

hon1nbo:

Legitimate criticism is fine, but that's not what you were doing. You were spamming your content because you weren't happy that you have to follow the same rules as everyone else and had to be warned as such.

Closing the PPE thread is unacceptable and not required by the rules. Every time I've brought up this criticism, I have been silenced or the topic has been closed. I brought it up on your SOI thread and was silenced for doing so. You can't provide actual evidence of me spamming, all you can do is repeat that claim ad nauseam. You haven't linked to any examples. That's not reasonable. While I think you're being honest, I don't think repeating that is open or rational. I'm happy be proven wrong about that. Maybe my view of what happened is warped and I really have spammed my view. I'll note that I was speaking generally in this thread only as it relates to the topic before you added your off-topic replies trying to defend your actions specifically.

hon1nbo:

They're free to use an existing topic

That's not true. After [you closed my topic](#), I went to [the existing PPE thread](#) and then you closed it because you personally thought the topic had been talked about enough.

hon1nbo:

That's not a legitimate reason to spam the forum with repetitive content across threads

Again, you can repeat this as much as you want, but you have yet to back it up with links.

[Skip to main content](#)

This is not a duplicate. There is no other thread with the information about James breaking the rules.

There is a related thread about all the misconduct done by the board. If it is a duplicate, then of what thread? Is it **this one** that got closed and archived?

hon1nbo:

threads like what Raffi was posting are not legitimate discussions.

I don't see how you can define legitimate discussion in a way that excludes criticizing actions taking by the board and by moderators. What specifically was illegitimate about it. Your straw man of my argument, the idea that "I should be allowed to break the rules," might be a dumb argument. The solution would be to ridicule such an argument, though, not close the discussion. And I don't think strawmanning my actual argument is reasonable at all. Challenge it. Confront it. Ridicule it. But don't ridicule the caricature of it that you created.

hon1nbo

May 2020

Draco, he had other existing threads already on the topic, and spamming Talk with his personal complaints about why he doesn't need to file the rules isn't a legitimate discussion.

He'd opened multiple threads at that point, spammed threads both public and private, across multiple platforms. It's a textbook example of spamming a board.

If he wanted a legitimate discussion about policies and procedures that's one thing, but he simultaneously spammed the same content on discord, members' emails, the moderators, and multiple threads on talk.

That's far from excellent behaviour by a member; and filing complaints because you don't like **Skip to main content** rules aren't sincere formal complaints, that's just a tantrum.

raffi:

Closing the PPE thread is unacceptable and not required by the rules.

You spammed the threads with existing content from other threads, even admitted you weren't reading the threads you were posting in (despite having been earlier active in that conversation, and the spam content having been repeated multiple times in that thread including just a few posts above you). I even quoted you every rule you were breaking at that point.

raffi:

Every time I've brought up this criticism, I have been silenced or the topic has been closed.

Bringing up the fact you're mad you because you have to follow the rules as everyone else isn't criticism, it's just throwing a tantrum.

raffi:

You can't provide actual evidence of me spamming, all you can do is repeat that claim ad nauseam.

I quoted you several times, linked threads here and in the discussion in my SOI. The fact you refuse to accept that you were spamming the board is part of the problem here, because you refuse to accept that you have to follow our rules.

raffi:

I'm happy be proven wrong about that.

Skip to main content ⇒ quoted the specific posts, the broken rules, etc you just do some mental gymnastics that somehow they don't apply to you. Dunning-Kruger abounds.

raffi:

I'll note that I was speaking generally in this thread only as it relates to the topic before you added your off-topic replies trying to defend your actions specifically.

Give us an actual example of censorship that has happened under the current board and moderators. You've been spouting all this stuff off like you're a martyr, when the behaviour has been that of a child that didn't get what they wanted.

My point in this thread was that counter to what you've stated, it simply isn't there.

raffi:

That's not true. After [you closed my topic](#), I went to [the existing PPE thread](#) and then you closed it because you personally thought the topic had been talked about enough.

You were spamming and necro'ing a thread with content that had been repeated ad-nausea. That's not contributing to a discussion, that's just spamming the board. I even quoted you the rule about it when you complained in my SOI. Your post content was literally just the same quote from the county that had been repeated multiple times, and you couldn't even be bothered to read the handful of posts before yours to see that.

That is spamming the board, not contributing to a discussion.

raffi:

Again, you can repeat this as much as you want, but you have yet to back it up with links.

(this is just on talk, let alone your spamming of emails and discord, as well as the spamming of flags because you simply disagree with the content)

You additionally continued to spam by evading the thread lock controls, using what's supposed to [Skip to main content](#) a flagged post to bring it to standards to instead post more spam content.

"Through consensus, we decided not to hear your complaint" - James Henningson

All formal complaints need to be addressed at a special meeting or at the next board meeting, but this board has, through consensus, decided not to hear either of my two complaints or a third complaint against me. The recommended solution of the complaint against me was two weeks of silence on Talk, which got enforced and ended this morning. I created a thread about everything leading up to the silencing, but that thread has since been closed by Freddy, hidden, and archived. [\[Screenshot_2020042...](#)

<https://talk.dallasmakerspace.org/t/silenced-by-the-board-and-jim/70932/1>

you started with this post in which you were told this topic has already been beaten to death and nothing new was contributed: <https://talk.dallasmakerspace.org/t/we-should-be-open/70676/12>

In this thread you proceeded to spam it with content that was quite literally already repeated a few posts above yours: <https://talk.dallasmakerspace.org/review?status=all&type=ReviewableFlaggedPost&username=raffi>

That's all I'm going to bother with right now; this is just the immediate items on Talk, let alone your spamming the other venues.

It's dead Raffi; no amount of tantrum will vanish the fact you were breaking the rules, as quoted to you here: [Tails Hartnett - Statement of Intent BOD 2020 & AMA - #23 by hon1nbo](#)

This isn't an issue of censorship, it's an issue of a member that refuses to understand that they were breaking posting rules, and rather than carry on decided to continue spamming the forum, filing complaints against those enforcing the rules just for the fact they were enforced, then when you didn't like the outcome continue to spam the board about how you didn't get your way.

This is far from the behaviour of an ideal member; it's not even close to excellent behaviour.

[Skip to main content](#)

Anyway I'm done; that's all there is to say on the topic of censorship on talk, because it doesn't exist. I don't like that members post outrageous content like the chloronique threads but it's their right to say it, and it's a discussion within the confines of its thread. Personally if I tolerated censorship at all it would have been out the window, but we don't contrary to the belief of some.

An ideal member just follows the rules, doesn't harass people, and (if they can) contribute back. I don't think there's anymore to it.

Draco

May 2020

hon1nbo:

If he wanted a legitimate discussion about policies and procedures that's one thing, but he simultaneously spammed the same content on discord, members' emails, the moderators, and multiple threads on talk.

Ah ... I think I know what might be happening here. You think that because he brought up one thing that it leads back to all the other things. People like Raffi, sometimes think very specifically at one topic at a time. Raffi, let me know if I am way off base here. But this spread out into many separate topics from Raffi's perceptive. There was the original topic of opening the space, and a separate topic of closing the thread/censorship, a separate topic of the formal complaint process not being followed. You grouped them all and assumed that all three of them are about trying to open the space, when in Raffi's mind they are separate things and deserve separate conversations. I'm sure it frustrated him when you linked it all back to opening of the space. This is not how many think.

Perhaps, if we separate them all out and handle each separately, it might prove fruitful.

[Skip to main content](#) [Why can't we have a reasonable discussion? \(Raffi Rincón\)](#)

hon1nbo

May 2020

Draco:

You grouped them all and assumed that all three of them are about trying to open the space, when in Raffi's mind they are separate things and deserve separate conversations

No; the first round of spamming was the "we should be open" / spamming non-content posts such as quotes from the county that had already been repeated multiple times and not contributing to a thread,

The next rounds were the tantrum spam where he kept posting ad-nausea for his refusal to accept that his posts were blocked because he broke the rules, and then spammed the moderators and board as retaliation for the fact the rules were enforced.

PearceDunlap DMS Member

May 2020

Well I think this successfully got derailed from dracos original attempt at making a baited thread about "what kind of person pr should be pushing to have at the space"

raffi

May 2020

Jim, if you silence someone, and they try and add new information somewhere else, you can't then accuse them of spamming.

All you have to show for your claims of spamming are two instances where I tried to have a conversation in one place, it got shut down in a matter of hours, then I tried to add something new in a separate place, and that got shut down.

[Skip to main content](#)

Of the four threads you linked to, three are shut down, and the fourth is your SOI thread, where I got shut down with a two week silencing instead of having the thread shut down.

hon1nbo:

content that had been repeated ad-nausea

Again, that's just false. I accidentally repeated something that had been said earlier in that thread. Therefore close the thread? Where does it say that in the rules?

hon1nbo:

you weren't reading the threads you were posting in

You continue to make this claim, but it's not true. I've said it before, but I missed one in 100+ replies to the thread. So I accidentally repeated what someone said. It's unacceptable that you would close a thread on that basis.

hon1nbo:

members' emails

Whose emails? The board's when I filed a complaint against you? So if I bring something up in Talk, I can't file a complaint about it? I disagree.

hon1nbo:

He'd opened multiple threads at that point, spammed threads both public and private, across multiple platforms. It's a textbook example of spamming a board.

[Skip to main content](#)

If the thread about your misconduct had not been closed and archived, there would not be the need to create a new thread about James breaking the rules. You can't silence someone, then when they try to speak again with new information, accuse them of spamming.

hon1nbo:

You were spamming and necro'ing a thread with content that had been repeated ad-nausea

I replied once with info that had been said before. The other reply was in response to something in that thread. Do you honestly think that's spam? How many times did I post that info from the stay-at-home order? Wouldn't it have to be at least twice to be spamming?

hon1nbo:

spamming of flags because you simply disagree with the content)

I haven't flagged anything just because I disagree with it. And your assumption that I have disqualifies you from being a moderator.

Jim, your two examples fall under no definition of spam.

In your first example where I criticized you and the board, the thread was closed and archived for no apparent reason well before the discussion was over.

In your second example, you said "We don't need yet another argument about this. We have this discussion in enough threads already." And so I contributed to another thread, which you promptly closed.

PearceDunlap:

What I think this thread successfully got derailed from dracos original attempt at making a baited

[Skip to main content](#)

thread about “what kind of person pr should be pushing to have at the space”

Agreed. I think Jim’s first reply on here was clearly off-topic, so I flagged it as such because that’s what the guidelines say to do.

[lukeiamyourfather](#)  Makerspace Member

May 2020

Nobody cares.

[raffi](#)

May 2020

Some people don’t. And it shows.

[John_Marlow](#)

May 2020

Let me ask an orthogonal question. Could we categorize potential members by their usage profile - not how many days they attend, but *why* they join and why they stay? Personalities/persona are irrelevant IMO.

Should we be looking for:

- **hobbyist members**? This fits our educational charter, but many hobbyists seem to be in-and-out members who join and quit for specific projects. (Compare the total number of persons certified in specific AD groups vs. how many are of those are still active members.)
- **small craft shop business members** (i.e., “mom-&-pop” low volume sales or equivalent)? This might (or might not) promote customers instead of members but I suspect that type of user would bring a more consistent revenue stream because they always have projects.

[Skip to main content](#) **business members**? Probably violates our educational charter, possibly consumes an undue share of resources, but is potentially a good revenue stream.

- **other types** I haven't considered?

In the perfect world we probably want a hobbyist member, who joins and continues to pay their dues whether they attend or not, takes/teaches some classes and behaves excellently in all manners. I'm not convinced we can find enough of those unicorn members to meet our revenue requirements, and I'm not sure we can change enough of the other types of members to fit that profile. So, if that's not possible, what type(s) of members should we be targeting?

mstovenour Makerspace Member

May 2020

How about the "I'm really interested in this social experiment and willing to donate money every month to be a part of it" member? I suspect we have a few of these that only visit once or twice a month and even then for projects they could probably do at home or could just pay a professional.

ESmith  Makerspace Member

May 2020

- **Masochists** - typically volunteer - SIG leaders, chairs/vice chairs, officers, stand for election to the Board, etc - getting dragged into DMS operations and politics to the point that they rarely find time to *make*

Josh_Melnick

May 2020

Retired people.

Josh_Melnick

May 2020

[Skip to main content](#)

Probably the ideal maker volunteer is a retired atheist who is an expert in some skill like metal working, fixing cars, science, pottery, etc.

procterc Machine Shop Vice-chair

May 2020

I didn't know you could retire from atheism.

MadScists

May 2020

It usually happens right before everything goes dark...

Mrksls2

May 2020

raffi:

We should all be eager to be proven wrong. I'd rather go through the embarrassment of being proven wrong for the reward of improving my opinions than continue to believe something that doesn't make sense to protect my ego

Well said.

David_A_Tucker Makerspace Member

May 2020

Draco:

What kind of members should we be looking for to become members?

[Skip to main content](#)

artg_dms Electronics Chair

May 2020

Josh_Melnick:

Probably the ideal maker volunteer is a retired atheist who is an expert in some skill like metal working, fixing cars, science, pottery, etc.

Would love to hear your rationale for this. 🤔

Raymond Makerspace Member

May 2020

[@Team_Moderators](#) , can Raffi's hijacking of yet another thread be split off from this one and flushed to where it belongs?

jast  Makerspace Member

May 2020

I did consider it, but with Draco pulling the “let's row” ripcord, and Raffi and Jim's obliging, I am reasonably happy to let the McMurphy bros. continue their circle in the same spot...



[Josh_Melnick](#)

[May 2020](#)

not making a value judgement on atheist or believers, my only point was that people who don't have a community may be more likely to see makerspace as a place of community if they lack a church setting, that being said we have plenty of strong religious members who contribute greatly.

[Draco](#)

[May 2020](#)

[Skip to main content](#) re than atheists. There are also plenty of agnostic people that don't go to a church that might find the makerspace a good community and knitters.

artg_dms Electronics Chair

May 2020

Good points.
Thanks for sharing.

sroriginals DMS Member

May 2020

There are actually a fair number of pagans / heathens who do not have a large organized community and many of them are active makers. Some are even DMS members. If you want other target groups

MachtNichts DMS Member

May 2020

MadScists:

It usually happens right before everything goes dark...

Now, that is a good one!

sroriginals DMS Member

May 2020

SO not accurate.

New & Unread Topics
[Skip to main content](#)

Topic	Replies	Views	Activity
New Exhibition about Dallas architecture open downtown	2	99	27d

Want to read more? Browse other topics in or [view latest topics](#).

 Powered by Discourse