

Cold Email: Protecting participation without suppressing disagreement

The goal is not to eliminate faction, but to make coordinated injustice harder while preserving genuine disagreement.

Subject: Protect participation without suppressing disagreement

In a community of hundreds of thousands, the hardest moderation problem may not be disagreement itself-it is when a majority or highly coordinated minority makes participation intolerable for everyone else.

Federalist No. 10 offers a useful design principle: faction is unavoidable, so the remedy is to control its effects rather than force uniformity. Representation, dispersed interests, and barriers to coordination can make it harder for any group to turn numerical strength into injustice against a weaker one.

Applied to community governance, that means distinguishing sharp disagreement from behavior that threatens others' ability to participate-and building transparent safeguards that remain legitimate across rival groups.

Would a brief exchange about translating this principle into durable moderation rules be useful?