

Cross-Referencing VangelinaSkov's Response to the Plagiarism Allegations

Watch Here

<https://youtu.be/Ywr5CxxDHbw>

Intro & Content Warning

SKOV: "Another thing was that she said that I'm just another iilluminaughtii, but illuminaughtii has been accused of abusing people, allegedly. It's just not the same thing and that was just used because she could put it in the title, in the description and in the tags for good SEOs." [1, 35:19-35:37]

ETHEL: "Because it is downright shocking to see the similarities between Skov's actions here and iilluminaughtii, aka Blaire, as called out in hbombguy's plagiarism video last year:

HBOMB: "But here's where it gets interesting. Blair knows people might notice this so she's come up with a defence mechanism. The video has a link in the description to a list of sources where stuff she quoted or showed in the video gets linked. This is normal. Lots of people do this, although usually they cite them when they use them in the actual video, but still. It's an unlabeled collection of links that's difficult to sort through, but if you keep digging, eventually you find the link to Brian Deer's YouTube upload of the documentary. So now if anyone criticises the fact she ripped it off, she can say, 'No, I-I was using a source! I cited it! Check! It's in my list!' 'Somewhere!' And she uses this flimsy excuse to basically steal anything she wants. Blair frequently plagiarises people, never mentions they exist in the video or cites them anywhere, but she puts a link in a list no one will read. So that makes it okay, right?" [2, 42:42-43:46]

Schönen guten Tag! My name is Levi Schrader, formerly known as Levi Bird, and today we'll be talking about VangelinaSkov's response to the plagiarism allegations against them. I've already shown you one example of Skov grossly misrepresenting the allegations and you can find even more in the chapter, "Cross-Referencing Skov's Claims". In addition to those, we'll also be covering their response to the evidence that their video was plagiarised as well as their various counter-allegations against Ethel of Essence of Thought.

Before we begin, I want to make it absolutely clear that I do not want anyone to harass Skov, contact them or leave any angry or critical comments on their videos. Other than watching the

videos to check my claims, please leave them alone: I do not want anyone harassing them on mine or Ethel's behalf, full stop.

I also need to make it clear that these are ultimately my opinions. While I've done my very best to research and evidence everything properly, I could very well be mistaken. Both mine and Skov's opinions of the facts are also, by definition, not factual. So, I encourage you all to check the evidence for yourself and form your own opinions separate from both of us. You can find all of my sources in the google doc linked below, including timestamps for all the quotes.

Finally, I'd like to give everyone a content warning for harassment, extortion, transmisia, transmisogyny, ableism, child sexual assault, child grooming, paedophilia, antisemitism, neo-Nazis, wishing for someone's death, and physical injury.

Did VangelinaSkov Plagiarise?

We love to do this thing in online discourse where we treat statements as though they're all made in a vacuum, judging them only on whether they're internally consistent or morally agreeable. That won't work for this discussion because whether it's reasonable for someone to accuse Skov of plagiarism, demand compensation or speak out against them *kind of depends* on whether they actually engaged in plagiarism, as well as the nature and extent of that plagiarism.

So, we're going to look at the evidence of Skov's plagiarism, listen to their side of the story and then discuss.

What is Plagiarism?

Obviously, there's no point in discussing whether someone plagiarised if we don't know what plagiarism is, so I'm going to briefly dispel any misconceptions.

Plagiarism is defined by the University of Oxford as,

“Presenting work or ideas from another source as your own, with or without consent of the original author, by incorporating it into your work without full acknowledgement. ...” [3]

The university also clarifies that,

“The necessity to acknowledge others' work or ideas applies not only to text, but also to other media, such as computer code, illustrations, graphs etc. It applies equally to published text and data drawn from books and journals, and to unpublished text and data, ...” [3]

Also, of particular interest to us, the university states that, “Paraphrasing the work of others by altering a few words and changing their order, or by closely following the structure of their argument, ...” is a type of plagiarism called “paraphrasing”. [3]

So, in other words, yes, taking screenshots without clearly stating where they came from is plagiarism. Yes, taking a summary without clearly stating where it came from is plagiarism. Yes, covering the same topics in the same order without stating where this structure came from is plagiarism. Yes, this also means clearly acknowledging where these things are taken from in your work itself, not just linking random pages in a source list.

Granted, the university does also say that, “Plagiarism can also include re-using your own work without citation.” [3] But that’s because this is also concerned with academic rigour. We’re mostly concerned with consent, ergo we’re not going to take issue with someone re-using their own work.

With that made clear, let’s talk about the evidence we have of Skov’s plagiarism.

Evidence of Vangelina Skov’s Plagiarism

The most concrete piece of evidence of Skov’s plagiarism are the screenshots. 8 screenshots from their video on Lily Orchard were found to match up with 8 screenshots from videos in Essence of Thought’s series on Lily Orchard. The screenshots were all found to be taken at the same zoom factor, they all had the same background and profile pictures and they all contained a security feature which was personalised to Ethel. [2, 09:10] I won’t show all of that here, partly because Ethel has already covered it in detail, but mostly because Skov hasn’t exactly disputed it. [1, 18:46-19:08]

In addition to the 3 data points Ethel covered, it’s also important to note that the versions of the screenshots in Skov’s video were much blurrier than the ones in Ethel’s videos, meaning that the data was more compressed than the originals. This suggests that they’d been screen captured or snipped from a video display, meaning they had to be ripped from a video as opposed to archive links. They were also cropped closely, cutting out elements which would differentiate similar screenshots, such as the number of notes and the replies. [2, 09:10]

Now, to be clear, this technically only proves that Skov used screenshots that were stolen from Ethel, not that they stole the screenshots themselves. This isn’t the only piece of evidence, though.

There’s also the order of the screenshots. Skov discussed each screenshot and, by extension, the events surrounding each screenshot, in the same order they appear in Ethel’s series:

1. At 22:16, Skov discussed the screenshot shown at 1:45 in Ethel’s 1st Lily Orchard video, [4, 22:16; 5, 1:45]
2. At 25:36, Skov talked about the screenshot shown at 16:35 in Ethel’s 2nd Lily Orchard video, [4, 25:36; 6, 16:35]

3. At 25:40, Skov covered the image shown at 17:56 in Ethel's 2nd Lily Orchard video, [4, 25:40; 6, 17:56]
4. At 26:30, Skov talked about the screenshot shown at 22:56 in Ethel's 2nd Lily Orchard video, [4, 26:30; 6, 22:56]
5. At 28:17, Skov discussed the post shown at 2:22 in Ethel's 4th Lily Orchard video, [4, 28:17; 8, 2:22]
6. At 28:20, Skov talked about the image shown at 2:23 in Ethel's 4th Lily Orchard video, [4, 28:20; 8, 2:23]
7. At 28:42, Skov discussed the tweet shown at 19:08 in Ethel's 4th Lily Orchard video, [4, 28:42; 8, 19:08]
8. Finally, at 33:21, Skov talked about the post shown at 16:06 in Ethel's 5th Lily Orchard video. [4, 33:21; 9, 16:06]

Ethel didn't discuss the screenshots in chronological order, so the fact that Skov discussed these events in the same order, without a *singular* exception, is significant.

It's also not just about the screenshots that came from Ethel's video, but the screenshots that didn't. Or, rather, the lack of: in that entire 13-minute section, I couldn't find a *single* screenshot that didn't match up with one in Ethel's videos.

There are also 2 facts which Skov states in their video which I couldn't find another source for. These are 2 details of Glade's testimony (what Lily said to him and what he saw in her stream).

On top of all of this, there are certain ideas Skov has which are similar to the ones in Ethel's series, such as the idea that Lily could be sending herself asks to control the conversation and that Lily has no way of vetting any nudes which are sent to her. [2]

Finally, Skov's summary of *Stockholm* is very similar to Ethel's, effectively being a watered-down version. [2]

VangelinaSkov's Side of the Story

So, what does Skov have to say?

They don't properly dispute that the screenshots came from Ethel's videos. While they imply that the screenshots could have come from anywhere, they also admit that they can't guarantee they didn't come from Ethel's series.

SKOV: "So, what I will say is that I cannot guarantee that none of the screenshots that I received or that I found online in random places did not originate from Essence of Thought, but what I can guarantee is that I did not go to Essence of Thought's video to screenshot things and take that as my own." [1, 18:46-19:08]

Instead, they claim that they got them from 3rd parties in other places, including random pages on Tumblr and Reddit, from DMs and even from KiwiFarms. Yes, *that* KiwiFarms.

SKOV: "... I should mention, as well, one of the sources that I didn't mention, and I still haven't mentioned, this — admitting this is probably going to get me in trouble but — um, was actually KiwiFarms, and I only really went there to see archives, screenshots of things ... The other thing that I did wrong in this situation was that I didn't check the source of all of the screenshots I used. 'Cause, like I said, some of them came from random Reddit posts, random Tumblr posts, um, and from the DMs as well." [1, 15:07-15:24, 18:08-18:24]

They also argue that their ideas being similar to Ethel's is a coincidence. For example, they say that the idea of Lily sending herself asks was obvious to them because they'd seen that behaviour before, and they say that they didn't plagiarise Ethel's ideas about *Stockholm* because they were summarising the story rather than analysing it.

SKOV: "The other thing that she said I plagiarised was that, um, there was a section in both of our videos talking about, ... like, Lily Orchard's probably sending herself messages so she can respond to them herself, right? We both said the same thing. ... but this is not, like, a super 4D-chess move thought to have. Like, this is a very basic thought to have because creators have been outed for doing that all the time. ... It's not a bizarre thing to think; I think most people, without being told that opinion, would think it themselves. ... So, we did just have the same thought: that's not plagiarism." [1, 21:06-21:13, 21:18-21:25, 21:36-21:45, 22:10-22:20, 22:34-22:38]

SKOV: "Another thing that Ethel said that I plagiarised was, erm, *Stockholm* ...? ... I summarised some of the main points of what *Stockholm* is about because, obviously, it's YouTube; I didn't want to go into the full details of it because, like, it is disgusting ... And because I did that, Ethel is saying that I plagiarised their video because they also talked about *Stockholm*. But, that— it just doesn't make sense. Like, I think they're trying to say that I plagiarised their analysis of it? But I didn't analyse it — I just summarised it." [1, 22:56-23:03, 23:19-23:31, 23:34-23:51]

Finally, they argue that they wouldn't have used Ethel as a source of information because of Ethel's character. Specifically, Skov claims they don't trust Ethel as a source of information because she,

SKOV: "... goes after people, and how she twists things, and how she lies about things ..." [1, 25:06-25:29]

Did VangelinaSkov Plagiarise?

At first glance, the argument that the screenshots came from 3rd parties seems pretty damning. Maybe we can prove that the screenshots originally came from Ethel's video, but we can't prove that Skov was the one who stole them. Case closed, right?

Well, no. This is only a slightly different version of the same problem. Before, we had to believe that Skov managed to create screenshots of these posts that were, by some cosmic coincidence, identical to Ethel's in 3 different ways, including one which is personalised to them. Now, we have to believe that up to 8 separate internet users created these same identical screenshots. Or, at best, that they ripped the screenshots from Ethel's video in the exact same way and that not a single one chose to simply use the Internet Archive links Ethel provided or post the video in its entirety.

If there's one thing internet users are known for, it's uniformity, am I right? /s

Not just that, but we also have to believe that all of these users cropped out identifiers like the replies and the number of notes, as though random Reddit and Tumblr users are scared of being tracked down and accused of plagiarism for posting a screenshot.

Now, Skov also claims to have used KiwiFarms as a source, but specifically for archive links. That rules out KiwiFarms because archive links wouldn't contain the security feature. Skov also claims that they verified everything they found on KiwiFarms, so we're back to the original problem: where did Skov find the corroborating evidence?

Of course, Skov can claim that they were misremembering and that they did actually pull blurry screenshots from KiwiFarms without verifying them, except that would mean claiming to use a transphobic, neo-Nazi harassment website as an honest-to-god trustworthy source for information on a predatory trans woman. I'll let Skov choose which defence they'd prefer.

Now, to be fair, we have found one screenshot in use by a third party. Specifically, the screenshot of Lily explaining her support for FireRose appears in a video by Definitely Bored Oranges. [10] However, there are still several problems. First and most obviously, this still doesn't explain the other 7 screenshots — even if this one screenshot isn't stolen, the other 7 still can be. Second, this screenshot is missing the traces of red that are visible on the edges of Skov's version of the image, meaning that Skov couldn't have used it because it's a smaller image. Third, Oranges' version of the image contains the security feature, which suggests it was also stolen from Ethel's video, which also suggests Skov got it from there since Skov couldn't have used the version in Oranges' video.

The only other explanation we have evidence for is that the screenshot came from KiwiFarms, because Oranges mentions using KiwiFarms in another video on Lily Orchard. [11] Thing is, this puts Skov in the same situation I outlined a minute ago: if they're not trusting KiwiFarms as a genuine source, where are they getting independent verification of these screenshots?

By the way, remember that name — Definitely Bored Oranges — because I have a surprise twist for you at the end of the video.

Even if we do buy that they got these screenshots second-hand, though, all of this still doesn't explain how they ended up in the exact same order, even the 2 screenshots that Ethel showed at 2:22 and 2:23 in the same video. If Skov really did rip these from random places on the internet, how did they establish the exact same sequence of events? Again, Ethel didn't cover these screenshots chronologically.

On top of all that, we're supposed to believe that Skov found all of these randomly, in the wild, but didn't find any screenshots *besides* Ethel's to use in that 13-minute section? Apparently, Skov did all of this research from all of these sources *except* for Ethel's series, but they somehow ended up with *only* screenshots from Ethel's series in that section?

At this point, maybe some of you are thinking, "okay, that sounds pretty unlikely, but it's still *possible*! Unbelievable coincidences happen all the time!"

The problem is, it's not just that Skov's explanation is unlikely. It's also that it lacks any and all supporting evidence, despite this evidence being extremely easy to provide. If Skov could show just *one* example of a screenshot identical to theirs out in the wild, it would throw half of my argument into question.

And, if they don't want to trawl through their browser history or random web pages, they could instead show us the DMs where they imply they received some of these screenshots (while blocking out the profile information of the sender, of course). This is such a simple and basic way to support their innocence that its absence is, personally, for me, almost enough to demonstrate their guilt by itself.

In summary, I do not believe for a moment that they found these screenshots by accident. There are too many unlikely coincidences that I would have to accept, along with an inexplicable lack of evidence.

But there's more. Even if we accept their story unquestioningly — we ignore how unlikely it is for separate users to produce identical screenshots, how unlikely it is for Skov to order these random screenshots in an identical way, we ignore the complete lack of evidence that these screenshots were even made available to them outside of Ethel's video — there's still one very important question they need to answer: how did they learn about all the context surrounding these screenshots?

How did they learn that Lily specifically baited a minor into watching a stream where she flashes? How did they know Lily's exact words were, "watch and find out"? [4, 27:32-27:51] The Lily Orchard Gossip Blog talked about Lily baiting a minor into watching an NSFW stream, but nothing beyond that. [12] I also couldn't find any details about this incident in any of the other

sources in their updated source list. The only reasonable explanation we have is that they found out about this by watching Ethel's video containing Glade's testimony.

It's also not like Skov couldn't have shown us where this came from if there were a simple explanation: we asked about this in the initial video, yet Skov hasn't even tried to address it.

If they have explanations, which they can *show evidence for*, I'm more than happy to eat a slice of humble pie, apologise and post a retraction. I don't think that will happen, though. Seriously, what's more likely? That they found all of these identical screenshots out in the wild, put them in the exact same order as Ethel, divined additional context not in their sources, and that all of these screenshots suddenly can't be found anywhere on the internet (including their DMs), or that they lied because they don't want to admit to plagiarism?

These screenshots also provide important context for the claim that Skov stole mine and Ethel's thoughts. See, Skov has this "divide and conquer" approach to addressing the evidence where they talk about each piece in isolation. For example, they argue that they knew Lily was sending herself screenshots because that behaviour's obvious to them, because they've seen other people do that. This is a fair explanation, until you consider that we already know they *had* to have seen Ethel's series, due to both the screenshots and their knowledge of the surrounding context. It's all well and good to say that you *could* have come up with an idea independently, but just because you could doesn't mean you did. If it was pointed out to you before you got a chance to think of it yourself, it's not your own independent idea.

This "it's obvious" defence also doesn't explain Skov's summary of *Stockholm*. *Stockholm* is a complex story with an entire book's worth of content, so there are a plethora of ways you can summarise it depending on what you want to highlight. For example, here's a few of the milder ways I may summarise *Stockholm*, as someone who's read the first book in its entirety:

1. *Stockholm* is Lily Orchard's fantasy of a world where people accept and accommodate abuse,
2. *Stockholm* is a story in which Lily writes child characters as temptresses who are responsible for being sexually abused,
3. *Stockholm* is a story which blames paedophilia on intersex hormones and body parts,
4. *Stockholm* is a story in which a mental health professional condones domestic abuse,
5. *Stockholm* is Lily's fantasy of a paedophile being allowed to form close relationships with children, be around them unsupervised, and even adopt a child.

As you can see, even one person can come up with a lot of different ways to summarise *Stockholm*, so it's already unlikely that Skov would come up with such a similar summary to Ethel. When you consider that we *know* Skov watched Ethel's series, it's impossible for it to be a coincidence, because Skov didn't even get the chance to come up with that summary by themselves.

The many ways one can summarise *Stockholm* also makes Skov's "I didn't plagiarise it, I summarised it" defence really weird to me: you absolutely can plagiarise a summary. A

summary is, in fact, a unique piece of work, especially for a piece as long and complex as *Stockholm*.

We now have only one piece of evidence left to address: the objection to Ethel's character. Of course, at this point, we know it's not true because we have iron-clad evidence that Skov plagiarised Ethel's videos. Still, I want to talk about how it doesn't make sense in any case. Ethel's videos are fully referenced, meaning that trust isn't part of the equation to begin with. If you don't trust her claims, you can go into Ethel's transcript, go to their source list and check all the facts for yourself and form your own opinion. Even if you think Ethel is so cartoonishly dishonest that they're basically a lying guard in a logic puzzle, never telling the truth, you can approach their videos Wikipedia-style and go straight to the links without even listening to a word out of their mouth. Also, unlike some people, Ethel's source list isn't a mess of poorly labelled links: every link not only has a detailed label, but a reference number that's used in both the video and transcript to tell you *exactly* which reference corresponds to which claim. The defence of "I would never trust that person as a source of information" works on so many people, but *not Ethel*.

It was also pointed out to me by a member of our community — who I won't name, for their safety — that it's rather hypocritical of Skov to denounce Ethel as an untrustworthy source while admitting to using Encyclopedia Drammatica and *KiwiFarms*! [1, 14:29-14:48, 15:07-15:24] Skov cannot use poor character as a defence when they will admit to sourcing from much more biased and unsavoury people.

So, we have 8 identical screenshots, arranged in an identical order, 7 of which have no demonstrated origin other than Ethel's videos and one of which is only available elsewhere in a modified state. We have context surrounding those screenshots which also has no other demonstrated origin. We have Skov sharing thoughts which are very similar to those in Ethel's videos, including an almost identical summary of an extremely complex work. Finally, we have a character defence which makes absolutely no sense to apply to Ethel in particular and is contradicted by Skov's other sources. In response to all of this, Skov's only defence is, "I promise it came from somewhere else! You can't objectively prove it didn't!" This is the best they have, even though objective evidence of their innocence would be very easy to provide.

I would say that we have to go with Occam's Razor on this one, but the evidence is better than that: it's not just the most reasonable explanation, but the *only* reasonable explanation, supported by *all* of the available evidence. As if that's not enough, we even have evidence *against* some of their arguments and claims — even the ones you would expect to be unfalsifiable, such as their claims about their opinion of Ethel's character. As far as I'm aware, the only situation which would require more solid evidence than this is an actual murder trial.

Skov plagiarised: that's just a fact.

If you won't take my word for it, by the way, you can take theirs:

SKOV: “The other thing that I did wrong in this situation is that I didn't check the source of all of the screenshots I used. 'Cause like I said, some of them came from random Reddit posts, random Tumblr posts, um, and from the DMs as well, and I didn't check where those originated from, which was stupid.” [1, 18:08-18:29]

We have a word for taking materials, including screenshots, from other people and presenting them in your work without telling people where they came from: that word is plagiarism. Even if Skov really did get these screenshots from 3rd parties — nevermind that we've already discussed why that's impossible — that doesn't mean they didn't plagiarise. You don't get a free pass for being such a lazy plagiarist that you don't even remember who you plagiarised from. You also don't get a free pass for plagiarising from other plagiarists. If we gave them a free pass on those grounds, well, we'd have to let every plagiarist off the hook.

This is behaviour that would get you a failing grade in your average high school class. If it's not acceptable there, why should it be acceptable in a commercial product which is being monetised in 4 different ways, including by direct contributions from private citizens who haven't consented to supporting plagiarism?

Was VangelinaSkov Extorted?

From this point on, I'm going to assume that we all agree that Skov plagiarised because, well, if you weren't convinced by that evidence, I don't think anything I can say will change your mind. With that context in mind, I want to address the allegation that Ethel engaged in extortion.

The Order of Events

First, we need to establish the order of events, because Skov isn't clear about that in their video.

SKOV: “I just want to explain... Well, I guess firstly why I didn't respond. Um, and I think you need to understand from my perspective, that this is somebody emailing me, claiming that I've plagiarised them, and demanding money, so that they don't make a video about me. And this is me knowing that I haven't plagiarised anyone's video. So, in my eyes, when I get this, it feels like somebody is trying to extort me for money ...” [1, 6:43-7:13]

That's not what happened: Ethel asked for money in the initial email, as well as for recognition of the plagiarism, but there was no mention of anything bad happening if Skov didn't comply. [2, 45:44]

Now, to be fair, Skov does acknowledge this earlier in their video:

SKOV: “Otherwise, they were going to end up making a video about me — this is said in the later email.”. [1, 6:36-6:39]

Except that doesn't really absolve them, does it? Truths and lies don't cancel each other out: beginning with the truth and then going on to lie is no less wrong than lying from the beginning. After all, the end result is the same: they're still mashing together 2 separate events to make Ethel look more aggressive.

It's also not just about the emails being separate: Skov conveniently leaves out the inciting incident. See, Ethel didn't mention going public for no reason. She mentioned it because Skov had updated the description of their video to cite several people *except* for Ethel. [2, 49:02-49:27] This was, from Ethel's perspective, not only a sign that Skov was deliberately excluding them, meaning the plagiarism was no mistake, but also of them preparing a narrative that the screenshots came from somewhere else. Maybe you don't like how Ethel handled the situation, and you don't have to, but you can't say it was unprovoked. And, if you do want to say that — if you feel like this information changes nothing — just ask yourself one question: if this information truly doesn't reflect badly on Skov, why did they go out of their way to hide it?

It Wasn't "Hush Money"

In addition to conflating the 2 emails, Skov also argues that Ethel was asking for "hush money".

SKOV: "... if I respond in any way, without just giving them money to shut them up — which, I don't want to give somebody money to shut them up. I don't want to give somebody hush money ..." [1, 8:43-8:52]

Thing is, this doesn't make any sense if you read Ethel's email, where she states that, "... these actions are to be taken along with issuing a correction/apology to all social media, as well as including an explanation of the issue at the top of the video description (run by us first) explaining the error." [2]

Skov, throughout their video, speaks as if the money would make the plagiarism accusations go away for them, but that was never true: they were always supposed to be addressed publicly, in one way or another. The real choice was whether Skov would own up to the plagiarism or be exposed.

This could not be hush money, by definition. Hush money is a bribe that you give to someone so they keep your secrets, but how could Ethel be paid to keep secrets when *they are the one* demanding that Skov address the issue publicly? This was also not extortion for a similar reason: keeping the issue secret can't be used as leverage to coerce Skov if keeping the issue secret was never offered to begin with. No secrets means no threats means no extortion.

VangelinaSkov's Framing Was Dishonest

So, Skov is guilty of at least 3 lies at this point: they lied about Ethel threatening to go public in the initial email, they lied by omission when they spoke as if Ethel talked about going public for

no reason, and they also lied when they claimed that Ethel was extorting them and asking for hush money. It can't get any worse than that, though, right?

Oh, yes it can, because Skov's entire framing is a lie: they speak as someone who was minding their own business when a random stranger approached them to demand money, but we know that's not true because we *know* they plagiarised Ethel. Let's imagine what would have *actually* happened from their perspective...

So, you're making a YouTube video and you decide to take more than one-third of that video's contents from a YouTube series. Not only do you rip 8 screenshots directly from the videos, but you also cover those screenshots in the exact same order and most (if not all) of the commentary you give is a pared-down version of what was discussed in the series. You publish the video and then, some time later, the YouTuber whose series you stole contacts you telling you that they have evidence you stole their work and that they want 30% of the video's monetary value as compensation as well as public acknowledgement of the plagiarism. You already know they're exactly who they say they are and that they're telling the truth because, remember, you did, in fact, steal from several of their videos.

Now, you get this message and, instead of, say, owning up to the issue and trying to negotiate on the compensation, or even flat-out ignoring them, you specifically choose to update your video description to include all of your other sources *except* for them.

Later that same day, you get another email from them where they tell you that they saw you update your source list and they want to give you another chance to own up. You tell them to talk to your lawyer.

Is that really the experience of a hapless victim? Stealing a minimum of 8 pieces of someone's work, spurning 2 separate offers to discuss the situation, publicly signalling that you excluded them on purpose, then threatening legal action only *after* you've made a move against them? You can see why they went with the "I'm so confused and scared" version of events. Speaking of...

Was VangelinaSkov Scared?

In their video, Skov does actually give us an explanation for why they wouldn't talk to Ethel. They say that they were scared and that they didn't think Ethel was acting in good faith. Are they being honest, though? I don't think they are, for 3 reasons.

One reason is that Skov is inconsistent about the seriousness of the alleged extortion:

SKOV: "... it feels like somebody is trying to extort me for money, and that is a serious legal issue. That's not something I can just immediately respond to and be like, 'no', or 'here's some money'." [1, 7:12-7:21]

SKOV: "So, when Essence of Thought reached out to me, I thought, 'Well, okay, yeah, fair enough. I haven't actually done a good enough job of putting all the sources more concisely. So, I'm going to fix that.'" [1, 16:37-16:48]

So, which is it? Is this a scary and serious legal issue of extortion? Or is it the sort of situation where you can mess around with your description and source list willy-nilly?

Additionally, is Ethel a malicious actor who's attacking Skov for no good reason? Or are they correct that Skov didn't source her video properly?

I think, by updating the description, Skov has backed themselves into a corner: they have to admit that Ethel had a point, because the only other reasonable explanation for them updating their source list is to give themselves plausible deniability for their plagiarism. At the same time, they can't admit that Ethel was right because it would conflict with their narrative that Ethel is irrational and malicious. How do they reconcile this? They don't. They simply switch back and forth between those 2 versions of events and hope no-one will notice. Sadly for them, I noticed.

Another reason I don't believe Skov is that they simultaneously argue that they're too scared of Ethel to talk to her, while also complaining that Ethel didn't talk to them.

SKOV: "So I'm thinking, if I respond in any way, this person is going to be furious. This person's going to go ballistic, and it's going to actually be worse." [1, 8:58-9:07]

SKOV: "... they're already calling me a plagiarist without having spoken to me ..." [1, 30:56-31:00]

Now, full disclosure: this "calling me a plagiarist" bit is in reference to things Ethel said on twitter. However, prior to Skov updating their source list, Ethel only said, "... I am aware that someone has plagiarised my videos ...", [13] which is not "calling [Skov] a plagiarist". This was Ethel communicating to our audience that the situation was being monitored and addressed to make sure no-one felt the need to get involved. The only other way Ethel could reasonably do this is to say, "I'm aware of the situation with VangelinaSkov", which would not only direct everyone to them, but also prompt the very obvious follow-up question of, "What situation?" Then we're back where we started with saying Skov plagiarised, except this time being forced to identify Skov by name. I truly think Ethel chose the best option she had available to her in these circumstances.

Hey there! Just a quick editor's note about some important context that was left out by Skov, and that was the fact that, literally an hour and a half after my original post in which I did not name them, I quote tweeted myself, stating very plainly that:

"Now that I've calmed down, I've messaged them to try and reach a clean resolution.

I think it goes without saying on this channel, but I'll say it anyway: Please do not seek out/antagonise anyone you believe responsible." [14]

So I was very clearly distressed when I wrote the original post yet still circled back around to make sure nobody tried to harass anyone on my behalf. Of course, me doing such isn't mentioned anywhere in Skov's video, with them going so far as to assert I did no such thing at any point: [1]

SKOV: "Please do not harass or send any hate — hate (sorry), to Ethel or to anybody involved. To be perfectly honest, this is a courtesy that was not extended to me."

"To be perfectly honest, this is a courtesy that was not extended to me."

Why? Well because it contradicts the narrative Skov's trying to construct about me as this malicious monster. Anyway, back to the bird.

All of this is immaterial, of course, because we already know that Skov plagiarised and that Ethel had proof from the beginning, meaning that Skov was never owed the chance to explain himself, but I wanted to be transparent.

So, with that in mind: according to Skov, Ethel is bad because she's too violent and scary to talk to, but she's also bad because she didn't discuss the issue?

It's especially cruel of Skov to make this argument when we consider that they claim to be terrified of Ethel: Skov made it clear in their video that they already didn't feel comfortable talking to Ethel, so what was she supposed to do? She already tried twice! Was she supposed to physically force Skov to talk to her? If you don't want to talk to someone, that's your right, but don't turn around and complain when you don't end up talking. Is that really a crime, now? Respecting someone's boundaries?

Speaking of twitter, as I was writing this script, Ethel let me know that Skov had followed them. Skov did block Ethel, but only after she called them out for the follow. [15] Now, to be clear, I'm not claiming that the call-out caused the block because I can't possibly know that. I'm just telling you what I know.

That's not the point, though. The point is, is this really the behaviour of someone who's scared? Who's worried that, if they "respond in any way, [Ethel] will go ballistic"? Would someone who's scared follow Ethel on social media, knowing that she'll get a notification?

Now, Skov claims this was a misclick, but I find that difficult to believe given that the block and follow buttons are nowhere near each other in twitter's UI. I also feel like, personally, if I were terrified of someone, I'd be extra careful to make sure I was definitely clicking the right button,

specifically to prevent something like this from happening. It's not as if Skov was in the middle of a heated argument and had to block Ethel quickly.

On its own, I don't think the twitter follow proves anything, but I find it suspicious. When I combine it with the 2 very blatant contradictions in Skov's video, I cannot believe that Skov is genuinely scared. Like, they only seem to be scared when they're focused on talking about how terrifying Ethel is, but that act seems to falter when they're distracted by other topics, including *other criticisms of Ethel*, such as Ethel referring to their actions as plagiarism.

The Fires of Your Own History

Another allegation we need to talk about is that Ethel is apparently going on a smear campaign. This is supposedly evidenced by Ethel saying, "I will make sure your reputation burns". This is a quote that Skov repeats throughout their video. [1, 19:50-20:00; 31:27-31:38; 41:57-42:13, 42:28-42:37]

Now, that is something Ethel said, but it's only half of the quote. The full quote is, "I will make sure your reputation burns on the fires of your own history." This wasn't the threat that Skov makes it out to be. Ethel wasn't saying, "I will make your reputation burn": she was saying, "I will expose what you've done, other people will inevitably come forward and your past behaviour coming to light will ruin your reputation."

No, really — Ethel very clearly says that, as long as you don't immediately cut her off:

ETHEL: "I will make sure your reputation burns upon fires fuelled by your own history. Because, if there's one thing I've learned about plagiarists, it's that they're never satisfied with doing it once. That all it takes is for one person to stand up, to go, 'hang on a second', and the next thing you know, you have a chain reaction of fellow victims doing the same." [2, 1:07:10-1:07:38]

Now, maybe this doesn't move you. If that's the case, I want you to ask yourself, "If this context doesn't matter, why did Skov leave it out? Why did they keep repeating only half a quote?"

While we're on the topic, another quote Skov uses is, "we are beyond making amends". [1, 19:50-20:06]

Again, Ethel did say that, but Skov takes it out of context. Whilst Ethel did say, "we are beyond making amends at this point ..." that was right after she explained:

ETHEL: "Yet, even worse than that, when I reached out to you about the harm your actions were doing, to try and reach an accord, you spurned me. You pretended to ignore my cries whilst editing the description of your video, acting like you were an honourable person. When I did not give up, you threatened me. ... We are beyond making amends at this point. I gave you that chance, twice." [2, 1:06:17-1:06:40; 1:07:03-1:07:10]

This is what Skov uses as their evidence that Ethel was *never* interested in amends:

SKOV: "We are beyond making amends at this point. I gave you that chance twice. I will make sure your reputation burns on fires fuelled by your own history.' So, they don't want to discuss this. They don't want to make amends ..." [1, 19:50-20:06]

"They don't want to discuss this." Skov says, as if Ethel didn't try twice. That really is a neat trick, isn't it? Refuse to talk to someone, change things behind their back without explanation, shut them down by mentioning a lawyer, then use them giving up on you as proof that talking to them was always pointless. Time really is immaterial on the internet, isn't it?

What's worse is that Skov was literally a glance away from this context: they use Ethel's transcript when they quote her, so all they had to do to see this explanation was look up slightly. It's not that they didn't know, it's that they didn't want to know.

This is their "proof" that Ethel had no interest in a peaceful resolution: Ethel's explanation of how Skov denied her a peaceful resolution.

Cross-Referencing Vangelina Skov's Claims

While we're on the topic of Skov taking things out of context, let's lightning-round a few more examples.

Here's Skov claiming that Ethel accused them of breaking her foot with plagiarism.

SKOV: "They also had an entire section, 'how this affected my health'. It was that, they had a tooth infection and a broken foot before... before I even published my video. Before they reached out to me or anything. And, for some reason, I made it harder? It just doesn't make any sense. It feels like, again, you're trying to associate me with things that have nothing to do with me. ... Like, I have nothing to do with your broken foot. I... I didn't run over your foot." [1, 35:53-36:20, 37:24-37:29]

SKOV: "I'm sorry you're injured. It has absolutely nothing to do with me and it just feels like it's just trying to add as much negativity onto my name as possible to try and make sure people's emotions are heightened, so they hate me as much as they possibly can, because they want to watch my reputation burn." [1, 37:29-37:47]

ETHEL: "... this really couldn't have come at a worse time for me. ... at the time Vangelina Skov plagiarised me, I was getting ready to have surgery, meaning she added to said stress." [2, 58:15-58:18, 1:00:08-1:00:15]

As we can see, Ethel obviously didn't accuse Skov of breaking her foot, because who the hell would? Also, like, this very mild-mannered, minor complaint is supposed to stir up a frenzy, apparently?

Skov also claims that Ethel is accusing them of personally making her wife lose her job.

SKOV: "Like, there's a part in their video where they're talking about how they're going through some financial difficulties, something to do with her wife's job — it's none of my business, but they said it in the video — but, that's followed up by, I'm 'taking food from their starving mouths', because I made a video on the same topic." [1, 32:18-32:39]

SKOV: "That's just... I mean, it's making it sound like I'm depriving you of money, like I'm, I'm the reason something is happening with your wife's job and the reason that you're maybe not making as much money." [1, 32:41-32:53]

ETHEL: "Udita's field has been left in ruin by new restrictions placed on the UN by the Indian government ..." [2, 1:01:59-1:02:04]

ETHEL: "Is that I found out that someone with 100,000 subscribers has just plagiarised one of the hardest series I have ever produced, mincing it up and presenting said sick mockery as their own, original work. Someone who is not only making bank on the ad revenue and Patreon, but also merchandise and brand sponsorships. It's more than a little soul-crushing, I'm not gonna lie. And yeah, the more I think about it, how I was ripped off, how Glade was dehumanised, and just what a lazy ass job Skov did with all she stole, the angrier I get." [1, 1:04:51-1:05:29]

Skov was never blamed for Udita losing her job because, again, who would do that? Skov was accused of "stealing food from [their] starving mouths" because they monetised Ethel's work without disclosing where it came from. Given that views are money on YouTube — sometimes literally, thanks to AdSense — publishing someone's work without citing them is, in fact, taking money away from them. It's not like Skov doesn't understand how this works: they also use AdSense, and it's not like they got a sponsorship deal for being obscure.

This next one is quite heavy, just a warning: this is Skov claiming that Ethel associated them with child sexual assault for no reason.

SKOV: "They said ... and this is another reason why I don't, I just feel like this is just an attempt to smear me, um, and to make people angry at me. And again, associating me with things that have nothing to do with me. They said that... [sigh] sorry. They said that they were raped as a child, and because of that, they're even more disgusted with my actions. I just don't understand what that has to do with this." [1, 38:03-38:40]

"It's really unfair to try and associate me with something awful and criminal that happened to you as a child, that also happened to me as a child, because I wouldn't give you money? For a video I didn't plagiarise?" [1, 40:59-41:21]

ETHEL: "So, returning to the misinformation, Skov doesn't even do us the decency of going back to double-check the specific context of her assertions. She just makes the most generic statement possible and that's it. Which is not only dangerous in how it gives Lily Orchard ammunition, it's also fucking insulting! ... As someone who was raped as a child and later groomed online, I am personally disgusted by just how half-arsed Skov's coverage of the topic is. Her commentary on the issue is worse than worthless: it is actively harmful." [2, 35:00-35:20, 36:02-36:27]

So, it wasn't for no reason: Ethel was criticising Skov for covering the issue poorly. It turns out that if you lazily plagiarise information about child sexual abuse and get a bunch of things wrong, some child sexual abuse survivors will get upset with you and talk about how you did a bad job.

Can we talk for a moment about how dishonest this is? Like, more than once, I've seen people choose to cover heavy topics like child abuse and sexual assault, then act like they're being dragged into these discussions against their will when people mention their names in the same breath. If you don't want to be involved with these topics, don't talk about them! It really is that simple.

As for this next one... actually, no, I only have the four and I showed one of them at the beginning of this video. "Only", he says, as if 4 blatant and obvious lies isn't a lot...

Just one note on the 4th one, though: there's even more evidence that Skov knows iiluminaughtii was accused of plagiarism as well as abuse;

SKOV: "... I said, 'I really liked hbomborguy's video. I think the stuff he said about plagiarism was great, he did a really good job with the video, but there's one little bit that I didn't like.' ..." [1, 1:11-1:21]

SKOV: "The hbomborguy thing: he made his 'plagiarism and YouTube' video and, because I've been covering iiluminaughtii, I watched it, mostly because of the iiluminaghtii thing ..." [1, 00:50-1:00]

Not only have they seen hbomborguy's video, but they watched it *specifically because* they had been covering iiluminaghtii. They knew full well that iiluminaughtii was also a plagiarist, but being honest about that meant passing up an opportunity to accuse Ethel of calling them an abuser, so they pretended not to.

While all 4 of these obvious lies are still fresh in our minds, I want to take a moment to appreciate what Skov said about Ethel being untrustworthy. What was it, again?

SKOV: "I've seen how she goes after people, and how she twists things, and how she lies about things." [1, 25:23-25:29]

Takes one to know one, I suppose.

Before we move on, I want to point out a pattern I noticed: this isn't just Skov lying about what Ethel said but, specifically, in many cases, Skov pretending to be confused as they lie. I think this helps them assign particularly bizarre and unbelievable claims to Ethel.

I think that them looking and sounding confused helps sell the lie, because it's how we would feel in that situation. I think people look at them and feel, on some level, "yeah, that's basically how I would react", and it makes the situation more believable than if they said these things with a straight face.

I also think it gives Skov a layer of plausible deniability. Even though these are very obvious lies — lies so simple and blatant that they can be disproven by cross-referencing a few clips — Skov's apparent confusion makes people feel just that *little bit* more inclined to think this could all be a mistake.

This is Transmisogyny

I think now is as good a time as any to talk about how Skov's behaviour is not just dishonest, but transmisogynistic.

If you've talked to someone, gone outside or looked at the internet at all in the past 10 years, you've seen trans women be called violent, dangerous, and predatory. From trans women in bathrooms and changing rooms, to trans women in sports, to trans women just existing in public, there's a deluge of propaganda based on the idea that trans women, and transfems in general, are a violent threat, especially to white cis women and those who are perceived as such.

This isn't any less prevalent online, sadly, not even in supposedly progressive spaces. Over the years, I've watched Ethel be victimised by these narratives more times than I can count.

One perfect and terrible example is, actually, one of Skov's friends. In their video, Skov alleges that Ethel has been harassing their friend for years. [1, 31:03-31:21] That friend is Rachel Oates. Now, what happened between Ethel and Oates is its own multiple series' worth of videos. [16] I can't get into it here, so I'll keep it simple by showing you this screenshot of Rachel Oates asking all of her Twitter followers to talk to Ethel about her, even though Ethel had her blocked. This is what we here on, um, Earth call "inciting harassment", yet the narrative is, to this day, that Ethel was the sole aggressor. [17]

That's transmisogyny in action: Oates demonstrably, explicitly incited harassment — quite serious, mass harassment — against someone who had her blocked. But Ethel was an angry transfem and Oates was a sad cis woman, so Oates not only gets a free pass but Ethel somehow gets saddled with all the blame. Ethel must always be the aggressor, even when she's demonstrably not.

When we think back to everything we've covered with this bias in mind, I think the transmisogyny on Skov's part is rather clear.

- Did you ask for compensation? That's extortion now.
- Did you say that being plagiarised was inconvenient? Well, you're accusing someone of breaking your foot over the internet.
- Did you say you weren't willing to make amends after you were rebuffed twice and shown signs of bad faith? Well, you clearly were never willing to make amends in the first place.

Every little thing is taken to the extreme. For a cis person, for example, I think you'd usually misconstrue them by saying that they claimed you made their injury worse with stress, or something like that. For a transfem person, it's, "you claimed I injured you".

Even Skov's reading of the initial email as an extortion attempt is an example of this. Like, yeah, Ethel did say that, "... these actions are to be taken ...", implying it's a demand. However, she also says, "... we feel we're entitled to 30% ..." which does suggest she's open to negotiation. I get that the messages are a little mixed, but Skov isn't complaining that Ethel was unclear: they're going straight to calling it extortion. It's a "one strike, you're out" attitude which I've personally never seen directed at a cis person, but have sadly seen happen all too often to transfems.

It's not just that minor comments are taken to extremes, though. It's also that they're presented as overtly malicious attacks. It's not just, "you accused me of breaking your foot", for example, but "you accused me of breaking your foot to add negativity to my name so that people would hate me and try to burn my reputation". It takes a special kind of person to see a sick and injured transfem complain that plagiarism is inconvenient and see a grand conspiracy against them: it takes a transmisogynist.

There's also this idea that Ethel is always acting as a perpetrator, never a victim. For example, Skov complains that Ethel is using iiluminaughtii to game the algorithm, to boost her video. Thing is, yeah! She *is* doing that, but why is that wrong? Why is it wrong for a victim to try to boost evidence of plagiarism against them by referencing another high-profile case? Isn't it on the plagiarist to not plagiarise, not the victim to remain silent? We all know the answer, but Skov knows that you're not thinking of this as a victim boosting evidence of a crime against her — you're thinking of a perpetrator trying to destroy them, because transfems are always the perpetrator. The evidence, the actual events, aren't going to matter.

There's also a whole other face of transmisogyny to consider, this time centring on ableism. All trans people are subject to ableism because we live in a society where being transgender is widely considered a mental illness. A trans person, by definition, is coded as mentally ill. For transfems, though, this specifically manifests as coding them as violently delusional. For example, consider Buffalo Bill from *Silence of the Lambs*. "It puts the lotion on its skin ...": this is the sort of thing people are taught to think of when they think of transfems.

Is Skov accusing Ethel of being a grotesque serial murderer? Of course not. But Skov *is* accusing Ethel of an unusual degree of irrationality and violence with neither a scrap of evidence to back it up, nor any attempt to consider alternative explanations of *why* Ethel may be saying and doing these things. Did Ethel choose her words poorly? Did she exaggerate because she was upset? Is Skov ignorant of key information, or simply misremembering? Was there a misunderstanding or miscommunication on either side? These things, and more, aren't considered, because they don't have to be: Ethel is a transfem and, therefore, we don't need to question why (or if) she would be so irrational or violent. She's just *like that*. /s

Skov also accuses her of being highly malicious without, again, a single piece of evidence to support their claims. They just say that Ethel is doing all these things to destroy them, including completely ridiculous things like claiming that Skov broke her foot over the internet, and people believe it. I don't think they would listen to them so readily if their allegations didn't mimic pre-existing transmisogynistic narratives.

Okay, that's not entirely fair: they do have *one* very weak piece of evidence, which is Ethel supposedly harassing their friend for years. According to Skov, this plagiarism accusation is *possibly* a way for Ethel to keep harassing Oates. [1, 31:03-31:21]

Now, again, Skov produces no evidence of this, not even a simple pattern of behaviour, even though there's apparently years' worth of incidents. We also just discussed how Skov's friend has incited mass-harassment against Ethel, calling Skov's entire narrative into question.

Even if we believe Skov, though, it still doesn't make any sense considering that we already know they plagiarised Ethel. Like, even if we pretend that Ethel harassed Oates and we also pretend that Ethel had a pattern of harassing Oates' friends, the fact is that Ethel's accusations against Skov are demonstrably true. By arguing that this is really about Oates, Skov is effectively declaring that the rest of Oates' friends can treat Ethel however they like, as unethically and even unlawfully as they like, and Ethel is the one who's in the wrong if she so much as talks about it: she's automatically the aggressor. Oh, look! There's the transmisogyny again.

We also need to consider how ableism and transmisogyny mix to disproportionately impact Ethel in particular. See, Ethel is autistic, and one of the ways autism impacts them is that it makes them struggle a lot with language. That's actually why I work with her — I work as the script editor and I double-check some of the posts and correspondence because my autism happens to make me quite good at that sort of thing. (Yes, autism really can impact 2 different

people in opposite ways — it's a complex condition.) But what this means for Ethel is that she often words herself poorly, even with the best of intentions, even after the last few years of me coaching her: it's just who she is. Sadly, people are already unkind about that sort of thing in general, but it must have become so much worse for Ethel after she came out. Now that she has to deal with every little thing being blown to extremes *and* this "one strike, you're out" attitude, having trouble with wording herself poorly is a massive liability. It's no wonder that so many people hate her.

Audience Harassment

Another very serious allegation that we need to address is regarding audience harassment. In their video, Skov claims that audience members of Essence of Thought went to their channel and harassed them, apparently some quite viciously, and they claim that this is something our audience tends to do. [1, 44:43-45:01] They also complain that, unlike them, Ethel didn't do them the courtesy of telling our subscribers not to harass them. [1, 44:43-45:01]

Honestly? This is a shock to me. I've never heard of anyone from our audience harassing anyone before. It's always seemed like our community was clear on the fact that harassment is not okay. I thought it came with the territory of being human rights activists: freedom from violence, including not being harassed, is also a human right, after all.

Even though we thought our audience was clear on this, though, Ethel did still tell people not to harass Skov in a community post. [18] Should a statement have been included in the video as well? Maybe, but... well, we'll come back to that.

As for the harassment that Skov allegedly received... look, if it happened, I'm really, really upset with and disappointed in those who are responsible, and I'm also upset and disappointed in myself if it turns out that I didn't do enough to prevent it from happening. It is *not okay* to harass someone else on our behalf, no matter how horrible we say they are or how horrible you think they are. At the same time, Skov doesn't provide any evidence of this harassment. Given not only how easy it would be to provide screenshots, but also how much it would strengthen their allegations, I have to admit that I find the lack of evidence a little bit suspicious.

If nothing else, they're expecting you to accept their opinion about what happened without seeing what was actually said for yourself, and I think that should give you pause. You may have a very different opinion of what happened depending on what was said, and Skov is depriving you of the information you need to make up your own mind.

The Hate Comments We Received

We won't deprive you of that information, though. I'm going to go over a selection of hate comments that we received following the release of Skov's video so that you can decide for yourself whether you think we were victims of harassment and whether you think it's reasonable to hold her responsible. Be warned, this gets heavy: we will be covering people who want us to

die and be sexually assaulted, as well as extremely crass antisemitism, ableism and transmisogyny.

So, beginning with death, here's someone replying to my comment where I discuss being chronically ill. They say, "Unfortunately you're still breathing". A lovely way to start.

Moving on to sexual assault, here's someone telling Ethel,

"this is fucking weapons grade autism and you're a disgusting creep threatening people for doing nothing wrong. get fucked, just like you did as a child. yeah, if you can weaponize that, so can others. fuck you."

The ableism is not an isolated incident. Another person says, "lol delete more comments, mentally ill extortionist."

Here's one in response to me, where they take issue with what I had to say about my hypothyroidism. They say,

"Oh stfu, you're just looking for sympathy because you're a touch starved loser with a creepy parasocial relationship issue. Hypo and hyper thyroidism aren't disabilities and are manageable. As someone with this condition, you just sound ridiculous and like you're begging for attention by inserting yourself into a situation that isn't about you, your "disability" or anything else.

You don't get a pass for attacking people just because "uwu I'm so different and sick" nonsense. Go touch grass."

So, a few problems with this:

1. Hypothyroidism isn't the only disability I mentioned in my comment. I also said that I have mental health issues from childhood trauma.
2. It's true that thyroid disease is manageable... with medication. I was clear about this in my comment as I mentioned that I had recovered after being medicated. During the production of the Lily Orchard series, though, I was undiagnosed, unmedicated and quite ill.
3. I didn't say that I was disabled for fun or sympathy. I was making a very specific argument that I have to put more effort into my work, so stealing my work is stealing much more labour than you would assume based on the product. That's all I was saying.
4. Thyroid disease isn't the same for every person and I've also read that the severity of the symptoms doesn't even necessarily correlate with the severity of the hormonal imbalance. Maybe this person had an easy time with their thyroid disease, but *I didn't*! In the months leading up to my diagnosis, I was so exhausted that I couldn't sit up for more than 10-15 minutes at a time, and that isn't even the half of it! This is a PSA, now: read

about thyroid disease and learn to recognise the symptoms because it can ruin your life.
Read about it *today*.

So, basically, this person is not only ignoring what I actually said, but they're spreading misinformation about a very, very serious disease just because they don't like us.

Just in case you thought no-one could get any lower than what we've seen so far, one person decided to be antisemitic, saying that they would prefer to be a Jew in *Auschwitz* than be anywhere near Ethel. I actually have a friend who lost family members in those death camps and I've seen how it's affected them. It's difficult to explain this to someone who hasn't seen it, but... try to imagine someone saying to you, just after someone you love dies, while you're still trying to process the shock, that it's not so bad because at least you don't have to talk to the mean internet person, and that's kind of a fraction of what it's like for a Jewish person to hear this. These are the sorts of people who seem to be coming from Skov's video.

There was also a lot of transmisogyny in the comments, because of course there was. One commenter says, "Wow, really good looking woman ... Lmfao".

Another says,

"You people are all a bunch of sheep. This dude is clearly unhinged and psychotic and should be locked away from the rest of us. It's disgusting how people just believe everything they hear without doing any research. He'll get his. It's coming."

Here's a particularly telling comment: "A trans woman harassing a real woman for a perceived slight? Unheard of. Keep up the good work of breaking stereotypes! 👍"

Also rather ironic considering everything we covered in the transmisogyny section.

Finally, here's a rather long comment about how trans women are disgusting and how everyone supposedly hates them. I'm not going to read it because it's vile and very long, but you can see it on the screen.

That, by the way, is just a selection of the hate comments that are completely devoid of criticism. There are also a number of angry comments parroting Skov's version of events. Y'know, the version of events I debunked a short while ago.

I imagine that some people will argue that Skov can't be held responsible because we can't prove that these are her fans. Maybe that's true for the empty hate comments. For these ones, though, I think the fact that they're parroting Skov's lies makes them even more directly responsible: if these aren't members of their audience, it implies that completely neutral parties have been taught to hate Ethel for things that she never did. So, your move, Skov: are these your fans or not?

Our first commenter says, “This is ridiculous! Its absolutely disgusting that you would compare being raped as a child to a video on youtube you think plagiarized you!”

Of course, Ethel never said that. She simply took issue with Skov’s poor coverage of the topic.

Another commenter complains that,

“Demanding 30% of the money from the video, the sponsor of that video and of her patreon for that month is mad though. You can see how it clearly looks like blackmail right? If you’d said about having a credit first, I’d get it. But you went in guns blazing demanding money.”

But, as we discussed earlier, Ethel *did* also demand credit.

Here’s someone arguing that, “I don’t see how it’s plagiarism... using the same screenshots you used in your video doesn’t mean she plagiarized your video.”

Another person also takes issue with the screenshots, saying, “Wtf this whole issue is about a couple of screenshots??? Anyone can make those, how would anyone know you made them in the first place”

A third comment about the screenshots was, “You went after someone who used the same screenshots you used that was from another person???”

So, here are 3 people who don’t even know the most basic facts of the plagiarism: they think it was “just a couple of screenshots” that “anyone could make” as opposed to 8 screenshots that all match up perfectly along multiple data points, including personalised data points.

Finally, let’s end on a high note with some rather funny comments from people who are *so close* to getting it...

So, the first comment says,

“She didnt say things word for word and even so, similarities isnt plagiarism
This is literally 'i made a video about this so you cant'
Furthermore multiple people have down lily orchard videos, why not go after them as well?
Your being very petty and VERY snake like with all this”

The second, very similarly, argues that,

“You literally have been black mailing her. Your the bad guy here and don’t deserve your platform ♥ on top of that YouTube drama and covering topics isn’t your right and only your right. Everyone is allowed to. So it’s weird that

you and your fans keep going “but eot talked about this” when DOZENS of others have too.”

Yes, why not go after all those other people? The world may never know.

VangelinaSkov Fell Short

Remember what I was saying about the community post? About how it may not have been enough? It's time to come back to that. It's time to talk about arse-covering.

I said that it's possible that making a statement in the community post wasn't enough. Thing is, Skov was no better. They act as though putting that disclaimer in was so diligent and courteous... but they put it at the end. 44:26-44:43 in a 45-minute and 40-second video. I would be willing to bet actual money that a bunch of people didn't even see the disclaimer in the first place. Not only that, but anyone watching the video had 40 minutes to think about lashing out at us and leaving hate, 40 minutes of those thoughts forming and festering, before being told, “oh, don't do this, by the way”. Hell, I wouldn't be surprised if some people went and typed out hate before they even had a chance to hear Skov tell them not to.

Skov did not put that disclaimer in because they wanted to prevent harassment: they put it in so that they could say they did, so that they could wash their hands of any hate their viewers sent our way by saying, “well, I did everything that I could! I told them not to!” Possibly, even, they put it in just so they can pretend to be better than us, because we didn't check that arbitrary box.

But they're doing this in a video where they state dozens of times that they think Ethel is acting in bad faith, that they feel extorted and threatened, that Ethel has a pattern of harassing people... this is the video where they claim that Ethel is trying to attach as many negative things to their name as possible to make people hate them. This is the video where they deliberately compress all of Ethel's behaviour into a single incident and leave out their own actions against her so that they can act as though they were attacked without provocation. This is the video where they omit and lie about the wealth of evidence against them. This is the video where they repeat the same half a quote over and over again because Ethel said “burn” and fire is scary!

Not only do they frame Ethel as an irrational, violent aggressor, but they frame themselves as a scared, confused and vulnerable victim. Excuse my language, but *no shit* that a bunch of people got angry and attacked Ethel on their behalf! Even if they had put their disclaimer at the beginning of their video, I don't think it would've mattered after all that. An anti-harassment disclaimer means less than nothing if everything else you say is a demonstrable lie designed to stir up hate.

Thing is, you could look at all this and turn it around and say, “Well, Ethel accused Skov of this and this and this. They made Skov look bad, too!” Personally, I think it's a bit different when there's actually *proof* of those accusations, but there's also another aspect of this issue which is illustrated by Ethel's community post. In her post, Ethel doesn't just say not to seek out or

antagonise anyone. They also gave some explanation as to why not, saying, “Trust in that, if the person responsible refuses to fix the damage, I’m more than capable of setting off the alarm.”

This is another reason I don’t believe that our community went after Skov: Ethel has shown them that, despite all the shit she’s been put through, she can and will take care of herself. She will absolutely dress someone down and show every ugly detail of their bad behaviour, she’ll even call someone out as dangerous if she thinks they’re dangerous, but she doesn’t cry about being scared and confused and throw around allegations about how she *might* be harassed. She calls out terrible behaviour, but she doesn’t present herself as a victim who needs saving. This is even baked into the way Ethel approaches making videos: archiving evidence and referencing claims are a demonstration that they’re being careful and proactive, which also acts as a sign that they can take care of themselves, even if it’s not intended that way.

I think it also helps that Ethel cultivates an audience who aren’t hateful bigots, but that’s just a guess. Maybe people who like to spew ableism and make light of the Holocaust are the path towards a more tolerant internet. /s

Of course, all of this is somewhat speculative and uncertain. The fact is, no-one can ever be 100% sure of what every member of their audience is doing. So, let’s focus on intent instead.

I know that Skov chose to make their disclaimer less effective. How do I know this? Well, unlike me and Ethel, they can’t claim that they simply didn’t think of including a disclaimer. Not only do we know they thought of it because they put the disclaimer in, but they claim that they had recent experience with vicious harassment from our audience. This was clearly on their mind and they supposedly just saw and felt firsthand how awful harassment is, yet they didn’t talk about it at the beginning of their video! They left it for the end, where people could miss it or, worse, be beyond wanting to listen.

If you’re still unconvinced, then tell me something, and be truthful: who would you rather have talk about you? Someone who didn’t tell their audience not to harass you in a fully referenced, fully evidenced video accusing you of plagiarism, some dishonesty and a legal threat? Or someone who says not to harass you at the end of a video where they spent 40 minutes lying about everything that you’ve said and done to prop up a narrative that you’re a terrifying, unreasonable, violent harasser who made up a bunch of nonsense to destroy them for no good reason? I know which one I’d prefer.

VangelinaSkov is Still Plagiarising!

After all that heaviness, I’d like to end on a lighter note by covering the fact that Skov is *still* plagiarising, even in their supposedly “fixed” source list. Not just Ethel, either, but several other people. Of course, we already knew that because having a list of links is not proper citation, but what I mean is that they’re still plagiarising *even if* we go by their own standards.

SKOV: "... and then I also, obviously, did quite a lot of my own research. Um, I went and looked online, I looked at, well, Encyclopedia Dramatica was one of them, random Reddit Posts, random Tumblr posts ..." [1, 14:29-14:40]

Skov has not linked any Reddit posts whatsoever, and they only have 2 Tumblr links: a masterpost on the Lily Orchard Gossip Blog and an unaffiliated post about Lily's sister by user OpinionatedOnion. There's nothing "random" about one compilation and one post about a high-profile victim by a well-known LO-critical blogger. Even in their updated source list, they are, by their own admission, leaving out several sources that they say they used.

Not only that — not only have they left sources out that they claim they used — they also left sources out that they claim are *in there!*

SKOV: "So, when EssenceOfThought reached out to me, I thought, 'Well, okay, yeah, fair, I haven't actually done a good enough job of putting all the sources more concisely. So, I'm going to fix that.' And I went into the Tumblr blog and I took a few of the specific links from the, the Tumblr blog, and I put them in ..." [1, 16:37-16:56]

Again, the *only* Tumblr links in Skov's updated source list are the master post on the Lily Orchard Gossip Blog and the post about Lily's sister. That is not "a few of the specific links". Not only is 2 not "a few" but they talk about going into *the* Tumblr blog, meaning they had to be talking about the Lily Orchard Gossip Blog as that was their only original source, but they simply haven't posted any specific links from there. They are, once again, tacitly admitting to plagiarism by *their own standards*.

There's also another major problem with their source list...

SKOV: "I also didn't put the Deathly Bored Oranges as a source, I think, honestly, just because I didn't use it for research? But looking back at it now, I probably should have put that because I did watch it. Or, at the very least, put it as further watching, or something." [1, 16:22-16:37]

SKOV: "And I put a video that I *didn't* actually watch, but I had been told about it, so ..." [1, 17:13-17:19]

They don't have a "further watching" list: these are both in their sources. Their source list isn't even a source list; it's just a "things about the topic" list. Skov doesn't even seem to understand what a source is, much less how to cite one properly or why it's important to do so.

What this means is, if you watch their video and you want to look into any of the original authors of the information they use, maybe to support them or just to see what they contributed, you will not only be sent on a wild goose chase through a list of poorly labelled and uncited links, but also videos and posts which are not even sources. That second video they mention, by the way? It's behind a paywall, so you could end up wasting money, too.

This is Skov's *updated* source list! In a video where Skov claims that they never engaged in plagiarism in the first place, they have not only tacitly admitted to plagiarising in that they needed to update their source list, but also tacitly admitted that even the "fixed" source list is plagiarism in multiple ways: not only are they leaving sources out by their own admission, but they're also putting random nonsense in, making the relevant information even harder to find.

By the way, did you remember that name? Definitely Bored Oranges? Remember how that was the closest Skov had to a 3rd-party source for any of those screenshots? *They themselves said* that Oranges was not one of their sources! So, even if you want to argue that this one modified screenshot absolves them of everything we've covered today, they have told you themselves that *no*, that is not the case.

Even worse, do you remember when I showed you their side of the story? Do you remember how they said that they thought of Lily Orchard sending herself messages because it was such an obvious thought to have? *Even that* was plagiarised, by Skov's own admission!

SKOV: "It was my thought and, actually, the reason it was my first thought was because, as I was doing the research for this and I saw that, I— the thoughts of the comments came to my head and I could think of people commenting, 'Oh, what if, like, she just did that herself?' and I was like, 'Yeah, actually, she-she probably did.'" [1, 21:54-22:09]

Who knew that, when Skov said it popped into their head, what they meant is that memories of *other people saying it* popped into their head? We didn't, because they *didn't cite* those people!

Thing is, even if all of these links were labelled properly — all of the Reddit posts were added in, the individual Tumblr posts were linked, everything was described in detail and maybe even numbered — this would still be plagiarism. If you don't agree with me, prove it: go to their video right now and identify exactly which information was taken from each source. You can't because, outside of the testimony of high-profile victims, Skov doesn't tell you. You could not tell me which information came from Encyclopedia Dramatica and the Lily Orchard Gossip Blog if your life depended on it. That is plagiarism.

Closing Thoughts & Questions

We've covered a lot today: we talked about the evidence of VangelinaSkov's plagiarism, we discussed their justifications, we covered some very heavy allegations from them, we talked about harassment and some very nasty hate comments, we learned about transmisogyny and, most importantly of all, we learned that VangelinaSkov says a lot of things that are very easy to disprove with some basic cross-referencing.

Sadly, I couldn't quite cover everything. It turns out that fact-checking 40 minutes of rambling takes a lot more work than producing it. That's why I'd like to invite you lovely people to *civilly*

share anything you noticed that I missed. I'd also love to hear your thoughts on the wider issue of plagiarism. How do you make use of references as a viewer? What do you feel would be an adequate citation for your work? What are your thoughts on artists and creators wanting compensation? Finally, please do let me know if there's anything you'd like me to clarify or expand on and I'll do my best.

We'd just like to thank the following Patrons: Matthew Kovach, Hannah Banghart, Gerrit Van Voorst, MarbleWings, Sosh Daniels, Flynn, & Higgins the Seagull.

HIGGINS: "You're welcome."

Thank you all for listening and, from myself, Uditā and Ethel, take care!

References:

[1] "addressing the accusations" by VangelinaSkov:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RKP-FJhgT9c>

[2] "VangelinaSkov Plagiarised My Lily Orchard Series - #JustAnotheriilluminaughtii" by EssenceOfThought:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=571fiRC2W5Q>

[3] "Plagiarism" by the University of Oxford:

<https://www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/guidance/skills/plagiarism>

[4] "Lily Orchard: YouTube's Biggest Creep (Lily Peet)" by VangelinaSkov:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6261lgfEKo0>

[5] "Lily Orchard Encouraged A Friend To Groom A Minor" by EssenceOfThought:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qQTvw1L258U>

[6] "Lily Orchard Grooms Her Audience W/ Victim Testimony" by EssenceOfThought:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kFuyQPocKY4>

[7] "Lily Orchard Sexted A 16 Year Old - 2nd Victim Testimony" by EssenceOfThought:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=feWZdTfnaxY>

[8] "Debunking Lily Orchard's Pro-Child-Predator Arguments [Check Description]" by EssenceOfThought:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pKVkKRM2e8s>

[9] "Lily Orchard's Pro-Child-Predator Fanfic: Stockholm" by EssenceOfThought:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IQxnmE2Bdjo>

[10] "Lily Orchard is INSANE" by Definitely Bored Oranges:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LdGTiqqRbds&t=780s>

[11] "The Pathetic Existence of Lily Orchard" by Definitely Bored Oranges:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xv5UOYSKqlw&t=64s>

[12] Lily Orchard Gossip Blog (Tumblr), search for "minor":

<https://lily-orchard-gossip-blog.tumblr.com/search/minor>

[13] "Yes, I'm aware someone has plagiarised my videos ..." by Ethel Thurston:

<https://twitter.com/EthelThurston/status/1759895729055879216>

[14] "Now That I've Calmed Down..." by Ethel Thurston

<https://twitter.com/EthelThurston/status/1759916811859165376>

[15] "So Let's Get This Right" by Ethel Thurston

<https://twitter.com/EthelThurston/status/1765744805043372367/photo/1>

[16] Essence of Thought (2024) "Rachel Oates Videos Masterlist", Google.com

Accessed 25th February 2024:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/10KkZPNSzm6ZqVw-OfUKMg30oKcnpAxHjszXcS8XN6xQ/edit?usp=sharing>

[17] Essence of Thought (2023) "Surviving Rachel Oates - A Trans Victim's Testimony", YouTube.com

Accessed 28th December 2023:

<https://youtu.be/ycJDRUxwDRA>

[18] "Plagiarism update!" by Essence of Thought:

<https://www.youtube.com/post/Ugkx9LKYrDHHoHmgphZjK0cmttpRdDdNZUPA>

Meta

The thumbnail for the Essence of Thought video 'Cross-Referencing VangelinaSkov's Response to the Plagiarism Allegations', depicting a nervous Vangelina Skov averting their gaze next to Levi's profile pic, a pixel art cockatoo, on a green background. Above them bold white text reads "What the evidence shows", with the word 'evidence' coloured red for emphasis.

Today's video is a detailed breakdown of Vangelina Skov's response to our allegations. We demonstrate how they plagiarised our series on Lily Orchard and cover the ways they edited what was said, omitted key events and presented assertions as evidence.

<https://youtu.be/Ywr5CxxDHbw>