

## On Asymmetric Conflicts

This piece is an expanded version of material in the Premises page of The David Coalition (TDC) website. In a sense, the thoughts actually belong on both websites, but that would be unnecessary redundancy. There is one point however that (in Webmaster's opinion) 'needs' to be made in both places. He began the Premises page with the following:

*"To be very clear at the outset of this section, TDC is about what are sometimes called "asymmetric conflicts". That is, one side is perceived as having vastly greater resources and thus an enormous advantage over the other side. Put most simply, Goliath was bigger and stronger than David. Most people tend to equate Goliaths with corporations that can spend unlimited amounts of money on lawyers, 'expert' witnesses and so forth. In fact, that is a simplification (see #1)."*

He then expanded (in Endnote #1) as follows:

*"As Webmaster sees it, this very brief 'definition' of an asymmetric conflict is much too narrow. First, the inequality as to resources is not confined to money and the help it can buy. It extends to the implicit influence that comes with being perceived as a business 'too big to fail'; this perception extends to the population as a whole, but most importantly to the so-called 'power brokers', who often are elected officials and/or their appointees. This is NOT meant to imply corruption or conspiracies: it is a very simple statement that most of us have a tendency to presume that large corporations have a wealth not only of dollars, but also of knowledge and experience and that - for the most part - they tend to use the knowledge and experience for the greater good. [Because we all know that a vibrant economy is good for all of us.] Conversely, there is a tendency to think that the civic activist lacks such knowledge and is not acting for the greater good. The term NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) is so commonly used that is in essence a sort of mantra that civic activists are really only concerned about themselves, which is manifestly NOT true of the 'davids' discussed in the body of this page! Moreover, corporations are NOT the only entities against which 'davids' wage asymmetric battles. We wage them against government and many other large organizations, for example school systems that continue to assert that they are delivering 'world-class' education, when so many of us know that our educational system is NOT doing the job. In addition, Goliaths need not be large corporations or other large agencies. A single person can be a Goliath if s/he has significant wealth and is willing to use that wealth (for example in nuisance lawsuits) in an attempt to bully a group - or even a single individual. Webmaster, for example, recalls vividly when such an individual (who had not only wealth but also 'political contacts') filed a frivolous lawsuit against a fellow activist. That 'david' (the activist) was well-known to be a 'fearless' champion of the public good; but even he was stressed by the frivolous lawsuit!"*

Webmaster feels it is important to expand that endnote, in the interests of clarity, because some - reading that endnote out of context - might conclude that

Webmaster is always in agreement with the supposed 'weaker' side in any asymmetric conflict. Nothing could be farther from the truth! Webmaster is concerned that someone reading this out of context might misconstrue Webmaster and think he was also talking about the sort of asymmetric battles in which terrorists fight the forces of 'nation states' and inflict horrific damage on people who are not involved in the conflict. To be extremely clear, Webmaster is NOT equating a 'cell' of 'davids' with a terrorist cell. There are - to be honest - some similarities, but there is one EXTREMELY important difference: 'davids' are 'good guys', fighting for the common good. And, while they are asserting that they know - better than a Goliath - what is good, they are not doing so based on any sort of religious principle. Even more importantly, 'davids' totally reject the use of force to achieve their goals. They would never abuse the law to justify their actions, never inflict physical harm on anyone - and so forth. To act as terrorists act is not only morally wrong, it is the ultimate example of hubris - the most extreme form of bullying of which Webmaster can think. And Webmaster detests bullies. In fact - although the connection(s) may not be obvious to others - his contempt for bullies is one of the main reasons he has established many of his websites! Anyone reading this piece is urged to look at the TDC website and consider the possibility that s/he might want to become (if they are not already) a 'david'.