

*Due Dalliance*¹ - A Subversive Strategy Exposed

In the normal course of business, management and boards are regularly presented with proposals requiring a decision to accept, reject or counter. To ignore a legitimate proposal would be irresponsible and unprofessional. To reach a responsible decision, a process of research and analysis, referred to as *due diligence*, is used.

But what if your objective is to avoid a decision or defeat the proposal for personal reasons without appearing irresponsible? The solution is ***Due Dalliance***. This is a strategy designed to prolong, misdirect and generally undermine the due diligence process. It conspires to defeat the proposal by either delaying a decision until the proposal ultimately is withdrawn or the deciding body votes to kill the proposal to end the stalemate.

A closer look at Due Dalliance:

The concept of Due Dalliance is closely related to the marketing strategy called FUD. The objective of the FUD strategy is to create Fear, Uncertainty, and Doubt in the minds of the decision-makers regarding the competition's products or services. This is accomplished by the subtle use of innuendoes, open-ended questions, veiled threats and unverifiable claims.

Like the FUD strategy, a Due Dalliance strategy may employ the same tactics, while seeking to subvert the due diligence process by various covert and overt means. The actual tactics used in a given situation are as varied and creative as the individuals involved. These tactics typically fall into four categories: FUD, delays, restrictive policies and passive support of the opposition.

FUD Tactics:

- Attack the Messenger
- Question the proposal backers' "real" intentions.
- Challenge the backers' ability to deliver, regardless of the evidence presented.
- Demand financial and personal data from backers beyond the scope of the proposal.
- Attack the Proposal
- The proposal will cause change with unforeseen consequences.
- The benefits are unrealistic and overstated.
- What will happen if the proposal isn't fully implemented for whatever reason?
- The proposal is just too difficult and complex- Don't elaborate.
- Hire an attorney.

Delaying Tactics:

- Assign a committee to develop a survey of constituents, but don't authorize the distributions of the survey.
- Require numerous revisions of all documents – wordsmith to the max.
- Demand disclosure of definitive outcomes for future events.
- Answer requests for information with requests for clarification.
- “Study” all issues raised by the opposition, regardless of their merit
- Focus on the process not the results.
- Declare other projects have priority.
- Hire an attorney.

Restrictive Policies:

- Curtail all open discussion of the proposal.
- Defer discussion on related motions until after the vote.
- Require all research and analysis to maintain a “neutral” position.
- Edit all communications to constituents.
- Hire an attorney

Passive Support of Opposition:

- Solicit comments from opposition
- Do not challenge or question opposition's tactics or claims regardless of their ethics or accuracy.
- Ignore the proponents.
- Avoid becoming too informed.
- Hire an attorney

These are just a few examples of effective Due Dalliace tactics. Properly employed in the right environment, with a sympathetic or biased media these tactics can defeat even the best of proposals.

This is purely a philosophical exercise. Any association with actual proposals or individuals resides in the mind of the reader.

DALLIANCE

Function: noun: an act of dallying : frivolous action : TRIFLING

Examples:

Damn the Facts...I'm doing my **Due Dalliance**

Due Dalliance...because I can!

Truth? It's all a matter of perspective, *and mine is right.*
Due Dalliance

Due Dalliance Consensus:
You and I agree to do it my way

Due Dalliance
Trifling with the truth

Due Dalliance Certificate of Obstruction:

