Introduction

Cavin's document
Deko's document
I do not care about B3313 but I thought writing a statement would be funny and also I like Cavin and he really did a reasonably good job imo

Also I want to claim ownership of red rectangle #1 in Image 1.1 in Cavin's document.

Sorry for tearing apart your statements Deko if you end up reading this, I don't mean you ill will and as far as I know you haven't caused anyone any serious harm. But Cavin was a little sad and I think he will appreciate my arguing that he did not particularly screw anything up

Installment 1: Here is a screenshot from Deko's document

I think the criticisms against Cavin and his document made here are pretty unfair.

Chapter 3: Another Document

I feel the need to cover the other document.

I'd like to mention that he leaked our conversation.

The document apparently is going to be fairly massive, with quite a bit more content.
While we do recommend you read it. I do think you should take it with a grain of salt.
Here's why.



It has become clear that he has a focus on tying back evidence to a source.
While my evidence lacks a source(which is exactly why we are trying to get you as the reader to investigate for yourself), we have seen Chris modify messages, and delete entire channels to protect his image. What's the point of a source if the source is absolutely unable to prove your point?

The document in question
It is really concerning how much this guy takes out of context. The fact that he has echoed Chris' misinterpretations of the doxxing threats, the false raid info, etc. Also how he's adamantly against you contacting people, and the fact that he doesn't even mention the dms. Overall it seems poorly thought out. Please do your research, Contact both sides. Just don't be a jerk about it.

It's also the fact that he had an extremely clear bias in talking to Chris and getting info straight from the source. He refused to take evidence that chris had deleted and only talked to Deko and Roman, completely ignoring the other team members for evidence

Image 1.0

Segment 1.1: He leaked our conversation

If there was an explicit agreement that the conversation was private, then I think violating that agreement was pretty bad of Cavin to do. I strongly doubt that Cavin ever made any such promises, and I suspect that he didn't think Deko particularly intended it to be private.

I *personally* err on the side of not leaking dms, but I don't think that's a universally agreed-upon norm, and if you want to ensure something is kept private then you need to request that ahead of time.

Segment 1.2: While my evidence lacks a source

I have zero guesses at what this is supposed to mean? Deko's document has screenshots?

Segment 1.3: We have seen Chris modify messages and delete entire channels to protect his image

I haven't actually seen evidence of this claim, but I also don't have particular reason to doubt it. I suppose ideally Cavin should've mentioned this allegation more prominently in his document?

***If* there are a ton of accusations against Chris which Cavin refused to mention at all because of a lack of confirming evidence, and people stated that they could not find evidence to support those accusations because Chris deleted it, *then* I think that would be a significant failure on Cavin's part.**

I do not think that happened.

Segment 1.4: What's the point of a source if the source is absolutely unable to prove your point?

Well, it could provide evidence for your point? Or *counter*-evidence *against* your point, which you will be equally interested in if your goal is to find the truth rather than to promote a particular side of a partisan argument.

Segment 1.5: He echoed Chris' [sic] misinterpretations of the doxxing threats

The only paragraph where Cavin discusses the doxxing is as follows:

> "Roman learned of this Sharty raid because he was still in Chris' server using an alt account (Images 7.6). Roman then went to the website and found a thread where users were discussing Doxxing Chris. These users were unrelated to any B3313 development. Roman attempted to warn Chris. Chris, in turn, shrugged it off and felt that Roman was to blame for inciting the drama that led to the dox threat (Image 7.7)."

How is this a misinterpretation? I don't see any room for interpretation in the chain of events here? What?

Segment 1.6: the false raid info, etc

Cavin's statements about the raid are as follows:

> On July 28th, **Several people from Roman's dev team including Roman** and Benedani "raided" the public channels on Chris' discord server (Image 7.1, Image 7.2). **Some used alt accounts as their main accounts were banned**. During the raid, Chris left the server because he didn't want to deal with it, giving server ownership to one of his long-time mods. Said mod banned the raiders.
>
> However, afterwards, **one of Roman's group realized that they still had admin powers on Chris's server, and abused these powers to demote** every **other mod and unban the previous raiders from Roman's group**. There were too many messages for me to manually sift through, but **both Roman and Chris mentioned Roman throwing strong insults at a completely unrelated person** (Image 7.3). According to Chris, this person was very upset and even left the server for weeks, allegedly.
>
> Additionally, according to Chris, this raid was the final straw. Chris' dev team quit all development afterwards and Chris himself wanted nothing to do with it for his own mental health and wellbeing (Image 7.4).

I have bolded all of the claims which have been confirmed by Roman. Is the idea that Roman is lying? If both Chris and Roman are telling the same lies, how is it supposed to be Cavin's fault for not figuring that out? What the hell are you talking about?

I will note that Roman only said that he in particular was on an alt at the start—so you might think the "*some* used alt accounts" part is misleading—but later on he says that a mod "unbanned *all of* our main accounts", which seems to imply it was multiple people on alts.

It's also the case that "to demote every other mod" might not be quite true, because Roman specified that there was one exception—presumably the server owner.

(I'd also like to note that Roman's claim that they weren't engaging in TOS-breaking "raid behavior" is incredibly dubious. At *absolute minimum*, the ban evasion was TOS-breaking, but I would argue that in fact coordinating a visit to a server to "do a little trolling" constitutes a raid—or at least, it absolutely isn't *unambiguously not* a raid.)

It's been claimed that Roman's message (Image 7.1 in Cavin's document) was taken "out of context." I have no idea what context other than "Roman was engaging in an elaborate roleplay when he posted the message" that could possibly change the conclusion that Roman has admitted, if nothing else, that part of his team engaged in coordinated trolling and ban evasion.

Deko's document claims

The demotion of Moderation happened after everything was over, and was unrelated to us

The bans were lifted, even if it wasn't to chris's knowledge there was no evasion

But these seem to directly contradict things Roman said. Maybe Roman was mistaken, I guess, idk. I think "took out of context" is a bizarre accusation to level at Cavin here, if there was confusion it was certainly not entirely Cavin's fault for ignoring context.

Segment 1.7: How he's adamantly against you contacting people

I think "should I contact anyone involved in this" is a somewhat nuanced question. If you have some reason that you really need to know what's going on, then yeah, maybe doing further research is a good idea? But I think it's probably correct to discourage *most* readers of the document from bothering anyone.

Stances on how good of an idea contacting people is could vary, but I don't think it's *concerning* to feel like it's a bad idea. I don't think Cavin is trying to prevent a piece of data from coming to light.

Segment 1.8: The fact that he doesn't even mention the dms

I have no idea what this is talking about. Maybe he missed some substantial piece of evidence? If so, I personally am really quite sure it was an accident.

Is this saying Cavin shouldn't mentioned his dms with Deko? I don't really see what relevance those have to anything, why would he include them?

But yeah it's possible there are some noteworthy dms he left out and that this is a legitimate issue with the document, I'm not really sure what this is about.

Segment 1.9: It's also the fact that he had an extremely clear bias in talking to Chris

This is entirely untrue, he talked to Roman a bunch and tried to talk to Deko but got blocked.

Is this supposed to be saying that, in Cavin's screenshots of his conversations with Chris, you can see Cavin acting in a biased way? I think I disagree, though I haven't closely inspected every single conversation for evidence of bias.

Segment 1.10: [and an extremely clear bias in] getting info straight from the source

Stories can get distorted over time. When you are trying to gather evidence, the best thing is flat out direct evidence and the second best thing is first-hand accounts (preferably from both sides, so you can look at what things they agree and disagree about.)

If Cavin was like, refusing to report on any claims anyone made which he was unable to verify, that would potentially be an issue! But I don't think that is the case. I'm pretty sure he was mostly not being like "sorry the accusation you're making against Chris doesn't have compelling enough evidence so I am not even going to mention the allegation." I agree that, if Cavin was acting like that, it was bad.

Segment 1.11: He refused to take evidence that Chris had deleted

I'm not certain what precise claim is being made here. He included at least one screenshot of a YouTube comment which Chris had since deleted (Image 6.1). He does say that he wasn't able to confirm exactly where the comment was posted, but like—that's a true statement? He's not saying that Roman is wrong about the comment, Cavin's just saying that he cannot personally vouch for where exactly the comment was.

Segment 1.12: and only talked to Deko and Roman, completely ignoring other team members

I thought he was supposed to have a bias in talking to Chris? Which is it?

Anyways, this reads like it's saying someone else tried to talk to Cavin and was unable to. If someone tried dming Cavin and he refused to talk, then that would perhaps be an issue. But I don't think that happened.

Installment 2: Overall comments

It seems plausible to me that there are some specific things that Cavin underemphasized. For example, Deko's document addresses the pluralphobia stuff in more detail. I strongly disapprove of Chris's attitude towards the matter. (Though it seems to me that Benedani/Copper weren't acting the best either—I think it is at least *often comparable to* ban evasion if a plural system uses one headmate's account to talk on a server when another headmate's account has been banned.)

Anyways, if you think Cavin left things out, then—like, lay out the particular things he didn't mention. If you accuse someone on taking something out of context, then I think it is best to also, like, provide the context.

Overall the accusations laid against Cavin in Image 1.0 seem ill-founded to me. Possibly he made a few mistakes but like, he's human, and they don't invalidate all of the evidence he laid out.

Installment 3: Closing note

Mostly I think you shouldn't take any given person's overall opinions too seriously. You should look at the *specific individual claims* everyone makes, *think about how compelling they are*, and then *draw your own conclusions* based on your understanding of the situation. And then hold your conclusions lightly—don't act rashly when you don't have all the information, and be ready to update your conclusions if you learn anything new.