



>>>>>Might be useful thoughts....think about how useful<<<<<<

Because they feel the stigma and then internalize others' disinterested contempt. In this sense, individuals are placed into a dichotomous relationship of stigmatizing agents and stigmatized Others. Shame becomes the affect of only the stigmatized embody, as the stigmatizing agents enact prejudice and contempt. Rather than a circulating affect that connects the lookers and those who are looked at, as in Tomkins's work, this objectified shame further separates the lookers and the looked at. In Herek's model, stigma is theorized as an object from which individuals want to escape. Herek et al. (2007) write, "Felt stigma involves stigmatized individuals' desire to avoid enactments of stigma, which is the motivational basis for modifying their behavior". If they do not break away from it, it becomes internalized stigma, an external perception about the negative identification of the stigmatized group living in the psyche.

Shame is central to identity development and the reflexivity of the self. Psychoanalyst Francis Broucek writes, "Shame is to self psychology what anxiety is to ego psychology—the keystone of affect". Shame is the sense of disturbance and defeat activated and felt within the self. Tomkins (1963) states,

If distress is the affect of suffering, shame is the affect of indignity, of defeat, of transgression and of alienation. Though terror speaks to life and death and distress makes of the world a vale of tears, yet shame strikes deepest into the heart of man. While terror and distress hurt, they are wounds inflicted from outside which penetrate the smooth surface of the ego; but shame is felt as an inner torment, a sickness of the soul. It does not matter whether the humiliated

Restarting from shameful place

>>> One has been shamed by derisive laughter or whether she mocks herself. In either event she feels herself naked, defeated, alienated, lacking in dignity or worth. <<<

*The question of human suffering often points the problem outward to locate the objects of pain and distress, as if we feel distressed because the objects we encounter have an essential property of distress, and our body merely reacts to that. Here, Tomkins's emphasis on the experience of shame offers a humanistic lens, which draws attention to the necessity of dignity in the capacity to experience suffering at all. Indeed, Tomkins's affect theory makes a provocative argument that affect, rather than biological drive, is the "primary motivational system" (1962, p. 4). The predominant drive paradigm marks human beings' affective experience as subordinate to the urgent state of hunger or thirst, meaning people are only free to pursue the higher values in life only when these basic, lower needs are met (see Maslow 1943). Tomkins does not reject the necessity of biological drives; however, his affect theory makes the affective struggle against these biological and environmental forces more primary and essential. The self in the affect system is a dynamic being with multiple goals, aims, and wants, and it has a high degree of freedom and an indeterminate path that is distinct from the drive system restricted by primitive biological logic. One may repeat a pleasurable act simply because it is pleasurable. It does not have to be reinforced by an external purpose—the positive affect of pleasure is both the aim and the drive to accomplish the act. In the case of shame, the affective self not only acts in response to external objects but also produces the internal gaze that makes one feel exposed by one's own eyes. Therefore, in the midst of shame, "the phenomenological distinction between the subject and the object of shame is lost" (Sedgwick and Frank 1995, p. 136). The self feels shameful by its very own mechanism. This movement of looking inward heightens one's self-consciousness. Shame thus*

*activates a response to reduce interaction through dropping one's head or looking away. Although the inhibitive function of shame temporarily impedes intimacy within the self and with others, Tomkins stresses that shame does lead to permanent renouncement of the object, as shame is the "incomplete reduction of interest or joy" (1963, p. 354). In the case of encounter with a stranger, I may feel ashamed and turn my eyes away. I may wish to keep looking at the stranger out of interest in being seen reciprocally, but do not continue the act because of feeling ashamed by my own interest in looking. The activation of shame thus does not contradict the interest or continued investment in its object, unlike contempt or disgust. Shame is thus, phenomenologically speaking, stretchy and sticky. It constitutes a persistent but ambivalent identification to the object that ties both the positive affect (i.e., love-identification) and the negative affect (i.e., shamehumiliation) to the self, who is unwilling to abandon either of them. Shame, in its essence, is the refusal to split and the desire for oneness. The flexibility of Tomkins's affect theory points to an alternative framework that resists the dogmatic, ritual positivism of cause and effect. More importantly, it shifts the Freudian theory of drive and repression attached to the Oedipus complex away from predisposed object relations. Tomkins's framework of the affective system*

*proposes that "any affect may have any 'object'" (1962, p. 190). This model establishes a profound critique of Freud's theory of sexual drive, which operates based on the analogical switch of expression or repression. Sexuality, rather, is amplified by the multiple possibilities of the affective system and produces qualitatively different expressions. The sex drive mechanism no longer needs to be the result of splitting identification between the two parents but, rather, "involves the far more general wishes to be both parents and to possess both parents" The freedom of the affect system, whether intentionally or not, disputes the heterosexual romance in the foundations of psychological development theories. Tomkins's theory was developed in the cold war period of American psychology saturated by universalist, heterosexist assumptions of personhood and the self. Sedgwick and Frank note that the "sublimely resistant of Tomkins's subject in the flexible and heterogeneous affective system may not necessarily be an explicitly antiheterosexist project in psychology, but the affect theory was a*

WTF?

And all the time there is red, red, red . . . love in blood being shed

**The Stasi. Totalitarianism in operation. codified inquiries**

Between the years of 1950 and 1989, 275,000 people served in the Stasi. The treatment of dissidents that they perfected was administering of a bullet to the back of the head, though the severity of the communists oppression was by means not confined to murder, it was alongside so called 'legal' executions and in terms of numbers, placed them on a par with the Third Reich whose uniforms they did resemble.

The Stasi probed practically all facets of life. Full time intelligence officers were posted to all places of work. One tenant in each and every apartment house was designated as a watcher, reporting to an area Vopo (Volkspolizei), or People's Police. Every single thing was reported, a visitor, a chance meeting, a new friend, a stranger seen in the street. Universities and schools were especially targeted, these being infiltrated at all levels of the hierarchy. Hospitals

too, in fact all places of meeting of people. Professionals such as lawyers, accountants, and medical staff were chosen by the Stasi. Academics, artists, writers, athletes, hotel and restaurant staff and so on were subject to enormous scrutiny. The wiretapping of over 100,000 telephone cables was the duty of Stasi officers, as was the eavesdropping devices planted in literally every place, private and public alike

**And 4 The Owl is silent**

**Absolutely nothing was overlooked. Little holes were made in apartment and hotel room walls through which the Stasi filmed those who were of interest to them. Washrooms (toilets) were the abode of these communist voyeurs.**

**The Communist party chiefs were not content to rely only on the Stasi's millions of informers to weed out dissident sentiments. They imposed a law that made the failure to denounce fellow citizens a crime punishable by up to five years' in prison. A 'Spitzel' was the snipe for a Stasi informant.**

**However, many of the codified offenses for which East German citizens were prosecuted and imprisoned were unique to such totalitarian regimes; fascist and communist.**

**Certain sections of the code, such as those on 'Treasonable Dispatching of Information' were most severely applied and countless East Germans were sent to maximum security prisons. Many of these were people who had requested an exit permits from the authorities and had been turned down, their crime was having contacted a Western consulate to inquire about immigration. Sentences of up to two and a half years' hard labor were the norm as punishment for such inquiries.**

**The engaging in propaganda hostile to the state was a further offense and a long term of hard labour the recompense.**

**Full-time officers were posted to all major industrial plants. Without exception, one tenant in every apartment building was designated as a watchdog reporting to an area representative of the Volkspolizei (Vopo), the People's Police. In turn, the police officer was the Stasi's man. If a relative or friend came to stay overnight, it was reported. Schools, universities, and hospitals were infiltrated from top to bottom. German academe was shocked to learn that Heinrich Fink, professor of theology and vice chancellor at East Berlin's Humboldt University, had been a Stasi informer since 1968. After Fink's Stasi connections came to light, he was summarily fired. Doctors, lawyers, journalists, writers, actors, and sports figures were co-opted by Stasi officers, as were waiters and hotel personnel. Tapping about 100,000 telephone lines in West Germany and West Berlin around the clock was the job of 2,000 officers.**

**Stasi officers knew no limits and had no shame when it came to protecting the party and the state. Churchmen, including high officials of both Protestant and Catholic denominations, were recruited en masse as secret informers. Their offices and confessionals were infested with eavesdropping devices. Even the director of Leipzig's famous Thomas Church choir, Hans-Joachim Rotch, was forced to resign when he was unmasked as a Spitzel, the people's pejorative for a Stasi informant.**

**Absolutely nothing was sacred to the secret police. Tiny holes were bored in apartment and hotel room walls through which Stasi agents filmed their "suspects" with special video cameras. Even bathrooms were penetrated by the communist voyeurs. Like the Nazi Gestapo, the Stasi was the sinister side of deutsche Gründlichkeit (German thoroughness).**

**I hate alcohol wish he'd stop asking \_\_\_\_\_ Makes me feel like  
shit\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\***

**The communists' brutal oppression of the nation by means including murder alongside legal execution put the SED leadership on a par with Hitler's gang. In that sense, Walter Ulbricht or Erich Honecker (Ulbricht's successor as the party's secretary-general and head of state) and secret police chief Erich Mielke can justifiably be compared to Hitler and Himmler, respectively.**

**Members of the twenty-one-member ruling Politburo also have been tried. Former Defense Minister Heinz Kessler was convicted of manslaughter in connection with the order to kill people who were trying to escape to the West. He received a seven-and-a-half-year term. Two others, members of the Central Committee and the National Defense Council, were tried with Kessler and sentenced to seven and a half years and five years, respectively. Politburo member Harry Tisch, who was also head of the communist trade union, was found guilty of embezzlement and served eighteen months. Six others, including Egon Krenz (Honecker's successor as party chief), were charged with manslaughter. Krenz was found guilty, and on August 25, 1997, was sentenced to six and a half years in prison.**

**The preamble to the East German criminal code stated that the purpose of the code was to "safeguard the dignity of humankind, its freedom and rights under the aegis of the criminal code of the socialist state," and that "a person can be prosecuted under the criminal code only in strictest concurrence with the law." However, many of the codified offenses for which East German citizens were prosecuted and imprisoned were unique to totalitarian regimes, both fascist and communist.**

**Moreover, certain sections of the code, such as those on "Treasonable Relaying of Information" and "Treasonable Agent Activity," were perversely applied, landing countless East Germans in maximum security penitentiaries. The victims of this perversion of justice usually were persons who had requested legal exit permits from the DDR authorities and had been turned down. In many cases, their "crime" was having contacted a Western consulate to inquire about immigration procedures. Sentences of up to two and a half years' hard labor were not unusual as punishment for such inquiries.**

**Engaging in "propaganda hostile to the state" was another punishable offense. In one such case, a young man was arrested and prosecuted for saying that it was not necessary to station tanks at the border and for referring to border fortifications as "nonsense." During his trial, he "admitted" to owning a television set on which he watched West German programs and later told friends what he saw. One of those "friends" had denounced him to the Stasi. The judge considered the accused's actions especially egregious and sentenced him to a year and a half at hard labor.**



Whereas the ratio for the Stasi was one secret intelligence operative per 166 East Germans and if one adds regular informers, these ratios become much higher. With the Stasi there would have been at least one spy watching every 66 citizens. In addition, if one adds the estimated numbers of part-time eavesdroppers, the result is quite literally amazing; one informer for every 6.5 citizens.

One can therefore safely assume that at least one Stasi operative was in attendance among any group of ten people, irrespective of reason for the gathering.

The Owl is visible to me 14 at 14 uyxpp remember

Is not LEADERSHIP basically a commandeering of requisite facets of a situation and steering these facets toward a goal owned by the leader? I say owned because a leader usually is perceived as one owning power that those being led do not. Of course this perception might be only partially correct or incorrect. Thus, if one was to state that leadership was manipulation and a mutually adjusting circumstance better for some than is a leader, would I be correct? I ask because I don't know. There are leaders who have been for good and for ill and all appeal to instincts and often have stated that their ideals are the ones to accept and if left, people merely mark time or something akin to it. Thus the intention to seize opportunity to cause effect can be 'good' leadership and it is left to posterity to decide on whether that leadership was good or bad and why.

As an afterthought I was wondering whether a leader could be unintentional in influence. What would constitute the unintentional? Perhaps those who as mentors (leaders?) excerpt effect via their example whatever that example may be and those who follow this example were not of the intended group? I would say there are many who would fall into this category.

**Circular reasoning** – when the reasoner begins with what he or she is trying to end up with; sometimes called assuming the conclusion.

**Fallacy of division** – assuming that something true of a thing must also be true of all or some of its parts.

**False dilemma (false dichotomy, fallacy of bifurcation, black-or-white fallacy)** – two alternative statements are held to be the only possible options, when in reality there are more

**Fallacy of quoting out of context (contextomy and I can't pronounce this)** – refers to the selective excerpting of words from their original context in a way that distorts the source's intended meaning.<sup>[27]</sup>

**Onus probandi** – from Latin "onus probandi incumbit ei qui dicit, non ei qui negat" the burden of proof is on the person who makes the claim, not on the person who denies (or questions the claim). It is a particular case of the "argumentum ad ignorantiam" fallacy, here the burden is shifted on the person defending against the assertion.

**Post hoc ergo propter hoc** Latin for "after this, therefore because of this" (faulty cause/effect, coincidental correlation, correlation without causation) – X happened then

Y happened; therefore X caused Y. The Loch Ness Monster has been seen in this loch. Something tipped our boat over; it's obviously the Loch Ness Monster.

Reification (hypostatization) – a fallacy of ambiguity, when an abstraction (abstract belief or hypothetical construct) is treated as if it were a concrete, real event or physical entity. In other words, it is the error of treating as a "real thing" something which is not a real thing, but merely an idea.

Remarks; in certain contexts a very genuine NAIVETY works to an advantage. What I mean by this is that it is awkward to be in a situation and be legitimately seen to be naïve/ignorant when one is not. My poor understanding of the complexities inherent within hacking skills was thus used as a vehicle to carry a cluster of real emotion/ my real personality that would not be regarded as a threat. I say this because often one's acting otherwise can present certain flaws that the other very quickly picks up on (one's suspected of being a phony), even if the other keeps this from view. Similarly it was important not to appear fixed to a regimen, necessitating often being absent.

Management; the potential to misconstrue the status of the relationship, thus a requirement to ascertain the other's precursors to attitude and needs in this particular/important respect and to work sensitively with them. The assessment of any degree of danger to self in so doing.

Addendum. Regarding hacking; what level of proficiency, proven via what example/s? Leading to (in subsequent processing and analysis); what extent useful to 'other parties'/ presenting what level of security risk?

What was the nature of his commitment, the degree and to consider the most appropriate method of continued assessment of this commitment?

To identify the core skills of computer hacking/level of attainment reached.

Overriding question to be asked (in planning and direction); could he (PQ) be useful in counter-intelligence? If so, how to motivate in this direction, leading to the need to assess and break down the dichotomy between 'establishment/'enemy'? if this was the view owned and other's place (familial) in society.

Direction; how best to manipulate this to advantage, likely success, thus taking time and effort in management of trust achieved.

&&&&&^gfgfgdzzapoittt

I said I didn't like ((((((( and he is a dumb fuck and meant it which is better than saying I do when I do not. So what?



(Summatim)

## Infiltration/Subversion

I like word subversion (covert assault) so will use it. On reading through Wyndham-Lewis's short article 'On Concealment,' I was left to ponder on a few issues around the activity of subversion or I can closely refer; the tactics of the agent provocateur.

Also, the theoretical is essential to know and to see it action is better. In addition because no two circumstances (human activity systems) present the same characteristics (or even similarity at all), there is no consistent appeal to theory or application.

Apologies but in a presentation much has to be stated in superficial fashion, certain made appeal to for application and so on.

I want to introduce the foundation for the experiential which is part two.

So what is the overriding reason for subversion? It is to protect national security, to maintain the existing social and political order via clandestinely entering, monitoring, disrupting or subverting.

What is subversive activity? On a broad scale, often it is the lending of benefits (sponsorship), reassurance and moral support to individuals, groups, or organizations that back the overthrow of serving governments. All willful acts that are intended to be detrimental to the best interests of the government and that do not fall into the categories of treason, sedition, sabotage or espionage are placed in the category of subversive activity.

Describing subversion requires the identifying of 'things', structures that can be subverted.

This does not mean that each type of subversion follows neither a predetermined practice nor the employment of predetermined tools. Each subversive operation is different because of the socio-economic, geo-political and historical-traditional contrasts that each country displays or part thereof. Subversive activities are utilized based upon an assessment of such factors.

Theoretically, the infiltration of state related organizations can offer the opportunity to achieve many things. The infiltration of security forces can provide insights regarding the government's capabilities. A covert entry enables the planting of untruths with the intention of leading the government to mismanage its resources and ultimately weakening and delegitimizing the government.

Any group, organization, or institution that may help sway opinion and beliefs of the collectivity against the established government could be a target for covert entry/subversive activity.

In this broad form of subversion, for example it is not only the government directly that can be targeted by the agent/s (ourselves) but any prevailing cultural character, that distinctiveness, mater/pater familias/bonding, quietude and so on.

Allow that I narrow down my application to one of subversion of certain types of organization, the subversive activity which is more that of the agent provocateur. These organizations often are already viewed in the public arena as being legitimate concerns and often provide a social stage to express ideas.

It is the case that political organization or governments themselves may use agents provocateurs against any political opponents. The provocateurs try to incite the opponent to do counter-productive or ineffective acts so to foster public disdain or provide a pretext for aggression against the opponent.

Sdwqqa once established in the organization - do not merely collect intelligence, the main purpose could indeed be to discredit and disrupt.

Nota Bene. The activities of the agent provocateur can raise ethical and legal issues. Specifically that in common law jurisdictions the legal concept of entrapment may apply if the main impetus for any crime was the provocateur.

It is important to establish the needs (inputs) of the organization. When identified, these needs are linked to solutions that our own interests can provide. Once established the agent can work to establish ties with other organizations.

If some organizations are too difficult to covertly enter, it may be necessary to create a new organization that merely appears to be independent but is under the direction of the operative/s (ourselves).

I think the examples of how things had to be done during the past bear less legitimacy than might appear while using them to understand the present. We have moved into a new paradigm and in this paradigm are advances in the technology employed for our purpose. So by implication subversion during the Cold War period holds with it a different performing of the task than it would if that situation was apparent in the same way now. Or perhaps not.

Yes, I can see that you are jumping from the chair and hollering, "Woman, things are the same now and worse!" I think so too. There is more activity (more requirements) now and it brings into play the very technological advances referred to heretofore and these, emerging constantly add a qualitatively different procedure to the task (subversive) at hand.

One can consider it still as very much a human activity because human beings, their thoughts and actions are the raw material that we are working with.

Basically, we want to make 'XY' think in a certain way. We either know how 'XY' already thinks or I have to find out. We want to make 'XY' begin behaving in a certain way/be compelled via thinking that we have caused. In order to do this we have to consider the most appropriate strategy.

'XY' could be an individual or a group. I want here to concentrate on groups.

What is the primary task of 'XY'.

Geographically, where is XY. What is the character, cultural characteristics, what is its size, structure, which are its leaders, operators, and support?

What of the group context/group within its state and or nation?

How does 'XY' perform? Are they a hierarchical organization or degrees toward a mutual adjustment?

How is the information stored? How is the information shared?

What is already known from collection, processing and analysis?

Specifically, what is my interest?

Because of the era specific facets, these dictate to a large extent the nature of the intervention (nature of the steps employed) of entry into the organization (XY).

Must allow the consideration that on a personal level the closer to home the agent provocateur is, the easier it is to gain entry. I can list the criteria:

How easy is it to get in? Do I have to qualify and in this qualifying require credentials and psychometric/polygraph?

Is entry based upon declaration of shared interest, demonstrated via statements, appearance, character?

There is much more to consider but the point being that there are degrees of impossibility associated with certain cases of entry into 'XY'. These are related to nationality, culture, language, sex, age and so on.

It is advantageous to inspire commitment to a person/s already a member of 'XY'. Likewise there can be degrees of impossibility associated with being successful.

There are also degrees of success because the person/s have to be trusted. There are methods employed to work on surety in this and I can discuss these.

What's in the kitbag of tools?

## Enticement/lure

Direct bribery (executives are only useful if they influence or act in accordance with how we require them to). Actions performed over a period of time can make others (both close and distant) become suspicious. The requirement is for careful concealment of activities.

Psychological operations (the employing of 'dirty tricks') so to undermine, for example the planting of false media stories and publishing bogus types of publication in the name of targeted groups. The forging of correspondence, sending of anonymous letters, making anonymous phone calls. The spreading of misinformation, setting up fake groups to cause trouble for 'XY'.

The employing of legal harassment, the making of the appearance that XY is a criminal. The manipulating of inputs such as adding tax levies or other regulations. So to intimidate XY and those supportive. Manipulation of credit facilities.

The searching of the domestic residence/s associated with 'XY', the object being to intimidate and disrupt (illegal).

It is indeed the case that what can be done can also be done to me/us, and consequently these considerations in counter espionage are an impetus to action in this respect. raise impetus

A happy life. A life of happy. The F word is not allowed there fuck fuck fuck

The Owl is hooting from yonder 14

## CRIMES OF COUNTER-REVOLUTION

A "crime of counterrevolution" - any act that is committed with the aim of overthrowing the political power of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system and endangers whoever.

Whoever colludes with a foreign state in plotting to jeopardize the sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of whoever shall be sentenced to life imprisonment or fixed-term imprisonment of not less than . . . .

Whoever plots to subvert the government say of China for example, or dismember the state will be sentenced to life imprisonment or fixed-term imprisonment of not less than ten years.

Whoever instigates lures or bribes a state functionary or a member of the armed forces, the people's police or the people's militia to defect to the enemy and turn traitor or to

**rise in rebellion shall be sentenced to life imprisonment or fixed-term imprisonment of not less than ten years.**

**Whoever defects to the enemy and turns traitor shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not less than three years and not more than ten years; if the circumstances are serious or the case concerns the leading of a group defection and betrayal, the offender shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not less than ten years or life imprisonment.**

**Whoever leads members of the armed forces, the people's police or the people's militia to defect to the enemy and turn traitor shall be sentenced to life imprisonment or fixed-term imprisonment of not less than ten years.**

**Ringleaders of an armed mass rebellion or others whose criminal involvements are very serious shall be sentenced to life imprisonment or fixed-term imprisonment of not more than ten years; other active participants shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not less than three years and not more than ten years.**

**Ringleaders who gather a group to raid a prison or organize a jailbreak or others whose criminal involvements are very serious shall be sentenced to life imprisonment or fixed-term imprisonment of not less than ten years; other active participants shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not less than three years and not more than ten years.**

**Whoever commits any of the following acts of espionage or aiding the enemy shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not less than ten years or life imprisonment or, if the circumstances are relatively minor, to fixed-term imprisonment of not less than three years and not more than ten years:**

**Stealing, secretly gathering or supplying intelligence for the enemy;**

**Supplying arms and ammunition or other military materials to the enemy; or**

**Joining a secret service or espionage organization or accepting a mission assigned by the enemy.**

**Whoever organizes or leads a counterrevolutionary group shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not less than five years; others who actively participate in a counterrevolutionary group shall be sentenced to fixed-term imprisonment of not more than five years, criminal detention, public surveillance or deprivation of political rights.**

#### **SPECIFIC TO MILITARY INTELLIGENCE**

**Any person who discloses important military secrets of the state or loses documents or object containing such secrets in violation of the laws and regulations on the protection of state military secrets, if the circumstances are serious, shall be sentenced to imprisonment of not more than seven years or criminal detention.**

**Any person who commits the crime in the preceding paragraph during wartime shall be sentenced to imprisonment of not less than three years and not more than ten years or,**

if the circumstances are especially serious, to imprisonment of not less than ten years or life imprisonment.

Any person, who steals, collects or furnishes military secrets for the enemy or foreigners shall be sentenced to imprisonment of not less than ten years or life imprisonment or death

Any person who fabricates rumors to mislead others and undermine army morale during wartime shall be sentenced to imprisonment of not more than three years or, if the circumstances are serious, imprisonment of not less than three years and not more than ten years.

Any person who colludes with the enemy to spread rumors so as to mislead others and undermine army morale shall be sentenced to imprisonment of not less than ten years or life imprisonment. If the circumstances are especially serious, he may be sentenced to death.

Relevant is this extract from 'Intelligence and Security Committee of Parliament. Annual Report 2012-2013'

Chairman: The Rt. Hon. Sir Malcolm Rifkind, MP

*'Disruption' and Military Cyber*

The Committee believes that another key aspect of work on cyber is what we refer to as 'disruption' or military cyber - this could involve disrupting an adversary's systems to prevent cyber-attacks on the UK, or actions in cyberspace that support a conventional 49  
*Written Evidence - Defence Intelligence, 27 March 2013.50 Oral Evidence - Foreign Secretary, 22 November 2012.51 Oral Evidence - Security Service, 17 January 2013.52 Oral Evidence - Foreign Secretary, 22 November 2012.53 Oral Evidence - GCHQ, 31 January*

Secret Intelligence Service

Diary Extracts IV (C-I) OR

Adversitate. Custodi. Per Verum