FreeMoCap

Theoretical Foundations

Volume 2 of 3

> *"The open source community is what the scientific community pretends to be."*

Integrating:
Political Organizing Theory • FOSS Governance
Labor Movement Strategy • Commons Economics
Cooperative Models • Sustainability Science

The FreeMoCap Foundation

February 2026

Contents

How to Use This Guide

This is Volume 2 of a three-volume set. **Volume 1 — The Manifesto** tells the FreeMoCap story in the founder's own words. **Volume 3 — Source Documents** contains the complete transcripts and working documents.

This volume provides the intellectual infrastructure for FreeMoCap as a movement—not just a software project. It draws on political organizing theory, FOSS governance research, labor strategy, commons economics, and case studies to answer four questions:

Part I: What Are We Fighting? maps the systems that FreeMoCap challenges—not as abstract theory, but as analysis of the specific forces that make motion capture expensive, science inaccessible, and technology extractive.

Part II: How Do We Grow? applies organizing strategy to the specific challenge of building a community around free software—reaching beyond the already-converted, building narrative, designing engagement pathways.

Part III: How Do We Last? addresses governance, sustainability, burnout, and the structural challenges that kill open source projects.

Part IV: How Do We Win? examines case studies, campaign strategy, coalition building, and the transition from insurgent project to lasting institution.

Part V: The Work Ahead provides worksheets, action items, and a reading list.

Theory enters this guide when it illuminates a specific FreeMoCap challenge. The goal is not to survey political philosophy but to forge tools for action.

A note on theoretical language: the natural language used in FreeMoCap's founding documents maps remarkably closely to formal political theory—often without using the academic terminology. Where theory appears here, it is because it names something FreeMoCap is already doing. We lead with the project's language and let theory serve as annotation, not foundation. See the theoretical mapping table in Volume 1 for the full correspondence.

I What Are We Fighting?

1 The Current "Common Sense"

Before you can change what people believe, you have to understand what they currently believe—and *why those beliefs feel obvious.*

The Italian political theorist Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937) called this **hegemony**: the process by which dominant groups maintain power not primarily through force but by making their worldview seem like "common sense"—natural, inevitable, and unquestionable. A consensus culture develops in which people identify their own good with the good of the dominant class.

In FreeMoCap's language: "the techno capitalist corpo hegemony." The terminology is different. The analysis is the same.

1.1 What People Currently Believe

Ask anyone outside the FreeMoCap community about motion capture, and you'll hear some version of the following:

"Motion capture requires expensive equipment." "You need a professional lab or studio." "Real research requires institutional affiliation." "If software is free, it must be inferior." "People without credentials can't do real science."

These beliefs aren't random. They're produced and reinforced by an interlocking system of institutions:

Table 1.1: The Institutional Landscape of Knowledge Control

Institution	What It Controls	Justifying Ideology
Universities	Access to education, research, credentials	"Expertise requires formal training"
Academic Journals	What counts as "real" knowledge	"Peer review ensures quality"
Proprietary Software	Tools for knowledge production	"Professional tools cost money"
Professional Associations	Who counts as "qualified"	"Credentials protect the public"
Funding Agencies	What research gets done	"Competitive funding ensures quality"

Each institution reinforces the others. You need a university affiliation to get funding. You need funding to buy proprietary tools. You need proprietary tools to produce data that journals will publish. You need publications to keep your university affiliation. The circle is closed.

1.2 Gramsci's Key Concepts

Gramsci developed these ideas in prison notebooks written under Mussolini's censors. His key insight was that power operates more through **civil society** (schools, churches, media, cultural institutions) than through **political society** (police, army, courts). Hegemony works through consent, not coercion.

This is why simply building better software isn't enough. FreeMoCap must transform *common sense*—making different arrangements seem natural and obvious.

Organic intellectuals are people who emerge from and serve their community, as opposed to "traditional intellectuals" who see themselves as a class apart. FreeMoCap needs organic intellectuals—researchers, artists, educators who came up through the FreeMoCap community and can articulate its vision in the language of their own fields.

War of position is the long, slow work of building alternative institutions and transforming common sense—as opposed to a "war of maneuver" (frontal assault). FreeMoCap is waging a war of position. The strategic decision to remain at Northeastern while building the alternative is a textbook example: using institutional resources to construct counter-hegemonic infrastructure.

2 Manufactured Scarcity: Why Tools Aren't Free

The Austrian priest and social critic Ivan Illich (1926–2002) provides the sharpest analysis of *why* institutions make things scarce even when they don't have to be.

2.1 The Two Watersheds

Illich argued that tools and institutions pass through two critical thresholds. The **first watershed**: a new approach genuinely improves things. Anaesthesia, antibiotics, basic literacy. The **second watershed**: the same approach, pushed further, becomes *counterproductive*. Medicine creates iatrogenic illness. Schools create ignorance and dependency. The educational system no longer educates—it sorts, credentials, and extracts.

FreeMoCap's founding story illustrates this in real time. The university that was supposed to produce knowledge was producing debt. The research system that was supposed to advance understanding was producing "smart research"—strategically publishable papers that advance careers rather than knowledge.

2.2 Radical Monopoly

Illich's most powerful concept for FreeMoCap's situation:

> **Definition:** **Radical monopoly**: When one *type* of solution (not one brand) becomes compulsory, excluding alternatives. Cars didn't just compete with walking—they reshaped cities so that walking became impossible.

The proprietary motion capture industry represents a radical monopoly. It's not that one brand dominates—it's that the *type* of solution (institutionally controlled, expert-mediated, credential-requiring) has been made to seem like the only option. The alternative—cheap cameras, free software, no institutional affiliation needed—isn't just unknown. It seems impossible. Absurd. Unprofessional.

FreeMoCap exists to break this radical monopoly.

2.3 Convivial Tools

Illich proposed an alternative: **convivial tools**—technology that enhances human autonomy and creativity without creating dependency on experts or institutions. A convivial tool can be used by anyone without special training, doesn't require institutional permission, and allows multiple uses its designers never anticipated.

> **Key Insight:** The distinction between convivial and manipulatory tools is **independent of the level of technology**. High technology can be convivial. Simple tools can be manipulative. A $30 webcam-based motion capture system is *more* convivial than a $100,000 proprietary system—not because it's simpler, but because it enhances autonomy rather than creating dependency.

FreeMoCap's design goal—to be "a tool that teaches you things about how it works"—is pure Illich. A convivial tool makes its own workings visible. It invites understanding rather than demanding trust.

3 Critical Consciousness: From "That's Just How It Is" to "This Can Change"

The Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (1921–1997) provides the framework for understanding how people *change their minds*—how they move from accepting the current system to seeing it as changeable.

3.1 The Three Stages

Freire identified three stages of consciousness:

Magical consciousness: Fatalistic acceptance. "Motion capture is expensive. That's just how it is." "You need a university to do real research." "Professional tools cost money." These statements feel like descriptions of reality. They aren't experienced as beliefs that could be otherwise.

Naïve consciousness: Recognizes problems but blames individuals, not systems. "That *particular* software is overpriced." "My *particular* university is corrupt." The structural analysis is missing.

Critical consciousness (conscientização): Sees structural causes, understands the situation historically and politically, recognizes capacity for transformative action. "The entire structure of proprietary tools + academic gatekeeping + credentialism is a *constructed system* that benefits specific interests—and it can be changed."

FreeMoCap's design goal—that users should "feel the understandings beginning" and "feel the opportunities to pull threads"—is conscientização in real time. The moment when the machinery becomes visible.

3.2 Banking vs. Problem-Posing Education

Freire distinguished the **banking model** of education (students as empty vessels for knowledge deposits) from **problem-posing education** (teachers and students learning together by confronting real problems).

The academic outreach model that FreeMoCap critiques—"show them how cool it is to be super highly educated and then just leave"—is banking. FreeMoCap's design as "a tool that teaches you things about how it works" is problem-posing. The user isn't being lectured. They're encountering real problems (How does camera calibration work? What does a 3D coordinate system mean?) and developing understanding through engagement.

3.3 Praxis and Hope

Definition: **Praxis**: The unity of reflection and action. Neither alone is sufficient for liberation. Action without reflection is mere activism; reflection without action is mere verbalism.

This three-volume document set is an exercise in praxis: reflection (analysis of systems, theory, strategy) in service of action (building FreeMoCap, organizing the community, transforming common sense). If it remains only a document, it has failed.

Freire also insisted that **hope is an ontological need**. Without it, we cannot begin the work of transformation. "The world that is is not the world that has to be" is FreeMoCap's version of this same commitment.

4 Why Open Source Works: The Economics

Yochai Benkler, a Yale law professor, provided the theoretical foundation for understanding why open source production exists at all—and why it can compete with corporate production.

Standard economics recognized two ways to organize production: **markets** (price signals) and **firms** (hierarchical management). Benkler identified a third:

Definition: **Commons-based peer production**: Radically decentralized, collaborative, and non-proprietary production based on sharing resources among widely distributed individuals who cooperate without relying on either market signals or managerial commands.

This explains FreeMoCap's existence. Once the cost of communications dropped and distributed computing became universal, thousands of volunteers could produce software that competes with billion-dollar corporations. It's not intuitive—but it's real. Linux runs the internet. Blender competes with Maya. Wikipedia replaced Britannica.

The conditions that enable peer production are precisely the conditions FreeMoCap meets: low capital requirements (you need a computer, not a factory), modular tasks (work can be broken into independent pieces), low-cost integration (digital tools make combining contributions cheap), and intrinsic motivation (people contribute for non-monetary reasons).

Key Insight: Benkler explains *why* FreeMoCap can exist. Gramsci explains *what* it's fighting. Illich explains *what's wrong* with what it's replacing. Freire explains *how people change their minds*. Together, they form the theoretical foundation for a counter-hegemonic technology movement.

II How Do We Grow?

5 Deep Organizing: Beyond the Already-Converted

Labor organizer Jane McAlevey made a distinction that should reshape how FreeMoCap thinks about community growth.

Advocacy involves writing checks while professionals handle problems. The FOSS equivalent: users who donate but never participate.

Mobilizing gets existing supporters off the couch. The FOSS equivalent: rallying current community members for releases, hackathons, or funding drives.

Deep organizing does something fundamentally different: it persuades people who don't yet agree to change their opinions and join the cause.

> **Key Insight:** "For organizers, we wake up every morning asking how to engage the people who don't agree with us—or who think they don't agree with us. These folks are definitely not part of our social media feeds, and they're not coming to our activist meetings."

For FreeMoCap, deep organizing means reaching researchers using expensive proprietary systems who *assume* open source can't match quality. Artists who are *skeptical* that free software could meet professional standards. Educators who've *never considered* motion capture accessible for their contexts. Potential contributors who don't see themselves as "open source people."

Broadcasting to people already in your orbit is mobilizing. Building relationships with people outside it and persuading them is organizing.

5.1 Organic Leaders

McAlevey's concept of **organic leaders** is essential. These aren't activists or professional organizers—they're people deeply respected within their own communities who can bring others along. A biomechanics professor who starts using FreeMoCap and tells their colleagues. A dance instructor who integrates it into their studio. A high school STEM teacher who makes it part of their curriculum.

These people have social capital that FreeMoCap's core team doesn't. Their endorsement carries weight that no amount of marketing can replicate.

5.2 Structure Tests

McAlevey operationalized deep organizing through **structure tests**: collective actions measuring what proportion of your constituency participates in activities of increasing commitment. For FreeMoCap, a structure test progression might look like:

1. Can 80% of mailing list members complete a simple survey about their needs?
2. Can 80% of active forum participants attend a community call?
3. Can 80% of community call attendees commit to a specific small action?
4. Can the community collectively push back against unfair criticism or corporate exploitation?

Each test builds capacity while revealing organizational weak points before they become crises.

6 Public Narrative: The Story That Builds a Movement

Marshall Ganz, former United Farm Workers organizer, contributed the **public narrative** framework: Story of Self, Story of Us, Story of Now.

Story of Self: Why am I called to this work? What personal experiences and values drive my involvement? FreeMoCap's founding story—from institutional betrayal to the garbage camera pivot to building the Foundation—is a powerful Story of Self (see Volume 1). But the movement needs more than one. Every community member has a story of why they're here.

Story of Us: What brings our community together? Not demographics, but shared experiences, values, frustrations. "We are people who believe that tools should just work and not try to take anything from you."

Story of Now: Why must we act, and why now? AI is consolidating power. Institutions are crumbling. The window for building alternatives is open but won't stay open forever.

For FreeMoCap, cultivating public narrative means collecting origin stories from users across domains, building canonical narrative about why democratized motion capture matters, and framing releases and campaigns as moments requiring collective response.

7 The Ladder of Engagement

Labor movements developed the **ladder of engagement**: people progress through stages of increasingly deep commitment, with clear rungs and intentional transitions between levels.

Most FOSS projects have a broken ladder. They recruit users and hope some magically become maintainers, without designing the intermediate steps. The result: a vast passive user base, a tiny burned-out maintainer core, and almost nothing in between.

Table 7.1: Ladder of Engagement for FreeMoCap

Level	Description	Transition Mechanism
Passive User	Downloads, uses software	Welcome sequence, documentation
Engaged User	Joins Discord, follows updates	Forum invitation, community calls
Community Member	Participates in forums, helps others	Recognition, mentorship invitation
Contributor	Creates tutorials, reports bugs, docs	Contributor guide, paired projects
Evangelist	Recruits others, presents at conferences	Speaking opportunities, case studies
Module Owner	Maintains specific area	Gradual responsibility increase
Governance	Votes, shapes direction	Clear pathways to leadership

The critical transition is from "person who uses the software" to "person who identifies as part of the community." This happens through relationship—someone answers your forum question, you attend a community call, you see your use case reflected in project communications.

7.1 The Blender Model

Blender Foundation provides the clearest model. Blender has a small core development team but millions of users. The vast majority will never write C++ code. They are artists, animators, architects, educators. They populate forums. They create tutorials. They evangelize. They fund development.

The genius is recognizing that **artists evangelizing to other artists is more powerful than developers trying to recruit artists**. FreeMoCap's equivalent: researchers evangelizing to other researchers, dancers to dancers, educators to educators.

7.2 Making Artists into Scientists, Scientists into Artists

FreeMoCap occupies a unique intersection. An animator who captures thousands of movements develops intuitions about biomechanics that formal training often lacks. A researcher with deep technical knowledge might discover creative applications they'd never imagined.

This cross-pollination is FreeMoCap's distinctive advantage. No other FOSS project sits at quite this intersection of art, science, and technology.

III How Do We Last?

8 Governance: From Founder-Led to Community-Accountable

Every successful FOSS project eventually faces a governance crisis. The question is whether you've built the infrastructure to survive it.

8.1 What We Learn from Crises

The **Rust crisis** (2021–22): The entire moderation team resigned citing "structural unaccountability of the Core Team." No mechanism existed for oversight. Resolution required dissolving the Core Team in favor of a representative Leadership Council. *Lesson: every team must be accountable to someone, including the top.*

Python's post-BDFL transition: When Guido van Rossum stepped down after the walrus operator debate (2018), the PEP process already existed for structured decision-making. The community used it to debate seven governance proposals and select a Steering Council. *Lesson: mechanisms for community deliberation should predate crises.*

Node.js and the fork: Dissatisfaction with Joyent's corporate control led top contributors to create io.js with open governance. Within a year, the Node.js Foundation formed and adopted the open model. *Lesson: corporate stewardship must allow genuine community input, or the community will exercise its ultimate check—forking the codebase.*

8.2 Models

BDFL (Benevolent Dictator for Life): Clear decision-making, consistent vision. Creates succession crises and bottlenecks as projects scale.

Meritocracy (Apache): Influence through demonstrated contribution. "Community over code." Risk: how "merit" gets recognized can mask bias.

Electoral democracy (Debian): Annual elections, constitutional framework. Slower but more resilient to capture.

Foundation-backed (Linux Foundation): Legal and financial support. Trade-off: corporate membership models where paying members get board seats.

8.3 Including Users in Governance

Most FOSS governance discussions focus on developers. But projects serving substantial user communities face a question: how do users have voice? Models include user advisory councils, multi-stakeholder boards, community assemblies for major decisions, and survey-driven roadmap prioritization.

The labor parallel is direct: unions represent all workers, not just activists. FOSS governance should consider the full community, not just those with commit access.

9 The Commons: Ostrom's Principles

Elinor Ostrom won the Nobel Prize in Economics (2009) for demonstrating that communities can successfully manage common resources without either privatization or state control. Her eight design principles, derived from actually-existing commons that endured for centuries, translate directly to FOSS governance:

1. **Clear boundaries**: Who is a contributor? Who can merge PRs? Clear governance.
2. **Proportional equivalence**: Do active contributors have voice proportional to contribution?
3. **Collective-choice arrangements**: Do users and contributors participate in roadmap decisions?
4. **Monitoring**: Are there ways to track contributions, quality, compliance with norms?
5. **Graduated sanctions**: What happens when someone violates community norms?
6. **Conflict resolution**: How are disputes resolved—cheaply, accessibly?
7. **External recognition**: Does the broader ecosystem recognize FreeMoCap's legitimacy?
8. **Nested enterprises**: As FreeMoCap grows, does governance scale appropriately?

A critical insight for digital commons: unlike natural resources where the challenge is preventing over-extraction, open source must stimulate both use *and* contribution. The code is non-rivalrous—my using

FreeMoCap doesn't prevent your using it. **The scarce resource isn't the code; it's maintainer attention and time.**

Nadia Eghbal's research found that low-quality contributions can be *worse* than no contributions because they consume scarce review bandwidth.

10 Cooperative Models

Platform cooperativism, developed by Trebor Scholz and Nathan Schneider, offers a framework for technology owned and governed by stakeholders rather than shareholders.

Mondragon, the world's largest worker cooperative federation (70,000+ workers, 266 businesses), provides governance lessons: one-worker-one-vote regardless of capital, maximum 6x pay ratios, worker reallocation during downturns rather than layoffs, and a cooperative university for ongoing education.

Schneider warns that online platforms suffer from "implicit feudalism"—a bias for building communities as fiefdoms with all-powerful admins. He argues this "trains us to give up on our communities' democratic potential."

For FreeMoCap, cooperative principles suggest multi-stakeholder governance, explicit documentation of ownership and control, open-sourcing governance itself (not just code), and connection to broader solidarity economy movements.

11 Preventing Burnout: Structural Solutions

The sustainability crisis in open source is acute: 60% of maintainers are unpaid, 60% have quit or considered quitting, and 61% of unpaid maintainers work alone. The 2024 xz-utils backdoor demonstrated how burnout creates security vulnerabilities: the original maintainer, overwhelmed after years of solo work, accepted help from malicious actors.

Eghbal reframes the problem: **maintainer attention, not code, is the scarce resource**. Design for intrinsic motivation, not obligation.

Structural interventions matter more than individual self-care: distributed leadership (no one person should be indispensable), documentation of philosophy (explaining *why*, not just *how*), tiers of contribution (not all engagement should require maintainer attention), aggressive automation, and—above all—paying maintainers.

11.1 Emergent Strategy

adrienne maree brown (lowercase intentional) draws on complexity science and Octavia Butler to develop an adaptive approach to social change:

"Small is good, small is all." "Move at the speed of trust." "What you pay attention to grows."

For FreeMoCap: pay attention to *how* the core team works together, not just what you produce. Don't scale faster than relationships can sustain. Accept nonlinear progress: failed features and pivots are compost, not failures.

IV How Do We Win?

12 Case Studies

12.1 Blender: The Success Story

Blender traces to 1994. When its parent company collapsed in 2002, Ton Roosendaal raised €100,000 in seven weeks to purchase the source code—the first-ever crowdfunding campaign. The 2.80 release (July 2019) made Blender professionally competitive. The Development Fund now supports 26 full-time staff.

Key success factors: professional DNA, dogfooding through open movies, centralized vision from a 30-year founder, corporate sponsorship through enterprise relevance, and foundation structure enabling paid developers.

12.2 GIMP: Thirty Years of Missed Opportunities

Started in 1995 as a Berkeley class project. Major version gaps (6–7 years between releases), insular governance, no dogfooding, no corporate relationships. A cautionary tale of technical excellence without community strategy.

12.3 Krita: The Strategic Pivot

Origins as another GIMP clone. At a 2010 sprint, the team made a pivotal decision: abandon generic image manipulation, focus exclusively on digital painting. Explicitly modeled on Blender's organizational structure. By 2019, three full-time developers and over 3 million annual downloads.

Key Insight: Krita succeeded by finding a niche and copying Blender's organizational model. FreeMoCap occupies a unique niche (accessible motion capture) and would benefit from studying Blender's model closely.

13 Inoculation: Preparing for What's Coming

Labor organizers developed inoculation tactics: prepare workers for management pushback *before* campaigns begin. When people encounter something they've been warned about, it feels confirmatory rather than surprising.

FreeMoCap should inoculate its community against: corporate co-optation (companies offering resources with strings), community conflict (inevitable disagreements), burnout cycles, external criticism ("open source can't match professional quality"), and success challenges (scaling growing pains).

Tactic: **The AEIOU Model** (from IWW organizing):

- **Agitate**: Surface discontent with the status quo
- **Educate**: Explain how collective action addresses those problems
- **Inoculate**: Prepare advocates for opposition
- **Organize**: Delegate tasks, build structure, identify champions
- **Unite/Act**: Take collective action

14 Coalitions and Framing

14.1 The Right to Repair Lesson

The Right to Repair movement offers the most instructive recent example of technical concerns achieving mainstream political success. Starting from trade associations, the movement built coalitions including iFixit, EFF, Consumer Reports, and disability advocates. Massachusetts passed Right to Repair with 87.7% support. As of 2024, all fifty states have some form of legislation.

Key success factors: bipartisan appeal (framed around consumer choice), concrete relatable framing ("Will this make my screen repair cheaper?"), coalition breadth, and connecting technical issues to broader values.

14.2 Framing FreeMoCap for Non-Technical Audiences

Effective frames: rights-based (right to repair and control your own tools), security and control (own your data), economic (reduced costs, no vendor lock-in), democratic (digital self-determination), educational (learning how things work).

> **Key Insight:** Lead with problems people experience, not ideology. "Frustrated that your expensive software stopped working after an update you didn't want?" resonates more broadly than "software freedom is a fundamental right."

15 Comprehensive Campaigns

Kate Bronfenbrenner's research at Cornell found that unions using comprehensive campaigns—combining multiple tactics simultaneously—achieved 74% first contract rates compared to 58% for less comprehensive efforts.

A comprehensive campaign for institutional FreeMoCap adoption might combine: internal champion committees, peer-to-peer advocacy, issue-focused messaging, escalating demonstrations (individual pilots → departmental trials → institutional proposals), external alliances, implementation support, and success documentation.

16 From Insurgent to Institution

FreeMoCap faces a tension common to successful movements: needing paid staff and formal governance while fearing alienation of volunteer contributors who valued the informal, mission-driven culture.

Users are not free riders. They are the community the project exists to serve. Without users, there is no project—only code no one uses. Users contribute by using the software, reporting bugs, answering questions, creating tutorials, evangelizing, providing feedback, and funding development.

Strategies for maintaining founding spirit: document founding values explicitly, design governance that protects original mission, continue recruiting insurgent voices, balance stability with disruption, and maintain connection to the user community.

V The Work Ahead

17 Immediate, Near-Term, and Long-Term Actions

17.1 Immediate

- Document current informal governance before formalizing
- Create explicit engagement pathways for users at all levels—not just developers
- Establish structure tests to assess community capacity
- Consider fiscal sponsorship through NumFOCUS or Software Freedom Conservancy
- Begin collecting user stories across domains for public narrative

17.2 Near-Term

- Build collective care practices into community rhythms
- Inoculate community members against predictable challenges
- Develop comprehensive campaigns for institutional adoption
- Create pathways for cross-pollination: artists into scientists, scientists into artists

17.3 Longer-Term

- Design governance that explicitly includes user voice
- Connect to adjacent movements (Right to Repair, digital sovereignty, research democratization)
- Build the full ladder of engagement with clear rungs
- Develop funding models that don't compromise independence

18 Reading List

Political Theory and Organizing

- Smucker, Jonathan Matthew. *Hegemony How-To: A Roadmap for Radicals.* AK Press, 2017.
- McAlevey, Jane. *No Shortcuts: Organizing for Power in the New Gilded Age.* Oxford, 2016.
- McAlevey, Jane. *A Collective Bargain.* Ecco, 2020.
- Ganz, Marshall. "Public Narrative, Collective Action, and Power." In *Accountability Through Public Opinion*, World Bank, 2011.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Continuum, 1970.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of Hope.* Continuum, 1992.
- Illich, Ivan. *Deschooling Society.* Harper & Row, 1971.
- Illich, Ivan. *Tools for Conviviality.* Harper & Row, 1973.
- brown, adrienne maree. *Emergent Strategy.* AK Press, 2017.

FOSS Governance and Sustainability

- Eghbal, Nadia. *Working in Public: The Making and Maintenance of Open Source Software.* Stripe Press, 2020.
- Benkler, Yochai. *The Wealth of Networks.* Yale, 2006.
- Ostrom, Elinor. *Governing the Commons.* Cambridge, 1990.
- Schneider, Nathan. *Governable Spaces: Democratic Design for Online Life.* UC Press, 2024.

Case Studies

- Blender Foundation organizational structure and community programs
- Rust governance transition documentation
- Python PEP process and Steering Council formation
- Apache Software Foundation, "The Apache Way"

19 Key Concepts Glossary

Banking model (Freire) Traditional education that treats students as empty vessels for knowledge deposits.

Commons-based peer production (Benkler) Decentralized, collaborative production without reliance on markets or hierarchies.

Conscientização (Freire) Development of critical consciousness—from fatalism to systemic understanding to transformative action.

Convivial tools (Illich) Tools that enhance human autonomy and creativity without creating expert dependency.

Counter-hegemony (Gramsci) The project of building alternative "common sense" to challenge dominant ideology.

Deep organizing (McAlevey) Persuading people who don't yet agree to change their opinions and join the cause.

Emergent strategy (brown) Building complex change through small interactions, trusting patterns to emerge.

Hegemony (Gramsci) Maintaining power by making dominant values seem like universal common sense.

Inoculation Preparing community members for predictable challenges by discussing them in advance.

Ladder of engagement Structured progression from passive user to governance participant.

Organic intellectuals (Gramsci) Intellectuals who emerge from and serve their class.

Praxis (Freire) Unity of reflection and action.

Public narrative (Ganz) Story of Self, Story of Us, Story of Now.

Radical monopoly (Illich) When one type of solution becomes compulsory, excluding alternatives.

Structure test (McAlevey) Collective action measuring constituency participation.

War of position (Gramsci) Long-term work of building alternative institutions and transforming common sense.