

SecretIntelligenceService

Conversation No. V

Room 15

Olga Rubenskaya

Olga (C-I) is known to us as a close colleague and schoolchild of Stephen Wyndham-Lewis (C-II). This is to be a draft adapted from a series of conversations had with her which began when she was asked to write an opinion. This opinion was necessarily broad in its request because central to it was the issue of psychological and physical well-being, of herself. We have narrowed it down in order to tease out the most pertinent which here is presented and will be enlarged later and considerably for the Section; 'Mental and Physical'
Here are her salient points.

Hello. There is lots and lots written which in their revealing holds that one's life will somehow improve if this course of action is followed, if this situation becomes the case, if this item is purchased, even to believe that 'something' is the case, and so on. Most often, if not always, the telling is for the benefit of the teller.

To begin with a few statements to ponder.

I think we have emerged into a qualitatively different era, one that brought with suddenness many threats to the way we have come to regard the world. These threats were the case during the past of course, but now because of the era specific paraphernalia I cannot live without, these threats and in their great and constantly emerging intensity are closer to me than

ever. It has to be said that much of the world is a veritable catastrophe for the psyche, seemingly impossible to ignore. What others do partake and accuse remains and I, as are many, am subsequently affected by it.

That's not all because we all have been party to designing and constructing a world of supports which have left behind much of what was apparent to our forebears. If one asks the question; what as a collectivity do we patronize? The answer would reflect what many have only ever known in the present moment's offering, or thereabouts. By saying this, we are inhabitants of a machine which in its multifarious operation and in varying degrees does dictate the responses we are eager to give. I am to a certain extent no different than anyone else.

What does beautifying our time mean? Does it encompass the supports, or does it encompass the world we largely ignore and/or view as useful to exploit such that the machine is serviced? In this latter, the expected and the repetitive flavor of life that ensues serves not the fulfillment of the person, though most often this is stated as being the case, it fulfills the machine in its commercial mass-exploitation.

Where does this leave the person who feels that somehow all is not right, mentally and physically? Life is not easy and nor is there an easy path to fulfillment, a fulfillment that only the person concerned can realize eventually for him or herself.

Yes, there are many offering services and advice, but my diary is free to read and is merely a conversation piece not intended to be prescriptive, not intended as professional advice or anything of the sort. It is a collection of a woman's thoughts on the subject as they pertain to me, if you would like it pertains to someone who has thought about it. I refer to feeling psychologically and physically right.

To feel better about the world, I mean hold gladness, requires input from many things but the overriding concern is how one actually feels.

A profound undertaking one might accuse, and in response the weight is not born in this writing but more by the ones who read it and want to change in some way.

How one feels in this place of myriad threats and assaults to one's composure is not a static state but it is both possible and beneficial to be sufficiently strong of mind to develop a capacity where one remains aloof.

What is the place of reconnoiter, the place that one does not have to pay for and where resides trust in what is genuine and the subsequent reinforcement is always available? What is it? Where?

This is a good question and one to develop because my thesis is that it is not easy to find and to say it can be within yourself requires much clarification, yet this is the point to begin.

A person examines his or her life to date and often the emotional baggage brought along makes doing so not necessarily a fulfilling task. The present time has to be the point of joy aimed at because this is where one is and so the past can be addressed for what it was and dealt with so that the present is ideally detached from it, either wholly or in part. Is this easy to achieve, one might ponder.

What are the fundamental issues to take into consideration?
These can be expanded later.

What does 'feeling right' actually mean? What of one's context because this is very specific for the interplay that is constantly the case. What regarding all that is offered as meaningful, to what extent is it meaningful? On the latter point, we live in a society whose commercial thrust bestows the person with the products of that commercialism. What do these products constitute in the minds of the many? Are they the person or are they mere supports, but if society values the person with respect to owning these supports, what then? Is the debt that ensues a rampage upon the psyche undermining the very foundation of one's life, that freedom is mortgaged and one's subsequent time in the machine is less one's own than ever? What does it mean to ask whether 'things' can be seen from the outside and for what they are? Is standing aloof so to make a judgment even possible given the plethora of propaganda that defends the situation? What of attainment, is it a factor in the question of whether we could actually feel better about things? Where has the creative pulse gone and by this, I ask; are we artists at all now in what we do? What is missing and can it be put back?

To what extent does feeling right persist in the condition of insecurity, uncertainty, threat and fear? What can a woman reveal that provokes a different regard and this regard become a catalyst whose sparkle increases and does embrace a future time and one where the joy persists, irrespective?

A great deal can be said conversationally and as suggestion, because it applies to me. The best way to present is via increments and where there is a building up of the suggestion. Much can be covered in a vivacious and eager way, but I have to say that there are fundamentally important prerequisites of mind which are the beginning. These are that as I, one has or

develops an open mind, is flexible in how one regards the world and owns a respect for that world in its entirety.

On self-expression; to what extent does what a woman divulges about herself have credibility in a world whose character is still largely male oriented? Should it be a challenge for me to embrace, or should I be reticent for fear of censure?

Yes. The picture of the world or parts of it under the influence of thinkers and planners - while most of the rest are swept along via their influence is very controversial. At a micro level and I say close to home, the arguments relating to individual freedom - what does it mean to say that one is a free agent - is central. I can ask; what is freedom in the context of threats to that freedom and where the capacity to deal with them cannot be removed. This is the state of the collective. I know the notion of being controlled enters and the question who is controlling and to what extent also.

I say that you have to step away from where we have arrived at and try and view its complex machinations from a detached perspective and while identifying the factors that constitute control of it all. We share a world of thoughts and actions and one has to wonder most of the time who or what is the catalyst for these thoughts and actions, in other words the content because it is not easy to see much if anything that does not come from without, from what is external to the person and the concomitant reacting. Almost clone / zombie like, we all perform! Therefore anything, any precursor to behavior modification that exists (*On Stratagem) should not be a big surprise. * (attached file. Wyndham-Lewis article)

I'm thinking of the language that is used by the media, for example, the pictures of life events that are created and which do become the substance of much thought. The media does manage what it creates, reinforcing or trying to, where it sees fit so to do.

I have a lot to be saying on this from a Psyop perspective.

(C-III's response) You have me asking the question; 'How much of what I am told and what I subsequently come to think is for my betterment? Almost everything? Nothing? So what have I become, a kind of receptacle, easily herded from pillar to post because...what I am told is otherwise of what I am led to believe?' It sounds simple but the emotionality bound up with 'racketeering' is a savage insult to thwart. Who owns my life? My purpose? What threat to the transgressor? This is what is manipulated and whatever the altruism intended it often is seen only in one way. I am not saying we are the racketeers, not at all, but the model addressed in the article * (On Stratagem) is the one adopted, or variant thereof, by commercial organizations who manipulate for monetary gain.

(C-I) I'm not sure that gets it actually. I was thinking more about novel ideas and how these, when introduced, tend to flow against the tide. How ideas can be original if the capacity to create them exists in the mind in the first place, as opposed to being an amalgam of the thoughts of others and their power to control via propaganda....

Here is something, it might be not too glamorously boring: It is fine to suggest that ideas are simple, but the question 'why are they pertinent at all' be more revealing, I say. I mean what be their, I'm trying to think of a word...what was and continues to be their 'reason'? It is bound with human predisposition, what humanity wants to use them for and this fostering is human

instinct manifest. This does not change, has not and will not ever. Einstein's discoveries and those of others were, arguably to some, commandeered to practically contribute most significantly to what constitutes the potential demise of civilization. Since then this facility to employ fabulous complexities that reveal the hitherto undiscovered, their practical employment, has become an accepted mask of human discontent. Not certain of the relevance neither!

I was doing the thinking late about the Wyndham-Lewis article and to be honest it is as most things in the dealing with all of the many complex attributes that cannot own a simple concluding. Here is something that is a broad sweeping of the issue and which I say, does both encompass W-L's intentions along with others doing same, and also how it is possible to step aside and be the 'authentic' person. Maybe both, but the statement really is that I understand the state of affairs I am a part of. How many can't and why can't they? What is the stimulus for change, does it arise from within or from without (the latter an example set by others/by the environment)? One can change attitude and or emotional response to the same context and the question what is the precedent is very pertinent because certain individuals transcend circumstances while others do not and remain in what is often a state of stagnation.

Collectivities of individuals are often seen to be moved from one state of being to a different one by virtue of certain powerful cues. These cues can be individuals who desire to effect a response or by the environment, be this changed by others, that is, by governmental authority because it views a transition as necessary and to pull those who it is intended for toward a different/more appropriate status. The latter is what can be referred to as innovation and can be a model based upon other models presented elsewhere. These models consist of physical attributes created via intellectual contribution and thus, their acceptability with respect to the individual and group subject to them is often a process in itself. Some regard the latter as imposition, others as opportunity, and others as anywhere in between.

Often change cannot be identified, it is a kind of excitement of the mind with no clear vision until a process of release is begun. One enters the universe naked, without preconceptions and with freedom to be. Arguably this is not often the case but it is a tactic employed to set the scene for a mental landscape where either the individual places the meanings or someone subsequent.

Personally my view of change as it applies to me is a process of considerations based upon a desire within myself, often a frustration with the wider norms, but without clear outline of what will become. These considerations are based upon my own creative/artistic impulses that have no obvious psychological basis other than they manifest as something that did not exist before. Is this growth in the sense of Wyndham-Lewis's intention, for example the widespread application of electronic world and its continued development? I would say many would argue against him and many for him, the latter because what they bring is a kit bag of values and these are often based on what commercial success typifies, that being economic growth. My own creation of a treatise is not likely to fall into this commercial category although my creation is fundamental to my own person and with each stage the work appears I experience growth.

(C-I) Olga Rubenskaya

SecretIntelligenceService.london

OR15V61115 WL

SecretIntelligenceService

Adversitate. Custodi. Per Verum

