



Freeman Ng <tenorslowworm@gmail.com>

Recent Facebook Post

11 messages

Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>
Reply-To: Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>
To: Freeman Ng <freeman@freemanng.net>

Wed, Dec 10, 2025 at 4:41 PM

Freeman,

This letter serves as a formal request that you discontinue public statements or posts that may mischaracterize the actions, decisions, or intentions of the current Board or its members.

Your recent Facebook post revisited matters already resolved by the Association and presented them in a manner that may lead to confusion among owners regarding the Board's current work. Additionally, continued public commentary of this nature risks further dividing the community and contributing to a hostile environment.

The current Board is actively working to reunite the community and bring an end to ongoing hostility. Public statements that reopen past disputes or question the Board's integrity undermine those efforts and further erode the good-faith attempts being made to restore trust and cooperation among owners.

To prevent further misunderstandings and continued division, I am requesting that you cease making public statements that could reasonably be interpreted as misrepresenting Board actions, motives, or deliberations without authorization or factual basis.

Please be advised that the Association reserves all rights to pursue appropriate remedies should inaccurate or misleading statements continue. At this time, this communication is intended solely as a formal request that future communications remain accurate, constructive, and consistent with officially documented information.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Freeman Ng <Freeman@freemanng.net>
To: Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>

Thu, Dec 11, 2025 at 5:38 PM

There are so many ways to reply that come to my mind, and I'm going to write them all.

Happy reading!

Reply #1: The Irony

Your email actually supports much of what I believe and say about the current board majority.

Reply #2: Possibly Faulty Intelligence

It's interesting that you're targeting me. Had you ever been willing to just talk with me, you might be aware that I'm actually the current board majority's best friend in the Owners Group. (And to some extent yours personally as well.)

Reply #3: Say What?

Which statements of mine are you specifically objecting to? And why wouldn't you simply respond to them in the public FB group and disagree with me openly there, so that we could have, you know, a *discussion* of the *issues* that other owners could consider and weigh in on themselves?

I did see you recently joined the group, and have been hoping it was for that very reason.

It still can be.

Reply #4: The National Context

Speaking of FB, I just looked over your profile and see you were in a protest at the Capitol holding a sign reading, "Dissent is Patriotic."

Do you no longer believe in the value of dissent?

Reply #5: Sez You?

Are you speaking for the entire board in your email? Did the entire board discuss what its contents should be? I ask because my next reply will be to the entire board, unless it was only a subset, and then I'll just reply to that subset.

Also: Are you personally 100% in agreement with everything the email says, or are you just dutifully delivering the message you as a group decided on?

Reply #6: My Sympathy

I appreciate the tough position you're in. You're a new board member thrust into a situation in which there's a lot of past baggage which you had no part in, and you've been asked to be the friendly face of the board. I do accept the value of your mission, but I'd love to learn if you're doing more: if, in addition to mollifying upset over board actions and attitudes, you're also personally aware yourself of its problems, and are trying behind the scenes to help it get better.

If this is what you are in fact doing, we should definitely talk. I'd love to have more hope.

Reply #7: An Offer

I'm going to repeat this later, but am squeezing it now, in case you don't read much further. (Some of my upcoming replies are going to be much more wordy.) I'd like to make you an offer to forget you ever sent this email. I think that might be in the best interest of the future peace of the community, but I'll leave it up to you.

Reply #8: Three Boards

The previous board made the critical mistake, when under attack, of assuming that answers and explanations they gave at board meetings would be sufficient to clear things up. What they didn't realize was that very few people attended those meetings, and that there was communication going on through other channels they weren't aware of. I emailed three members of the board in early 2024 telling them that if they didn't start communicating better to the entire ownership, they'd be voted off the board. I underestimated the threat.

I think the current board majority might have learned a lesson from the fate of the previous board, that they saw how the previous board was undone through the weaponization of complaints against them, and have decided the solution is to suppress those complaints in their turn. The problem with the previous board was weakness and naïveté. And maybe they're right. Maybe the course they've chosen is the safest way to hold onto power. But I think there's a third way I'd love to see tried.

I'd like to suggest to the next board (or this one if it stays in power next year) that there's a better way to handle such attacks: openness. Accept the complaints patiently and civilly, which the first board did as well, but go beyond the first board in this: respond publicly, seeking to engage as much of ownership at large as possible in the issue, making it plain who is complaining, what their complaints are, and each side's facts and reasons.

This seems to me to be a better way, because in the first place it's more democratic, but also because it's the only way to prevent the same thing from happening over and over again. As I emailed to Barb McLean at one point last year: It's easy to demonize anybody. Just take everything they do in the worst possible light. The solution? More light.

But maybe I'm naive myself. Maybe we could never engage enough of the ownership to overcome the news bubbles and echo chambers that can be so much more easily created. Maybe the current board majority is right that their way is the only way to govern in our particular situation.

I'd be happy to discuss this, any time.

Reply #9: A Hypothetical

Imagine a hypothetical group that decided at some point, due to an HOA dispute they were involved in, that they had to get rid of every party that wronged them in that dispute. There was nothing wrong with having a preference about who should serve on the board, or for that preference to be shaped by that experience, and nothing wrong with bringing the facts of their situation to the attention of their fellow owners, but they did much more than that.

- They weaponized every possible complaint against the board, even on issues where they agreed with the board.
- They demonized individuals rather than debate policies in a public, civil way that would preserve the peace of the community in its aftermath.
- They spread (or did nothing to stop) misinformation and conspiracy theories that favored them.
- They engaged in questionable electoral tactics to enable and win a vote of ouster.

Now suppose this group achieved all its aims: every board member involved in the original dispute was eventually voted or bullied off the board, and even the management company was booted. Now they were in control, but they had two problems:

1. What if the people they ousted tried to fight back using the same methods which had proven so effective?
2. What if the ownership at large learned about their past questionable tactics?

Finally, imagine that they responded to these dangers in the following ways:

- Suppressing speech. (Say, for example, by trying to shut down Resident Concerns at the board meetings).
- Adopting a message of "let's just move forward and not have any more conflict" after being the instigators and beneficiaries of massive conflict that brought them into power in the first place.
- Sending certain individuals that they identified (rightly or wrongly) as ringleaders of the opposition emails like you just sent me.

Imagine that entire hypothetical situation and then answer this question: How would that hypothetical board look any different from how the current board majority looks right now?

You might feel you know better, but if you do, it's due to inside information you have about the people you know. Think of how it would look to an impartial, outside observer.

Do you see the problem now?

Reply #10: It's Not Just "He Said She Said"

The difference between this hypothetical board and the Owners Group is that almost everything the group or I have done has been public.

- The FB group is one that any City Walk person can join (a far more democratic alternative to the email you sent me would have been to simply join the group and disagree with me there.)
- I used to do City Walk Zooms to discuss important HOA issues and would always invite Ray and Bob and others in your group, but none of you ever accepted.
- CityWalkTalk is a forum that any City Walk owner or resident can read and join. Anybody that creates an account can post.
- The Owners Group meetings themselves are open. David attended once, and so did Barb, and they were allowed to express their opinions and disagree with things that were said.
- The upcoming Candidates Forum is open to all attendees, and anyone planning to run for the board will be allowed to speak.
- I regularly send audio recordings with AI-generated transcripts to people on my City Walk Talk mailing list, which any owner can ask to join. (If you'd like to hear more of what I say to fellow owners, just ask to join the list.)
- I continue to work on my mission to get as many fellow owners engaged with the governance of our HOA as I can even if they end up disagreeing with me.

So it's not a case of "he said, she said." It's a more a case of, "he said through secretive means (and threatening emails) while resisting any open discussion of his claims; she said publicly, inviting all interested parties to hear both sides."

So again: maybe you feel you know better, but if you were a brand new owner here and you saw an apparent factional fight going on, and one side was doing and saying everything publicly and the other was suppressing speech, which way would you initially lean in your sympathies?

Reply #11: A Reference to the National Scene Again

- The shutting down of Resident Concerns
- The antipathy toward the petition drive to restore it that led some supporters of the current board to tear down bulletin board announcements of it as quickly as they could be put back up (and that led to private angry outbursts

against me by both Ray and Barb)

- The threats to dissolve committees or to depose their heads
- Your email

Do such tactics feel to you more Democratic or MAGA?

Reply #12: A Renewed Offer

In the hope you've read this far, I'll repeat my earlier offer: Are you sure you'd rather not just forget you ever sent this email? I really truly believe, honestly trying to take your side of things, that it was a mistake to send it. If I were the pure troublemaker that some frame me to be, I'd jump at this chance make hay with this clear example of authoritarian bullying. But I believe you can do better, and that for you to do better is the hope for future peace in this community, and so I'm giving you a chance to "undo" your "send."

Reply #13: Peace vs. Justice

There's a classic progressive slogan that there can be no peace without justice. I agree with this 100% when it comes to national and international politics, but I'm currently struggling with it in the context of City Walk. I believe the current board majority has acted unjustly in the past, but I'm not sure how practical or possible it will ever be to seek justice in that regard, especially when justice is not likely to lead to peace.

I currently have no problems with any of the major HOA decisions the board has made: not to the management company change, and certainly not to the increase in the Reserve Fund transfers.

(If I were to act like the hypothetical hypocritical board from earlier, I might weaponize these decisions in turn, seeking out anybody unhappy with either and enlisting their votes. But I won't because I have no real problem with them, and in fact, in the case of the Reserve Fund transfers, I've been actively campaigning for them for a long time now, and I've praised the board publicly for them. In fact, something that has always puzzled me is why the board wouldn't distribute the attached Reserve Committee report to all the owners. They even secretly voted No to it back in 2024 but never actually replied to us, just ghosting us as a way of saying no. But now, it would actually help them stay in power. There are going to be owners upset by the HOA fee increase, but this document explains why a big part of that increase was necessary.)

The only problem I currently have (again, not counting my upset at their past behavior) is how they've continued to conduct themselves: the suppression of speech and generally authoritarian attitudes (even more so now that I've received this chillingly Orwellian email), their self-righteous rudeness to questioners and other perceived enemies, their secretiveness, their locking out of non-majority members of the board as if having the majority of votes exempted them from collaboration, and their lack of procedural rigor.

I just want them to be a mature and professional board, and there's no reason I can think of why, having achieved their tactical goals (the removal of the past board and management company) they can't simply turn to this new challenge.

I do agree they've gotten much better lately. (And have said so publicly, once at the end of a meeting.) It's just that they really have so much further to go. (When I tell friends about some of the stuff that goes on here, they're just flabbergasted.) And, of course, this email itself sets off all my alarms and makes me wonder if I was completely wrong after all to see things as improving in the first place.

Would it really hurt so much to:

- Try running the meetings better, or failing that, to accept the help of a parliamentarian to guide you through them? (I've heard there could be genuinely serious liability concerns about a board that makes the vast majority of its decisions in completely undocumented ways.)
- Respond to questions and criticisms civilly and with an openness to improve (as I saw Ray do once, and publicly praised him for it) rather than acting aggrieved or condescending or autocratic?
- Value committees and the opportunity they give you to lighten your own workloads by delegating less important chores to others, welcoming owners who want to help out?
- Communicate better with owners about what's going on and why?
- Communicate better with their own choice of management company? (At least, I hear about lots of frustration from FSR at how uncommunicative the board can be.)

90% of the above seems to me like it's just a question of common decency. How I'm sure every board member is already naturally inclined to treat people--unless they've decided to tag them as Irredeemable Enemies.

Reply #14: A Secret Weapon for Ray

Maybe Ray's not planning to run in January, or maybe he's planning to run but has no fears about getting the required votes, but if he's planning to run and wants to get as many votes as possible, or if he just wants to weaken the Owners Group generally, I have a secret weapon to suggest:

He should go to all the people he's publicly insulted in the past and apologize, and he should do it in a way that's as visible and public as possible. This would take a lot of wind out of a lot of sails in the Owners Group, because most people are very emotional in their actions. His past behavior has a disproportionate effect on people's motivations today, and my great fear is the next time he'll blow up at someone, privately or publicly, exacerbating the conflict even further. If he stops that and makes amends for past offenses, people might not know what to do with it! He'll have his "enemies" in complete disarray.

Reply #15: A Secret Weapon for You

Here's another way you might have written your email that would have been much more effective:

Freeman, could we talk about some comments you've made in the Facebook group? We think you've been mischaracterizing our actions. Why don't we discuss them? We'll tell you which statements we're talking about, and you can tell us what you're seeing in us that led you to make them. Maybe you're misinterpreting some of our actions, or don't know about some things behind the scenes. On our side, maybe there are some things we could improve, as no one's perfect. Let's talk and find out.

Reply #16: Sez Me

To reference wider politics again: It's generally authoritarian factions that are better able to stay in lockstep. Pro-Democracy movements tend to be less united. You hear a lot of complaints from U.S. Democrats about how ineffective their leadership can be, but part of that is due to this natural difference in mindsets.

All this is to say that everything I've written here is only my own opinion, and not necessarily the opinion of anyone else in the Owners Group. As I hinted at before: it would be a mistake to assume I was the leader of the group and that we all believed the same things about everything. There are some owners in the group quite at odds with me over certain issues, as I'm not thrilled with certain actions or attitudes of others. But we're largely united in wanting a well-run, responsive, and civil HOA, as you do.

hope is the roped off queue
of the TSA check-in

forcing me along a flip-flopping path
that could be more direct

especially when
there's no one else in the line

but back and forth I go
along those empty iterations

constrained by limp synthetic cords
that couldn't stop a child

I'm conditioned to obey them
to hold to the zigzag way

leading up to the machines
that will finally reveal

what's in my heart
and my baggage

Yours in Community,

Freeman

|| [Freeman Ng - www.AuthorFreeman.com](http://www.AuthorFreeman.com)
 || [Bridge Across The Sky - an Angel Island novel](http://www.BridgeAcrossTheSky.com)
 || [Trumpbert - a parody of Dilbert](http://www.Trumpbert.com)
 || [Haiku Diem - a daily haiku feed](http://www.HaikuDiem.com)

*

[Quoted text hidden]

 **City Walk Reserve Fund report - 2024-10-25.pdf**
387K

Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>
To: Freeman Ng <freeman@freemanng.net>

Thu, Dec 11, 2025 at 7:27 PM

Freeman,

My previous communication was intended to encourage a more constructive and respectful approach when discussing the Board's actions and decisions within our community. My hope is always to foster an environment where dialogue is productive and aims towards collective solutions, rather than perceived as undermining the efforts of those serving on the Board.

Regarding your recent post concerning the Reserve, while comprehensive background can be valuable, there is a sentiment that a more concise presentation of key outcomes and decisions might be more effectively absorbed by the community. Focusing on the essential information allows for clarity and reduces the potential for misinterpretation or feeling overwhelmed by extensive detail.

Ultimately, my aim is to promote positive and collaborative engagement among all residents. I believe that by focusing on factual, solution-oriented communication, we can better achieve harmony and progress for our community.

Kari

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

On Thursday, December 11, 2025, 7:15 PM, Kari Aaeng <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com> wrote:

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Freeman Ng <freeman@freemanng.net>
Date: December 11, 2025 at 5:38:43 PM CST
To: Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Recent Facebook Post

[Quoted text hidden]

Freeman Ng <Freeman@freemanng.net>

Fri, Dec 12, 2025 at 6:53 PM

To: Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>, Raymond Aguirre <raya.72918@gmail.com>, "G. ROBERT MCLEAN" <grmpllc@comcast.net>, David Radcliff <b4igo2him@yahoo.com>, JO DRAIN <lady_jo60@hotmail.com>

Kari, since you didn't answer my question about whether it was the whole board or just part of it that discussed and authorized your email to me, I'm now responding to all the board members.

Were you all in agreement about the tenor and tone of the email? Would none of you prefer to simply join the FB group and reply to whatever comment of mine you're upset with, stating your side of the story in public? Do any of you at least feel you could have engaged with me in this real way in the email? (e.g. by actually specifying what I said that upset you?)

I invite you all to consider the third option from Reply #8 below (starting with "I'd like to suggest to the next board"). It's a far better way to deal with questions and complaints. A way that would *increase* people's support for you.

Ray, I invite you to consider Reply #14 below. I'm telling you: it would seriously discombobulate many members of the owners group. In fact, you could do this at the annual meeting. I would initiate the applause in response to it. It would also increase support for you. If you decide to give it a try, let me know and I can give you a list of people I know of that you could address. (We aren't always aware when we've offended someone.)

David, were you part of the discussions about the email, or were you locked out again?

Kari, the one item from my email you responded to was the question of the Reserve Fund analysis.

- If you'd like to try coming up with a more concise summary of the issues than the two-pager we produced, that would be great. More concise is always better, as long as no essential information or readability is lost in the process.
- But it's funny to me that you're only giving this reasoning now. At least two members of the current board majority were members of the Reserve Committee at the time. They saw all the emails that went back and forth as we worked on the drafts and never said a word.
- Nor did they say a word after the board voted secretly to reject the report, not even to inform us of the decision. This fit a pattern I've noticed over the two years I've attempted to engage them: a tactic of "running out the clock."
- Meanwhile, we've only gotten positive feedback on the analysis. People are actually grateful to be informed, despite the tough news. You can explain things to people, and if your reasons are sound, they'll accept them.
- Finally, an even better approach to replacing the current two--pager with something more concise would be to offer owners both. Some might like it more simple. Others might like more detail. There are very nice YouTube videos of concepts like gravity being explained at five levels of difficulty: first as if to a kindergartener, then to an older child, etc., etc. I'm all for more communication to the owners.
- But until there's a better or additional version, I'll continue making efforts to distribute the current one.

I think I have an idea now, though, what the real reason might have been for the current board majority to oppose distributing the report: because it interfered with the narrative that got them elected and that continues to justify their heavy-handed approach to questions and criticisms: a narrative that the previous board was responsible for the terrible financial mess we were in, and that the new board were the only ones who could fix it.*

* This, by the way, along the lines of the political comparisons I made to Kari in my earlier email, is the standard authoritarian playbook as we've seen it executed in many countries around the world such as Hungary and Turkey and now in the U.S.. The authoritarian strongman conjures some terrible threat, usually involving immigrants or crime, and declares that he's the only one who can fix it, and that the urgency is so great that democratic principles like due process and freedom of the press can be suspended. If any of you are Trump voters, then I understand why you're using these tactics and doubt I'll be able to persuade you to change. But if you're Democrats or rational Republicans, you should really think about why you're behaving the way you are.

The report, by contrast, traces that mess all the way back to the ten prior years, when we only put 53% of what we ought to have into the reserve fund. And it also addressed a problem that most people have with scales of magnitude: the fitness and party room renovations played no significant part of the total shortfall.

I was out of town for the big 2024 Special Meeting when Deb was ousted, but I've heard that someone tried to raise the issue of 2014-2023 there, and Ray shut it down by saying that Rod Halvorson (the board president through those years) was a great guy and not there to defend himself. But it wasn't about Rod personally. It was about the HOA's whole approach to the fund (and to maintenance expenses in general) during that period that led us to the mess we were in: a subject it was important to discuss, especially when some were framing that mess in a false way, for their own political purposes.

I offered Kari the chance to just take back what she wrote, but I guess she rejected it without comment. But I want to tell you all now that I don't think the email she sent will look good for you, and I'd much rather see you simply start doing better:

- Responding better to questions and criticisms.
- Stop demonizing those you perceive as your Enemies.
- Stop perpetuating (and maybe even start correcting) the false narratives you used to gain power.
- Improve your transparency, responsiveness, and professionalism.

The tragic thing is that, until I received Kari's email, I believed you were **already starting to do (at least some of) these things**. As I stated publicly at the end of a recent board meeting, I thought they were getting better. I praised Ray for it. I was feeling optimistic that I wouldn't have to fight as hard in the future to achieve them. I got pushback from some members of the owners group for stating this opinion. And then I received this chillingly Orwellian email, over a mere FB post or comment!

Are you seriously doubling down in this way on authoritarian control? Are you absolutely sure you don't want to try a better way? Your past tactics won you power, but now you have it, and they aren't necessarily the best way for you to keep it. (Assuming you want to.)

I remain, as always, as I have been since early 2024 when I first starting getting inklings of the troubles here, (but not necessarily forever), willing and ready to talk.

Freeman

[Quoted text hidden]

Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>
To: Freeman Ng <freeman@freemanng.net>

Sat, Dec 13, 2025 at 9:05 PM

Freeman.

Your broad range of topics, historical analyses, and personal observations within a single message makes it challenging to provide a focused and actionable response to each item.

I suggest that future communications address one primary topic. You are not writing a novel.

Sincerely,
Kari

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

[Quoted text hidden]

Freeman Ng <Freeman@freemanng.net>
To: Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>

Sun, Dec 14, 2025 at 7:10 PM

Fair enough. (As an actual novelist, I tend to go long-form! 😊)

How about starting with just two items, then? (You can ignore either of them if you want to start with just one item.)

The first is a heads-up I feel obligated to give you. The time I tried to make a future intention of mine clear to Barb McLean, she labeled it a threat, but I was just trying to be conscientious and not have the thing take her by surprise. And it's in that same spirit I want to let you know that I'll be sharing your email with everybody on my current City Walk Talk mailing list, because I feel it represents a big escalation in the current board majority's suppression of speech that everybody needs to know about.

When I share it as a post to City Walk Talk, you (and anybody else) will be able to publicly respond to it in the comments, and I will actually be thrilled if you or anybody else asks to write your own opinion pieces, in response to mine or about any other subject you like, and I'll be happy to publicize them in my monthly newsletter just like I publicize mine.

(I'm very much committed to issues being discussed in the open, with all sides and as many fellow owners as possible able to see what's being said and weigh in on it. Isn't that a good thing? Wouldn't it be worse if I only communicated to my subscribers in secret ways and never let you or any other board member respond to what I told them?)

So that's the first item. If you want to limit our conversation to just one topic at a time, you can ignore the second one, or you can ignore this one and only respond to the second one. Which is this:

I have a guess about why you, as someone who doesn't strike me as having an authoritarian mindset at all, don't seem to have a problem with the current board majority's authoritarian approach. (Note: I don't say that the authoritarian mindset is necessarily a bad thing; about half the human race seems to have it. But I just say that you don't seem to be that type, at least to me, and it's a puzzle to me.) Anyway, my guess is this:

1. You've been persuaded that the former board was not just bad, but an existential threat to the building.
2. You might also feel that all the dissent occurring right now is all about putting them back in power.
3. Therefore, you're okay with both the questionable tactics the current board majority took to come into power in the first place, and their very authoritarian approach to questions and concerns.
 - o First, because of the existential threat that requires more extreme measures (much as Lincoln felt he had to suspend habeas corpus during the Civil War and Trump is now suspending due process in deportation cases)

- Second, because you don't feel any of these questions or concerns are being expressed in good faith so there's no need to respond to them in good faith ways.

Is this where you're at? If so, then I can honestly understand your feelings. If not, can you explain where you're at?

Thanks!

[Quoted text hidden]

Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>
To: Freeman Ng <freeman@freemanng.net>

Sun, Dec 14, 2025 at 8:33 PM

Freeman,

I want to share my perspective on your recent blog post in a constructive light. I believe the intent was to communicate the agreed-upon reserve plan, and I appreciate the effort you've put into helping the community understand that work.

My concern is that the message went beyond that purpose and revisited past issues that, at this point, feel less helpful. I think the information about the reserve fund would have landed more clearly if it had been kept simple and focused on where we are now.

As you know, there were several valid reasons the reserve fund took time to finalize. The Board needed to work through issues related to Cedar, address inconsistencies between versions of the documents, and ensure the numbers were thoroughly reviewed. Bob's careful and methodical approach was important given the size and impact of these decisions.

I truly do recognize the time and energy you contributed to the reserve planning process, and the Board has expressed its appreciation for that work multiple times. My hope is simply that, as we move forward, we can focus communications on current outcomes and next steps rather than revisiting past challenges.

I believe keeping messages concise and forward-looking better supports the Board's efforts to rebuild trust and move the community ahead together. I prefer to keep communications simple and to the point, as that approach tends to reduce confusion and helps ensure everyone stays focused on the same goals. I prefer simple, to-the-point communication because it helps keep everyone aligned.

Nothing authoritarian or nefarious here. I just want peace in the building.

Sincerely,

Kari

[Quoted text hidden]

Freeman Ng <Freeman@freemanng.net>
To: Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>

Sun, Dec 14, 2025 at 10:06 PM

I want peace, too, but as I said in my first email, I'm struggling with the tension between Peace and Justice.

Thanks for mentioning the blog post about the reserve study. I promised the readers I'd update it when the budget was released, and I've just done so, praising the board for adopting the reserve study's recommendation for increasing the transfer. Whenever the board does something I think is good, I'll give them credit.

But I also added more about their ghosting us over the reserve fund shortfall explainer. I cited the reasons you just gave me for it for their No ("sentiment was...") and added my response to it. I invite you to comment on the post with anything you might want to say, or to write your own opinion piece on this or any other subject you like. Whenever the board does something I disagree with, I'll express my opinion and give anybody who wishes a chance to publicly respond.

The reason I included all that stuff about the delays is that it wasn't just a case of, "well, things take time." If it were just that, it might not have been worth mentioning. But it fit into a pattern of aggressively intentional and dysfunctional communication I'd experienced up to that point, and that made it important to include. You only mentioned the "time it took to finalize" in your email, but in my post, I explicitly connected it in my post with the ghosting of the committee, the No that was "communicated" by simply not replying (**emphasis mine in this email**):

The delay itself, which is not ideal, of course, but it's even more disturbing **given the precedent** of the current board majority saying No to the release of the Reserve Fund explainer by simply never responding. When you don't hear back from them in a long time, you wonder, "Are they just busy, or have they already decided No and are intending never to respond? Are they basically just 'running out the clock' on me?"

This is why it was relevant.

I believe these tactics were wrong, not in a major way but in way that was consistent with other, more serious wrongs I believe have been committed. And I'm going to do what I can to stop them from happening more.

One of the things that makes it easier to do wrong is if you can get away with it in secret. If you know that a lot of people are going to find out about it, you might be less inclined to try it. And so I'm not going to stay quiet about things I see just for the sake of peace at the cost of justice. I'm willing to sacrifice *some* justice for peace, but not that much.

I do think I'm already restraining myself from all that I could be writing. Most of the stuff in my first email to you, for example, I haven't posted publicly anywhere. I'm trying to find the narrow path to a reasonable peace without too much injustice. Push for pure justice too hard, and you might destroy the possibility of peace forever. Prioritize a "peace" that is the mere absence of conflict, and you betray all possibility of any level of justice.

But whatever I do, I'll do as publicly as I can, inviting you and anyone else to respond publicly, rather than build a faction in secret that only hears what I tell them (as some have done in the recent past). I think this is the only right way to do it.

[Quoted text hidden]

Freeman Ng <Freeman@freemanng.net>
To: Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>

Tue, Dec 16, 2025 at 9:58 PM

I shared your original email to City Walk Talk today. As always, I invite you (and anybody else who wishes) to respond to it in the comments, or to post your own opinion piece on the site on this or any other subject. I invite you to *discuss* the issues in a public forum where any other owner who wishes can see it and respond as they wish as well.

[Quoted text hidden]

Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>
To: Freeman Ng <freeman@freemanng.net>

Wed, Dec 17, 2025 at 5:49 AM

I saw. You conveniently omitted my three responding emails. And did not include your three page long responses. Why? Because you love drama and it doesn't fit your narrative. I consider you in the category of MAGA. You're exactly like Trump, Rage writing and then positing it on your version of "Truth Social". I tried to have constructive dialogue, but you spin it. This is a slippery slope. This most recent move is harassment and bullying.

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

[Quoted text hidden]

Freeman Ng <Freeman@freemanng.net>
To: Kari <roxyinaspen@yahoo.com>

Wed, Dec 17, 2025 at 12:45 PM

Actually, Kari, I did offer to show the entire correspondence privately to anyone who asked to see it, and the reason I took this halfway approach was consideration for you and the others. I thought I was actually doing you a favor, in the interest of a compromised but acceptable (to me, anyway) peace. But you're making the tension I feel between peace and justice more and more difficult.

In any case, I'm happy to do as both of us apparently want: I've now made our entire correspondence available to all readers of my opinion piece. As always, I invite you or any other interested parties to comment on it or post your own opinion pieces on this or any other subject, in any public forum where our fellow City Walk owners can find it and weigh in with their own opinions.

[Quoted text hidden]