

THE DUBIOUS DEALINGS
OF AN
ONLINE ENCYCLOPEDIA

by

TW Huston

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapters 1-7

1. Deep in the Trenches of Wikipedia [Pages 1-4]
2. Editor Killer Jimfbleak [Pages 5-8]
3. Admins Sarekofvulcan and Deepfriedokra [Pages 9-13]
4. Wiki Men Theroadislong and Jpgordon [Pages 14-17]
5. Wikipedia's Mysterious Voorts and Rsjaffe [Pages 18-21]
6. Problems Without Adminship Term Limits [Pages 22-25]
7. Gaslighting on Wikipedia [Pages 26-29]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapters 8-14

8. Serious Incidents on Wikipedia
[Pages 30-33]

9. Get Ready for Randy
[Pages 34-37]

10. Wikipedia Abuse [Pages 38-41]

11. Teahouse Draft Article
Submissions [Pages 42-46]

12. Draft Article Submission on
Wikipedia [Pages 47-48]

13. The Made in Gimp Movement
[Pages 49-51]

14. Indecency on Wikipedia
[Pages 52-55]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapters 15-22

15. Gang Attacking Admins
[Pages 56-59]

16. Wikipedia Crushing a
Whistleblower [Pages 60-63]

17. UTRS Admin Jpgordon
[Pages 64-68]

18. Inappropriate Admin Request
on Wikipedia [Pages 69-72]

19. Improper Wikipedia Appeal
Review by Jpgordon [Pages 73-77]

20. Wikipedia Gang of Admins
Silencing an Editor [Pages 78-81]

21. Death of Another Wikipedian
Editor [Page 82]

22. Summary [Pages 83-90]

DEEP IN THE TRENCHES OF WIKIPEDIA

Unless you've been deep in the trenches of editing Wikipedia over the past several years, you'll be shocked by the story you're about to hear. Evidence of everything described in this story had to first be collected before this story could be published, because on Wikipedia, admins have a way of making the unwanted disappear. Some of what you'll read has already been deleted by Wikipedian admins, but that was expected. Everything was protected like kittens first.

Admins run the show on Wikipedia. Admins are editors who have been given power from other admins who liked them enough to grant power. Those power granting admins themselves received power in the past in the same way.

DEEP IN THE TRENCHES OF WIKIPEDIA

Once in power, an admin rarely loses their power as long as their account stays fairly active, unless there is a falling out regarding internal politics. Most of the controllers of Wikipedia have had their admin power for 15-25 years, and most received their adminship prior to 2005. Once they attain power and get established in the ranks, they act virtually unchallenged and are almost impossible to remove.

This particular story demonstrates the toxic and unfair environment that has been cultivated behind the scenes of Wikipedia to keep outsiders remaining outside. First, a bit of background about the seven specific admins who were a direct part of this story, a riveting account which will have you questioning whether no encyclopedia would have been a better idea.

DEEP IN THE TRENCHES OF WIKIPEDIA

Wikipedia consists of ten different encyclopedias based on ten of the world's popular languages, with English being the primary and also the focus of everything in this story. If you've ever read a Wikipedia article in English, there's a good chance these admins or their admin friends had absolute control over what you were allowed to read, right down to every allowed word and punctuation.

The following seven Wikipedian admins are all directly involved in the dubious dealings you'll soon learn about. This group of seven admins shamelessly acted together in an organized bad-faith manner against just one editor, RandyKnotts.

DEEP IN THE TRENCHES OF WIKIPEDIA

However, RandyKnotts was not to be underestimated. He has an astounding talent which will become clear to you as everything unfolds. It also must be said that RandyKnotts was on the side of good, which should also never be underestimated.

We'll first learn more about these power wielding admins which make up a sampling of the people who currently control the world's ubiquitous encyclopedia, Wikipedia. This story contains real examples of petty grudges, quintessential bias, and bad-faith acts which are routine for admins, and for which there are rarely any consequences. After all, the biggest fear of most admins is losing their admin power, so they rarely stand up to the corruption from within.

EDITOR KILLER JIMFBLEAK

JIMFBLEAK hails from near Derbyshire England, and currently has blocked almost 40,000 Wikipedia editors, mostly Americans. The numbers are staggering. One miserable person really banned that many contributors trying to edit on Wikipedia. Jim F. Bleak takes great joy in blocking other editors, and has been caught making statements confirming as much.

He promotes the impression that he's a cultured world traveler and he may just be a bored trustfunder feeling inadequate. His most recent whirlwind trip was an evidence deleting adventure, in which he quickly deleted tens of thousands of characters all related to his admin actions and statements made by him.

EDITOR KILLER JIMFBLEAK

Some of what he deleted were of himself bragging to another admin friend about unnecessarily blocking an editor he had a grudge against. The newly blocked editor had not even logged in to make an edit in five years. When joked with about it, Jim F. Bleak bragged that his block was meant to "put a stake in their heart and make sure they're dead".

He says he's interested in birding but his most obsessive interest seems to be in the vanity of his Wikipedian statistics: 185,184 other editors' edits deleted, 219,902 other editors' pages deleted, 35,752 other editors blocked from Wikipedia. Now, here are some statistics that Jim F. Bleak doesn't want known...

EDITOR KILLER JIMFBLEAK

Almost immediately after his admin friend SarekofVulcan blocked an editor RandyKnotts in retaliation for threatening to blow the whistle on the both of them, the Derbyshire admin immediately made a series of five massive deletions. Jim F. Bleak quickly destroyed evidence in places which included his user talk page. From Sept 4th 2025 to Sept 11th 2025, five statistically irregular massive data deletions totaling 48,915 characters were completed by him on his talk page alone.

Among the self incriminating evidence which was hurriedly deleted, was the revealing response he had made to another admin friend Deepfriedokra, as the two mucked it up about the blocking of the editor who hadn't even edited in five years.

EDITOR KILLER JIMFBLEAK

They viciously ensure that outside editors remain dead. Murder is how admins like Jim F. Bleak see their powerful blocks against other editors they don't like. When making these statistically irregular five massive deletions, the admin gave the coy reason of "clearing old" in the required summary field. Clearing evidence would have been more accurate.

Jim F. Bleak and his old friend SarekofVulcan are a powerful and wily duo on Wikipedia. If you don't have adminship on the site and you challenge either of them, you can be certain that they may be plotting to murder you from the encyclopedia too.

ADMINS SAREKOFVULCAN AND DEEPFRIEDOKRA

SAREKOFVULCAN is an extremely bad-faith actor and power abusing admin on Wikipedia. You'll soon learn of a legendary example of how ruthless he can be in a detailed account of retaliation. SarekofVulcan has most recently claimed to be Garrett Fitzgerald, perhaps as part of a conscious effort to clean up his image and appear legitimate immediately after the notorious events you'll soon learn more about.

Curiously, he's currently applying for additional Admin power for not one, but three new Wikipedia accounts: SarekOfVulcan2, SarekOfVulcan3, and SarekOfVulcan4.

ADMINS SAREKOFVULCAN AND DEEPFRIEDOKRA

It's a suspicious tactic which has become common and widespread among abusive admins who often try to get adminship for as many accounts as they can to statistically minimize their chance of ever losing all power. Losing all their admin power on the encyclopedia could easily lead to an emotional downspiral and full identity crisis.

SarekofVulcan is an extremely obese knitting man who might not be able to cope without a plethora of power charged Wikipedian accounts. Wielding admin power to his liking compensates for a lack of power in his real life. "SarekofVulcan" is the alter ego of a failed musician, a man who lacks respect and admiration offline.

ADMINS SAREKOFVULCAN AND DEEPPRIEDOKRA

Garrett Fitzgerald's greatest accomplishments seem to be his successful conflict of interest editing on the Wikipedia pages for Bangor High School, Brewer High School, and the Bangor Public Library in Maine, where the Vulcanite apparently actually hails from. Vulcan sounded more powerful though.

DEEPPRIEDOKRA is a man of German descent and a pitbull owner to boot, who has blocked almost 15,000 other editors from using Wikipedia. Fifteen thousand contributors had to die on the backstreets of the world famous encyclopedia because of a man who calls himself Deepfriedokra.

ADMINS SAREKOFVULCAN AND DEEPFRIEDOKRA

This enthusiastic okra fan has admitted on his own account page that he has Asperger syndrome. Aspergers is a neurodevelopmental disorder which consists of obsessive repeated action, social problems, and control issues. Those issues are then consoled obsessively by repetitive behavior. Do you see how Wikipedia could have become a strong part of that?

Deepfriedokra has bragged that he is number 373 on the Wikipedian list of users ranked by number of edits. He hangs his cap on that stat. So everyone else be damned? Deepfriedokra has obsessively climbed the controlled rankings to become a top echelon admin and he's a member of only a few active Unblock Ticket Request System (UTRS) Admins.

ADMINS SAREKOFVULCAN AND DEEPFRIEDOKRA

UTRS is like the Supreme Court of Wikipedia and its judges have the power to unblock a contributor or deny the block appeal to keep that person blocked indefinitely.

WIKI MEN THEROADISLONG AND JPGORDON

THEROADISLONG is a man (sensing a pattern here?) from North Cornwall in the United Kingdom. Theroadislong is the least corrupt of this vicious gang of admins, but is that really a good thing? He's either a friend or a frenemy of the others and is the only admin in the gang with a great deal of creative talent himself.

Theroadislong is more of a reluctant follower in these circles. His motivations are unclear. Some might ask if it's a simple internet addiction. One can't help but wonder if a mental health screen should be a prerequisite to controlling this monopolistic encyclopedia. One thing is for pure certain... Theroadislong doesn't have the courage or will to stand up to the abuse he's well aware of.

WIKI MEN THEROADISLONG AND JPGORDON

Theroadislong is equally obsessed with his own vanity in becoming the Wikipedia admin with the most edits in history, and is currently ranked 196 for most edits. When the voices of the surrounding abusive admins are loud enough, Theroadislong silently goes down the road with them on a path of bad-faith actions. He's skilled at looking the other way and maintaining his position within the organization.

JPGORDON or Josh Gordon is the 72-year-old failed musician with an obsession about which words people should be allowed to write with. Some words just irk the wannabe lawyer. His claim to fame is that he was once one of the many, many revolving members of 70s band The Mystic Knights of the Oingo Boingo.

WIKI MEN THEROADISLONG AND JPGORDON

Despite a conflict of interest, Josh Gordon may have even helped to ensure the band which remains close to his heart would be remembered always with a Wikipedian article that rivals that of The Beatles.

Unfortunately for people who'd like to contribute to Wikipedia but have found themselves on the wrong side of a block, Josh Gordon is one of only a handful of active UTRS Admins, estimated to currently be about seven people. JPGordon is indeed hanging on to the precious Wikipedian power he's attained, and with the grip of a hyaena on a newly found carcass. Only death could separate this geriatric.

WIKI MEN THEROADISLONG AND JPGORDON

Reportedly and rather ironically, Josh Gordon started attending law school in his 70s, admittedly because he's a weirdo, and even though he has been very outspoken against any perceived Wikipedia lawyering. Ask yourself why would a guy who takes frequent naps and when awake, is busy wielding his Wikipedian power with a grumpy dose of lethargy suddenly want a law degree?

You might think Josh Gordon would be busy building birdhouses instead or writing that autobiography before it's too late, but interestingly and very ironically nope.

WIKIPEDIA'S MYSTERIOUS VOORTS AND RSJAFKE

VOORTS is the mysterious New York Lawyer who seems to be connected with the state of New York or some powerful New York organization. Voorts is another fan of the "One Wikipedia Account Just Isn't Enough" club. Voorts has admitted to having atleast one additional account, where he goes by the username TechnicallyVoorts.

He seems quite interested in virtue signaling wherever and whenever the opportunity should arise. He displays a sense of entitlement in that his actions on Wikipedia don't need a whole lotta explaining. Not much else of substance is known about Voorts. He's kinda like an enigma really but fully entrenched in upper admin dealings. Simply put, other admins aren't exactly known to challenge Voorts.

WIKIPEDIA'S MYSTERIOUS VOORTS AND RSJAFJE

RSJAFJE or Rory Jaffe is the California medical doctor who practiced in Sacramento and Davis as an anesthesiologist. The doctor likes to get his admin on when the urge arises. Dr. Rory Jaffe also operates on Wikipedia as Truth69420. The good doctor managed to work a 69 and a 420 into his username. He seems to be a member of the Collaborative Healthcare Patient Safety Organization.

Very little else is known about this Wikipedian admin and Rory Jaffe seems to prefer it that way. When he's not crushing editors with less status, he's networking among Wikipedia's top echelon of admins.

WIKIPEDIA'S MYSTERIOUS VOORTS AND RSJAFJE

Bazaarly, the medical doctor Rory Jaffe was blocked when operating as Truth69420 on December 3, 2022 by ScottishFinnishRadish, another underappreciated though tart vegetable.

Upon being blocked, Dr Rory Jaffe gave the ignorant radish-loving admin the "Hey, know who I really am?" message. Suddenly blushing red, Radish man quickly apologized and unblocked Dr Jaffe and they had a good laugh about it.

So much could be said about these characters who run the show at your household name encyclopedia but you'll have to wait for the documentary film to come out if you want the full picture.

WIKIPEDIA'S MYSTERIOUS VOORTS AND RSJAFKE

Wikipedia is run by an organized group of men who seem to have a great deal of spare time on their hands and a strong urge to make consequential decisions over other people or matters. They almost all display personal political ideology or other personal preferences on their personal pages indicating it's self-important for them to display a chosen egotistic identity.

PROBLEMS WITHOUT ADMINSHIP TERM LIMITS

Now that you know a bit about the cast of characters involved in this dubious encyclopedic story, you'll have a better understanding of the dark human dynamics that were involved.

Wikipedia is a place of corrupt internal politics. For the past 20+ years, rules for yet more rules have been written exhaustively in what's known as the Wikipedia guidelines. Those rules usually sound good on the surface, but are typically interpreted arbitrarily and applied unevenly, mostly to non-admins and generally speaking people who have not been accepted as okay to make edits. If you aren't a well-known and accepted quantity and you try to make an edit, statistically it will almost certainly be undone.

PROBLEMS WITHOUT ADMINSHIP TERM LIMITS

On Wikipedia, it's called edit reverting. Every single word on Wikipedia and even every single punctuation on any page of slight popularity is tightly controlled.

If you were to make a contribution as an editor, it would be immediately scrutinized by many stalking admins monitoring for recent changes site-wide and additionally everyone "supervising" the page you just edited. What do you think the chances are that atleast one of them pounces on you and your new edit? If even one of them decides they don't approve of it or they just don't like that you're someone editing there, they'll revert your edit.

PROBLEMS WITHOUT ADMINSHIP TERM LIMITS

Assuming you made a good edit, if there's nothing obvious they can think to say in their one-line summary of the revert, they may just say something rather ambiguous like it was an unnecessary contribution or a non-improvement. Even on a minor edit, they might weasel you about stylistic choices claiming that yours are inferior.

Anyone can say any of that about practically any edit, and then it's simply an opinion based argument. You'll lose that argument everytime, because you lack admin power and social acceptance. When an admin argues with you, they will rarely back down no matter how wrong they are, especially if even one other admin shows up in a display of solidarity with them. If you put up much of a protest, expect that to happen.

PROBLEMS WITHOUT ADMINSHIP TERM LIMITS

Every user has their own talk page for behind the encyclopedia scenes discussion. After the almost immediate revert of your exciting new edit, the admin who reverted it may immediately follow up with a public message on your talk page.

The post on your talk page is typically where the admin will school you on their reason for undoing your recent contribution. At this point, many admins like to throw an extra directive or two at you for good measure. It might sound something like, in the future read this and that first so you don't mess up again. Right then, it may suddenly occur to you that editing on this encyclopedia is not something you're going to really be welcomed at doing.

GASLIGHTING ON WIKIPEDIA

The post made on your talk page is a form of checking you, often an intimidation tactic and a power move to put you in your place. If you reply to their post to defend your edit and cite guidelines to support your position, it can lead to a high chance that the watching admins will next seek a reason to quickly block you.

They'll scour through every recorded action you've taken so far with your account, targeting you for any reason they can. They call the process "check user" and you can be sure you've been marked for execution. The only question left is regarding the time of death.

Wikipedian admins don't like to be challenged and they have common catch-alls to get rid of you decisively.

GASLIGHTING ON WIKIPEDIA

They can simply label just about anything you say or do as inappropriate. How is it inappropriate? What specifically is inappropriate? Doesn't matter... you're gone, blocked indefinitely from the world's encyclopedia, and you can't just create a new account. They expect that, and they're watching for it.

They have technical tools and bots that will find you by matching up many things like your site navigation pattern, choice of edits, browser choice, IP range, and so on. If you make a new account and try to continue on, you'll be caught, blocked, and labeled a sockpuppet on a special page created just for you which will essentially detail what you are. You're dirty goods now, practically irredeemable.

GASLIGHTING ON WIKIPEDIA

Calling you disruptive is all any admin has to do to block you. They may see you merely disagreeing with them and not backing down promptly as disruptive. It's so vague and bias, and the block almost certainly won't be challenged by anyone else in power. These admin excuses can be applied arbitrarily when they want to.

An astonishing portion of blocked Wikipedian editors were labeled as inappropriate, disruptive, or some other harsh vaguery. These excuses often mean nothing other than the admin didn't have a better reason, and the admin may have royally lost a discussion on merit.

To make it worse, the unfair block probably won't be overturned on appeal.

GASLIGHTING ON WIKIPEDIA

It's a big unwritten rule for admins on Wikipedia to never interfere with or undermine any other admins, especially admins with more seniority. Many of the admins are extremely petty and this is their ego exercise.

There are only a few active block appeal reviewers on Wikipedia, currently about seven. It's called the Unblock Ticket Request System or UTRS. Most admins who've been granted UTRS power are looking for only one thing on an appeal and that's total submission. They like it when your statement includes some pure groveling too. In other words, you have to essentially say that it was 100% my fault. I'll never be stupid again. Please let me back. Then you'll have a small chance of being unblocked, very small.

SERIOUS INCIDENTS ON WIKIPEDIA

Another small number of top admins actively oversee "Serious Incidents". Any issue can be escalated to a serious incident by any admin. Many admins hesitate to perform an escalation because there's some chance, even if only a very small chance, that the responding admins which have the power to remove their adminship could side against them, or decide to atleast look at all of their actions of late with scrutiny.

There's always an element of unpredictability involved with anything and remember there are always various internal politics going on, and the tide could shift against any particular lower admin for any reason.

SERIOUS INCIDENTS ON WIKIPEDIA

To escalate an issue to the world's most serious incidents on Wikipedia, all any admin has to do is post a brief (one sentence) complaint saying you're a problem accompanied with a link to wherever the issue is being discussed. When that happens, you will almost certainly be dealt with swiftly and harshly. Not only you, but there's a good chance that large IP ranges even remotely close to your IP address will be blocked too. Admins call it collateral damage.

Hundreds if not thousands of other people who may have never even had a Wikipedia account before are now blocked from Wikipedia too. If they ever decide to edit Wikipedia, they'll quickly find out when they go to edit that they're blocked.

SERIOUS INCIDENTS ON WIKIPEDIA

They'll be met with a full-page cookie cutter block message which will usually be accompanied with some generic abuse accusation as the reason it was necessary. Almost nobody ever questions the details behind that and it wouldn't be fruitful anyway.

In other words, some admin who probably calls himself something like BlueToastwButter or GreatBigVampire and commonly resides in West Europe has decided that you're guilty and that's it. Not only that, but hundreds of other people nobody involved has ever met will go down with you. All blocked. No trial. No need. You're thinking about fairness and that's not how Wikipedia works.

SERIOUS INCIDENTS ON WIKIPEDIA

If you try to speak up diligently for yourself, it only seems to anger the admins no matter how reasonable or diplomatic you are. They may even call your very protesting inappropriate. Merely defending yourself against unfair admin treatment or statements made to or about you on your own talk page can in itself be labeled as inappropriate or disruptive.

Wikipedia effectively made advocating for your contribution and defending yourself a crime worthy of capital punishment on the encyclopedia. The contributing game is utterly rigged against you as an outsider. You will lose and it doesn't matter if you were right.

GET READY FOR RANDY

Next is a perfect and even legendary example of unfair and bias events which lead to the block of a remarkable editor RandyKnotts. That editor then filed a block appeal and the appeal process itself was also abused by even more admins piling on. The gross mishandling of the appeal demonstrates the impunity these dubious admins operate with.

Then after speaking up about the blatantly improper appeal review, the editor's issue was escalated to a serious incident. The escalation was executed by a bad-faith UTRS admin Josh Gordon just as it had become fully apparent that the involved admins all looked utterly horrible for their actions.

GET READY FOR RANDY

This particular serious incident escalation seemed more like a plead from the admins to be saved from themselves. It screamed make it end already, because we've been fully cooked.

The outsider RandyKnotts' ability to communicate expertly all of the wrongs happening in real time was incredible and worthy of a summer blockbuster. Yet with the callousness and arrogance of no valid justification needed, top admins put the final nail in the editor's coffin with a removal of his talk page access. That means that the only place left where an editor can communicate, ask for help, or respond to his or her talk page posts, is no longer available to them. That talk-page-denied editor is completely prevented from posting about any issues no matter how egregious and improper toward him or her.

GET READY FOR RANDY

It's the ultimate execution of the editor. They're totally silenced.

An editor whose very own talk page access is revoked can't even publicly appeal their block as would normally happen on their talk page. To appeal, they must go through a private system. In a private form appeal, the blocked contributor is even less likely to be treated fairly due to that much less transparency.

Normally, when an editor is blocked, they atleast continue to be able to post on their own talk page and that's the only place they're allowed.

Wikipedia typically leaves talk page access open so it can maintain a (false) sense of hope and fairness, in that any editor can someday, even if many years later, be unblocked and restored to a basic editor.

GET READY FOR RANDY

However with RandyKnotts, admins urgently shut him up because the editor knew he was on moral high ground and just wouldn't back down.

They don't want the talk page used effectively against corrupt admins. It's similar to how a casino will kick out a poker player who isn't breaking any rules simply because he or she is beating the casino royally.

WIKIPEDIA ABUSE

Admin abuse is common on Wikipedia. It can appear subtle at first, especially to an uninitiated editor without a trained eye. It's often done with passive aggressive language and usually starts off with superficial niceties. When you overlook any sea, the surface of the water appears calm, but just underneath that surface are big fish chewing smaller fish's heads off.

The big fish on Wikipedia are much more sophisticated than your favorite salt water fish. An admin will often hide complex political reasons for eating a potential rival, and they'll mask their admin actions as something else noble, which deceptively seems valid at first glance.

WIKIPEDIA ABUSE

What's most remarkable about this Wikipedia story of admin abuse is the exceptional knowledge of internal guidelines by RandyKnotts, coupled with his ability to respond perfectly to sink any shred of false legitimacy put forth by corrupt admins like Jim F. Bleak.

Most people after being treated the way this editor was, would have told one of the abusing admins to chew some slightly molded hay already. However, that would have given the increasingly desperate admins exactly what they're used to getting, the appearance of a justified block, which is what they were terribly desiring. RandyKnotts understood that and his discipline and sheer expertise was second to none. The editor valiantly took on a team of admins with skill and precision.

WIKIPEDIA ABUSE

Each response from RandyKnotts served to leave a beautiful and extremely well documented case of Wikipedia abuse for the knowledge loving ages, which went all the way to the top of Wikipedia's structure. RandyKnotts is the most talented and skilled person ever known to challenge Wikipedian admin abuse. These events happened over a period of weeks in September 2025.

There are admins who shockingly state in all seriousness that there is no authority above theirs. Their grandiose self-perceived power within the environment drips off them like drool from a greedy pig. Wikipedia has certainly winded down a dark path from its humble and noble beginnings.

WIKIPEDIA ABUSE

Ironically, this story happened while Wikipedia was already under public scrutiny in the news on a daily basis for the same things, proving that their admins have no intention of changing their ways.

Many of the admins wielding power abusively may even have mental health conditions which would prevent them from being able to stop without an intervention.

Much of the public has recently become aware of gross abuses by Wikipedian admins regarding some well publicized events. Those injustices are only a small fraction of the overall problem with corruption, bad-faith editing, and malicious admin retaliations that go on routinely at the famous encyclopedia.

TEAHOUSE DRAFT ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS

Teahouse is the name of the process and group of dedicated admins who have been granted the power to oversee new draft article submissions on Wikipedia. If you think there should be an article on Wikipedia that doesn't yet exist, you can create one and submit it to Teahouse.

Teahouse has their own policies about reviewing submissions, ensuring a draft qualifies, approving or denying the draft, then typically allowing the editor six months of editing time to try and improve their drafted article if Teahouse denied it. If after six months, it doesn't appear that the author of the draft or any other editor is putting any effort into improving it, the draft will then finally be nominated for deletion.

TEAHOUSE DRAFT ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS

If there are no objections, it will soon after be deleted. That's the normal fairly-designed process on paper for drafting new articles on Wikipedia. If at some point everyone agrees that a draft article is up to par, it's then moved into the mainspace where the public can view the official Wikipedia article. At anytime even after an article is live in the mainspace, it can be nominated for deletion by any admin, and the whole survival process for the article begins again.

An article basically needs the blessing of some powerful admins to be left alone and to keep others backed off from trying to kill it. That might not even be enough if another long tenured admin wants an article gone. Some admins have personal reasons why they can't stand to see a subject have an article.

TEAHOUSE DRAFT ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS

A real world Wikipedian example of how the draft article submission process is supposed to work follows.

An editor noticed there was no article for Friedrich Goethe, the grandfather of a famous German poet. So the editor decided to create one and submit it to Teahouse for Friedrich Goethe's future Wikipedia article. The problem is that Friedrich Goethe isn't considered notable. He is related to someone notable, but that doesn't make a person notable. Likely, he could never have a Wikipedia article because he died in November of 1730.

The eager editor pressed on anyway, surely a loyal Friedrich fan and a firm believer in his extreme notability. It's all rather relative.

TEAHOUSE DRAFT ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS

Interestingly, Friedrich could possibly someday be considered notable for being written about at length in this very book, but let's stay on track shall we...

This particular editor submitted his draft to Teahouse on September 5th, 2025, the same week as the other events with editor RandyKnotts you'll soon hear more about, and which were chock-full of admin abuse.

The Friedrich draft was submitted with only one reference and an inadmissible reference at that, because it was a reference to a user-editable website called WikiTree. It's a family tree site that anyone can log into and start making changes, and therefore it's considered to be an unreliable secondary source.

TEAHOUSE DRAFT ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS

So on this seemingly non-notable subject with only one shaky reference cited, the draft article was still seen by TeaHouse. Not only did Teahouse admin PadGriffin review and deny it, he fairly allowed six months of further improvement time.

That means the author of the Friedrich Goethe draft has been fairly allowed to continue for the months following the article submission and denial, to voluntarily work to improve the article. The eager editor can go to the local library or research online, and try to find some reliable notability information and secondary sources if any exist. However, it will be up to the editor to decide if it's a pursuit worth continuing, and it will give a fair chance for other editors with a similar interest to decide if they would like to join the draft contribution effort.

DRAFT ARTICLE SUBMISSION ON WIKIPEDIA

That's how draft article submission is "supposed" to work on Wikipedia. However, it's extremely common for drafted articles to be cut off at the metaphoric pass by a stalking abusive admin for any arbitrary reason including personal bias, morning power trip after cereal, or their dog Rover just died. They have a posted rule on Wikipedia forbidding biting new editors for this very reason, but almost nobody polices Wikipedia's abusive admins. So the rule is extremely rarely enforced.

Next is another real Wikipedian example, but of a typical abusive situation upon a draft article submission. Another editor, the talented RandyKnotts, spent much more effort on his draft article only to have it instantly annihilated by a disgusting-behaving admin Jimfbleak.

DRAFT ARTICLE SUBMISSION ON WIKIPEDIA

Remember, he's the same admin who will block an editor that hasn't even logged in for years to make sure their corpse stays unequivocally dead forever. He's a big fan of capital punishment from the encyclopedia he patrols obsessively.

The subject of the draft article submitted by RandyKnotts to Teahouse certainly seemed to be plenty notable. There were oodles of good secondary sources with their own independent fact-checking and verification systems. The subject had publications which included a famous independent video game, software, famous artwork, and a notable series of in-depth interviews with other world famous video game designers, artists, and musicians.

THE MADE IN GIMP MOVEMENT

Courtney is also notable for creating the first ever published video game to be made using the popular image editing software G.I.M.P., called Lucas the Game (2015). It's a historic milestone which has been written about by many people in reliable secondary sources, in many languages and countries, around the world. The published 2015 video game was also sold and mass distributed in a popular Groupees Game Bundle, and started the 'Made in Gimp' movement. There has since been thousands of video games and other professional productions published as 'Made in Gimp'.

The draft submitted by RandyKnotts contained 46 references, 24 of which were independent of the subject, many with fact checkers. The draft should have been reviewed by Teahouse and approved as an article.

THE MADE IN GIMP MOVEMENT

Well, that's not what happened, because... abuse.

A ruthless admin Jim F. Bleak who was not authorized by Teahouse to review it, swooped in like a vulture and used his admin power to delete the draft article completely. Gone forever with one disastrous button click and a grin.

The brutal admin Jim F. Bleak had struck again. The editor killer wasn't approved by Teahouse to delete an extraordinary draft or any draft for that matter. Further, even if a real reviewing Teahouse admin had for some reason thought there was an issue with it like tone or structure, the Teahouse admin should have denied it with the stated reason, and given the editor and any other interested editors a chance to improve the draft and fix the cited issues.

THE MADE IN GIMP MOVEMENT

There's no doubt that an equal and fair opportunity to improve the draft for up to six months should have been the worst case scenario for the draft.

However, the draft properly created and submitted to Teahouse had been cut off by a notorious admin and killed ruthlessly. It had likely taken many hours of skilled research and writing, all to have a self-admitted heart stabbing admin, instantly and callously destroy it.

Six months of improvement time?
How about a second day? Second draft?

Nope, and Jim F. Bleak, nor any other admin, showed a shred of empathy for the deleterious cruelty of it.

INDECENCY ON WIKIPEDIA

You might be thinking that surely there are some decent admins that would recognize the butchering which just occurred by a bad-faith admin, and step in to at least suggest the draft be appropriately restored for Teahouse. Not at all.

What happens next is a saga that will be enshrined in Wikipedia history. Editor RandyKnotts was not about to just walk away without a full discussion and demanding to be treated fairly.

This saga goes all the way to the very top of Wikipedia and proves that bias and corruption is at every level.

INDECENCY ON WIKIPEDIA

It should have been a no-brainer that the draft be approved as an article by Teahouse or atleast given a standard six-month chance for improvement.

In reality though, Jim F. Bleak intercepted the submitted draft before a Teahouse admin could perform the normal fair process, and he simply erased it all. Not even a second draft was allowed to work on Jim F. Bleak's bogus claim.

That's because the admin was clearly wrong, he knew it, and he didn't care. It seems to be the point actually. Remember, he loves to destroy more than create, and he takes egotistic satisfaction in getting his way about it. Jim F. Bleak has blocked almost fourty thousand Wikipedian editors, mostly Americans. Some of his victims hadn't even edited for years.

INDECENCY ON WIKIPEDIA

RandyKnotts appropriately started by leaving a message on Jim F. Bleak's talk page respectfully asking for reinstatement of the draft, while skillfully discrediting Jim F. Bleak's given reason about references. At this point, the admin could have easily just reinstated the draft article and moved on, but he couldn't cope with the idea of doing a 180 because of a complaint. His reputation for being a ruthless admin that always wins one way or the other was on the line.

Instead, Jim F. Bleak began a gaslighting campaign. He simply moved on to another reason completely unrelated to the bogus reason the draft was now non-existent, and he did so with thick sarcasm.

INDECENCY ON WIKIPEDIA

Ironically, the indecent admin's new excuse was that the tone of the draft was promotional he claimed. Editor RandyKnotts argued that it wasn't, but agreed anyway to rephrase or omit any lines that were claimed to be of a non-neutral tone.

This olive branch was thrown back at RandyKnotts. The admin never had any intention of being reasonable. He simply dropped those excuses and moved on to yet another, the subject wasn't notable enough he now claimed. Along with each new excuse, the abusive admin included some measure of dismissal and condescension in his remarks, increasing the growing tension. A forming audience of stalking hyaena-like admins began to build, waiting to nip away.

GANG ATTACKING ADMINS

Though fully aware of being gaslighted, RandyKnots surgically responded and calmly detailed how the subject was provably notable. Then, in light of the new bad-faith objections being well overcome, he again requested reinstatement of the draft, also pointing out that it was standard Teahouse procedure to receive six months as a chance to improve upon any objections.

One of the stalking admins already nipping and growling, a friend of Jim F. Bleak called SarekofVulcan, began to further gang attack with false statements about Teahouse. He absurdly claimed the mentioned Teahouse procedures weren't true and with a gaseous tone.

GANG ATTACKING ADMINS

It almost seemed that the undeserving admins were completely ignorant of Teahouse procedures because they weren't involved with it or authorized by Teahouse to review drafts. Either that, or they were bold faced lying about it. Given their years of Wikipedia trolling, the latter is assumed.

By this point, it was quite obvious that the botcher Jim F. Bleak was never going to undo anything. The draft article was in the trash exactly where he wanted it, and now all he wanted was the editor dispatched too.

The power abusing admin continued to move from new excuse to new excuse, and each was properly dismantled for what it was, bogus excuses to not right the malicious wrong.

GANG ATTACKING ADMINS

The admin buckled down and further ratcheted up his gaslighting games with even more personally insulting language and by fracturing the discussion. Discussion fracturing is when a person continues the talk for no apparent reason on an entirely different page, only adding confusion and making it difficult to follow along clearly with what's happening.

The editor immediately stayed with Jim F. Bleak moving to his own talk page where the discussion continued. He responded just as skillfully and made it clear that the fracturing was harmful to the issue, and requested that the discussion now stay on his talk page where Jim F. Bleak had inappropriately moved it to, to avoid any further confusion.

GANG ATTACKING ADMINS

The seething admin began to post that he didn't even see the point in continuing the discussion, and implied that the editor was incapable of understanding him.

RandyKnotts continued by dismantling each post by the admin. Suddenly the admin moved the conversation back to his own talk page and then abruptly back again to the editor's talk page, with even more bad-faith objections and gaslighting.

Then in an emphatic outburst, Jim F. Bleak unexpectedly proclaimed he must now move on, because as he claimed, he hadn't even been answered about a (ridiculous) inquiry he'd made, but RandyKnotts had answered and skillfully at that, but on the other talk page where the admin had posted it.

WIKIPEDIA CRUSHING A WHISTLEBLOWER

Then it happened. When it became clear that the wrong would stand, the editor, seeing this, told the prime pair of abusive admins Jim F. Bleak and SarekofVulcan that if they didn't right this immediately, he'd be sending an explanatory letter to the DOJ and Wikipedia's head office about it.

Understandably, RandyKnotts was at the very end of his plentiful rope and said the one thing that could be used to scapegoat him. Freedom of speech outside of Wikipedia isn't lawyering, it's whistleblowing. However, some admins may interpret whistleblowing as a legal threat and Wikipedia doesn't tolerate whistleblowers.

WIKIPEDIA CRUSHING A WHISTLEBLOWER

Just then, another admin Theroadislong who had been page stalking like a creep suddenly slapped the editor from behind with a posted Disciplinary Warning.

The public action was an official Wikipedian templated warning to RandyKnotts that his last sentence may appear to some to be a legal threat, and that any further talk like that would result in a block. Though disagreeing in principle, editor RandyKnotts made no more such statements and fully adhered.

It was finally over. Jim F. Bleak had successfully abused his power, and though he and his friend SarekofVulcan had been ripped to shreds on merit, Jim F. Bleak just didn't have to do the obvious right thing.

WIKIPEDIA CRUSHING A WHISTLEBLOWER

RandyKnotts humbly moved on. He took a break and then decided to edit elsewhere on the encyclopedia. Then, during an unrelated edit, he got the templated official message. He had just been blocked by the obese knitting man SarekofVulcan. The admin's grudge was just too much. SarekofVulcan had retaliated with double jeopardy and an after the fact double discipline.

Though RandyKnotts had already received disciplinary action and fully adhered to it, the petty admin could never let it go. SarekofVulcan had pounced like a hog on an odorous mud pie. He had taken a bad-faith capital punishment action because he could, for the same issue which had already been concluded.

WIKIPEDIA CRUSHING A WHISTLEBLOWER

RandyKnotts was left with the option to either walk away from this misjustice or file a block appeal. With a historic and extraordinarily profound appeal statement, RandyKnotts appealed the retaliatory block by SarekofVulcan. In his appeal, RandyKnotts explained everything that had happened and hoped for a decent human being to appear.

Maybe a UTRS admin would recognize all of the guidelines broken against the editor, and that he had received double jeopardy disciplinary action for the sentence in question, and that he had even adhered to the posted warning fully. Maybe they'd even help restore the draft article and allow Teahouse to review it.

UTRS ADMIN JPGORDON

Did you think things were going to turn fair and hunkydory all of a sudden?

That's far from what occurred next. Instead, a lazy and corrupt UTRS admin called JPGordon, or Josh Gordon, agreed to review the appeal.

The problem is Josh Gordon had no intention of properly fulfilling the powerful role he had signed up to do, presumably without a firearm pointed at his noggin. Instead, Josh Gordon glared superficially at the marvelous appeal statement made by RandyKnotts, then he quickly scanned what was going on, and he took note of the other admins involved which he surely wasn't about to undermine.

Then JPGordon immediately denied the appeal.

UTRS ADMIN JPGORDON

UTRS Admin Josh Gordon's lazy appeal denial was about two short sentences, which amounted to I didn't see a full submission by the guilty Wikipedian.

In his incompetent appeal review statement, Josh Gordon arrogantly, surely sensing his pure impunity, admitted that he hadn't even reviewed most (any) of what had happened. Then Josh Gordon, in black and pure white on a public Wikipedia page, expressed that he didn't feel like figuring out what really happened, and he didn't think any other admins would care enough to either, because as he proclaimed, they're not being compensated financially. The powerful UTRS admin apparently needed money to do the right thing.

UTRS ADMIN JPGORDON

This astounding (lack of) appeal review by JPGordon was immediately responded to by the discriminated and blocked editor.

By now, the amount of viewers tuned into this epic Wikipedian drama unfolding before everyone's bug eyes was staggering. No matter what happened after this, RandyKnotts was simply a Wikipedian legend.

Nobody had previously ever been able to dissect the abuse of the world's encyclopedia in this manner, and he was doing it in real time. It was goose-bump inducing.

UTRS ADMIN JPGORDON

RandyKnotts quickly replied to this admittedly illegitimate appeal review with the clarity of a Botswanan diamond. He described how the reviewing UTRS admin had acted dishonorably and with bad-faith in his duties as he cited Josh Gordon's very own confession of not reviewing all the facts of the appeal.

Just then, sensing panic and urgency, another page stalking admin called Deepfriedokra attacked while completely ignoring the valid points made by RandyKnotts. Deepfriedokra said brashly and superficially that he agreed with Josh Gordon's appeal review.

UTRS ADMIN JPGORDON

The inappropriate post by page-stalker Deepfriedokra on RandyKnott's talk page further served to interfere, and is yet another example of Wikipedian gang bullying by admins.

Adding insult, Deepfriedokra's post had been dismissive, toned deaf, and nonsensical.

INAPPROPRIATE ADMIN REQUEST ON WIKIPEDIA

Though there were many admins directly involved and more watching closely, not one during any of this saga ever acknowledged any of the truly valid arguments made by RandyKnotts of plainly improper actions against him.

What was this vicious place that over 20 years earlier had started with such humbleness and even nobility in cause, and why had gaslighting and passive aggressive bad-faith actions become standard and routine? Maybe, there would soon be some type of saving grace, a highly respected admin who'd show up and be a real hero for good, a voice of cool reason among abused power. Still undaunted, RandyKnotts pressed on bravely against the organized gang of blatantly unfair admins.

INAPPROPRIATE ADMIN REQUEST ON WIKIPEDIA

Without hesitation, editor RandyKnotts expertly responded on merit to the nonsense of Deepfriedokra with a stinging objection. You might be thinking this Wikipedian circus of cruelty couldn't possibly get any more shocking. Then, it most definitely and absolutely did.

With level zero awareness of irony, admin Deepfriedokra lost his self-control once again and made another aggressive post on RandyKnott's talk page, this time specifically instructing the blocked editor to immediately file a new appeal and he had crafted a legal statement for RandyKnotts to include in it.

INAPPROPRIATE ADMIN REQUEST ON WIKIPEDIA

The rules had changed once again and suddenly legal statements were not only okay but necessary.

To have the wrongful Wikipedia block, upon abuse and mistreatment, overturned, Deepfriedokra's prepared legal statement had to be recited back to them in another appeal, a legal statement which was crafted to indemnify Wikipedia and this coordinated cast of disturbing and bullying admins.

At this point, RandyKnotts could have just submitted and followed orders, and made the legal statement which was prepared for him by hounding admins. He probably would have even been unblocked. Well maybe, but his conscience wouldn't have been very clear.

INAPPROPRIATE ADMIN REQUEST ON WIKIPEDIA

If he'd done that for the selfish reason of being allowed back as an editor, it would have meant that he had also chosen to overlook wrongdoings. The irony wasn't lost on RandyKnotts.

Then the editor had an epic moment reminscent of the final scene in the fabulous film Brave Heart with the great Mel Gibson. He chose freedom and respect over tyranny. The blocked editor proudly responded that he shouldn't be required to submit a new appeal when the last one wasn't handled properly and was therefore invalid. He expressed that he didn't believe it was appropriate to be required by Deepfriedokra and the boys to recite a crafted legal statement in exchange for an unblock. It was all especially flagrant when rules were being applied unevenly against him only.

IMPROPER WIKIPEDIA APPEAL REVIEW BY JPGORDON

Out of nowhere and uninvited, the shamed UTRS appeal reviewer Josh Gordon arrived back into the picture rather pompously.

The notorious admin made a desperate post on RandyKnott's talk page. Suddenly, Josh Gordon was engaged after sensing how bad all of this made him undoubtedly look.

The disgraced appeal reviewer made more bias and nonsensical statements, and attempted to give the impression that he had now finally atleast somewhat read over the facts, and that he'd somehow come to the same (ridiculous) conclusion.

IMPROPER WIKIPEDIA APPEAL REVIEW BY JPGORDON

Josh Gordon acted buffoonishly as if his appeal review hadn't already been concluded in the previous days. The incompetent appeal reviewer's haphazard attempt to save face and essentially grant himself a redo was also not lost on the blocked editor. The circling hyaenas were twitching and stammering, hanging on in suspense for the next words to be uttered by RandyKnotts a true leader. Their mocking laughs were now quieted, and they were suddenly not so confident anymore.

Without flinching, RandyKnotts replied with a devastating blow to Josh Gordon. He pointed out that he had not filed a second appeal, and therefore should not be receiving one.

IMPROPER WIKIPEDIA APPEAL REVIEW BY JPGORDON

RandyKnotts further explained in detail the unfairness of Josh Gordon's inappropriate new post. His response to the disgraced UTRS admin was uncharacteristically shortened but ever so powerful. The editor formally requested that in light of Josh Gordon's recent dishonorable appeal review, the UTRS admin recuse himself from the matter.

It would be an appropriate action for Josh Gordon to recuse himself, but could he suddenly act honorably? This is where the saga suddenly comes to a breathtaking stop.

IMPROPER WIKIPEDIA APPEAL REVIEW BY JPGORDON

The futile attempt by a gang of bullying admins to gaslight RandyKnotts had failed utterly.

The admins were like bullfrogs that had been slow cooked and brought to a boil by an expert chef in a hot encyclopedic kitchen of chaos. They hadn't realized until it was far too late that they had made a monumental Wikipedian mistake.

Jim F. Bleak was already in the process of deleting tens of thousands of bytes of data. For his part, SarekofVulcan was silently watching in the wings with caution ready to throw his weight behind any admin's next power move.

IMPROPER WIKIPEDIA APPEAL REVIEW BY JPGORDON

The road is long hung on with absolute silence and crawled the talk page of RandyKnotts eagerly awaiting for what was next. Deepfriedokra was beside himself. He had tried to pile on for the gang, but failed so badly.

WIKIPEDIA GANG OF ADMINS SILENCING AN EDITOR

Josh Gordon had been asked respectfully and appropriately to recuse himself after admitting in his dishonorable and bias review that he hadn't actually reviewed the facts of it, and instead complained pathetically and inappropriately about the woes of being a volunteer.

What might have then happened if Josh Gordon could have found it within himself to do right by recusing himself? He could have ensured a different and good devoted UTRS appeal reviewer stepped in. Maybe that new appeal reviewer without a conflict of interest would have been the needed saving hero. He or she might have even posted official reprimands to all the abusive admins involved.

WIKIPEDIA GANG OF ADMINS SILENCING AN EDITOR

Perhaps, he or she would have stripped Jim F. Bleak and Sarek of Vulcan's adminships on the damn spot as an example to all others thinking about treating an editor like that. We'll never truly know, because what actually happened next in this finale of the saga proves that the corruption has permeated every last level of the encyclopedia.

There's no independent neutral source of authority dedicated to solely policing powerful admins the way they need to be. The only solution that's plausible at preventing these seemingly hopeless situations is a Wikipedian Internal Affairs (WIA), an independent powerful group tasked with nothing but monitoring admins for abuse of power. Anonymous admins and overly long-term admins must also never be allowed.

WIKIPEDIA GANG OF ADMINS SILENCING AN EDITOR

Josh Gordon wouldn't admit his wrongdoing and recuse himself appropriately. Instead, the UTRS admin immediately complained to the Wikipedian Serious Incident board with a conflicted and bias escalation. It of course included a link to RandyKnott's talk page and a basic message to deal with him. Well, it was a serious incident alright, but not in the way that the admin gang surely meant. RandyKnotts now awaited a swift and dark judgement as he sat in the cue of Wikipedia's most serious offenders.

Like lightening, two admins from the Serious Incident board, with only a few more coy words muttered, took brutal and equally unfair action against RandyKnotts.

WIKIPEDIA GANG OF ADMINS SILENCING AN EDITOR

Top admins Voorts the New York lawyer and Rsjaffe also known as Dr. Rory Jaffe simply confirmed editor RandyKnott's fate. They showed no emotion and absolutely no interest in any of the wrongdoings documented and expertly detailed.

Wikipedian admins put the final and painful nail in his coffin when they instantly removed RandyKnott's TPA (talk page access). The editor would statistically never edit again on Wikipedia, and maybe several hundred other people wouldn't either for no other reason than they had the wrong IP address.

DEATH OF ANOTHER WIKIPEDIAN EDITOR

RandyKnotts could no longer even respond on his own talk page to posts to and rudely about him. The editor could no longer speak out about the admin abuse dealt to him. He couldn't plead for a neutral admin to look at all the facts fairly and somehow help.

The ruthless silencing of RandyKnotts had been ordered. It was somberly official that Wikipedia's admins had executed the brave editor.

Today, the marvelous corruption fighter is dead from the world famous online encyclopedia, but he will live on indefinitely as a legend.

RandyKnotts is the icon we needed and our courageous martyr. The brave encyclopedic editor lives in our warm hearts forever, with or well... without Wikipedia.

SUMMARY

The Dubious Dealings of an Online Encyclopedia details the willing unfairness and bias of admins on Wikipedia.

It explains in practical terms using real world examples how the environment is for a new or outside Wikipedia editor. In the story, a group of seven Wikipedia admins worked loosely together against a power lacking editor RandyKnotts.

The non-admin editor had expertly worked on and contributed an extensive draft article, which he properly submitted to Wikipedia's Teahouse. Teahouse is a specialized group on Wikipedia who are the normal reviewers of submitted drafts.

SUMMARY

This book details how the draft contained 46 references, 24 being independent of the subject. However, it was never allowed to be reviewed by Teahouse, because it was quickly and destructively cut off from the Teahouse process by a notorious admin Jimfbleak, who brutally deleted it. This book highlights the important issue of needed accountability for bad-faith admin actions on Wikipedia, and it reveals how a fear of losing one's admin power can prevent internal misconduct from being handled correctly.

After the ruthlessly rapid and unfair destruction of RandyKnotts' submitted draft, the wronged editor formally requested it be restored, with a respectful post on the power abusing admin's Talk Page, while expertly refuting the given coy and bogus reason for deletion.

SUMMARY

However, the admin boldly refused to restore the draft article he had mercilessly deleted. This was followed by a lengthy discussion in which Jim F. Bleak gaslighted the editor.

This book describes how when a false justification would be refuted, including the original stated reason for deletion, Jim F. Bleak would simply move on to another and another excuse for the blatantly unfair deletion. All the while, the malicious admin continued to change the location of the conversation from Talk Page to Talk Page. The wronged editor was powerless to stop it though he pleaded with the admins. This process of confusing the issue by changing its place of discussion is known as fracturing.

SUMMARY

Talk fracturing makes it difficult to fairly follow along with the progression and facts, something the out of control admin was aware of, and respectfully and clearly put on notice about. He seemed to revel in it.

Eventually, due to frustration, the wronged editor said to Jimfbleak and SarekofVulcan that he'd inform in detail the DOJ and the HQ office of Wikipedia soon about their mistreatment, unless it were corrected. Another stalking admin Theroadislong then issued a formal template warning on the editor's Talk Page, calling his sentence about whistleblowing a threat not allowed. Though wronged, the editor complied with the formal discipline and made no further similar posts.

SUMMARY

Then as RandyKnotts later went back to making unrelated edits on Wikipedia, he was unable due to just being blocked by SarekofVulcan. SarekofVulcan had added a second and extremely harsh discipline for the same issue that was already resolved by a formal discipline from admin Theroadislong. All of this was over a potential first infraction. Admin SarekofVulcan blocked RandyKnotts though the editor had even complied with the other admin's public and formal discipline.

RandyKnotts then fairly and properly filed a block appeal from his Talk Page, citing everything that had transpired. However, the block appeal admin Josh Gordon denied the appeal. During Josh Gordon's very brief and rushed appeal denial, he admitted he hadn't actually reviewed the facts, citing his volunteer status.

SUMMARY

Even further wronged by Wikipedia admins, the blocked editor fairly and formally requested that admin Josh Gordon recuse himself from the matter, citing the UTRS admin's own admission of an improper review. In an increasingly disturbing pattern of admin abuse, Josh Gordon did not recuse himself and allow for a new appeal reviewer. Without empathy, Gordon instead requested that the Serious Incidents Board of Wikipedia deal with the brashly blocked editor.

With few words and no explanation, and in swift brutality, additional admins from the Serious Incidents Board backed Jimfbleak, SarekofVulcan, JoshGordon, and other admins by terminating the Talk Page access of the wronged editor. This meant that RandyKnotts was also blocked from his own Talk Page, brutally finalizing his public silencing.

SUMMARY

This coldly prevented the editor, indefinitely, from communicating with editing peers on the encyclopedia about serious admin incidents and mistreatment. It stopped cold any chance of publicly filing a second block appeal with an impartial and fair reviewer. The final shred of transparency had been eliminated just like the editor had been eliminated.

This book expertly details how a gang of seven admins worked together excessively against one editor, an editor without equal platform power to even one of them, and still the underdog fought valiently and with great honor.

With impunity, admins crush unwanted contributions and editors, but for the first notable time, they were unable to crush the history of ruthless admin acts. It lives on for all.

SUMMARY

This book describes in great detail how admins outnumber and overpower less established power-lacking contributors, and it demonstrates how the environment behind the scenes on Wikipedia operates in practice, with real examples. It's a truly engaging, revealing, and thrilling read about the world famous online encyclopedia, known everywhere simply as Wikipedia.

THE END