Secret Intelligence Service

Room 15

BRIEF : ON STRATAGEM

Introduced by Stephen Wyndham-Lewis

Welcome gentlemen and of course, I offer a warm hand to our guest of the morning Olga Rubenskaya, alias (C-I), as you know her of course, and who will be with us until 12.00 hours.

The brief for discussion

I shall begin by stating the obvious, that there is great complexity in most if not all facets of our work, just as there is in others, but for the next hour I want to exaggerate simplicity. In doing this I want to step away from the linguistic paraphernalia that often attaches without apology, I mean the descriptive terms that do apply, and return to them later with the intention of completing our portrait. Often in retrospect it's useful to view what began in its pristine form and while we compare with where we ultimately end up.

So then to begin; consider XY as a 'requirement'. What does it mean to say this, that we have a requirement? It means that XY is a necessary course of action, deemed as such, by virtue of the culmination of a multiplicity of efforts in aiding our awareness, a multiplicity of efforts that is, relating to the types of intelligence available and in varying degrees of their contribution. I don't need to list these as it's not necessary; you know what they are and how they apply in their varying degrees of magnitude across a wide range of affairs.

Allow me to state concisely; the focus is the requirement XY that has emerged.

What we intend doing is creating a platform whereupon we can place our requirement and this

necessitates our being both the source of XY and the destination of XY. Look at the chart would you please. Let's call the source AB, and the destination OO. What are we doing here?

We want to enter the source AB, because our requirement is to create a very particular social perception. Though we are the precursors, we are not the genuine AB and this is not important. I mean we are not the genuine source but we become 'their' voice and that voice says exactly what we want it to reveal concerning XY, our requirement.

Is that clear so far?

(pause)

Do consider what this can achieve. We are not AB and even so, our target which is the destination OO begins feeding the perception of whatever social collective we have chosen to focus and does so on our behalf. This provides a great deal of control and manipulative potential. For example, we can make ourselves appear in the negative and by virtue of AB whose facilities we commandeer so to speak, we can manipulate OO the destination, using exactly the same methods and while defending the negative perception we have engineered and in the way that satisfies the requirement AB.

Questions, anyone?

(pause)

You might want to consider what such a requirement achieves but remember there is a great deal of input in formulating this which can and in this example does pertain to future trends of mass audience perception. A negative view that we contrive and allow the source to propaganda is better for our control than a negative perception that we have no part in forming. Of course there might be occasions where the negativity or indeed any proposal out there overlaps with what we might like to engineer, but it is better if we formulate the perception in its entirety and subsequently be the ones dealing with it.

It could be the case that we place a spanner in the works, I refer to what the source has already set in motion and this spanner can be either positive or negative, thus likewise how we then address it is either positive or negative and contradicts or supports the original message from the source.

So then, because we are the source, and we are not seen to be we can respond to our own critical commentaries with very great and deliberate precision. As I said, this can create an extremely large public debate that we control.

How do we engineer this state of affairs? What tools might we employ? Let me say that these are not so important as are the requirement itself. We need to try to create the future and often this means creating furor and simultaneously dampening the flames. We create pictures in minds that were not apparent until we put them there. These pictures do then exist in time, have three dimensional attributes.

Just to briefly address the issue of tools, I refer to what we might feed in, what particular language, its extent, its ability to create atmosphere and emotion. Consider what is accepted as a leaking of information and how the 'audience' views the leaker with heroic status, a status we placed out there because what they leak is what we gave or better stated, allowed them. From there, the public perception is the issue not often so easy to predict in terms of its nature and force but given that we have to address the collateral syndrome we can wander freely, adding here and there whatever we want.

Yes, it is much easier now to impress and or influence the media because of the extent and instantaneous nature of computer generated information we can produce and via our assets, for that information to be owned, viewed as being theirs.

I can see that you are wondering why, why is it necessary in the example I just used, to create and disseminate, then address negative sentiment, that we, if we are included are seen to be potential

losers. Allow me to just say that the public mind becomes both softened and primed for further more impactful revelations regarding the nature of the future citizen. We are seldom in the equation, there are countless social situations that do not have a bearing on our purpose but which we see fit to socially engineer.

Another example is the National Health Service and with regard to its negative perception fed to us from other nations. They do this without our manipulating but we run parallel negative perceptions concurrently which we address while knowing the psyche of our audience much better than do foreign nations. If we tell our citizens that they stand to lose what they have and become as those elsewhere, then we address this with the intention of bolstering their commitment, shattering their complacency, we not only defeat our foreign critics by negating the intention of their rhetoric, we move our society where we want it to be.

Often a public quickly tires of a subject, for example with regard to a political change we have engineered, thus it is essential to keep the subject alive and by doing so guarantee the outcome we want. Very obviously with regard to most political events the context can be fraught with a myriad hysterical voices and this cultural characteristic is born in mind at the outset.

Allow me to ask you to think about where and why this simple model could be applied because in doing this the model becomes absorbed into life worlds and events that follow and whose complexity is not simply addressed. However you should see that it is a necessity to become sub requirements, XY1 XY2. . .XY3 and so on, thence addressing these accordingly. Do we invent fictitious people and fictitious situations, of course we do. You can think of our writing a play and where the audience becomes the players attending to our script. The players are the collective and we can make them feel successful in the process and via incremental adjustments keep on doing so. The players own and deal with information as we see fit for them to.

Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot be complacent in the world. We cannot allow situations / events to arise and where we are merely reactive / responsive to them. We can be seen to be in this position as I have said, but our place is one in which we are the controllers because we are focused on a future state of affairs and when these arrive, irrespective of the majority view they are not happenstance.

Just to end this very brief offering, later perhaps you might like to ponder on the source, what is the extent of our effort with regard to the destination, how much we need to expend in addressing? Small effort at the source AB and large effort at the destination OO. Consider the sub requirements and how these might require concurrent intervention of different extent. Certain efforts at the source can be small and large at the same time.

Often it is necessary if we need to continue an existing dispute to send out from the source both antagonistic and supportive gestures at concurrently because in this maneuvering we can confuse those who begin viewing us as aggressors. It's always better if we are seen as defending against something threatening us (though we invented the threat). Hurt is a powerful device as far as its potential to be scooped up and wrapped in soothing rhetoric and thence, the hurt becomes a purpose of our making.

Another issue you might want to ponder is; what of the danger if any regarding the possibility of the effort backfiring? What would this involve, the backfiring I mean? What of the possibility that once we have fed the source we can't control the blossoming effect and it rampages off on its own?

Now let's complicate the whole thing by my asking you the question; What might have been our requirement in the context of a geopolitical event such as the current turmoil taking place in Kiev, Ukraine (the mass protests and pro EU rallies) and with regard to our requirement, whatever you decide it is (what critical infrastructure components become your focus for change), what would we have

been feeding the major sources (such as RIA
Novosti, Itar-Tass, RT, Xinhua, BBC, CNN)? What
other sources might there be, what is their nature?
You will have to consider the sub requirements and
the disposition of the source/s. You have to
remember at the destination, which is the
collective thought now at work that you have
engineered, you dealing with this has great
affinity with our requirement. What combination of
things would you be doing at the destination? Play
around with this would you. Perhaps you could
present me with a few examples later.

W-L (C II)

A partial discussion of this brief appears in
Section : Room 15 Conversation V. Olga Rubenskaya

Stephen Wyndham-Lewis. (C II)

OR15V61115 WL 2