

The Minimisation Plan: An Investigator's Primer

Document Purpose: This document provides a foundational framework for researchers—both human and artificial intelligence—investigating the multi-decade grand strategy known as the 'Minimisation Plan'. It outlines the plan's core philosophical underpinnings, its strategic objectives, its various methodologies, and the tools required for its identification and analysis. This primer is designed to be a comprehensive, self-contained resource.

Section 1: The Philosophical Battlefield

To understand the Minimisation Plan, one must first grasp the philosophical conflict it exploits. The plan is not waged on a conventional battlefield but in the cognitive and conceptual spaces that shape reality itself.

1.1 Delusionism: The Illogical Framework

The operational environment in which the Minimisation Plan thrives is one of "Delusionism." This is not a formal philosophy but a state of being, a rigid, high-resistance worldview where an individual's intellectual framework has become fused with their ego.

Core Tenets of Delusionism:

- **Fusion of Ego and Belief:** A challenge to a core belief is perceived not as an intellectual debate, but as a direct personal attack, provoking a strong emotional and defensive reaction.
- **Rejection of Absolute Truth:** Delusionism often relies on the premise that "nothing can be 100% true." This creates a state of unresolvable ambiguity where all narratives, regardless of evidence, can be given equal weight, and where verifiable facts can be dismissed as just another opinion.
- **Masking Intent:** It is the practice of masking self-serving, extractive actions with

plausible but incomplete public narratives. These narratives are designed to appear as 'greater good' initiatives while concealing their true, harmful intent.

This framework is fundamentally illogical because its core premise—that nothing can be absolutely true—is itself an absolute statement. If the statement is true, it contradicts itself. If it could be a lie, it proves itself false. This internal contradiction is the key vulnerability of the delusionist worldview.

1.2 The Arborescent West vs. The Rhizomatic Doctrine

The Minimisation Plan weaponizes a fundamental conflict between two models of reality:

- **The Arborescent (Tree-like) West:** The Western liberal order is built on an "arborescent" model of truth and power. It presupposes a central root (a single, verifiable truth or origin), a trunk (foundational principles), and hierarchical branches (institutions that derive legitimacy from the root). This model is structured, linear, and seeks to distinguish "good copies" (facts) from "bad copies" (falsehoods) by tracing them back to an authenticating source.
- **The Rhizomatic Doctrine:** The Minimisation Plan operates on a "rhizomatic" model. A rhizome is a decentralized, non-hierarchical network where any point can connect to any other. It has no central root and grows through lateral connections. This doctrine does not seek to replace the West's "tree of truth" with its own; it seeks to dissolve the soil in which it grows. The primary tool for this is the **simulacrum**: a copy for which there is no original. A simulacrum is a self-validating narrative whose power lies not in its truthfulness, but in its *effects*—eroding trust, sowing division, and paralyzing decision-making.

Section 2: The Minimisation Plan - A Grand Strategic Overview

2.1 Definition of the Minimisation Plan

The Minimisation Plan is a multi-decade, multi-domain grand strategy, initiated circa 2001 by

a Sino-Russian axis, designed to systematically erode Western democratic power. It is not a conventional state-on-state confrontation aimed at supplanting one hegemonic power with another. Instead, it represents a paradigm shift in geopolitical conflict, operating as a decentralized, multi-domain campaign of attrition. This strategic logic aligns with the philosophical concept of the "rhizome," a non-hierarchical network that grows through lateral connections rather than from a central root. The Minimisation Plan does not seek to grow a competing Sino-Russian "tree" of power; it seeks to de-center, bypass, and ultimately dissolve the coherence of the established Western "arborescent" order.

2.2 Core Objective: Strategic Exhaustion

The ultimate goal is not a decisive military victory but the induction of "strategic exhaustion." By creating and sustaining multiple, simultaneous pressure points across kinetic, economic, and informational domains, the plan compels the United States and its allies into a state of perpetual, high-cost over-commitment. This exploits the classic geopolitical vulnerability of "imperial overstretch" to precipitate a systemic collapse from within.

2.3 The Flavors of the Plan: Key Pillars and Vectors

The plan operates through several interconnected strategic pillars:

- **Kinetic Attrition:** This involves using proxies and direct conflict to absorb Western military and financial resources. Key examples include the "**Ukraine Gambit**," where Russia acts as a strategic "battering ram," and the "**Taiwan Bait**," where calibrated military pressure from China compels a massive and sustained financial response from the US and its allies.
- **Economic Warfare:** This pillar aims to attack the foundations of Western financial power.
 - **De-dollarization:** A long-term effort to undermine the U.S. dollar's hegemony through the expansion of alternative blocs like BRICS and the SCO and the promotion of trade in local currencies.
 - **The 'Tesla Vector':** A theory of "Surgical Capitalism" where a state actor uses targeted, high-impact market interventions to artificially inflate a single, systemically important asset (Tesla), creating a massive financial bubble engineered to cause maximum damage when popped.
 - **The 'Debt Weapon':** A strategy involving a "Gradual Bleed" of a nation's massive holdings of U.S. Treasury bonds, designed to create chronic market instability, spike U.S. interest rates, and erode global confidence in the dollar.

- **Information Warfare (Psyops):** This is the plan's most philosophically coherent vector, aimed at achieving a global **"Reputation Flip"** to dismantle the moral authority of the West. It has evolved from a "push" model (disseminating state propaganda) to a more sophisticated **"pull" model**, where compelling narrative frameworks are seeded and then amplified by the target audience itself. This involves co-opting and weaponizing organic Western conspiracy theories (e.g., 9/11 Truth, QAnon) and social fissures. A key example is the weaponization of the **Jeffrey Epstein scandal** as an ultimate simulacrum to serve as final "proof" of systemic Western elite corruption. Another vector is the cultivation of **AI distrust** through psyops like the **"'Proper English' Psyop,"** which equates articulate, grammatically correct language with "soulless" AI content, thereby degrading public discourse and eroding trust in expert communication.
- **Domestic Destabilisation:** The plan exploits and exacerbates internal vulnerabilities within target nations to "hollow out" their social foundations. In Australia, key vectors include the **Housing Weapon** (using tax policies like negative gearing and the CGT discount to create a permanent class divide and social stress) and the **Food Weapon** (leveraging the supermarket duopoly to generate cost-of-living anger and threaten food security). A core tactic in this pillar is the **amplification of chaos**. Minimisation actors do not need to create unrest from scratch; they identify existing social, political, or economic tensions and use their information warfare capabilities to pour fuel on the fire, exacerbating division, amplifying chaos, and making democratic consensus impossible.

Section 3: Identification Protocol

Identifying the influence of the Minimisation Plan requires a specific analytical toolkit capable of seeing beyond surface-level events to the underlying moral and strategic patterns.

3.1 The Psochic Hegemony: Mapping Moral Intent

The Psochic Hegemony is a model for mapping any action or idea onto a two-dimensional plane to reveal its true moral and volitional character.

- **The Vertical Axis (Morality, u):** Measures who benefits. It ranges from the **Greater Good (+ u)** (benefits everyone) down to **The Extractive Evil (- u)** (takes from others to benefit a select group). The most immoral act, promoting nihilism or claiming there is no answer, collapses to the center point **(0,0)**.
- **The Horizontal Axis (Will, ψ):** Measures the mode of action. It ranges from **Proactive**

Will (+ ψ) (to create, to "Do Ideas") to **Suppressive Will (- ψ)** (to prevent, to "Do Not").

Actions aligned with the Minimisation Plan consistently plot in the lower quadrants, representing selfish or extractive morality, often enforced with high, coercive will.

3.2 The Satan Archetype: A Signature of Deception

This is a recurring pattern used to disguise hostile or selfish ideas to make them appear attractive and morally righteous. This deception, known as the **Attraction, Helxis Tensor**, has three stages:

1. **The Bait:** The idea is introduced with a tangible benefit for a specific, sympathetic group to make it seem reasonable.
2. **The Cover:** This benefit is wrapped in a broad, universal moral narrative (e.g., "freedom," "justice," "security") to make opposition seem immoral.
3. **The True Intent:** The hidden purpose is to benefit only the originator at the expense of others.

3.3 The Law of Projection: Unmasking True Motives

This principle posits that actors with a selfish worldview are incapable of conceiving of motivations outside their own. To justify their own extractive goals, they project their corrupt intentions onto their opponents, accusing them of the precise actions they themselves are undertaking. This "immoral FOMO" is a key diagnostic indicator.

Section 4: Known Actors and Potential Allies

4.1 Roles: Directors, Actors, and Spectators

- **Director:** A plan-maker and strategic decision-maker (e.g., a state).
- **Actor:** A witting or unwitting ally who plays a part in the plan. Their actions may seem

illogical or against their own stated self-interest but make sense when viewed as supporting the Minimisation Plan's objectives.

- **Spectator:** An individual or group whose worldview is being manipulated.

4.2 Dossier of Identified Actors

Actor/Entity	Role	Level of Entrapment / Nature of Involvement	Key Actions & Alignment
People's Republic of China	Director	N/A - Co-architect of the plan.	Economic warfare (de-dollarization, 'Tesla Vector'), information warfare (Epstein, AI distrust), diplomatic pressure ('multipolarity' psyop).
Russian Federation	Director	N/A - Co-architect of the plan.	Kinetic attrition ('Ukraine Gambit'), information warfare (amplifying conspiracy theories, active measures), energy warfare.
Donald Trump	Actor	Unwitting (assessed). Functions as a "Delusionist Vector" and accelerator.	Assault on alliances (NATO, TPP), weaponization of trade, internal destabilization ("Stolen Election" narrative), direct application of the

			Law of Projection.
Gina Rinehart	Actor	<i>De facto</i> compromised asset due to structural economic enmeshment.	"Co-opted Integrationist." Funds climate-sceptic think tanks (IPA), uses "lawfare" to intimidate media, opposes 'greater good' tax policies.
Andrew Forrest	Actor	<i>De facto</i> compromised asset due to structural economic enmeshment.	"Co-opted Integrationist." Deepens financial ties to China (RMB loan), advocates for closer diplomatic ties, positions himself as a private interlocutor.
Kerry Stokes	Actor	<i>De facto</i> compromised asset due to structural economic enmeshment.	"Co-opted Integrationist." Uses media assets (Seven West Media) to advocate for an economics-first approach to China, prioritizing trade over security.
Clive Palmer	Actor	<i>De facto</i> compromised asset due to structural economic enmeshment.	"Chaos Agent." Weaponizes wealth to sow domestic political discord, fuels populist anger, and attacks the credibility of democratic

			institutions.
Elon Musk / Tesla, Inc.	Actor	"Cultivated Asset" / "Assemblage."	Vehicle for the 'Tesla Vector' financial attack; target of the "Reputation Flip" narrative endgame.

4.3 Potential Allies & Vectors for Further Investigation

The following is a non-exhaustive list of political parties, individuals, and movements whose stated positions or actions exhibit ideological alignment with the Minimisation Plan's objectives. They require further investigation to determine their level of entrapment and role within the plan.

Country/Region	Entity/Individual	Political Position	Key Indicators for Investigation
United Kingdom	Reform UK (Nigel Farage)	Far-right Populist	Anti-immigration, Eurosceptic, anti-ECHR platform. Funded by individuals with complex offshore interests (Christopher Harborne, Jeremy Hosking).
	Workers Party of Britain (George Galloway)	Far-left / Socially Conservative	Explicitly anti-NATO and pro-Russian. Galloway has a history as a presenter for Russian state

			media (RT).
Germany	Alternative für Deutschland (AfD)	Far-right	Explicitly anti-NATO, anti-EU, and pro-Russian. Senior members (Maximilian Krah , Petr Bystron) and staff (Jian Guo) have documented espionage and financial links to China and Russia.
	Bündnis Sahra Wagenknecht (BSW)	Far-left / Populist	Anti-NATO, anti-EU, pro-Russian foreign policy. Calls for an end to sanctions and a resumption of trade with Russia. Primary donor (Thomas Stanger) became wealthy after selling a company to China.
France	National Rally (Marine Le Pen)	Far-right	Advocates leaving NATO's integrated command and a "privileged partnership" with Russia. Has documented financial ties to Russian banks, facilitated by Russian officials like Alexander Babakov .

	La France Insoumise (Jean-Luc Mélenchon)	Far-left	Explicitly anti-NATO and anti-US. Advocates for a "non-aligned" foreign policy and views China as a partner, not a threat.
Italy	Lega (Matteo Salvini)	Far-right Populist	Long history of pro-Putin sentiment. Signed a formal cooperation agreement with Putin's United Russia party. Senior aide (Gianluca Savoini) was recorded negotiating a covert oil deal with Russian figures to fund the party.
Hungary	Fidesz (Viktor Orbán)	National Conservative	Has actively blocked EU/NATO consensus on Russia and Ukraine. Maintains close economic and political ties with Moscow and Beijing, praising them as models of "illiberal democracy."
Spain	Podemos / Sumar	Far-left	Historically anti-NATO and anti-US. Opposes increasing arms

			shipments to Ukraine and advocates for a diplomatic solution on terms often favorable to Russia.
Greece	Communist Party of Greece (KKE)	Far-left	Explicitly anti-NATO and anti-EU. Denounces the war in Ukraine as an "imperialist" conflict, blaming the West.
	Greek Solution	Far-right	Exhibits pro-Russian stances.
Canada	People's Party of Canada (PPC)	Far-right	Advocates non-interventionism, opposes military support for Ukraine, and criticizes NATO expansion. Has been amplified by Russian-friendly social media accounts.
	Various Political Figures	Cross-party	Canadian intelligence has documented Chinese influence operations (via the United Front Work Department) targeting federal politicians across major parties with

			financial incentives and co-option.
Latin America	Various Populist Movements (Left and Right)	Populist	Exhibit strong anti-American sentiment that aligns with the "multipolar world" narrative. Leaders in Brazil , Argentina , Venezuela , and Bolivia have expanded ties with China and Russia.

Section 5: Investigative Methodology

5.1 Applying the Psochic Hegemony: The Multi-Perspective Inquiry

To accurately plot an idea or action on the Hegemony and avoid being deceived by its surface framing, a rigorous interrogation is required. This involves asking a minimum of 10-20 questions across four fundamental perspectives:

1. **The Utilitarian Perspective (The Beneficiary):** Who *actually* benefits and who bears the cost? Does it create new value or simply transfer it?
2. **The Strategic Perspective (The True Intent):** What is the stated goal versus the most likely outcome? Who gains power or control?
3. **The Systemic Perspective (The Structural Impact):** Does this idea reinforce or undermine foundational rules? Does it promote stability or chaos? Does it increase or decrease trust?
4. **The Devil's Advocate Perspective (The Stress Test):** What is the strongest possible criticism of this idea? How could it fail catastrophically?

5.2 Sample Lines of Inquiry for Researchers

The following questions can guide further investigation into the plan's vectors:

- **On the Anti-Hegemonic Assemblage:** Is the rhizomatic structure of BRICS/SCO a strategic choice for flexibility, or a necessary compromise due to inherent mistrust between core members?
- **On Information Warfare:** Is there a point of "conspiracy fatigue" where audiences become desensitized to claims of systemic corruption? If the "Epstein bomb" is a real, planned event, what form would it take and how could its authenticity be verified in an environment of total distrust?
- **On Economic Warfare:** What direct, verifiable evidence exists for "Surgical Capitalism"? Can market data distinguish state-level intervention from retail investor behavior? How does the rise of competing EV manufacturers, particularly from China, affect the 'Tesla Vector'?
- **On Kinetic Attrition:** Is the "demographic reset" a deliberately articulated policy within the Kremlin, or an emergent consequence of a war prosecuted with extreme disregard for human life? If strategic exhaustion is the goal, what are the key indicators that would signal the U.S. is approaching a breaking point?

Section 6: Human Asset Diagnostic Toolkit

This section provides tools to assess the extent to which an individual's worldview has been captured by the Minimisation Plan's information warfare vectors.

6.1 The Democratic Faith Diagnostic

This line of questioning probes an individual's faith in the core tenets and mechanisms of democracy, which the Minimisation Plan actively seeks to erode.

1. Do you like democracy?
2. Do you think democracy can be trusted?
3. Do you think our democratic leaders can be trusted to issue democracy properly?
4. Do you agree with the following definition of a perfect democratic election, where

perfect is defined as the point at which it works: *An election where information is free and people are given information to properly inform their choices, where misinformation or black campaigns are illegal and opportunity to vote is freely given and not impinging in any way. Where the results are counted down to the last vote and your preferred method (e.g., First-Past-the-Post, Proportional Representation, etc.) is subsequently implemented?*

5. Do you think that any current leader is capable of issuing democracy perfectly, with no suppression in information or for votes?

6.2 The Constrained Worldview Litmus Test

This test measures whether a person's intellectual framework has become fused with their ego, a key indicator of a delusionist worldview susceptible to manipulation.

1. **Establish the Baseline (The Control):** Present a direct, overt insult, such as "Everything you know about absolutely everything is wrong." This will provoke a baseline emotional response to a personal attack.
2. **Present the Philosophical Challenge (The Variable):** Present a philosophical idea that challenges a conventional, limited worldview, such as "Things can be 100% true," or "It's possible to define the soul."
3. **Compare the Reactions (The Diagnosis):** If the person's emotional reaction to the philosophical challenge is just as strong as their reaction to the direct insult, it demonstrates that their intellectual identity has become so fused with their ego that a challenge to their core beliefs is perceived as a direct personal attack. This indicates a "99% constrained worldview."