

# THE /LEFTYPOL/ CONSTITUTION



**Staff of /leftypol/:**

**Webmaster:** Krates

**Volunteers:** antinous, Ausfaganon, Barbara\_Pitt, Caballo, Comatoast, Comet, Comrade Watermelon, comrade\_rat, ghostixo, Krates, Nox, pask, wvobbly, Zer0, Zul

**Technical Staff:** antinous, Barbara\_Pitt, comrade\_rat, Zer0

*This document is a continuation of the /leftypol/ Manifesto. Moderators should also review Articles 1-3 in that document and attempt to uphold these standards and user expectations through their work, with consideration for the more detailed guidelines herein.*

## ARTICLE 4: THE EXPECTATIONS FOR STAFF

The staff is expected to act as transparently as possible given the unique conditions of imageboards and of /leftypol/, and should generally try to act in accordance with the wishes of the user-base of the site's individual boards and that of /leftypol/ as a whole.

While individual contributions are both expected and welcomed, staff members should ultimately try to serve as vessels for the will of the users of /leftypol/ as far as can be reasonably achieved given the constraints of the medium of imageboards.

Staff members are expected to never issue unwarranted or unjustified bans, move or lock threads without valid justification, or otherwise attempt to undermine the democratic will of the users of the community.

Staff members must review the post history of a user before issuing an IP-wide post deletion in order to prevent unintended deletion of important posts or threads. A user's posts should only be wiped as a whole if they are consistently lacking in quality or merit or consist of spam.

Staff members must give an explanation for all bans along with the ban when it is issued. This might consist of one word in simple cases, like "spam", or a longer statement, like "posting in bad faith, trolling". The ban reason should let the user know in plain terms why they are banned, and should also not be used to insult a user.

When threads are anchored or 'bumplocked', the acting staff member must leave their justification for the decision in the offending thread. In the absence of such a justification the thread should be unanchored, or else the action justified by another staff member. The thread may still be unanchored at the discretion of a consensus of other staff members even if a justification is given.

In addition, anchoring decisions should primarily be made based on the content of the original post and posts by the original poster. Ideally, threads should not be arbitrarily anchored due to

later derailing or disruptive posts which are out of the control of the original poster, and the offending posts should simply be removed.

Moderation actions should ideally be recorded in a public board log which tracks deletions, bans, and so on, under the names of the individual mods who made the actions, so that moderators can be held accountable by the users and by their fellow moderators. In addition, the moderation team should announce major changes to the userbase, even if these do not involve moderator votes, so that the community can be made aware of any new expectations or rules.

While individual interpretations of the rules and agreed practices may differ somewhat, this manifesto is intended to provide the 'be all end all' authority on how /leftypol/ should be run, and should not be contravened except by a formal, critical, majority vote. The actions of the staff and users should follow from a straightforward interpretation of the text herein.

## **ARTICLE 5: CONGRESSIONAL MATTERS**

All matters shall be decided by vote of the staff and if possible should the opinions of the community as a whole will also be considered. The nature of international anonymous image-boards makes capturing user opinion difficult. The staff is expected to try to gauge the general opinion of the boards objectively as possible and use that information to guide their decisions.

Matters which have a relatively low impact, such as removals of individual posts or new threads which are without merit, or short term bans of individual posters, volunteers may act on their own initiative. However, the removal or modification of longstanding threads with a large number of posts, or matters which affect entire boards should be decided by the moderation team as a whole as a consensus.

When other staff members are not available for consultation for non-obvious bans which are urgent, the staff member is expected to list and share the details of the ban so that other staff members can review their decision and provide oversight at a later date.

The modification of site or board rules, the modification of the manifesto, or other decisions with a profound impact should be subject a formal vote among the staff in the moderation chat.

For a formal vote to be called, a mod or admin must clearly propose the matter in the relevant moderation chat. Votes will take place in the form of a thumbs up or a thumbs down and the wish to abstain shall be marked via the 'eyes' emoji. Votes in which multiple options are necessary may be responded to with the corresponding '1', '2', '3', etc emojis.

More detailed discussion is possible and encouraged where ambiguity or controversy exists. If possible, the moderation should come to a rough compromise between themselves on the matter where all perspectives are considered, though in some cases this will not be possible.

For non-critical matters, there is an option to fast track a proposal. A non-critical proposal may be fast tracked if there are three or more staff members which respond positively (including the original proposer) within **TWO HOURS**. The fast tracked proposal will then be considered de

facto agreed without objection **TWENTY-FOUR HOURS** later, and if possible other staff members should object during that time.

Critical matters shall include the election of staff members, moving well-established and popular threads between respective boards, and the amendment of these articles and otherwise matters that transcend the rules and jurisdictions of individual volunteers. When the presidium deems a matter as critical, the matters will have a minimum of a **SEVENTY-TWO HOUR** voting window and are ineligible for fast tracking.

When the votes are deemed as concluded by the majority of the staff, a decision will be made and the matter will be considered closed and ready to implement, if applicable. A decision which has been made should not be revisited without significant change in circumstances or extenuating circumstances for at least a period of one month. A member may choose to withdraw their own proposal during the proposal or voting stages, in this event, the matter will not be considered 'closed' and can be revisited as required.

Unless the matter requires secrecy for operational reasons, formal voting should be announced to the user-base at minimum within **SIX HOURS** of the start of voting, or before voting begins. The vote should be posted in the appropriate thread, most likely the moderation thread or as a dedicated announcement for truly momentous matters, and in the moderation votes thread on /gulag/, for the entirety of the voting period, and the post should be identified in an official manner (ie. using admin/volunteer IDs).

The user-base should be measured for their opinions of the matter wherever possible, and the staff should use this feedback to inform their proposals. Staff should try to balance the sometimes competing desires of different users in the best way possible but should not ride roughshod over the wishes of the userbase in general.

To this end, special rules are used for the creation of formal site polls – these can be proposed by the approval of only two staff members, and votes must run for only **TWELVE HOURS** before being accepted by a simple majority and implemented. Due to their speculative nature, internal polling votes will not be disclosed to the userbase until their success and the creation of the poll. Official polls should not be conducted outside of this mechanism due to the possibility for confusion.

A public log of all moderation votes and their results should be maintained for the later reference of both staff and users, and to ensure that decisions are recorded and followed.

## **ARTICLE 6: TRIAL AND REMOVAL**

All efforts will be made to guarantee due process for all users of /leftypol/. However, due to the transient nature of imageboards and anonymous users, the process for users must take place informally in moderation threads and internal chats. For staff members however, there must be a more formal procedure.

The staff has the right to begin trial or adjudication procedures against any staff member for any reason, but typical reasons may include failing to comply with moderation guidelines, seriously disruptive activity, abuse of other staff or users, contravening or attempting to contravene site security, or intentionally causing damage to the site or user-base through any means.

Staff members so accused should have the right to speak before the staff, the right to a full adjudication, the right to present their own case, and the right to a fair vote before the majority of the volunteer/administration team, with any users who may have a severe personal conflict of interest abstaining.

Removal of staff members should at all times require a critical vote in moderation channels. However, due to the nature of site security, the accused may have their moderation powers removed from them during the trial or before the trial begins for reasons of safety, to be returned immediately if they are found not guilty by a majority of moderators.

This trial process is not intended to determine the absolute truth of matters per se, and matters should be judged on the preponderance of evidence; whether it is more likely the accusation is true than that it is false. In addition, users who are found guilty by the letter of the rules or the accusation may regardless be found not guilty of committing an offense that deserves their removal by the moderation team through the process of jury nullification.

~~~~~

**Drafted and written by Comatoast, Antinous, and Caballo**

**Signed and approved by a majority of volunteers.**

**This document is the 2021/02/19 revision, which supersedes all previous versions of the constitution**