



# EXHIBIT J

Lori Parker &lt;alizaunde@gmail.com&gt;

---

## Working with other officers

2 messages

**An Tir Seneschal** <seneschal@antir.org>

Fri, Oct 20, 2017 at 12:58 PM

To: Kingdom Family Activities Officer &lt;familyactivities@antir.org&gt;

Hello Alizand.

Based on your recent post to your FaceBook feed, you appear to be confused as to your duties in the office of YAFA Deputy, specifically that of the need to work cooperatively with both Kingdom Officers and your fellow Seneschal Deputies.

This is not the first time there has been a great deal of unnecessary conflict and resistance when you have been asked to follow certain procedures. In this case, the Social Media Deputy, Mistress Isabella (Mary Larose on FB), gave you some instructions to follow regarding the An Tir YAFA FaceBook page. She supplied the link to the SCA Social Media Policy. The conversation appeared to go fine at first but then you chose to be resistant to what she was telling you, which is when she brought me in.

Both the Social Media Deputy and the YAFA Deputy offices report to the Kingdom Seneschal Office; as such, I requested that you follow the instructions that Isabella gave you regarding the page. Your response to both of us was silence, and your response on your FB newsfeed was:

“So, yesterday I learned just how much of a sheep I am NOT. Don't tell me to do a thing, because you said so. Don't refuse to answer my question "why?", and only repeat "because I said so". Especially when I give you printed proof that what you ask me to do is contrary to what is in print. "Because I said so" is NOT an answer, nor is it a viable reason ( Because I'm not under 18 any more!). The above scenario is guaranteed to have me figure out the best and clearest way to NOT do what you tell me to. So no. I didn't do what you wanted. Tough. Why didn't I? BECAUSE.”

And to one of the comments to that post, you responded: “Yes. Because I said so is never a good reason. I'm actually starting to keep a log. Intimidation is bullying.”

I am truly at a loss as to why we continually end up in conflict situations between you and other officers or deputies. The fact that you are being asked by a fellow deputy to follow certain procedures is not bullying, it's a request for you to comply with policies and/or instructions that are either Kingdom or SCA. The fact that I asked you politely to comply with what Isabella has asked of you is not bullying.

I do see that you are enthusiastic about this program, and have worked hard to support YAFA activities as we get it up and running in An Tir. However, we are at a crossroads because this kind of behaviour cannot continue. If you can work cooperatively with other

Officers and Deputies, you can continue in this position. If you are unable to do that necessary part of this job, I will have no choice but to ask you to step down.

-----  
Regards,

Viscountess Lenora Truble (Tami Hayes)  
Kingdom Seneschal, An Tir  
[seneschal@antir.org](mailto:seneschal@antir.org)

---

**Kingdom Family Activities Officer** <familyactivities@antir.org>  
To: "alizaunde@gmail.com" <alizaunde@gmail.com>

Sun, Oct 22, 2017 at 5:28 PM

forwarded

*HL Alizand Thorgeirsson née LeFevre*

*Kingdom Family Activities Coordinator-An Tir*  
[familyactivities@antir.org](mailto:familyactivities@antir.org)  
[alizaunde@gmail.com](mailto:alizaunde@gmail.com)

---

**From:** Kingdom Family Activities Officer  
**Sent:** Friday, October 20, 2017 4:09 PM  
**To:** An Tir Seneschal  
**Subject:** Re: Working with other officers

Greetings Madam Seneschal-

I have had issues with 3 officers- the Background Check officer (the issue long since rectified and at rest), the A&S officer (at your behest, I've agreed to a deputy Liaison, which I've heard nothing about since, and continue to wait patiently for) and now the Media Officer. I hadn't really thought this amounted to a lack of desire to work with other officers, especially since I successfully work with so many other Kingdom officers and deputies.

I've had the Facebook page up for over a year. I vetted my proposal with several people who run similar pages, and was told to just make sure it was unofficial. I've advertised this page everywhere, including my business cards and media postings. It wasn't a secret group-

I had the standard disclaimer (which I found in the Media Policy as I was reading it!) listed as my description. Its purpose was to have a place for Yafa families, Mentors and officers to discuss ideas, victories and problems. It was put in place as an unofficial \*spot\* since I lacked any other web presence, and still do.

Did I make it closed? I don't think I really paid any attention, nor did I care. However, in hindsight, being a closed group allows for finer control over who joins, and keeps content unavailable for just anybody to see. In these days of pedophilia, identity theft and more, it certainly seems a good idea to keep it that way, since pictures of children are displayed occasionally.

In that year, I have had no issues or problems.

Then you joined the list, and the Media officer, and suddenly, everything I done to set it up was wrong.

Point 3-At the time of the initial contact, I was not at home, but I was able to delete the event in question. I could clearly see her point. It didn't set up the way I thought it would- I was trying to set up a link. It didn't work. I had no problem getting rid of it.

Point 2- Admin- I added the second admin. No problem. Simply good practice that I had neglected to consider.

Point 3- Open versus closed group- here is where I have questions. And they remain unanswered today.

Yes- I was given the Media policy. And I read it.

Section 3a says:

*a. The Corporation is only interested in regulating any presence that **purports to be a public channel of communication** for one of the following: the SCA corporation; an SCA branch or Kingdom; a branch, Kingdom, or Society/Corporate Officer (including Crowns, Coronets, and Territorial Baronages); an officially recognized nonbranch group within a Kingdom (such as a guild or polling order), or a major, separately managed interkingdom war, hereafter known as Society entities. Insofar as a presence seeks to hold itself out as an official resource of a Society entity it must comply with this policy. Presences for households and other groups not officially recognized by Society policy are not covered by this policy.*

I see that, under section 3a- I could be considered as qualifying- although I never ever "purported" the page to be official, in fact, just the opposite.

- the page was always "unofficial" and was labeled as such in the description from day 1. Due to the conversation, I then made sure to label the group as "unofficial" on the actual title to assure that there would be no confusion at all.

Mary-Rose's comments were unclear at this point. I reviewed the media policy again, and according to section 3c- there was no reason for me to make it an official page- It was not covered by the media policy at that time the whole conversation was initiated and still wasn't when she began the conversation again in the last few days.

Both sections 3C and 3D specifically state that \*2\* pieces MUST be in place for the page to be official-

In fact, section 3C and 3D are quite clear-

*c. A presence that meets the criteria in “subsection a” that does **not** allow the public to view any content unless the individual is subscribed or otherwise approved as a member of the relevant group **will not be covered by the policy**. For these presences, the relevant policies for the Webminister’s office apply.*

*d. Two criteria determine if the presence is covered under this policy: Is the presence perceived as the official voice of the given Society entity? Can anyone access and consume the content of the presence from the first moment they find it with no further action taken? **If your communications do not meet one of these criteria, the policies herein are not binding.***

By maintaining the page as "Closed" - it, as per Facebook policy, is not viewable by the public, and therefore, per section C and D the policy is not applicable.

And so, the way I read this, the page was never under the media officer's purview. By making the last change she asked for, it certainly would be. My question still stands- Why should it? It has been happily functioning for over a year now.

I have done everything else she asked.

Last night, seeing her refusal to further discuss the issue (she did not allow me to respond to her past statements), and her refusal to answer my question, I alleviated the situation in the best way possible- I removed myself from the Admin position. I cannot, according to Facebook Help, give over ownership to anyone, but by not being an Admin, I am no longer an officer in charge of the page. That should satisfy her. There will be no implied "Official" presence. This way, the page maintains its history and membership without the upheaval that erasing the page would cause. I had hope this would end the issue.

Initially, I asked her to explain why the page needed to be opened, and all she could tell me was

Because that is Society rules. I am not sure why you wouldn't want that. It gives more families an opportunity to find you

But it is NOT Society rules- as defined by the media policy. I only had 1 criteria, not both. And she still won't answer me as to what benefit it will give. Any Families that need to find me can find me via the official contact information on the Webpage and the newsletter. Upon considering the aspects of an OPEN group, I'm still not convinced it is the right move.

I hope this has addressed any questions you have concerning my motives. I am happy to answer any additional questions you may have.

*As always~*

*In Service~*

*HL Alizand Thorgeirsson née LeFevre*

*Kingdom Family Activities Coordinator-An Tir*

[familyactivities@antir.org](mailto:familyactivities@antir.org)

[alizaunde@gmail.com](mailto:alizaunde@gmail.com)

---

**From:** An Tir Seneschal

**Sent:** Friday, October 20, 2017 12:58 PM

**To:** Kingdom Family Activities Officer

**Subject:** Working with other officers

[Quoted text hidden]

---

 **Social Media Discussion.pdf**  
518K