

# What Really happened to DJ Puddles at Burn2?

=====

This is a very lengthy document that lays out the truth, as I see it, of what happened to me and why I was suddenly banned, without any due process or chance to defend myself, by the Burn2 owner M2.

The reason I am writing this is because I believe I was discarded and silenced, after 5 years dedicated service, to protect and prevent me revealing the truth of serious abuses of position and corruption at the very top of Burn2 Leadership, including Rangers Leadership. There is now an active cover-up and mis-information campaign underway, to try to re-write history and hide the corruption.

I was not the first this happened to and unless there is some radical reform at the top, I will not be the last. I owe it to the Burners, the other Leads and the next potential victim of summary justice to speak out and warn them.

I am not looking for 'exoneration'. I am not a blameless, perfect Angel. But I have principles and when I am being bullied I push-back hard, very hard, to defend myself and our community. When I believe I am in the right and being maligned, I am the poster child for righteous indignation. But that can be a weakness and was used against me by the cunning with hidden agendas, twisting my words and context to frame me as the bully, instead of the victim.

If the people in positions of trust, the judge, jury and executioner cannot tell the difference between self defence and the defence of our community and excluded Burners, or wilfully ignore that difference to suit themselves, you are in trouble.

I do not expect anyone to believe just my 'side' of the story, but everything I write here I am doing so as accurately and honestly as I can. It is my opinion on the background, reasons and root causes behind what happened to me.

I urge anyone reading this to cross-reference the accuracy of what I am saying with the publicly available records, in the historical meeting transcripts.

The 'incident' as they are calling it refers to a conversation that happened on the playa during preparations for Burnal Equinox, 3/3/24, over 2 months ago. But the corruption and abuse of power that lead to me being banned, without ANY Ranger talking to me, doing FLAME or following any due process began earlier.

I have redacted, or not included some names where I consider they were only incidentally involved. Emails have only been included if they were sent to or from me as part of an official process. Excerpts from chat logs are only included from the public local chat and/or published public meeting transcripts.

No Private messages are included.

## THE DISCORD LINK & REMOTE PARTICIPATION

=====

Many Burners and leads had expressed concerns that our system of summarising planning meetings by a 'Notetaker' was too open to subjective interpretation, conscious or unconscious bias. Also, few people were willing to volunteer to be the Notetaker, its a bit of a boring, thankless task, and the burden was repeatedly falling on the same people.

As full meeting transcripts were being widely shared anyway by many people, it was agreed by the Leads in a meeting in January 2024, that we should move to sharing the full meeting transcript, via an automated process. I volunteered and was tasked with researching and developing such a system as I am able to write the necessary computer code in LSL, the Second Life scripting language.

I carefully looked into all the technical, legal and ethical implications of such a system and began coding a prototype meeting logger. Discord quickly became the obvious choice, because we already had a Burn2 Community Discord Server, it is widely available, fairly easy to use, cross-platform and most importantly it is free to use. There is not overt advertising in Community Discord channels, so it seemed the perfect choice.

During the research and development process I began to realise that it might be possible to create a 2-way portal to not only log the meetings real-time in our Discord server, but post messages back from Discord into the active Second Life meeting. Achieving that would be technically extremely difficult and complex, due to the limitations of how SL scripts and servers deal with external servers. In fact it is so difficult to achieve that nobody in SL has managed to do it, except by using paid-for scripted agents (avatars as Bots), but I like a challenge!

Burn2 has a serious problem of declining volunteer numbers (more on that later), so any system that would allow our Burners and Volunteers to monitor and participate in our meetings remotely would bring a number of significant benefits:

- Allowing remote meeting participation via computer, phone or tablet, by busy creative people, without them having to log into Second Life.
- Radically improve the Transparency of our decision making, with real-time meeting transcripts that are automatically archived.
- Improve the efficiency of our decision making, allowing Burners and Leads to stay connected and informed on event planning, even if they have conflicting duties at meeting times elsewhere in SL or "Real Life".

- Easing the administrative burden on Leads and Volunteers through automation.
- Encouraging and inviting others to participate and get involved, totally in keeping with our 10 principles, especially Radical Inclusion and Communal Effort - "Our community values creative cooperation and collaboration. We strive to produce, promote and protect social networks, public spaces, works of art, and methods of communication that support such interaction."

A number of significant technical hurdles had to be overcome to create a prototype, but with some help from Talia I was very excited one weekend evening, at around 4am our UK time, because finally we had a breakthrough. For the first time, we successfully got messages in both directions between Discord and SL, entirely using code and no avatar Bots.

This opened up possibilities and I regularly updated our progress in the Leads Discord channel. Most of the Leads understood the obvious benefits and were very pleased. But iSkye insisted that we discuss it at the next Leads meeting in Second Life and shut down my attempts to discuss it and get the Leads approval to consult more widely with the Burners at the public planning meeting.

Leads meetings in Second Life take place at iSkye's home and are very infrequent, with sometimes months in between them. Few Leads actually bother to attend them and they are never long enough for the issues we need to discuss. Just like the planning meeting agenda, iSkye controls the web site and Leads meeting agenda document.

Despite Discord being specifically designed for Team Comms, iSkye strongly objects to any attempts to discuss and make decisions in Discord. She has made it clear in multiple comments that she thinks Burn2 meetings should ONLY take place in Second Life, with avatars logged in and present. Sometimes leads attempt to discuss issues via email, creating bursts of disjointed multi-threads, that often reach no conclusion and get lost in spam folders. This is why the decision making process in Burn2 on so many issues can be so slow, that by the time an issue can be discussed by Leads it is too late and becomes irrelevant.

The desperately inefficient decision making process at Burn2, combined with iSkye's absolute control of the web site, meeting agendas, when agenda items get added, who gets to add them, who gets to speak, in what order and what gets discussed or dismissed, is also why some Leads and volunteers, with often great creative ideas become frustrated and disengage with planning or leave.

While most Leads share and discuss all their projects, some do not when it

suits them. Burnal Equinox this year was run almost entirely by iSkye & Huntress, with virtually zero consultation of the other Leads and their departments. Side-lining Leads she doesn't have time for, and ignoring consultation or consensus to do her own thing is the hallmark of iSkye's passive-aggressive grip on power at Burn2.

It is a widely known 'open secret' among Leads and regular Burners that if iSkye doesn't approve of something, it is almost certain to be dismissed. She has a number of tried and tested techniques to ensure she gets her way, ranging from the mild -> her inconsistent interpretation of 'consensus', to the unethical -> marginalising and manipulating others against them, to the extreme -> summary justice banning, without due-process, as happened to me and others, which is usually reserved for anyone brave enough to challenge iSkye, Leondra (or both of them) for their abuse of power. All the Leads are aware of this, but few are willing to speak out for fear of losing their jobs and being banned from the community.

Despite those abuses, iSkye is and remains the most committed and hard working volunteer at Burn2. Her knowledge and dedication is critical to Burn2's daily operations and I am not calling for her to step down or be removed. She must however stop, or be stopped from, abusing her 'power'.

Waiting months for a meeting to get something approved, then waiting even more months to get approval for every iteration or update is especially problematic for anyone trying to develop complex unique code, for free, while also juggling their own RL and SL commitments.

So iSkye forced me to wait to present my prototype and get Leads approval at the next Leads meeting in SL, as I always sought Leads approval first, prior to announcing the projects and consulting with the wider community at the planning meetings. But meantime I continued development of my system, testing and deploying it at my own Virtual Club.

It can be frustrating when you have created a gift for the community and think it's benefits are obvious, but must wade through pitifully slow bureaucracy to get it approved. But that's a necessary part of planning via 'consensus'. I have been down that road many times, with many gifts, and it was always frustratingly slow. In the end my gifts were always gratefully received and used. Most of my 'gifts' involve using Servers (like the B2TV Video Server) and Bots (like Bunsen the AI Burner who gives advice) that require paying for, but I have always absorbed the cost for years and never asked for any recompense from Burn2. But this time there was a fundamental problem, iSkye didn't like my gift.

The Discord linking system I created is so unique, groundbreaking and useful in SL, the highly respected journalist James Wagner Au did an article on it for "New World Notes", where he suggested that it was something that "Linden Lab should officially integrate directly into the SL messaging system by default."

<https://nwn.blogs.com/nwn/2024/04/sl-public-chat-bridged-to-discord.html>

So a month later, when the Leads meeting finally happened on 10th Feb 2024, only 6 Leads including myself bothered to attend. I had signed-up to chair it and I patiently passed the floor to iSkye and others to discuss their agenda topics first. My agenda item was last but before I could explain it one of the Leads said they had to leave. I suggested we continue the discussion later on Discord, pointing out that all 13 Leads were in the Discord Server, but otherwise only 5 of us would remain here, but they simply objected to doing that and left the meeting. I made the point that this is "Precisely why we need to make our meetings and decision making non-linear and more open and transparent".

So I continued, presenting my research, the concepts and issues relating to my system and while all the other Leads supported it, iSkye made it clear that she objected to it, saying she did not like remote participation from Discord.

I explained that I was developing a verification process, to run alongside my system, to ensure we could identify and moderate the Discord users participating in the meeting in exactly the same way we could those in SL. I explained that due to my research, and the technical, legal and ethical complexity of my system I proposed forming a focus group of Leads and Burner stakeholders to Beta test and consult with on the system.

iSkye continued to object, insisting that anyone wanting to participate remotely could 'send her a notecard' as a proxy instead, then iSkye said we should discuss it at the next Leads meeting in SL, forcing my topic to be shut down again and the meeting to close.

So I realised at that moment that I had two stark choices: (1) Give up, as when iSkye objects to something it never happens...or...(2) try to create a precedent, of appealing to the reason and fairness of the other Leads and the wider Community, knowing full well that any attempt to continue without iSkye onboard, that she sees as a threat to her control over the SL meetings, the agenda, the messaging and her absolute control over Burn2 has ended up very badly for the person doing that in the past.

However this would be my most significant gift to the community to date, the most useful with dramatic benefits. I also knew that the administrative burden of attending meetings in SL, every week, between events was becoming an intolerable drain for me and others, so without my system to make continued participation easier and more efficient, I would likely get burnt out soon and end up leaving like so many before me. Admin for most of us is a necessary evil, not an art form, most of us do not have the ability to commit the same time as iSkye does. Therefore I chose option (2) to continue to fight for greater inclusion and remote participation in meetings.

By choosing to defy iSkye's will, I sealed my fate.

I continued development and got the verification system working at my club. In the Discord Leads channel I proposed a timeline, inviting discussion and feedback from any of the Leads. I proposed a beta trial of the system, first by leads, with a beta trial shortly after for the whole community, inviting their feedback, thoughts and any bug reports. Most of the Leads supported my proposal and timeline.

It was also around this time that I noticed iSkye had stopped contacting or consulting with me on anything. I also noticed that iSkye was appointing Huntress as Event Lead of Burnal Equinox, Event Placement Co-Lead and year-round Staff Advisor. I had previously had little interaction with Huntress, but nothing personally negative, although I was aware some had privately said she can be rude and abrasive. At the time, I did not think there was anything particularly concerning about how iSkye was working so closely with Huntress and giving her so many responsibilities. It has always been our custom that temporary event staff respect the needs of the other departments and teams, by consulting with the year-round staff who lead each team, before doing anything that could impact those teams and departments. All leads are fully aware of this policy as it is critical to avoid problems that have occurred in the past.

On 26th Feb, my system went live for a trial by the Leads. I encouraged them to try it and give me feedback. None of them did.

A Public Beta Trial of my System was announced at the Burn2 Planning Meeting on Sunday 3rd March 2024. I demonstrated the system by participating remotely, encouraged everyone to try it (and the verification system). I invited comments, suggestions, feedback and especially bug reports and took questions (you can read-back the Transcript by scrolling back in the Burn2 Community Discord Server, in the meeting-logs channel).

Almost all of the Burners at the initial meeting were very supportive, except Huntress with iSkye repeating Huntress's comments. Their objections were identical and seemed co-ordinated. I answered any questions asked and while I was typing a response to somebody's question, iSkye ended the meeting, abruptly cutting me off.

I was very busy just before the Burnal Equinox event, due to RL and dealing with the development of the remote participation system. Normally, before any event, iSkye would contact me as Lead of Performance team, to discuss Performance Team forms and the placement and areas for the Main and BOB Stages that my Team look after during the events. iSkye knows that my only concerns are that there is enough room to cater for our audience, including newbs and visiting RL Burners, and that the stages are sufficiently close that we do not lose audience during handovers. It is disheartening for performers to start their shows to zero audience, so we avoid that through careful audience

and stage placement.

So although I thought it odd iSkye had not consulted me about the BE stage and audience areas as usual, I trusted her experience to know what the Performance team needs.

#### THE "INCIDENT"

=====

Around the end of February, one of my performance team members contacted me, distressed that the stage areas were too small and too far apart. On 3rd March (the date of the 'incident') I went to the playa and sure enough, the stage areas were much smaller and further apart than usual. However the Roads between plots were much wider than usual.

I decided it was too late to do anything about the distance between the stages, because it would be unreasonable at that point to expect major changes to the placement areas. Making radical changes now would require multiple people to move their plots around so not an option, but we had to do something about the inadequate audience area for the Main stage.

Although I have nothing against an 'intimate' area close to the stage, we need to also cater for new people who have not mastered 'fly-camming' about and people who do not like to be confined within crowds. So the solution that would cause the least inconvenience would be to move a single, 1 prim boundary marker back a few metres to visually indicate a larger audience area.

So on 3/3/24, while on the playa, I contacted the Placement Lead iSkye to discuss it as normally such co-operation is routine between departments and iSkye is placement Lead. iSkye immediately deferred to Huntress, who was the 'event placement co-lead' and this is the transcript of the following local chat conversation:

<LOCAL CHAT-LOG PLACEHOLDER - AVAILABLE SEPARATELY>

There are three very important comments by me in that Transcript to note, and the reasons why will become apparent later in the chronology of events. They are comments that I made in response to Huntress's suggestion that Gin and Bar move or change their plots:

"DJ Puddles: I dont think she needs to"

"DJ Puddles: Gin TY but I dont think you need to move your build, we just need to move this marker line back a bit"

"DJ Puddles: Actually no, my compromise is not asking Bar to adjust his stage design and instead work with the infrastructure to cater for both his artistic vision AND the needs of Performance."

I was upset at Huntress's refusal to respect the needs of the audience, my team and her inflexibility to reach a compromise that would cause the least inconvenience to everyone, so I left and continued to collaborate with the Stage builder Bar Tenk on other issues, such as dance relays, chat relays and B2TV screens, which we always do respectfully and constructively, respecting his artistic vision and my teams needs. I created dance relays to match Bar's stage, at his request.

To avoid drama, I decided nothing further could be done about the audience area problems for BE, but my intention was to raise the lack of consultation by iSkye (and Huntress's inflexibility) at the next Leads meeting, as lack of consultation and respect for other departments by iSkye has been a growing problem that all Leads are aware of and was becoming more acute since iSkye had appointed Huntress. They now effectively did almost everything themselves. Burnal Equinox 2024 was 'The iSkye & Huntress Show'.

A few days later I returned to the playa to find Gin had moved her plot and Bar had moved the stage area, which did increase the apparent audience area. Although moving their plots was unnecessary and not what I had asked for. I had expressly stated that I thought moving plots was unnecessary.

On Thursday 8th March, in the very first public planning meeting after the 'incident' on 3/3/24, when I was not present (4am my time) and without any consultation with me or prior warning, Huntress suddenly announced her campaign against my Discord system. With iSkye's assistance She distributed a notecard and it was very clear from their comments that iSkye, Gin, Lyric and Lily, a known peer-group of friends, were all briefed and vehement in their disdain for me and my system. The sudden opposition surprised me and seeing who it was coming from made me suspicious.

The objections seemed to focus on a misguided view on a right to feel "safe", due to an inaccurate belief over how blocking an avatar works in Second Life, that is different in Discord (it's not). But their most profoundly misguided position was that the responsibility for their individual "safety" in a public meeting fell not on themselves, but on Burn2, who should exclude strangers to make them feel safe. They wanted to exercise their right to withdraw consent to participate in a meeting that included 'strangers' from Discord, not by leaving the meeting themselves, but by excluding the strangers. Their concept was the antithesis of our principle on Radical Inclusion.

Instead of the honest, thoughtful, logical, reasoned discussion I was trying to have with them, the objectors constantly resorted to unhelpful personal jibes and attacks "you don't get it", they claimed, while telling me something I knew to be patently false in how SL blocking works. "You're victim blaming" they alleged, oblivious to the hypocrisy of the victims to their exclusion, nor my efforts to explain accurately how they can remain "safe" in public and the



limitations of all online public forums, including SL.

I wrote lengthy and very detailed explanations from my research on the Technical, Legal and Ethical background to my Discord System. I explained and stayed to take all the questions, in the public meeting on Sunday 10th March meeting (and Thursday 14th meeting getting up at 4am my time to attend in SL) to try to counter the mis-information, with respectful, accurate and responsible truth;

- No online system, SL or Discord, can guarantee "safety" if you are reckless with you private information in Public.
- My System does not make anyone more, or less, "safe" than attending the meeting in SL.
- My system 100% complies with the requirements of Linden Labs TOS, Community Standards, GDPR Law and the ethics of consent.

But fundamentally, and most importantly, my system is designed to support and encourage the very principles that define us as a community. Burning Man did not require the 'prerequisite' of attendance at Real World events for Burn2 to be part of their community. Nor can we require from our international Burners the 'prerequisite' of the ability to log into SL every week, at set times, to participate in our community planning.

- Radical Inclusion - "Anyone may be a part of Burning Man. We welcome and respect the stranger. No prerequisites exist for participation in our community."
- Radical Self-reliance - "Burning Man encourages the individual to discover, exercise and rely on his or her inner resources."
- Participation - "Our community is committed to a radically participatory ethic. We believe that transformative change, whether in the individual or in society, can occur only through the medium of deeply personal participation. We achieve being through doing. Everyone is invited to work. Everyone is invited to play. We make the world real through actions that open the heart."
- Immediacy - "Immediate experience is, in many ways, the most important touchstone of value in our culture. We seek to overcome barriers that stand between us and a recognition of our inner selves, the reality of those around us, participation in society, and contact with a natural world exceeding human powers. No idea can substitute for this experience."

- Communal Effort - "Our community values creative cooperation and collaboration. We strive to produce, promote and protect social networks, public spaces, works of art, and methods of communication that support such interaction."

Some Burners spoke up in support of me and the system, both at the meeting and to me privately. Several Burners were participating remotely, loved the new ability and told me they would have been unable to attend the meeting otherwise.

But given the pressure and personal attacks I was receiving at those two meetings, I decided it was in the best interest of the Community to suspend the system, pending further consultation and a chance for me to counter the constant wave of mis-information and personal attacks coming from those opposing the system. So I shut down the system on the evening after the meeting on 10th March and posted some additional information in the meeting logs channel, trying to correct some of the mis-information.

One of the primary objections claimed was that SL is "Safer" than discord, based on the incorrect belief that when somebody is blocked in SL they cannot see you or read your posts, but that is untrue. Blocking somebody in SL only stops YOU from seeing their avatar and posts, it does NOT stop them seeing your avatar and posts in local chat.

Then, just 2 days later, on 12th March, I received the following email from 3V:

Hi Puddles,

This is to inform you of received incident reports from events on the date of 03/03/2024.

Rangers who have not been involved in the reports have been asked to talk to all sides involved.

The rangers are Radioactive Rosca, <2 RANGERS NAMES REDACTED>.

They will be reaching out to you for more information. Thank you for your cooperation and understanding as we work towards a way forward. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

3V

The email gave me no information on (1) Who had complained and (2) What was the nature of their complaint. But I knew that iSkye, being a Ranger, would have full access to all those details.

I knew immediately that I was under attack. I very strongly suspected that:

- iSkye was orchestrating the attack, because she sees Discord as a threat to her control over Burn2, her control of the meeting agendas, the messaging and 'consensus'.
- Huntress was willingly assisting iSkye in the attack, due to her personal animosity against me for challenging her on the playa 3/3/24 and due to being manipulated against me by iSkye.
- That Gin had genuine fears, that were being manipulated through misinformation and outright lies over "safety" in SL and/or Discord.
- That Lyric and Lily were either willingly, or unwittingly, being manipulated and poisoned against me by iSkye and/or Huntress.

As I knew I had done nothing wrong (see the local chat log above), I realised that iSkye was orchestrating a conspiracy against me with the intention of; (1) shutting down my discord system and (2) possibly to get rid of me and (3) probably to replace me with Huntress. I know this because of the long history at Burn2 of Leads and volunteers being pressured and leaving in disgust, or being banned, when they are 'out of favor' with iSkye. All the Leads know this, but most are too afraid for their own jobs to admit it or speak out in defence of any of iSkye's victims.

So on the same day as 3Vs email, 12th March, I submitted a complaint, through the incident report form, for 'abuse of position' naming Huntress, iSkye and other witnesses, so that independent Rangers could be appointed and I could formally present my evidence.

I was not, and to this day am not, calling for anyone to be banned or removed. However iSkye's lack of respect for, and consultation with, other leads and their departments is a known and growing problem that must be addressed. The exodus, through disillusionment or summary banning, of dedicated Leads and Volunteers, due to the 'open secret' of iSkye's abuse of her power and her control over everyone at Burn2 must be curbed, or Burn2 will continue to suffer and the problem of Burn2's falling reputation, and the declining performer, camp, volunteer and visitor numbers will continue unchecked.

I emailed 3V and the assigned case Rangers, asking that we expedite the investigation as quickly as possible, sending them the local chat log and with the hope that the investigation could be concluded before BE. I had a faith (later proved misguided) that the clear evidence of the chat log would swiftly prove my innocence in any fair investigation.

I expected that the 'abuse of position' element of my complaint against iSkye and Huntress might take longer to investigate, due to the need for sensitive handling, interviewing of multiple witnesses and would likely need escalation to

Meta-Ranger. However I hoped that at least the bogus complaints hanging over me could get dismissed more quickly, given the chat log evidence, and not cause the potential for drama at BE.

Over the course of the following 2 weeks, I wrote two emails to the assigned case Rangers, asking for clarification of who had complained about me, what the nature of their complaint was and asking that the investigation get underway as soon as possible.

One of the Rangers replied to inform me that Radioactive Rosca had recused (due to being present at the incident and speaking up in support of me) and that the other Ranger was unavailable. She asked for patience.

Leondra, the Burn2 Rangers Lead, also informed me that she had recused (but in reality she did not and has never recused when she should do). I had previously complained about an 'abuse of position' by Leondra, more on that later.

I was not given, and to this day have not been formally given, clarification of exactly who complained about me and what the nature of their complaints were.

#### MY FALL FROM THE QUEEN'S GRACE

=====

By 22nd March BE was upon us, but no Rangers had begun their investigation, so I decided that to avoid the potential for drama it would be better if I stood down from being visible at BE. However I continued to support Madog as Stage Manager behind the scenes and fixed various problems, including performers streams being switched to BMIR every hour, due to an outdated Octoburn Radio that iSkye had rezzed without consulting Performance Team.

During BE I also noticed that Huntress was openly offering to switch streams for Performers in Access Group, without consulting Madog, which undermines Performance Team procedures and prevents the handover being updated in the 'what's happening now' Discord channel. It was yet another example of the lack of consultation and over-reach that is becoming endemic in Burn2 by iSkye and her proxies.

After BE, Burn2 Ranger Lead Leondra announced that she wanted both iSkye and myself not to chair meetings, pending the outcome of the still outstanding complaints process. I was not in favor of this as such a precedent could be abused and I felt that both iSkye and myself could still Chair meetings respectfully, regardless of the still delayed investigations.

Over the course of several public meetings I continued to try to explain how the logging and remote participation system would work, how it did not make

anyone less "safe" than participating in SL, how it was in accordance with our 10 principles, LL TOS, Community Standards and GDPR. I explained that there are a multitude of ways a malicious person could 'spy' on others in SL, through alts or scripts, and I gave practical advice on how to protect yourself in both SL and Discord by applying Radical Self Reliance and not post private or compromising information in any public online forum.

Talia too, who has an extremely advanced understanding of scripts and capabilities in SL, was trying to help educate on safety concerns. It would be doing the Burners a dangerous dis-service to pretend that Burn2 or my system can protect anyone in a public meeting from eavesdropping, so we told the unvarnished truth respectfully, as advanced programmers, without blowing smoke or sunshine.

I took questions, made clarifications, and responded to everyone respectfully, all while continuing to receive personal comments and attacks by the same group of people who had complained about me on the playa and were now attacking me and my system. Despite having the support of many Burners and Volunteers, this small group of about 5 people were able to keep the system shut down and it's users excluded. I believe that allowing a tiny minority to exclude others in that way, with extremely questionable motives, is contrary to our principles and an abuse of, and a mis-application of, 'consensus': <https://journal.burningman.org/2014/07/philosophical-center/tenprinciples/consensus-collaboration-hierarchy-authority-and-power/>

All my efforts were in vain. The Hysterical, relentless and mis-informed attacks against me and my system continued.

In the meantime, I wrote a number of emails to the assigned Rangers and 3V asking for a status update and a start to the overdue investigation process. One of the assigned Rangers replied to me on 30th March to say: "We are trying to set up meetings with all involved . Time change, time zones and no response yet from some, is the issue . We plan to reach each and get back to you as soon as possible. I am sorry I cannot list the names of the complainants at this time. Thanks for being patient."

#### THE SHAM SURVEY =====

In order to break the stale-mate over my shut down system and excluded Burners, Talia and I came up with a major compromise, that I felt went way beyond what was necessary. We would sacrifice some inclusion, transparency and immediacy by shutting-down access to the real-time meeting logs channel in Discord during meetings and prevent anyone from participating remotely, unless they had been "SL verified". This compromise would ensure that everyone participating remotely had an SL account, had access to Deep Hole (had not been banned) and could be identified by their user name in exactly the

same way as anyone participating locally in SL could. It granted both local and remote users with exactly the same rights and responsibilities on a completely level playing field.

A few days before the Sunday planning meeting of 31st March, I announced my intention to offer this compromise in the Leads channel, then went to the online document to add it to the agenda of the next planning meeting. To my surprise and dismay, someone had entered an agenda topic entitled "Development of a team for a survey to the Burn 2 community on remote participation" directly relating to my system, but without consulting me, which was rude to say the least. If my compromise offer was accepted, then there would be no need for any Survey, the survey would become moot. At that time the agenda topic was not signed, so I did not know who had entered it, so I put my topic first, their topic second and posted about it back in the Leads channel with the hope the person who had put their survey topic in the agenda list would contact me, but they did not.

On the 31st, before the meeting, somebody told me that Leondra had entered the topic and I reached out to her to ask her to request that my topic get presented first, for the reason that if my compromise was accepted there would be no need for a time-consuming survey and that if her topic went first she would undermine the chances of my compromise being accepted. Leondra refused my request and insisted that she go first. From the public online transcript of the meeting ( <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1yuJwRw01YScjzthWxiGqfvk7YfEVosBQCF4tMzjKqVM/edit> ) this is what she said:

Leondra: "My original proposal was for a team to develop a survey for our community to express their views on the use of remote participation at Burn2 meetings. This has evolved over the past few days. I have received feedback regarding other facets of meeting participation. Shortly after my request for an agenda item for today's meeting, Puddles had a proposal for a compromise plan for remote meeting participation. We will hear from her shortly."

Leondra: "I envision forming a dedicated team tasked with crafting a comprehensive survey aimed at gauging community sentiments regarding attending Burn2 Meetings, including remote participation. It's imperative that the survey is designed to foster transparency, with multiple stakeholders granted access to real-time results. Notably, individuals who have exhibited a tendency to impose their opinions onto others should be excluded from this endeavor, ensuring an unbiased approach."

Leondra: "I'm open to relinquishing leadership on this team to community members in pursuit of fairness and consensus. However, I believe having a designated lead within the team is necessary, and I'm prepared to fulfill a liaison role if needed. I have been approached by one Burner, Lyric, to help head up the development of a survey for our community. Please see either of us

to be a part of this team."

Leondra: "We live in an age where technology can absolutely help us grow as a community. The vast landscape of remote participation solutions offers a wealth of possibilities. In this busy, modern age, accessibility is key. Drawing from my involvement in a range of community groups, including state courts, where inclusiveness is paramount, we've successfully integrated platforms such as Zoom and other virtual applications to facilitate verified attendance. Furthermore, the use of proxies emerges as another practical avenue to broaden participation for those unable to attend physically."

I found Leondra's characterisation of me as: "individuals who have exhibited a tendency to impose their opinions onto others should be excluded from this endeavor", offensive, when from the public meeting records it can be seen that I was trying to defend my system and the excluded Burners and treating people with respect, while under relentless ongoing and sometimes personal attack. Furthermore Leo had just assigned one of those attacking me to lead the survey. So Leo's comments were not just offensive, it was abject hypocrisy! But I let that pass without comment.

However, as Lyric had made a number of public comments at multiple meetings objecting to my system, I objected immediately to her leading the survey team.

Exactly what I had predicted to Leo would happen did, and when Talia and I offered my compromise proposal the exact same people continued to object to my system and made no effort to justify their ongoing objections, understand it or make any compromise on their side, because they now had one of their peers leading this new survey. Lyric said:

Lyric: "I want to address what Puddles said prior to the relay discussion. I can understand why Puddles would suggest that I am biased. However, my original proposal at Thursday night's meeting was completely separate from the relay issue. My proposal is to form a survey about the barriers that are keeping people from participating in our meetings. Clearly the relay questions have brought up concerns about inclusion and there may be more solutions than just the relay. I never indicated that it was to address the relay use at all. I brought the concern as an issue highlighted by this discussion. I am calling it the Radical Inclusion Project. How can we solve the issue the best way if we don't really even know what the need is, the barriers we are overcoming and the possible variety of ways to facilitate our community to be more involved."

I replied:

DJ Puddles: "You are as biased against the system by your comments at meetings as I am for it....If I am excluded you should be too, but I object to it anyway and it might not be needed"

Lyric replied:

Lyric: "i am not against a safe relay that respects consent at all"

From what Lyric had just said, she reinforced the primary abuse of our principles that the objectors fail to see, and it is this:

Nobody who objected to the inclusion of others into our community via the Discord link had any right to do that. If they did not consent to it they had one simple choice -> LEAVE the public meeting, but instead they have forced ill-informed, paranoid and irrelevant claims of "safety", as an excuse and 'prerequisite' to exclude others. THAT is utterly contrary to our principles....iSkye knows it....but it served her agenda of retaining absolute power and control to manipulate her anti-inclusion group of 5 into THINKING they were justified in doing that, but they were not and never will be... Radical inclusion is not just a word, or a team title, it actually MEANS something..

Furthermore, the way that the survey was being presented, was a thinly veiled attempt to engineer a situation where impractical "alternatives" to my remote-participation system (like sending a notecard to iSkye as a proxy) would be suggested and used as an excuse to keep my system shut down and the Discord users excluded. I strongly suspected that the survey was a sham and that iSkye was behind it, manipulating the others. I was not sure if at this stage Leo was also part of the conspiracy, or if she too was an unwitting useful stooge being manipulated.

My objections were ignored and after the meeting both Leondra and Lyric contacted me, trying to reassure me that my suspicions were unfounded. But there were now just too many joined dots for my intuition to do a U-turn and believe them. I remained deeply suspicious of the motivation, intentions and hidden individuals behind it. Nonetheless I waited to see if they would deliver what they claimed, as Leondra promised the survey would be ready within a couple of weeks.

Lyric and I did have a somewhat productive private discussion and I think there was a genuine attempt by both of us to understand each others positions better. I could see little point in surveying the community on WHY they could not always attend weekly meetings in SL, I myself could think of about 10 reasons, it is simply enough to know that they can't attend and to find a solution to SOLVE the problem, making the meetings MORE inclusive, MORE accessible, MORE efficient and LESS of an administrative burden. Which is exactly what my system did.

Most importantly, Lyric and I remained in fundamental disagreement about the most critical issue of all: The right (or not) for anyone to use their refusal to consent to others participating remotely as a justification to exclude them. The



Radical Inclusion principle could not be more clear on that: "Anyone may be a part of Burning Man. We welcome and respect the stranger. No prerequisites exist for participation in our community."

They were now, without any sense of irony, calling it: "The Radical Inclusion Survey Team" and my suspicions over their intentions were proved right when at the public meeting on 7th April, it was revealed that the entire "RIST" Team of 4 were made up entirely, and only of, people who had spoken out in opposition to my system!!!!!!

I objected of course and said the Team should be made up of 50/50 of those who oppose or support my system, and there was a limited concession to agree to do that, but Talia who volunteered (and knows my system better than anyone else) was denied.

By now I had effectively lost any hope that this Survey was nothing more than a ruse. A sham, carefully orchestrated to appear to look like an attempt at Inclusion and transparency, while in reality being neither and all about the suppression of my system and exclusion of Discord users. I remain convinced to this day that iSkye was behind it, misguidedly afraid of losing her control over Burn2 and using her proxies for plausible deniability.

The toxic atmosphere pervading Burn2 was palpable and was something I deeply regretted. I wanted these matters resolved as much, if not more, than everyone else and was extremely frustrated by the lack of any progress either starting the complaints investigations or on putting the remote participation issue to rest.

Also in full disclosure, I realise that I am not untarnished or handled the bogus complaints and attacks on me and my system perfectly. In my passionate defence of myself, my system and those excluded from participating remotely I could perhaps appear to some as rude, uncaring, cold, arrogant, even intimidating maybe, but that was never my intention. I came to Burn2 and dedicated 5 years and thousands of hours to the community because I thought I had found a culture and like-minded friends at a place I could call Home. When you believe strongly in the community, it's culture and principles, it makes you staunchly defensive to protect it from unfairness and attack. What ultimately happened to me, for the individuals who did it, was a visceral personal betrayal of not only our friendship, but a betrayal of the community's culture, values and ideology. They know that and they know I know that. I can sleep soundly but they will have to live with the knowledge of what they did to me.

FAKE-RECUSAL

=====

On the 8th April, with still no Ranger contacting me to start the investigation, I

wrote to one of the assigned Rangers asking yet again for details of who had complained, why and for the investigation to start. They replied the same day and finally some details were revealed, but not in a good way. They wrote:

-

Hi Puddles,

I completely understand your frustration in wanting this whole thing be settled. The problem was not only time to meet with all the complaintants but also the fact that the issue kept growing as time went by.

After I discussed it with Leondra we decided that it needs to be sent up the line . It has become above Rangers ability. <NAME REDACTED> and I have passed it along the chain. Here is part of the letter I sent.

"It appears that due to rl issues <NAME REDACTED> and I are not able to get together to interview the complaintants in the open LSD filed 3/4/24. First we put it off diue to <PRIVATE> issues and agreed to continue after the Equinox . I notified all of this decision. . After the event <NAME REDACTED> advised me that she cannot make a commitment at this time due to other rl issues.

It is my opinion that this issue should be included in a bigger issue that has been growing out of meetings and discord discussions and it is above Ranger 's level ."

Here is part of letter Leondra sent .

"

We had our equinox event, the stage builder Bar was asked to change his build, the lead of the performance team Puddles, said it was inadequate. The other people involved were iSkye who was lead of placement, Huntress who was event lead, and a camp builder, Gin. All 5 were present for a discussion, and Radio, a Ranger, happened to be there. Gin moved her camp, so the stage area could expand into that space.

I received 8 total formal incident reports over the next few days, in addition to many other notes and messages. I recused myself from the FLAME process because Puddles and I have had an ongoing conflict, and we settled in a Ranger mediation process. So a team of 2 long-time, excellent Rangers were assigned, <2 RANGERS NAMES REDACTED>, headed by 3V. The incident reports accused each other. The initial reports were from ISkye and Huntress and describe Puddles as rude, uncompromising and had left Gin and iSkye in tears. The Rangers investigating the complaint, when speaking with Puddles, prompted a counter complaint from Puddles. Then 3 or 4 anonymous reports came in. Then others from Puddles and Huntress. We have been using an incident report on our website for almost 3 years now. There have been less than 5 total up until this March."

So I hope that you will wait and not take issue with any of those who originally submitted the complaint,

I really feel bad about it all and hope discussion will end it for all of us.  
Thanks so much for your patience.

-

The email was deeply concerning to me for a number of reasons, so I laid them out in a reply, copying in 3V and Leondra:

-

Hi,

Thanks for your reply <2 RANGERS NAMES REDACTED>.

(1) I do not understand why we are abandoning the agreed policies on this being investigated locally first. I see no reason to escalate this without first investigating this locally and seeking internal remedies before considering escalation, as-per the agreed policy. I object to us operating outside of our agreed policies.

(2) There are some serious inaccuracies in the letter that Leo has written. Two of the most concerning are that I never asked Bar or Gin to move or change their plots, in fact I specifically said that should NOT happen, in their presence, which can be seen clearly in the local chat logs I provided. Including easily disproved allegations against me in that letter, but not including anything about my counter-complaint, is deeply unfair. This process should never have reached this stage and should not be happening in this unfair way. I strongly object to it.

If this process is already ignoring our agreed policies and unfair claims about me are being sent externally without my consent, how can I have any faith in this process being conducted fairly?

I believe a small number of people are using personal animosity, partly as a result of the disagreement on the original incident date, in order to pursue a persecution campaign against me. That is how the issue has escalated to attacks against me and the system I developed (and am gifting to Burn2) has spilled into meetings. But to deny me due process, under our agreed policies, is to become complicit in the intimidation campaign against me.

I actually have more faith in your ability <2 RANGERS NAMES REDACTED> to investigate this matter fairly and efficiently as there is clear evidence available to you in the local chat logs and other evidence I (and witnesses) can provide you. I am extremely unhappy that I seem to be being denied the right for that due process. Meanwhile I continue to be attacked and intimidated in public, my integrity questioned in public meetings and now unfair claims are being amplified externally by even Rangers leadership.

This should not be happening this way and I am officially asking for this to be investigated by you, in the first instance, as-per our agreed policies.

Puddles

-

I suspected then and now strongly believe that the highly prejudicial email that Leo (who had told me she had recused, but clearly had not from that email alone) had sent went to the BM Meta-Ranger, giving an extremely misleading assessment. Leondra has abused her position in the past to protect people she likes from genuine complaints by suppressing the investigations and abusing the trust M2 has in her by mis-representing people to him. In the past this has lead to people being banned, without warning, without FLAME and without any due-process. My objections to that abuse of position in the past was what she referred to as an "ongoing conflict", although as the unfairly banned person was now back at Burn2, and Leo and I had accepted and made agreements in mediation, I considered that a resolved matter. Clearly she did not see it as resolved. I think she was about to employ the same bias onto me, and so she did.

There was some more email correspondence between Leo and myself, but we were clearly in disagreement. Leo told me 3V was handling the case and any decisions on how the case was being handled were down to 3V (but 3V was away on personal business). Leo claimed she supported my system and I concede that even at this stage, she might have herself genuinely believed that and that her intentions with the survey were to solve problems, not exacerbate them. But to do so while ignoring the evidence of the clear bias on that Survey team, who was behind it, their intentions and their connection to the bogus complaints against me was negligent at best....extremely questionable.

I asked an AI to do some maths for me to give some context to the unfeasible probabilities:

It seems I have received complaints from iSkye, Huntress & Gin over the alleged 'incident' on the playa.

Within days, 6 people spoke out at a public meeting to object to my meeting logging and remote participation system or have it shut down. Of those 6, iSkye, Huntress & Gin made up 3 of them (the rest were their friends).

From the pool of 2,700 potential Burners (in the BM 2.0 Group) who could come to the meeting at anytime and object to my system, the chances of the same 3 people who had complained about me being in that group of 6 are:

1 in 163,842,795.

To put that in perspective, The National Weather Service in the United States estimates the odds of being struck by lightning in a given year at about 1 in 1,222,000 for an average person. Over a lifetime (estimated at 80 years), this becomes approximately 1 in 15,300.

So I am 10,709 times more likely to be hit by lightening, than have those 3 complainants happen to be 3 of the 6 objecting to my system.

Coincidence? I don't think so.

More weeks went by with no progress on either the RIST Survey, the re-enabling of my system, the exclusion of the Discord users or the complaints investigations. I emailed the case manager 3V on 20th April asking for a status update, but got no reply.

On the 28th April, due to the continuing toxic atmosphere and lack of any investigation starting, due process or Ranger talking to me after 2 months, I submitted the following complaint via the online incident form. I thought it better not to name Leondra directly as the problem even though I believed she was,. It was my belief that Leo was actively suppressing the investigation from getting started by Burn2 Rangers:

Names You are Reporting: Administrative breach of Procedure and Policy Complaint. I am not complaining about any individual.

Bystanders/Witnesses: Yes. The complainants and witnesses, relating to the complaints following the alleged incident on the playa on 3/3/24 and related following complaints.

Tell us about the Incident: I am complaining about the failure to follow the agreed Burn2 procedures and policies in a reasonable timeframe, contributing to unnecessary anxiety to everyone involved, a toxic atmosphere and adversely affecting the administrative functions of Burn2.

- Assigned Burn2 Rangers <2 RANGERS NAMES REDACTED> have been unable to start their investigation.
- Agreed Burn2 protocols and FLAME steps appear to have been skipped, preventing Burn2 having the opportunity to deal with these matters internally.
- Requests for a status update to the incident manager have been unanswered.

Solution: <2 RANGERS NAMES REDACTED> should be authorised to start their investigation immediately. Including collecting statements, local chat logs and

evidence. If only one Ranger is available, they could at least start the process and consult with their Ranger partner. Our agreed process and FLAME must be followed, to give <2 RANGERS NAMES REDACTED> and everyone involved the chance to remedy the situation in a timely manner and in accordance with Burn2 agreed policies and procedures, before any further escalation steps are considered or deemed necessary.

Please Investigate: Yes

-

I got no acknowledgement of my complaint submission (not even an automatic reply), so I emailed the assigned Rangers to tell them about it and again ask for a status update, but got no reply.

Reading the transcript after the planning meeting on Thursday 2nd May, I noticed that somebody was proposing a live video link-up between Burn2 and the playa at Burning Man this year. That was something I had been working on for 2 years and had got to a fairly advanced planning stage last year. Our proposal had prompted some policy discussion between a number of BM departments and I was awaiting their policy update for this year. So I messaged the person who had proposed the topic at the meeting (also somebody who had objected to my system) and gave them some details of my progress, suggesting we could collaborate this year. I got no reply.

My offer of collaboration was genuine. I have assisted with multiple projects at Burn2. Sometimes I might disagree with someone over one issue, but agree and support them on another issue. I see that as part of our duty in a diverse and international community, who values each other as equals who strive to adhere to the same principles.

In hindsight perhaps it was just another attempt to provoke me, I don't know, but the topic was on the agenda for Sunday's meeting. However I was due to work that Sunday and could not attend the planning meeting to offer advice on where we had got with the link-up proposal. This was the third time since my system got shut down that I could not participate in a meeting because I could not log-in, and I found that intensely frustrating.

So I edited the script and created a device for SL that opened a remote meeting link to a channel in my private Discord Server, one that only I had access to. I asked Leo (who was Chair) to explain that I would be the only person remote participating and asked her to explain that and enable it at the start of the meeting. While at work I waited for the link to open at meeting time and it did, only for Lyric, the leader of the "Inclusion" survey, to immediately accuse me of "breaking the rules", said she did not "consent" to me participating remotely and demanded I be excluded from the meeting by shutting down the link.

That was the final nail in their hypocrisy coffin as far as I was concerned. I had to pay someone in RL £250 to stand in and manage my RL team so I could leave and log-in via my computer. I did so and gave some advice to the person proposing the playa link (which they seemed dismissive of and have never contacted me about since), then I waited until I got the chance to post this comment into the meeting at the end:

DJ Puddles: "As I was excluded from participating remotely in the discussion earlier, despite no "safety" issues as I was the only remote participant, I have had enough of this exclusionary nonsense that is hypocrisy and against our principles. So here is my delayed comment: I can no longer trust the impartiality of the RIST Survey, as it was proposed and is being run by somebody who has made several comments biased against my system including today, who initially recruited only people opposed to my system and has excluded people (Talia) who support my system. I believe this survey is a sham designed to seek "alternatives" to my system as an excuse simply to oppose my system, under the ironic title of an Inclusion survey when actually it is clearly about exclusion. Therefore, using the same (misguided) logic on consensus that my system should be shut down due to a tiny minority, you must shut down the RIST Team....OR.....allow my system to operate....You cannot have double standards and hypocrisy to allow a survey that I think is biased and against my objections...but force my system and remote participation to be shut down by a tiny minority.....Shut down both, or shut down neither..."

By now the writing was on the wall. I believe I had seen through and called out, abuse of power, corruption in Leadership (including Rangers Leadership), bogus complaints, malicious attempts to persecute me and my system, attempts to exclude others, and a failure to follow our agreed complaints process or for Rangers to FLAME or conduct a fair investigation. For the people behind the abuse, me calling it out was becoming a serious problem for them.

The summary banning of people seen as a problem to iSkye or Leo has happened before, more than once. Its happened to one of my B2TV team members, without warning, while she was actively working at an event, for the crime of wearing a T-shirt saying "thrown under the bus by Burn2 Rangers Leadership". Her many years dedicated service was discarded with a click by M2, in the middle of a Burn2 event she was volunteering at, for the crime of mild protest of Leondra's treatment of her. As with my case, M2 blindly followed Leo's call to act as unquestioning executioner. Even later, when the facts were presented to him by me in an appeal on behalf of my team member he ignored them.

What the Burners saw in public was even worse behind the scenes. The breakdown in trust between iSkye, Leo and myself made the Leads Server a battlefield of accusations and recriminations. I was pushing back hard against the escalating abuses both of them were committing.

On 6th May, just before bed, I chatted to a very close Burn2 friend and confided that I expected to be banned. My words proved strangely prophetic as within 5 hours I was. I woke up to discover that M2, aka Danger Ranger, the co-founder of Burning Man, absent owner of Burn2 and the self-claimed author of the Rangers 'bible' had been summoned in by Leondra, who he hand picked and appointed, to do the deed. Which he did without question, again, as he has done before.

5 years of my life and service, thousands of unpaid hours, summarily discarded with a click.

The ban email from 3V actually made me laugh "We hope that you can use this experience as an opportunity for personal growth and self-reflection." <- is possibly the most hilariously patronising statement any organisation could make, after being complicit in banana republic summary justice!

That day I wrote to the BM Meta-Ranger. I got no reply. I knew some decent people were upset, guilty even, at what had just happened and they made representations on my behalf, but I should have told them not to bother as M2's response was as predictable as it was final, turning the normal 1 year ban into a permanent one:

As the registered owner of Burn2, a Burning Man Project Director, and the court of last resort for Burn2, I have made the decision to ban djPuddles from Burn2 due to what I have determined to be continued intentional disruption and manipulation. This ban is permanent.  
-m2Danger Ranger

So much for principles, due process, fairness and justice.

In the following days I have seen iSkye and Leo's desperate attempts at a cover-up swing into action. They know that I know what they did. They lied and mis-represented me to the Rangers, Leads, 007s, to M2 and now to the Burners.

There was not due process or FLAME - FACT.

There was no consensus to ban me within the 007s - FACT.

Leondra did not recuse, but actively suppressed the investigation, or any Ranger talking to me - FACT.

No call for available Rangers to FLAME the investigations went out to the Rangers Group - FACT.

There were no statements taken from me or witnesses, or chat log evidence



reviewed - FACT.

No agreed escalation steps were followed and no attempt to de-escalate or mitigate - FACT.

There was only summary justice AGAIN. An execution AGAIN. By M2 on the sole word of iSkye & Leo, the very people I was complaining about, to cover up their abuse. It was, quite simply, corruption by an organisation moving ever closer to becoming a dictatorship.

Such hypocrisy is a disgrace to Burning Man, Larry's Principles and an insult to Burner culture.

How many more dedicated volunteers will M2 ban before somebody finally pierces his vanity with the truth he refuses to hear?

iSkye's achievements are many. Her skills and knowledge essential to Burn2. But her abuse of position and power must stop. She must respect and consult with others, even if she disagrees with them.

Leondra can be a great Ranger. Not everything she does is corrupt and she often does act with fairness and impartiality. But she also chooses to refuse to recuse when she should, when complaints are about her and acts corruptly when it suits her. That makes her unsuitable to Lead the Rangers. She should step down from her Leadership Role in the Rangers group.

M2 owes me an apology. But it will never come, he is too vain.

I am uncertain if Burn2 will recover and stop the declining slide into insignificance, while M2 is in charge and put's his blind faith in those who abuse that trust.

Burners however should keep the faith. I hope that one day, with patience, tenacity and perseverance, meaningful reform has a chance of coming to Burn2. So that we can once again call "home", with trust, integrity and when the 10P matter again.

-

I told my B2TV Team that I would support them if they wanted to continue work for Burn2, but none of them wanted to. I have had numerous messages of support from performers and camps, most of whom said they don't want to return to Burn2 now.

Senior Ranger Radioactive Rosca sent me this letter, proving what an honourable and honest man he is, reproduced with his permission:

---

Dear DJ Puddles:

I found out yesterday, in a conversation with Talia Tokugawa, that I am partly responsible for DJ Puddles being banned from BURN2.

Although I did not accept 3V's invitation to be one of the 3 Rangers selected to talk to all sides involved (Radioactive Rosca, Dakota Schwade, and Gemma Cleanslate), as I was involved in the discussion that took place at Playa, in which I publicly said that I was supporting Puddles in that dispute for space for the main stage, I mistakenly accepted a subsequent request from Gemma, to send her the chatlog of what was said in the public chat that day, until I left the area.

That was probably the chatlog that was sent to 3V.

I currently regret not being one of those 3 Rangers, as I could have been a voice in DJ Puddles' defense. But in my quest to be impartial, what I did was allow those who are not, to take over the process and distort it in order to reach the outcome we know.

For that, I humbly apologize.

I know I can't undo what has already been done, but I just want DJ Puddles to understand that although responsible for presenting evidence relating to just one of several events (probably other discussions in which DJ Puddles was unfairly attacked repeatedly, did not reach who analyzed the incident), it was never my intention to harm in any way the maintenance of DJ Puddles in the BURN2 organization.

I also consider that the one who lost the most with this decision is the BURN2 organization, which lost an excellent audio and video technician, an excellent DJ, an outstanding Leader. What more proof could we have of this, given the example of the present "Mental Health Awareness Weekend" event?

Again, my apologize for trusting someone I've known for a long time, but who used me and let me down.

Best regards.  
Radioactive Rosca

---

I replied to Radioactive Rosca: "I do not in anyway hold you responsible. You tried to do the right thing and put your faith in a fair process happening....So

did I....We were BOTH let down by the fact that fair process did not happen..."

My dear friend Freia, a Senior Ranger and our Volunteer Co-ordinator also had enough of the continued abuses by M2, Leo and iSkye. She had appealed to M2 on my behalf but got no reply. It pushed her over the edge and she resigned. This was her statement to the community, in the Burn2 Discord Server:

"Several community members have asked if I have left leadership and I guess its time to confirm that I have indeed left all my leadership roles at burn2 with the exception of Lamplighter Elder. This was primarily due to my frustration at how the Puddles ban was handled - specifically the lack of due process according to our policies, as well as the attempt to justify the lack of due process immediately after. Obviously, I do not agree with some of the other leadership about this issue and therefore felt I could not ethically continue to work in this environment. I have found the years as a lead of multiple burn2 departments rewarding in terms of seeing individual and community growth but am very concerned that we have a pattern of misuse of authority. I can see that the work we leads did a few years ago to ensure this kind of instant , unexplained ban would not happen again was fruitless, and that makes me feel that my ability to help change from within leadership has expired. I will continue to be a Greeter and support the community and our events as much as possible, so youre not rid of me yet...LOL"

Experienced Volunteers H00gie and Moon also resigned. I was growing very concerned that there would be no good people left at Burn2 to work on the desperately needed reform, so I made this public annocement:

"To the Leads, Volunteers & Burners: I know the vast majority of you are good people. I am strongly encouraging anyone else thinking of leaving to stay at Burn2. If the abuses of power are to stop through meaningful reform, good and honest volunteers will be needed to make that happen and rebuild Burn2."

As for me, I am already trying to move past the anger and bitterness of the betrayal, after a weekend of cathartic trolling-as-therapy, but it's very hard when there is an active cover-up underway and lies are being told about me to hide the truth of what happened. This document marks the end of that journey before it becomes unhealthy. My Video Team has already been working with me to provide streaming services for a very worthwhile cause, who provide peer Mental Health support in SL. There will be other invitations and worthwhile causes and events for my team to support and keep us busy. Now I can focus more on my club and my friends. I will be fine :) Burn on!

DJ Puddles xxx

FIRST THEY CAME By Martin Niemöller

First they came for the Communists

And I did not speak out Because I was not a Communist

Then they came for the Socialists

And I did not speak out Because I was not a Socialist

Then they came for the trade unionists And I did not speak out Because I was not a trade unionist

Then they came for the Jews

And I did not speak out Because I was not a Jew

Then they came for me And there was no one left To speak out for me.