

5/20/25

Jules's response to the concerns about Luigi Vangione,
and a very serious, deeply-held opinion about the importance of
participating in community process when you have concerns

As the person who suggested the Luigi Vangione, I'd like to share my perspective about the backlash. That perspective emerges from and is deeply entwined with my beliefs about community process

We have a clearly established process for naming vehicles with years of precedent to back it up. I don't think there's a valid argument for circumventing the process because people who did not participate are retroactively unhappy with the decision.

The name suggestion list was posted on the Today Board in advance of the naming party and was on the O&I board before that -- members had ample opportunity to realize that there was a name they strongly opposed and should have attended the naming party to express that opinion. At the naming party, Luigi Vangione won by a wide margin; from the first round to the last, it received twice as many votes than any other name. No one expressed concerns with the name during the time for impassioned speeches, which is the designated time for expressing naming concerns.

Carry
MIR The name made me and others who voted for it really happy (and I think that matters), but at the end of the day a car name is not that deep. Realistically, this minivan will be referred to by two letters like any other car. I could craft a nuanced explanation about the positive impacts of Luigi's alleged crime on the health insurance industry and class consciousness. I could share my reasoning for my belief that the violence perpetrated by the health insurance industry is a far greater affront to the community's values than the assassination of a man profiting off that violence. But ultimately I think that's beside the point.

My point is that the choice to participate in community process is that deep. Twin Oaks governance is by its nature an opt-in system. That means when participation is solicited, those who don't give input don't get a say.

I can empathize with the frustration of disliking a decision when you've missed the chance to participate. I've been pretty out-of-the-loop since I went full time at my outside work job, and I've often been unaware that a decision-making process is happening until a decision has already been made. Fundamentally, those situations are my own fault—I did not participate, so I don't have the right to expect that my perspective would be considered. It would be unfair to those who put in the time and energy to participate in process for me to expect otherwise. Because of that, I try not to complain excessively about or dwell on those decisions. It's my core responsibility as a Twin Oaker to participate in process for the decisions I care about and to accept the decision made when I don't.

100%
-Seyd

From 2018-2022, we had multiple cohorts of short-term members who were constantly complaining about our policies and decisions. Most members in these cohorts didn't give input, participate in discussions on the O&I board, join teams, or take other steps to actually engage with our process. For the purpose of this paper, I'll call members exhibiting this behavior non-participatory critics, or NPCs.

A lot of these members were/are my friends, and I also participated in NPC behavior, particularly in my first two years of membership. I still share many of these cohorts' concerns, however the longer I lived at Twin Oaks, the more I diverged from their mindset. I realized that this way of being in community was a) unhelpful to the causes we were trying to advance, and b) actively harmful to the wellbeing of the community as a whole. It created a culture of factionalism and distrust, meanwhile none of the changes we wanted happened.

I firmly believe that the axiom "dissent is patriotic" applies at Twin Oaks. But the NPC combination of dissent and non-participation is different: it fosters a bitter, adversarial relationship with community, and it spreads quickly within and between factions. Cooperation is both the backbone and heart of this community, and non-participatory criticism significantly degrades it. A subtle but important commonality existed across separate NPC cohorts: in their complaints, these members consistently referred to Twin Oaks as "they" and not "we".

} "Pam
(don't like
NPC designation
tho)

When Twin Oaks is a "they" and not a "we", the needs of the collective are deprioritized. People are less motivated to do the work community needs, less considerate of community spaces/resources, and less capable of either giving or receiving feedback constructively.

"Kate
"Pam

The NPC mindset didn't emerge in a vacuum, so I don't think that NPCs were solely responsible for the tension of the time. More than a year into my membership, I was told that I was too new to have an opinion on a major community debate, and I heard similar stories from many new members in that era. Nonetheless, the dissemination of NPC bitterness among new members was a main contributor to our multi-year low-population problem.

In 2022-2023, the community's relationship with its newer members changed. We shifted the way we presented ourselves to visitors from "this is our system, do you want to join it?" to "we have serious problems, do you want to help us solve them?", and new member participation in community process skyrocketed. I suspect that everyone who was here at the time can attest our culture shift away from the hostility of the previous few years. Population started going up and several ex members returned. Things finally started changing, and while not everyone liked every change, it seems like most members who experienced it agree that this cultural shift made Twin Oaks a happier place to live.

I've noticed an uptick in NPCing lately, and it makes me nervous—I don't want to go back to the way things were. That's not to say that I don't want people with strong dissenting opinions to voice them, but I want to ensure that dissent is incorporated into process rather than happening outside of it. If we capitulate to naming party NPCs, we tell everyone who did participate that their participation doesn't matter against the voices of a few. I'm particularly worried that overturning a decision made by an overwhelming majority of participants will cultivate the belief that participation in our decision-making process doesn't matter.

If there wasn't an opportunity to provide input on a decision or if you gave your input and feel that it wasn't taken seriously, you're thoroughly entitled to appeal. If you don't like how a process works, you should propose a new process and solicit community input on your proposal. These are essential elements of participation in community governance. But if you didn't bother to participate when you had the chance, it's unhelpful and uncommunitarian to go back and try to change the decision. If you choose not to participate, you are tacitly voting in favor of the opinion of those who do. This is true whether the issue is as unserious as a punny car name or as critical as major membership or economic decisions.

Since naming parties aren't set in policy with a 10-day input period, I'm reluctantly willing to compromise—if the people who are concerned about Luigi Vangione genuinely feel that they didn't have the chance to express those concerns before the decision was made, we could have a do-over vote in which the majority decision wins. But if they were aware of the naming party but didn't think it was important enough to attend, it's unfair for them to try to change the naming party's decision now.

Regardless, I hope everyone comes away from this situation with a renewed belief in the importance of participating in our collective decision-making processes.

Comments



The naming party was scheduled during a time that I had regular work for a community business that I founded, and I posted my concerns with ~12 hours of the decision being made. How am I a non-participatory critic?

All managerial decisions are subject to appeals. I don't see why a car name would be an exception to this. } "Pam

-ADDER

I appreciate and echo Jules's call for intentional + wide participation in community process. The ability to be meaningfully civically engaged is one of the things that drew me to Twin Oaks. At the same time, I and the many other people here with packed schedules have to prioritize what we attend - and many of us will choose labor commitments, "clock stamp" community meetings, or feedbacks - not our naming parties. And when time and brain space to review O+Is is short, I'll prioritize those about major policy proposals or costly land use requests. While I love our culture of playful and silly naming parties, the brainstorm list is the kind of O+I I'm less likely to scrutinize if I'm pressed for time.

At a community meeting on, say, setting quotas, I expect controversy, differing views, and maybe even strong feelings. At a car naming party, I expect wacky puns and harmless inside jokes. I don't expect those jokes to be outside of our stated values, whether that value is feminism, egalitarianism, anti-racism, or non-violence. (And yes, my own theory of violence includes structural violence, and I do acknowledge that United Healthcare's business model denied lifesaving care to thousands of people it could have afforded to pay to save the lives of.) But the point remains. Twin Oaks does not endorse killing people, neither through greed nor through guns. Our bylaws are clear on this point - and our tax/legal status depends on it. While attending a naming party does not, in my view, clear the bar for "meaningful civic engagement", I do want to reiterate how much I appreciate Jules's call for vigorous civic participation at Twin Oaks. - Kate } Pam

I find it hilarious how this NPC clings to one stated value "non-violence" while at the same time writing against another stated value "Anti-Racism" previously... Luigi did more than just raise awareness about healthcare injustice, he also raised class-consciousness, which is very important in this capitalist-white-supremacist-hellscape of a country. Also, the implication that Luigi's actions lead to RFK Jr's ascension to power is just dumb.

Miles Woke Mob

To clarify my point re: RFK Jr., the point I'm trying to make is not:

- Mangione's actions caused the rise of RFK Jr.

But rather:

- Mangione's actions clearly did not result in positive healthcare reform.
- Both [support for Mangione's (alleged) actions] and [support for RFK Jr] come from a similar impulse, namely, us vs. them thinking about complicated issues.

-Adder

I'm not the only one who feels your implication of "Luigi's actions lead to RFK Jr" so maybe you're just not very good at communicating your ideas in a way that can actually be clearly understood, so maybe work on that? Also, as to the whole "us vs. them" thing... like it or not, the reality that we now live in is "Fascism" V.S "Anti Fascism" so if you want to play "centrist" you're really just saying "well, they can have a * little bit * of fascism, as a treat" I'm here to say "fuck that." centrists are nothing but spineless fools. I will never give fascists an inch, because they will take a "mile"

→ Miles

5

I'm commenting here because I would like to take accountability for my own role in this process and to voice some serious concerns with the way in which subsequent discussion has proceeded to this point.

I object in the strongest possible terms to characterizing members of this community as "NPCs", even where we're being mindful of describing behavior rather than people. Jules exercised care in this regard but the degree to which this is a slippery slope is demonstrated by Miles immediately crossing a significant moral line by calling Adder an NPC. As I hope the people using this term are not aware, "NPC" is a trope in wide use in contemporary right wing online spaces where it is used to strip people of personhood and mark them as legitimate targets of violence.

"

It also feels to me like there's a mismatch between the naming party that I took part in and Jules' analysis of community dynamics. It's very likely that we are seeing different cross-sections of the community, but I have not personally witnessed an uptick in nonparticipatory complaining. My experience has been quite the opposite. I do hear a great deal of frustration and negative sentiment, but it's coming from highly engaged members as the result of latent contradictions surfacing as those members take the community at its word and try to participate in the work of solving problems. I really appreciate and strongly agree with Jules' position that our being honest with incoming members about this work is good for the community. I have also heard complaints about a tendency toward "rules lawyering" in recent naming processes, which in my opinion is not what's happening here.

There are things in Adder's letter that I agree with strongly and there are things which I disagree with equally strongly, but **the question of whether we are living up to our values should never be dismissed as a frivolous one.** (Indeed, that kind of handwaving is part of the dynamic that's motivating much of the frustration that I see in the community.) I am grateful to Adder for checking me (and all of us) on this point.

"Mushka

To be clear, I voted for "Luigi Vangione" in the first two rounds and "Wicker Van" in the final round. I was charmed by the quality of the pun (it's a great pun). Adder's letter was only one factor that's made me reflect on this decision since then and conclude that it wasn't right action on my part. Kate is also correct that in practical terms it is extremely unwise from a legal and tax standpoint for us to be making public declarations (for example, in written communication with incarcerated people) which could be read as contrary to our bylaws. Seeing someone anonymously write "LOL" on the 3x5 that Kathryn posted expressing concerns and witnessing the subsequent pattern of escalation and inflammatory rhetoric have strengthened my belief that we are not on the right path here. I am sorry for my initial votes, which were not consistent with my own principles or with those of this community and I will try to do better going forward.

} "Pam

During the naming party, I briefly had a half-formed thought that those initial votes were sort of an olive branch. In a discussion on the Twin Oaks Discord server in the immediate aftermath of the assassination of Brian Thompson, several members took issue with my asking that we consider the safety of all members of this community before making statements celebrating political violence on an externally hosted server called "Twin Oaks Community". My anger, frustration, and sadness over the responses I received has since led me to stop participating in the Discord server entirely. Upon reflection I continue to reject the idea that not making performative public statements that endanger your community is moral cowardice or that asking that others not do so is "policing". Our collective understanding of this is reflected in our existing policies on activism by members. Building and sustaining this community and spaces free of class relations generally is a radical project which requires sustained commitment across multiple lifetimes. The struggle is long but it's necessary, meaningful, and worth taking seriously.

} "Pam

6

8
"say" } I would like to make my own position clear in the interest of not being misrepresented. Brian Thompson was a mass murderer and it's facile to say otherwise. Our shared commitment to nonviolence calls for a sophisticated theory of violence which encompasses structural and bureaucratic violence, particularly because we need to be able to recognize those forms of violence at work in community. My own ethical commitments (the same ones which motivate me to live in community) call me to reject all forms of utilitarianism as presupposing positions of moral authority which no actual person can ever occupy. Who are any of us as moral actors to say which people are "the wrong people"? That's a tough commitment to sustain; utilitarianism saturates our culture precisely because it's such a powerful tool for motivated reasoning. Indeed the terms in which Luigi Mangione has allegedly explained his decision to murder Brian Thompson specifically as opposed to any other health insurance executive are aggressively utilitarian.

That kind of motivated reasoning is what I hear at work in the use of othering language like "NPC". In the history of sectarian and inter-ethnic conflict, getting comfortable with the use of othering epithets like this is part of getting comfortable seeing categories of people as devoid of personhood and ultimately as legitimate objects of violence.

I've thought a lot recently about how something which I believe is missing from our culture is "do it, but do it with a heavy heart." A commitment to nonviolence does not mean being a dogmatic pacifist. We can maintain strong convictions regarding the practical necessity of violent acts in the liberatory struggles of marginalized people. We can understand the circumstances motivating the actions which Luigi Mangione is alleged to have taken. Some of us may even understand these alleged actions as part of the same struggle as the work we do in community. But we owe it to ourselves and to the other members of this community, past present and future, to catch ourselves and each other when we cross the line into trivializing or celebrating violence or using language which denies personhood to our fellow members. I am grateful to Adder, Kathryn, and Kate for doing this work. } "fam"

-CHRIS

I should probably re-read the bylaws, but my interpretation of our values around non-violence is that this is an internal commitment, kind of like the Paradox of Tolerance, I see it as a social contract which binds those who are party to it, but ~~doesn't~~ ^{doesn't} apply to those who do not abide its terms, which Brian Thompson and other perpetrators of structural violence have failed to do. Even within the community, I don't think we would view someone using violence to defend themselves from a physical attack to be outside of our values. To me that would be more a value of Pacifism, and I would recommend the book "How Non-Violence Protects the State" for a treatment on that. "fam"

At the same time I don't want people to have to use a name they're uncomfortable with, and I support letting the conversation play out and doing more process. } "fam"

I don't believe violence is a good tool
for social change. I don't want to
be a leftist version of MAGA.

I disagree w/ healthcare for profit. I believe
in universal free healthcare for all people.

I can not condone murder as a tool
for achieving this. I don't believe glorifying
murder achieves this.

I did not attend the naming party b/c
I do not enjoy them. I trusted those
assembled to select a name we all
could mostly live with. I don't think
the group did. I think this is egregious
enough for that name to be overturned

Tiger "Pam"

There are obviously a lot of issues @ play here that go beyond
the scope of naming party practice, but I do want to point out
that past vehicle manager has vetoed the winning naming party
choice before so this is not completely unprecedented. While most of the
time it works out, I view the naming party as the "community recommendation"
to the manager which could ~~be~~ end up being changed. Perhaps it would make it less
more formal veto period? ~~is~~ UPAM (8)

With all respect to Jules (and appreciation for this very interesting paper & comments): Not so long ago, they were making a case that we should change the name of a building called Lland, for ethical reasons.

Now others are saying we should change the name of a vehicle, for (widely varying!) ethical reasons, and

they are saying no, this is bad process? I'm having trouble understanding why this situation is so different from the Lland

name change. Sometimes we have second thoughts about our decisions decades later, sometimes the next morning. It doesn't make sense to me to say we can't reconsider them.

- Lindsey "Pam"

I have a 1-page comment (next page) including snippets from T.O. Policy. Please advise to use too if desired. →
Spice in this page if desired. - Sara



"non-violence" in the Digital T.O. Policy.

[p. 227, a reference to "books on applying non-violence," omitted]

All passages from DTOP updated 02024.02.25.

Other than our gun policy, which is specific to this institution, all references to non-violence occur alongside references to ending all forms of oppression, including class-based (an oppression in which Brian Thompson was a prominent player). Who gets to decide which policy trumps (no pun intended) which? Is there anything prohibiting thoughts or opinions on Luigi Mangione's actions? I don't like the idea of "thought crime" & would prefer this community not go down that path. - Seiya, 21 May '25

DTOP p. 26, Statement of Religious Beliefs

- To eliminate hierarchy in relationships between people.
- To practice non-violence in our personal, interpersonal and political lives.
- To respect and preserve the natural environment for the use of our own and other species, now and in the future.
- To eliminate classism, racism, ageism, patriarchy and other forms of oppression, both in ourselves and in other people.

We are called to both non-violence AND elimination of oppression.

DTOP p. 25 Articles of Incorporation

In order that the residents of Twin Oaks may achieve and preserve a clearer perception of community and realize a more pure and unfettered unity of spirit, the Corporation is organized for the following apostolic and communal purposes: the Corporation shall form and become a self-contained intentional community, having a common treasury and providing for its members and for persons who wish to become members an environment in which they may live in harmony with nature and their fellow humans, a community designed and maintained according to principles of harmony and love. In furtherance of these purposes the community shall endeavor to: eliminate hierarchical relationships between people; promote the practice of non-violence in personal, interpersonal, and political relationships; respect and preserve the natural environment for the use of all species, now and in the future; eliminate classism, racism, ageism, patriarchy, and other forms of oppression, both within and outside of the community; practice community of property, with all those in the community sharing what they are, have, and can produce with one another.

3. Practices non-violence; DTOP p. 35, FEC Constitution Art. III
4. Uses a form of decision-making in which members have an equal opportunity to participate, either through consensus, direct vote of appeal or overrule;
5. Actively works to establish the equality of all people and does not permit discrimination on the basis of race, class, creed, ethnic origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, or gender identity; currently, low-class people can't get health care.
6. Acts to conserve natural resources for present and future generations while striving to continually improve health care.

DTOP p. 82, Gun Policy

Twin Oaks members, visitors and guests will not use or have in their possession guns (or any weapon that might be defined as a gun such as a pistol, shotgun, rifle, etc.) on Twin Oaks property, at any time. This policy is a clear manifestation of our value of non-violence.

Where does it say this applies outside the community?

Chris, your attempt to rebuke me for daring to use the unforgivable term "NPC" is yet another perfect example of white tone policing, logical fallacy, and a continuation of the racist stereotype of Black people being more aggressive and violent. You specifically went after me for using that term more than you did Julie, while in the same sentence implying that the usage of this term will lead to violence. One of the reasons I criticize Addet's "centrist" veneer, as I stated originally, is also due to his public written support of twin oaks having so-called "colorblind" racism in our policy. I used to (naive?) think that anti-racism was another of twin oaks' supposed values, but after seeing the way that I and other POC have been treated and talked to in my 11 months living here, I can now see that this may not be the case, especially since so many of the most vocal white people here don't talk about anti-racism at all compared to this van's joke name, white tone policing, and liberal respectability pearl clutching.

Lindsey, I find it interesting that you chose to bring up the name "Llano" of all things. In the year 1914 the original colonialist community named "Llano" also claimed to be "egalitarian" while at the same time in their own advertisements they called for "Whites Only" as new members. They cowardly hid their racism behind claims of not wanting to rock the boat of the wider society saying "it is not deemed expedient to mix the races in these communities." Their spineless cowardice combined with their racism lead to the continuation of the systems of oppression of their mainstream society, which they claimed to be an alternative to. The parallels to Twin Oaks are feeling very familiar to me right now... Is the name "Llano" really an example of Twin Oaks history that you want to highlight in this discussion?

Miles



Yes. I thought it was a good idea to change the name of the building called "Llano" for these reasons, and I also think it's a good idea to change the name of the van called "Luigi Vangione" for, essentially, the reasons summed up by Shal. - Lindsey

Miles, my position as reflected in my prior comment on this paper is neither "centrist" nor "liberal". Had you shown any curiosity about where I'm coming from you might know that I also feel that this community often errs in its tendency toward liberal respectability politics. You might also know that I have advocated for the inclusion and enfranchisement of members from marginalized backgrounds, including PoC and suggested that the community can and should do better on this front.

There is no double standard in my treatment of your use of the term "NPC" vs Jules'. I was clear in making the distinction between describing behavior (as Jules for the most part did) and describing people (as you did). I was also clear that I felt that Jules' use of the term laid the groundwork for yours.

The difference between describing behavior and describing people is significant. It's the difference between a worldview that says "all of us are capable of making bad choices" and one that says "bad choices are made by bad people". Believing that there are "bad people" is a necessary precondition for creating and scapegoating an outgroup and marking them as legitimate objects of violence. That is the definition of fascism and I am confident to the marrow of my bones that my position is antifascist. I am also confident that my actions in this community are honorable and that I have no need to defend them to you. I am taking the time to make my position clear because I hope that you can understand that you are only isolated here to the extent that you want to be.

This is not the first time that I have seen you engage in hostile, inflammatory, belittling treatment of other members, including PoC. Living in community requires that we see each other as people and that our choices follow from that recognition. I'm not sure how you expect me to work alongside you in the garden or to seek your advice and assistance as Equipment Maintenance manager. I'm not sure how you expect any of the people you've targeted for abuse to feel safe approaching you as a member of Mental Health Team. This is serious. I'm asking you as a fellow member of this community and in a basic person to person sense, please reflect on your actions.

For what it's worth, my own thinking on how we can actualize radical antiauthoritarian commitments in a complex, plural society has been highly influenced by the cultural practices of the struggle for Kurdish autonomy in Rojava. It's something I recommend learning more about if you haven't already.

-CHARIS

At times I have the tendency to want to lash out at people whom I feel are being oppressive, dominating, or annoying. Sometimes the way I express my dissatisfaction (especially if I feel disempowered) is through name-calling and fun puns (read: "mean jokes"). This can also be a good way to score points with people that agree with me, and against those who are "in the wrong". I think many of us can relate to using these kinds of methods of communication from time to time. However, our general agreement

at Twin Oaks is to treat each other more respectfully than that, especially when we are in disagreement with each other. Our bylaws state that we "Strive to treat all people in a kind, gentle, honest and fair manner, without violence or competition. I feel bothered by the use of disrespectful language that has shown up in this paper and in the discussion around this topic, and want to invite more non-violent communication and openness/curiosity towards opposing views.

"Jessie
"CHRIS
"Pam

 Hawing

How would we feel about
NAMING something Kyle Ritter house?

-Tiger-

Genuinely curious about the tone policing of queer people & poc in this discussion. To me, Jules and Miles have matched the original tone of Adder's original letter, but I see no mention of that. Fascinating.

-Seya

"&

I agree that naming a car for Luigi Vangione would endanger our legal and tax status, so I want that name changed.

I had not thought it through before and was sympathetic to Jules enthusiasm. But reading the serious concerns raised has shifted my view to be very concerned about possible severe retribution against Twin Oaks Community.

And it is ~~against~~ policy that political statements and activism must not implicate Twin Oaks.

? double negative not intended? Pam

I understand that the man killed had caused many people to die by denying health care, and I sympathize with the motivation to make a statement of support for the assassin. And a statement from Twin Oaks would carry more weight than from individuals.

However making a political statement that implicates Twin Oaks is dangerous to our Community, since any retribution would be against Twin Oaks, not specifically against the individual people who voted for the name. So those making political statements that are connected with Twin Oaks, or voting for a name, are not just bravely taking risk on themselves, they would be putting risk of serious retribution on our Community. That would be dangerous to others living here, especially those who have made this their long term home.

100%
-CHAS

Those risks are especially high now, since Republicans have just passed a law that allows tax exempt status to be revoked based on only an accusation of affiliation with terrorists, no due process or proof required, and want to use that against tax exempt organisations they do not like.

About participation in community decisions:

We cannot all be at every meeting, which is why final decisions that have important effects on our Community are not made in meetings, so the rest of the members can participate. Car naming parties usually do decide the name because the names have almost always been harmless puns or inside jokes, but the vehicle manager can veto a name if it is not harmless or is controversial.

I also agree that referring to people as NPC's is a form of othering and demeaning people and I want that to not be done within Twin Oaks.

- IN COMMUNITY,
SHAL

100% ditto -
Lindsay "Mushka" Pam

(14)

I am actually relieved to see conversations about politics/social justice/social change happening here... It is so rare. I do find it interesting that we have been completely silent over the last year and a half whilst living through one of the worst genocides in recorded history. Human Rights Watch says 14,000 babies are at risk of dying in Gaza due to ^{the} Israeli military blocking aid. Where is the outcry about those lives? Why is one billionaire's life more important than ~~the~~ Palestinian children, or low-income sick folks ^{in the US}? It is the billionaire class that is responsible for destroying the planet, their greed and self-importance that allows and perpetuates ethnic cleansing ^{and the police state exists to protect and serve?}. It is all connected. None of these issues exist in ~~the~~ a vacuum. Class solidarity is part of supporting the most marginalized among us. How many "murders" was Brian Thompson responsible for? — Jeli 5123

"Lindsey"
"Jeli"

P.S. We have a building named after an Israeli kibbutz (deganah) ⁽¹⁵⁾ can we change that?

I'd like to point out that being ok with not naming the vehicle LV does not necessarily reflect one's personal viewpoint on Luigi Mangione.

I liked (and voted for) the LV name, but given the values-based objections to LV and how deeply it was bothering some cos, I changed my mind about supporting it as a vehicle name. I don't think we're all going to agree on a single interpretation of "non-violence" but I think there's room for a spectrum of interpretations/philosophies at Twin Oaks.

(But maybe we should have a veto period before naming parties or something) - M-shika

A veto period wouldn't have changed anything. The original topic of this paper was process; no one objected during the naming.

Also, Mangione is pleading "not guilty," and I don't like seeing this anti-process white mob form. Look inside and examine that.

I do agree with shal that fear of the state is legitimate. Twin Oaks does not take political positions, but individuals do.

continued →

You can't control social trends with policy, so we all know what the Van's name is, even if we refuse to say it for fear of the state. I remember Red Pens ^{rational}

and I remember Darth Dingo.

- Arlo

"Lindsay"



PS: If you want to live with other people, you can't dismiss their points because they're emotional. It's a privilege to not be emotional.



H X D E 2 R

Chris, you have arrogantly continued on your blind path of the slippery slope logical fallacy by implying that my single evil usage of the (redefined) term NPC (Non-Participatory-Critic) means I "must" believe Alder is a "bad person" and is therefore possibly a "target of legitimate violence" and therefore I am the "real fascist" due to what I have written here. Pretty serious implied accusations against me, which I would be concerned about, if your words weren't so laughably hollow and easy to refute. Your laser focused pearl clutching on my single usage of this "evil" term is an example of your distorted priorities. Your repeated implications that my words or opinions will lead to violence is as disgustingly censorious as it is Racist. It feels like you're claiming that I will be the next Luigi???

I'm not sure how your bringing up my hard work and good labor in the garden, EQM, or MHT is relevant to my personal opinions here, but I will not allow you to push me out of labor that I enjoy, am good at, and which this community needs. If you choose not to work with me because of my opinions, that's your choice and I won't miss you in my labor scene.

- Miles VangiWokie

I think this conversation is one worth having, but I also think this conversation on this particular forum, is proving to be unproductive. If this conversation is to continue, I would like to see it be in person with a moderator. This paper is oozing too many bad vibes. Can we please let it die and be reborn in a more productive format.

- Naomi "Pam"

"Jessie" ☺

REG V B D E M

It seems like a big issue this conversation is running into is that it's very unclear what the topic is. It seems like there are three main ones we are dancing between (below). Please comment to add agenda topics!

Sign if willing to moderate a community mtg on the topics below (so PTM doesn't have to):

1. Impacts of how one chooses to participate (or not participate) in community. (because this seems to be the original intended topic of the paper + there is another paper currently up about this)

Moderator is _____, _____, or _____

Agenda:

2. What does it mean to be apart of a non-violent community in the context of our current political climate? (As this seems to be at the heart of the original naming conflict)

Moderator is _____, _____, or Jessie

Agenda:

-Actions/Conduct vs. Abstract Moral Positions (pls see)

3. What does accountability look like in community and how should it look? (This paper touches on this a bit + there are other papers currently up about this + it seems like it's on a lot of people's minds rn)

Moderator is _____, _____, or _____

Adgenda:

-Providing a space for newer & marginalized members to feel heard w/out condemnation (p6940) -Naomi

Thanks Naomi. I support moving to m-person discussion. I'm not up to facilitating myself. Pam

Thank you for the initiative, Naomi, good idea. I know there were others still working on writing up their thoughts & personally I would still like them to post those so their energy wasn't "wasted" -Sara

↳ if this is the case for you, please strongly consider saving it for an in person meeting.

-Naomi

If you think wacky names for things of the community have not previously been taken as "harmful" and against the community values then I have 4 words for you: "The Obsolescence of Feminism."

-Harlock 4 being doomed to repeat history

- 1.) I really appreciate Jules' naming and exploration of non-participatory-criticism. I have definitely noticed the stark change in retention+culture because of the invitation into TO political process from "the establishment", and the excitement of new members to engage. It has been difficult for me to describe the change. I have complicated feelings around members who I was friends with, who engaged in a sympathetic, but ultimately unhelpful NPC discourse. The utility of this term is so strong that I don't want to completely abandon it. I think using it as a verb/noun instead of an adjective/name would help make it feel less derogatory, but we can workshop it. (I also find it kind of poetic how I think cos referenced in the past engaging in NPC would've loved the name Luigi Vangioni)
- 2.) I don't think the veto of Luigi Vangioni is NPC. Appeals are part of the political process at TO, and look at this lively participatory conversation it's sparked. I do think that the new form of NPCism that really worries me is the way that membership process has been run recently. The process of no engagement with conflict for 6 months, however many pieces of criticising input out of nowhere, a feedback where nothing can be addressed, just feels toxic and unhelpful.
- 3.) I've always found the non-violence tenant of TO to be the most disagreeable/inactionable. Anti-racism, egalitarianism, these are actionable, pragmatic ideas that can be implemented in a community setting, while non-violence seems more like a political/philosophical stance, almost akin to virtue-signaling (in that it's non-actionable,) with no agreed upon interpretation. It seems to me its primary use is when cos use their interpretation to rules-lawyer away something co doesn't like. Violent media, BDSM, luigi vangioni. It's all just drawing the line in a different place in the sand. I think that non-violence and anti-violence is actually a useful and real distinction that I use when reading TO values. To me non-violence means not using violence, while anti-violence would mean condemning violence in all forms, which is a difficult philosophical take to stick to. I can recognize how violence played a key role in liberatory struggles (almost all anti-colonial movements, WW2, blair mountain, MK in South Africa,) while also recognizing that political violence often hurts innocents, attracts reprisal, and is just generally very morally nuanced (vangioni doesn't hold a candle to these movements though.) In PDU history, I'm not going to teach that the union soldiers during the civil war were evil for using violence. I do use nuance when teaching violence in history, but I don't just wholly condemn it because "TO is a non-violent community." Should we condemn all those other liberatory movements too? Inactionable and differing interpretations make me think non-violence is a nothing-burger value.
- 4.) I am unconcerned with the idea that somehow Luigi Vangioni is going to get into the hands of right-wing militias/feds, and TO will be targeted in a right-wing reprisal. But the fear is valid. And ultimately, being uncomfortable with the name and calling for a veto is also valid.
- 5.) This discourse is not ideal, from all sides, including tone-policing. Of course name calling is meaner, but also a lot of the anti-vangioni comments use a righteous, indignant, patronizing tone that all but says you are stupid and evil for supporting the name. One is meaner (but maybe more subjectively sympathetic in its left-wingedness,) but they're both valid in their feelings/reasoning of having values undermined, and its clearly about more than a van name. It often takes understanding and addressing root feelings to tone down anger. Condemning O+I comments/3x5s usually makes people dig in more. We shouldn't use angry tones/bullying when discussing community topics, it sometimes warrants public condemnation and censorship. But this discussion and the feelings behind it are complicated, I'm sympathetic to both sides' reasoning/feelings, and I've seen heated conversations resolved more productively in the past. I want to delete this whole section because it feels so useless. I'm not seeking to do any of that hard work, but I want us to try and avoid fueling angry infighting/tone-policing when a more empathetic approach hasn't even been attempted.
- 6.) We should re-name degania. I nominate "Anares". It's communist + non-violently established.

and personal instead of public (continued) QMMR? (21)

I post this now as I dk if I can attend
a meeting, and I often find them to be not
very well attended. I'm sorry if this sparks more
hard feelings, hope we can talk in person if it does,
rather than over the O+I. - QUMR