

off-guardian.org

Steps to World Rule: First, Destroy Humanity

Editor

7-9 minutes

Todd Hayen

It has *always* been astounding to me that people think for even a second that their government makes decisions to help the people—that has never been the case.

If a government's decision helps anyone it is always an after effect...or an afterthought or a collateral unintended benefit. The primary intent is for power, control, and money...to satisfy individual pursuits and goals of the global narcissistic/god-complex elite.

Anyone (which turns out to be most everyone) who

supports this and thinks their government, or their nation, is operating in the people's interest is signing their own death warrant.

“Don't be so negative, Dr. Todd, there are good things in life too!”

Oh my yes, there are: newborn babies, sunsets, oceans, art, music, forests, waterfalls, sex with your lover, dogs...millions of things. But that is not what I am writing about right now. I am writing about the thing, and group of things, that will wipe all of that good stuff off the face of the earth. Sure, sure, sure, it won't be forever. Good will prevail, but it could be a million years before it all comes back if we let it go now. And I think it is worth the fight to preserve what we've got.

Needless to say, people have always followed leaders. I am not an anthropologist, but I would take a guess that even in primitive times there were leaders of tribes, chiefs, kings, queens, or whatever. I would also guess that this arrangement probably worked well more often than not. Societies were close knit; if a leader went bonkers it was probably easier to just push him or her off a cliff somewhere.

And considering how different things were back then, there probably was not as much incentive to be selfish, power hungry, wampum hungry, or weird in other ways. I also would guess this complacent sort of culture, if there ever was such a thing, did not last very long.

I'm sure adjacent tribes had some things the neighbors wanted, and sure the all too human trait of wanting power over others did not take too long to appear. Being the Grand Poobah of many people had to have the same allure it has today. Wars broke out, discrimination certainly reared its ugly head ("that tribe over there has longer necks than we do, let's kill them!"), and of course truly important issues caused conflicts, like need for food, water, etc.

Things were a lot worse back in history than today in a lot of ways. But things along these lines did actually get better, in my humble opinion, during a brief period in the West. The establishment of a new country with fresh ideals was a sight for sore eyes back in the late 1700's. I don't think anything like it, on that particular scale, had been attempted in the human experience post antiquity (which we,

regardless of what we have been told, know very little about). It indeed was a grand experiment—the new colonies in North America shedding the shackles of the tyranny of King George III of England.

The new fledgling country created a Constitution that was truly inspiring at the time. The checks and balances incorporated in that government was also inspiring, and did hold itself together fairly well for quite some time. Of course there are always problems, as there would be with anything brave and novel. But it all hung together fairly well for a bit of time.

I'll stop there with the history lesson, which may not be all that accurate anyway, but I think you get the picture. Even if you disagree that the new United States of America was an exciting bit of work, you probably can agree that putting one man, or woman, in charge of a lot of people, has never gone all that well. Before the presidency of the United States, there were of course Kings and Queens. Even the US was concerned about having a single person at the head of the executive branch of government, lest

it be too much like a monarchy. Some continue (many actually) to believe that the US form of government is still the best, and if certain things are readjusted, the US will continue to be the greatest country in the world.

I digress.

Wherever you are on that fence, you must agree that things are rather different now than what the founding fathers envisioned. Why? That would take a book, or several, to address. Point here is that we can no longer trust this system to be objective, compassionate, fair, benevolent, and not self-serving and destructive. In fact, it seems that the system itself is selling out to foreign interests, and the actual sovereignty of the nation is threatened, and this threat is largely coming from within.

We see this with other nations as well, basically handing over their sovereign rights as a nation to the likes of the WHO, or the UN, or even the WEF. What we see is much like watching a Sci-Fi motion picture where the bad guys are stripping a nation of everything that makes it the “representation of the people” into a personal self-serving slave to

unelected powers.

What does this mean? Well, when you really think about it, there is no way this sort of global take over could ever be in the best interests of other human beings living on the planet. Even if you could have a benevolent world power (which is an oxymoron, in my opinion) you would, just by its nature, have to rule in very broad strokes, i.e., everything you implemented would have to be implemented for the good of the majority. That leaves quite a few people out. The hundreds of diverse cultures and the billions of humans that make them up would have to be reduced down to manageable attributes —becoming more and more like each other.

What does this sound like? If you thought “prison” you win the prize. Look at cultures like North Korea, and you will get some idea of what would be happening. And it is worse than that, because North Korea did not start out as a diverse culture—unlike the diversity of the entire globe.

And all that assuming this world system is benevolent, which it most certainly is not. Of course they present themselves as benevolent, and much

like all fictional evil leaders (as well as the real ones throughout history), they may even believe they are benevolent. But any world leader(s) will have to focus on the destruction of humanity before they can accomplish any sort of world control over its inhabitants. That is simply the nature of the beast. I'll say it again: any world leader(s) will have to focus on the destruction of humanity before they can accomplish any sort of world control over its inhabitants. No two ways about it.

And of course, in our modern age, this destruction of humanity is quite a bit more complex than literally whipping people into compliance like they did in the old days. Right now (and this will probably change) most of the psyop is accomplished either through the carrot enticement and then ruling with the stick, or through fear (stick first, carrot as a reward for compliance.)

It is the same game.

Todd Hayen is a registered psychotherapist practicing in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. He holds a PhD in depth psychotherapy and an MA in Consciousness Studies. He specializes in Jungian, archetypal,

psychology. Todd also writes for his own substack, which you can read

[here](#)

SUPPORT OFFGUARDIAN



For direct-transfer bank details click [here](#).