



The story of David and Goliath is a biblical one, found in Book 1 Samuel. The teenage David had to defeat the giant Goliath, he could not be defeated by strength since David was smaller. It took cunning and skill to defeat someone bigger than him, and he did so with the slingshot.

Cyberwarfare is the UK's worst nightmare and has the potential to harm every single aspect of a British citizen's everyday life. Ensuring unilateral data gathering across the UK's sectors will be essential for the UK to effectively protect her national interests. Effective cyber operations are required to interfere in everything from internet chats to prevent terrorist communications, disrupt global platforms from being used for serious crimes (including, sexual abuse of children and fraud), and keeping both UK military assets and private sectors safe from being targeted by hostile weapons systems. The government and military need to embrace the debate, however uncomfortable or politically incorrect it may be, the UK must implement the necessary policies to protect British citizens and her allies. Over the next 20 years, the National Cyber Force (NCF) and it's counterparts need to solve the issue of deploying effective offensive cyber operations whilst promoting a free, open and secure internet and cyber domain. This is the overarching debate defining the UK's strategy on offensive cyber doctrine.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty": Said Thomas Jefferson, arguably one of the greatest apostles of human rights of all time. For the critical thinkers amongst us, such argument is a self-contradicting paradox. By definition, the process of vigilance is a state of keeping careful watch on others for possible danger, such as the cyber detection of terrorism and international enemies abroad. It is clear that the involvement of the UK military and the collaboration of branches of the UK through the National Cyber Force is needed to enhance its cyber capabilities to effectively compete its interests to prevent the interference of enemies both home and abroad. It is reported by the National Crime Agency that half of all crimes are cyber related including involvements from foreign governments. The UK must balance the use of big data across public available sources to detect these threats not only from hacking groups, but as well as governmental organizations that would not hesitate to overwhelm the UK's cyber systems. The UK must equally maintain its obligation to freedom of expression; the right to seek and share ideas, and the right to privacy. Defending the UK cyber domain should be consistent with the UK's commitment to uphold civil liberties. Ironically, the perpetual watchfulness undoubtedly impinges on the privacy and liberty of individuals. How should a modern democracy like Britain, strike the fine balance of preserving privacy and whilst securing safety, is the dilemma of an age-old debate.

The Being born in Britain and raised in the Asia, I cannot help but realizing the concept of individual privacy is a modern construct primarily a "rights" in the West, but a "Privilege" in the East. The boundaries of what constitutes "private" differ among cultures, and countries where the word "privacy" is untranslatable and may not even exist. In Asia, the "privilege" of not to be subjected to unsanctioned invasion by the establishment, is often very limited and enforced by laws and constitution. This oppressive model is long being upheld as the solution in the prevention of terror. In contrast, privacy in the UK may be loosely perceived as temporary involuntary sacrifice, normally in exchange for apparent protections from greater threats and danger. Of course, such infringement of "rights" is cautiously exercised and often challenged in the court of human rights. Many also argue such lack of control is the very platform for radicalism and extremism to flourish.

The establishments in the West are long aspired to look at Eastern authoritarian control "demanding to disclose" for security; Conversely, society from the East are looking Westward "fighting for the rights" of freedom. In reality, the divergent views of these competing ideological values can only be balanced if the dogma of what constitutes "the threat to security" and "rights to privacy" can be agreed upon.