traditional understandings of race and racial inequality. The Human Genome Project found that humans [share 99.9 percent of the same genetic makeup](#), despite our different appearances. Critical race theory recognizes that our ideas of racial difference—which run counter to this scientific evidence—have been socially constructed. It acknowledges how that social construction of race has shaped America and how systems and institutions can do the bulk of replicating racial inequality.

These tenets require a departure from the popular idea that racism is perpetrated solely by individual “bad actors.” If we confine racism to individual bad actors, we ignore the ways that systems and institutions can replicate racial inequality.

This framework is particularly relevant to education. Gloria Ladson-Billings, a leading scholar in applying critical race theory to education, explains how racial inequality can be replicated in education: Curricula that largely exclude the history and lived experiences of Americans of color are the norm. Deficit-oriented instruction often characterizes students of color as failures if a one-size-fits-all approach doesn't work for them. Standardized-test scores from assessments detached from what students learn in the classroom are widely used to confirm narratives about the ineducability of children of color.

Critical race theory helps us recognize how many contemporary policies that perpetuate racial inequality can seem innocuous or even logical. School discipline policies that prohibit the wearing of hair in locs might seem neutral, but they disproportionately impact Black students who are most likely to wear locs. Critical race theory helps us recognize that even policies not explicitly predicated on race are not objective—they can actively function to reproduce racial inequality.

As with the World Health Organizations;

The Thirteenth General Programme of Work (GPW 13) defines WHO's strategy for the five-year period, 2019-2023. It focuses on triple billion targets to achieve measurable impacts on people's health at the country level.

The triple billion targets are to ensure by 2023:

- **One billion more people are benefiting from universal health coverage**
- **One billion more people are better protected from health emergencies**
- **One billion more people are enjoying better health and well-being**
- **The Great Reset**
- Remarks to World Economic Forum
Kristalina Georgieva, Managing Director, IMF
- June 3, 2020
- My thanks to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and to Professor Schwab for bringing us together.
- Now is the time to think of what history would say about this crisis. And now is the time for all of us to define our own role.
- Will historians look back and say this was the moment of a Great Reversal? Today, we see very worrying signs.
- One hundred and seventy countries are going to finish this year with a smaller economy than at the start of the year, and we already project that there will be more debt, bigger deficits, and more unemployment. And there is a very high risk of more inequality and more poverty.
- Unless we act.

- So, what would it take for historians to look back at this crisis as the moment of a Great Reset?
- From the perspective of the IMF, we have seen a massive injection of fiscal stimulus to help countries deal with this crisis, and to shift gears for growth to return. It is of paramount importance that this growth should lead to a **greener, smarter, fairer** world in the future.
- It is possible to do this. Provided that we concentrate on the key elements of a recovery—and act now. We don't need to wait.
- At the IMF, we see some tremendous opportunities.
- **First**, let me first talk about green growth.
- Governments can put in place public investments—and incentives for private investments—that support low-carbon and climate-resilient growth.
- Many of these investments can lead to job-rich recovery—think of planting mangroves, land restoration, reforestation or insulating buildings. Think of the key sectors for reducing carbon intensity where both the public and private sector can invest.
- I am particularly keen to take advantage of the low oil prices we see today, to eliminate harmful subsidies and introduce a carbon price that would work as an incentive for future investments.
- **Second**, let me talk about **smarter growth**. We know the digital economy is the big winner of this crisis. But we must not allow the digital divide to widen so that some countries and communities fall further behind. This would bring more pain than gain in the future.
- So, it is critical that institutions like the IMF support investments that will shrink the digital divide—working in partnership with the World Bank and others.
- We also need to think carefully about how to make sure the jump in growth and profitability in the digital sector leads to benefits that are shared across our societies.
- And that takes me to my **third** point—**fairer growth**.
- We know that—if left to its own devices—this pandemic is going to deepen inequality. That has happened in prior pandemics.
- We can avoid this if we concentrate on investing in people—in the social fabric of our societies, in access to opportunities, in education for all, and in the expansion of social programs so we take care of the most vulnerable people. Then we can have a world that is better for everyone.
- I want to conclude with an example from the past. William Beveridge, in the midst of the Second World War, put forward his famous report in 1942 in which he projected how UK should address what he called the 'five giant evils.' That famous 'Beveridge Report' report led to a better country after the war—including the creation of the National Health Service that is saving so many lives today in the UK.
- And my institution, the IMF, was created at this time as well—at the Bretton Woods Conference.

- So, now is the moment to step up—and use all the strength we have—to turn the page. In the case of the IMF we have a one trillion-dollar financial capacity and tremendous engagement on the policy side.
- This is the moment to decide that history will look back on this as the Great Reset, not the Great Reversal.
- And I want to say—loud and clear—the best memorial we can build to those who have lost their lives in the pandemic is to build a world that is greener, smarter and fairer.
- Thank you.
- **IMF Communications Department**

• MEDIA RELATIONS

• **PRESS OFFICER:**

• **PHONE:** +1 202 623-7100**EMAIL:** MEDIA@IMF.ORG

• [@IMFSpokesperson](#)

•

•

•

•

•

From Open Democracy 20

- The set of conspiracy theories around the Great Reset are nebulous and hard to pin down, but piecing them together gives us something like this: the Great Reset is the global elite's plan to instate a communist world order by abolishing private property while using COVID-19 to solve overpopulation and enslaving what remains of humanity with vaccines.

•

• Conspiracy theories aside, there is something fishy about the Great Reset

- It's a corporate takeover of global governance that affects our food, our data and our vaccines

• [Ivan Wecke](#)

• 16 August 2021, 11.12am

•

- The Great Reset' conspiracy theories don't seem to want to die. The theories were triggered by the [World Economic Forum's](#) (WEF) summit last year, which had the theme 'The Great Reset' and argued that the COVID crisis was an opportunity to address the burning issues facing the world. [According to the BBC](#), the term 'Great Reset' has received more than eight million interactions on Facebook and has been shared almost two million times on Twitter since the WEF initiative was launched.

- The set of conspiracy theories around the Great Reset are nebulous and hard to pin down, but piecing them together gives us something like this: the Great Reset is the global elite's plan to instate a communist world order by abolishing private property while using COVID-19 to solve overpopulation and enslaving what remains of humanity with vaccines.
- Intrigued by the palaver around last year's summit, I decided to find out what the WEF's Great Reset plan was really about. At the heart of conspiracy theories are supposed secret agendas and malicious intent. While these may be absent from the WEF's Great Reset initiative, what I found was something almost as sinister hiding in plain sight. In fact, more sinister because it's real and it's happening now. And it involves things as fundamental as our food, our data and our vaccines.

• **The real Great Reset**

- The magic words are 'stakeholder capitalism', a concept that WEF chairman Klaus Schwab has been hammering for decades and which occupies pride of place in the WEF's Great Reset plan from June 2020. The idea is that global capitalism should be transformed so that corporations no longer focus solely on serving shareholders but become custodians of society by creating value for customers, suppliers, employees, communities and other 'stakeholders'. The way the WEF sees stakeholder capitalism being carried out is through a range of 'multi-stakeholder partnerships' bringing together the private sector, governments and civil society across all areas of global governance.
- The idea of stakeholder capitalism and multi-stakeholder partnerships might sound warm and fuzzy, until we dig deeper and realise that this actually means giving corporations *more* power over society, and democratic institutions less.
- The plan from which the Great Reset originated was called the Global Redesign Initiative. Drafted by the WEF after the 2008 economic crisis, the initiative contains a 600-page report on transforming global governance. In the WEF's vision, "the government voice would be one among many, without always being the final arbiter." Governments would be just one stakeholder in a multi-stakeholder model of global governance. Harris Gleckman, senior fellow at the University of Massachusetts, describes the report as "the most comprehensive proposal for re-designing global governance since the formulation of the United Nations during World War II."
- **Multi-stakeholder partnerships are public-private partnerships on the global stage**
- Who are these other, non-governmental stakeholders? The WEF, best known for its annual meeting of high-net-worth individuals in Davos, Switzerland, describes itself as an international organization for public-private cooperation. WEF partners include some of the biggest companies in oil

- (Saudi Aramco, Shell, Chevron, BP), food (Unilever, The Coca-Cola Company, Nestlé), technology (Facebook, Google, Amazon, Microsoft, Apple) and pharmaceuticals (AstraZeneca, Pfizer, Moderna).
- Instead of corporations serving many stakeholders, in the multi-stakeholder model of global governance, corporations are promoted to *being* official stakeholders in global decision-making, while governments are relegated to being one of many stakeholders. In practice, corporations become the main stakeholders, while governments take a backseat role, and civil society is mainly window dressing.

• **The multi-stakeholder ecosystem**

- Perhaps the most symbolic example of this shift is the controversial strategic partnership agreement the United Nations (UN) signed with the WEF in 2019. Harris Gleckman describes this as a move to turn the UN into a public-private partnership, creating a special place for corporations inside the UN.
- The multi-stakeholder model is already being built. In recent years, an ever-expanding ecosystem of multi-stakeholder groups has spread across all sectors of the global governance system. There are now more than 45 global multi-stakeholder groups that set standards and establish guidelines and rules in a range of areas. According to Gleckman, these groups, which lack any democratic accountability, consist of private stakeholders (big corporations) who “recruit their friends in government, civil society and universities to join them in solving public problems”.
- Multi-stakeholderism is the WEF’s update of multilateralism, which is the current system through which countries work together to achieve common goals. The multilateral system’s core institution is the UN. The multilateral system is often rightly accused of being ineffective, too bureaucratic and skewed towards the most powerful nations. But it is at least theoretically democratic because it brings together democratically elected leaders of countries to make decisions in the global arena. Instead of reforming the multilateral system to deepen democracy, the WEF’s vision of multi-stakeholder governance entails further removing democracy by sidelining governments and putting unelected ‘stakeholders’ – mainly corporations – in their place when it comes to global decision-making.
- Put bluntly, multi-stakeholder partnerships are public-private partnerships on the global stage. And they have real-world implications for the way our food systems are organized, how big tech is governed and how our vaccines and medicines are distributed.

• **The future of food**

- In autumn 2021, the UN is set to host the World Summit on Food Systems (FSS) in Rome. This is necessary, given that 3.9 billion people – more than half of the

- world's population – are currently battling hunger and malnutrition, even though there is enough food to feed the world. But this year's summit differs significantly from past UN food summits, embracing 'multi-stakeholder inclusivity', in which the private sector has 'an important role'. A concept note from 2019 showed that the WEF was set to be involved in organising the summit, though it is not now clear what the role of the WEF will be.
- "Abandoning pesticides is not on the table. How come?" asks Sofia Monsalve of FIAN International, a human rights organisation focused on food and nutrition. "There is no discussion on land concentration or holding companies accountable for their environmental and labour abuses." This fits into a bigger picture Monsalve sees of large corporations, which dominate the food sector, being reluctant to fix the production system. "They just want to come up with new investment opportunities."
 - FIAN International together with 300 other organizations have expressed their concerns about the multi-stakeholder setup in an open letter to the secretary general of the UN, António Guterres. In a meeting with civil society groups who signed the letter, Amina Mohammed, the UN deputy secretary general, assured them that strong safeguards would prevent a corporate capture of the event, "by allowing only platforms or **How the United Nations is quietly being turned into a public-private partnership**
 - 2 July 2019 | Harris Gleckman
 - A new agreement with the World Economic Forum gives multinational corporations influence over matters of global governance.
 - But for Monsalve, "this only makes it worse. Now corporations can protect their interests and hide behind these platforms because it's unclear who is in there." Indeed, a corporate partner list is nowhere to be found on the official website. The FSS organisers were contacted for comment but had not responded by the time of publication.
 - The signatories to the letter fear that, with corporate involvement in the summit, food will continue to be treated "as a commodity and not as a human right". If unchanged, industrial food systems will continue to have irreversible impacts on our health and the health of our planet.
 - **Big tech governing big tech**
 - Another landmark in the development of stakeholder capitalism can be found in the Big Tech sector. As a part of his 2020 Roadmap for Digital Cooperation the UN Secretary-General called for the formation of a new 'strategic and empowered multi-stakeholder high-level body'. Again it's not easy to find a list of stakeholders but after some digging a long list of 'roundtable participants' for the roadmap includes Facebook, Google, Microsoft and the WEF.

- Although the functions laid out for this new body are quite vague, civil society organizations fear it will come down to Big Tech creating a global body to govern itself. This risks institutionalising these companies' resistance against effective regulation both globally and nationally and increasing their power over governments and multilateral organizations. If the body comes to fruition, it could be a decisive victory in the ongoing war GAFAM (Google, Apple, Facebook, Amazon and Microsoft) is waging with governments over tax evasion, antitrust rules, and their ever-expanding power over society.
- More than 170 civil society groups worldwide have signed another open letter to the secretary general of the UN – this time to prevent the digital governance body from forming. The secretary general was approached for comment but had not replied at the time of publication.

- **COVAX**

- Then there's COVAX. The COVAX initiative aims to “accelerate the development and manufacture of COVID-19 vaccines, and to guarantee fair and equitable access for every country in the world”. That, again, sounds wonderful, especially given the staggering inequalities in vaccination levels between rich and developing countries.
- But why is the World Health Organization (WHO), which is part of the UN, not calling the shots? “Countries together, through multilateral agencies like the WHO, were supposed to take decisions about global health issues, with maybe some technical support by others,” says Sulakshana Nandi from NGO People's Health Movement, which has recently brought out a Policy Brief on COVAX.
 - **They just want to come up with new investment opportunities**
- COVAX was set up as a multi-stakeholder group by two other multi-stakeholder groups, GAVI (the Vaccine Alliance) and CEPI (the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations), in partnership with the WHO. Both GAVI and CEPI have strong ties with the World Economic Forum (which was one of the founders of CEPI) as well as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and both are also connected to companies like Pfizer, GlaxoSmithKline, AstraZeneca and Johnson & Johnson through manufacturer partnerships (GAVI) or as 'supporters' (CEPI). Even though COVAX is funded predominantly by governments, it is these corporate-centred coalitions that are overseeing its roll-out.
- The contrast between the multi-stakeholder approach and a 'classic' multilateral one came to the surface when South Africa and India proposed the so-called TRIPS waiver at the end of last year. They requested a temporary lifting of intellectual property rules on all COVID-19 technologies in order to boost the manufacturing and distribution of vaccines and other essential medical products in mainly developing countries. WHO director

- general Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus said in a speech that he backed the proposal. “But GAVI, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation – even Bill Gates himself – and Big Pharma opposed this proposal very strongly,” said Nandi. “It’s more important for them to protect their interests and market mechanisms than to protect universal health or protect people from COVID.” The WHO was approached for comment but has not replied.
- Again, there is a stark choice between a human rights-led approach carried out by the UN and a profit-led approach carried out by multistakeholder bodies representing the interests of corporations. In the case of COVAX – which is failing to meet its modest aim of vaccinating 20% of the populations of low- and middle-income countries – the former has won out.
 - **Stake out stakeholder capitalism**
 - So even if the WEF (or Bill Gates) is not responsible for the COVID pandemic, even if the vaccines are not laced with microchips to control our thoughts, something fishy really is going on in the realm of global governance. If you value your right to public health, to privacy, to access healthy food or to democratic representation, be wary of the words ‘stakeholder capitalism’ when they pop up at the next Davos summit.
 - The WEF was approached for comment on the issues raised in this article, but had not replied at the time of publication.
 - networks and no single corporation to the summit.”

References

Koonin, Steven, (2021), Unsettled what science tells us, what it doesn’t, and why it matters. Ben Bella Books, Inc. ISBN 9781950665792

Retrieved October 28, 2021 from [Conspiracy theories aside, there is something fishy about the Great Reset | openDemocracy](#)

Retrieved October 28, 2021 from [The Great Reset \(imf.org\)](#)

Retrieved on October 28, 2021 from [Layout \(weforum.org\)](#)

Retrieved on November 17, 2021 from [Conspiracy theories aside, there is something fishy about the Great Reset | openDemocracy](#)

Retrieved on November 3, 2021 from [Agenda21.doc \(un.org\)](#)

Retrieved Nov 3, 2021 from [Professor suggests transgender pronouns for God \(israel365news.com\)](https://israel365news.com)

[Retrieved November 3, 2021 from The Great Reset | World Economic Forum \(weforum.org\)](https://www.weforum.org)

Retrieved November 3, 2021 from [Introducing the 'Great Reset,' world leaders' radical plan to transform the economy | TheHill](https://www.thehill.com)

Retrieved November 4, 2021 from [Introducing the 'Great Reset,' world leaders' radical plan to transform the economy | TheHill](https://www.thehill.com)

Retrieved November 10, 2021 from [Culturally Responsive Teaching \(CRT\): Theory, Research & Strategies - Video & Lesson Transcript | Study.com](https://www.study.com)

Retrieved November 10, 2021 from [Critical Race Theory Isn't a Curriculum. It's a Practice \(Opinion\) \(edweek.org\)](https://www.edweek.org)