Between 2011 and 2019, the social network google+ hosted several Buddhist teachers, and from 2013 onward several 'communities'. In particular, two of the latter —"Buddhism and Meditation" and "Buddhism Q&A"— were instrumental in supporting practitioners, thanks to a variety of posts about the Dharma, thanks to supportive friendships (*kalyāṇa-mittatā*) and thanks to the availability of diverse, accessible senior practitioners and teachers.

With the termination of google+, enters...

Dharma.direct

Dharma.direct aims to propose an **online Buddhist magazine**, an associated **newsletter**, as well as the **'safe space'** and **communication tools** to support transmission, friendship and debates between practitioners... including *direct* access to more experienced followers of the Eightfold Path.

With strong emphasis on privacy, transparency, and ethical speech (rejecting the fashionable confusion between "free speech" and a *carte blanche* for irresponsible, unfettered abuse), **Dharma.direct**'s editorial strategy favours original content, from authors ready to engage online with their readers. Availability to provide clarifications, to dispel confusions, to discuss, to accompany, are preferred over celebrity status.

The project as well as the authors are funded by *dāna* (donations), rather than by advertising or by selling your data to behemoths prone to mass surveillance through innumerable trackers.

It's "early days" for **Dharma.direct**... which means

1. you might encounter bugs on the platform (please report any to *contact @ dharma.direct*, or log in and pick comment on the conversation <u>Report bugs here</u>),
2. some expected features are not available yet (e.g. the abilities to <u>search</u> through the content, or to <u>individualise</u> the newsletter —see also the <u>Any suggestion?</u> conversation), and
3. entire sections will arise later (e.g. on meritorious behaviour and on courses / retreats / cultivation —incl. meditation).

For now, the navigation bar only includes the inaugural issue of the magazine, and a section for conversations —hopefully in order to arrive at right view and right resolve (*sammā-diṭṭhi, sammā-saṅkappa*). The 'livelihood' part is temporarily redirecting to another site, to illustrate that it is possible to reflect on "right livelihood" (*sammā-ājīva*) in modern terms (and in affirmative, positive terms... for those inclined to follow *Mahāyana* schools). A link to join concludes the list:

<u>Magazine</u>   <u>Conversations</u>   <u>Livelihood</u>   <u>Join!</u>

While parts of the site are 'public' (or freely accessible), others require you to log in (to enable privacy-oriented features, e.g. most comments will only be visible to members), and some parts will in time require you to indeed join a logic of mutual support (and give, in wise accordance with your personal circumstances).

The <u>terms & conditions</u> are available, as is this user manual you're currently reading.
Suggestions and constructive feedback are welcome at *contact @ dharma.direct*

The **Ban** feature, favouring social interactions **towards learning**:
it's OK *not* to feed the trolls.

Banning other members, when we're all here to learn, is unfortunate and often unhelpful. Nonetheless, banning is acceptable if this allows to "cool things down", if this allows to take a step back and to prevent hatred from arising, if it supports restraint from harsh speech.

Users *you* ban cannot see *your* content, and your handle (e.g. "@userB") is anonymized to them. However, you will *still* see their content (and if you don't want this, you can additionally *mute* them! See the mute feature below).

It'd be ideal if members could limit themselves to banning others 'temporarily', rather than 'permanently', but there's no enforcement about such an ideal. The sooner you can forgive another, the sooner you can find a constructive way to engage with another, the better; but it is understood that some situations prove harder / longer to digest than others.

Example of thread:
original post by @userA:
(some content…)
comments:
@userB: I think this is not accurate, because (…)
@userC: Hmmmm… I cannot decide who's right about this! Help please!
@userA: Thank you for your remark, **@userB**. Maybe I wasn't clear enough, @userC, indeed. However, here is why I think **@userB**'s objection isn't valid: (…)

Let's assume userD opens this thread, and that userD was unduly aggressive vis-à-vis userB in the past, to the point that userB has **banned** him. As long as the ban of userD by userB is in place, the thread appears to userD thus:
original post by @userA:
(some content…)
comments:
@individual{96ae}: …/…
@userC: Hmm… I cannot decide who's right about this!
@userA: Thank you for your remark, **@individual{96ae}**. Maybe I wasn't clear enough, @userC, indeed. However, here is why I think **@individual{96ae}**'s objection isn't valid: (…)

Note that the "96ae" from "@individual{96ae}" is only an example, of a random identifier.

Of course, if userD had read this thread prior to the ban, and had noticed the first comment was from userB, then userD might identify the blocker based on memory and by inference. There's no escape from that, but hiding userB's comment wouldn't change such a recourse to userD's memory either: the only benefit would be that userD would not immediately know whether the comment has disappeared due to a deletion or due to a ban. If userD were to check userB's profile, the uncertainty would be quickly removed though, so there's little point in hiding.

It works best if all members "play by the rules", of course.

Most notably, it works best if userA's reply relies on tags ("@userB") to designate people: using e.g. "Ben" instead of "@userB" in the reply would obviously impede the system…

We **all** participate in creating the 'safe space', by favouring tags.

The **<u>Mute</u>** feature, favouring social interactions **towards learning**:
<u>ensuring you're *not* triggered is OK</u>.

This might seem fraught with a huge potential for confirmation bias.

As with banning, muting is acceptable if this allows to "cool things down", if this allows to take a step back and to prevent hatred from arising, if it supports restraint from harsh speech. It'd be ideal if members could limit themselves to muting others only 'temporarily', rather than 'permanently', but there's no enforcement about such an ideal. This being said, sometimes, one might need to protect one's own sanity, by muting the content (in general) from a specific member.

Such a situation might arise e.g. in relation to abuse within the sangha. People who have been abused may benefit from muting those who make excuses for unwholesome behaviours (in particular if they're somehow 'invested' with the accused, and let prejudices and personal preferences get in the way of valid enquiry).

You cannot see the content of those you mute, and their handle is anonymized. You don't receive notifications about their comments, even if you subscribed notifications for the same thread. They can *still* see your content (if you don't want this, you can additionally *ban* them).

Example of thread:
    original post by @userA:
        (some content...)
    comments:
    @userB: I think this is not accurate, because (...)
    @userC: Hmmmm... I cannot decide who's right about this! Help please!
    @userA: Thank you for your remark, **@userB**. Maybe I wasn't clear enough, @userC, indeed. However, here is why I think **@userB**'s objection isn't valid: (...)

Let's assume you **muted** userB. The thread will appear to you thus:
    original post by @userA:
        (some content...)
    comments:
    ⊗ (muted by you): .../...
    @userC: Hmm... I cannot decide who's right about this!
    @userA: Thank you for your remark, ⊗ (muted by you). Maybe I wasn't clear enough, @userC, indeed. However, here is why I think ⊗ (muted by you)'s objection isn't valid: ...

It works best if all members "play by the rules", of course.

Most notably, it works best if userA's reply relies on tags ("@userB") to designate people: using e.g. "Ben" instead of "@userB" in the reply would obviously impede the system...

We **all** participate in creating the 'safe space', by favouring tags.

You are able to click on the ⊗, since the mute is at *your* initiative, to access the profile, and potentially un-mute it.

Banning / un-banning, muting / un-muting is done thanks to **toggles you'll see on the profile page of the relevant person.** If you don't remember who you're currently banning or muting, you can see the lists on your personal profile page (with links to the relevant profile pages...).

You can access your profile page, by clicking on the round profile image in the top right corner on the screen.

The **<u>Anonymization</u>** feature, favouring social interactions **towards learning**:
it's OK to make mistakes, and you don't *have to* delete the proof!

Some discussions on social media can be quite heated. As a result, not only people regularly edit posts or comments (sometimes disingenuously, massively altering the meaning), but also people regularly delete posts and/or comments.

Deletion on Dharma.direct is achieved simply by *editing* the content to be removed, *clearing* all content involved, and saving it back. If a comment or post's *body* (post titles don't matter) is reduced to an empty field (perfectly empty, not even a space), then said comment or post will be deleted.

While edition and deletion may *sometimes* appear as the most reasonable, valid or constructive approach, they *often* limit the usefulness of social media for **learning**.

Most notably, when a user deletes one's comment on a thread, most (previously-given) answers to this comment will suddenly appear either non-sensical, or "out of nowhere". Any logical progression is likely to be broken.

Conversations with a pattern of authors "A B A B A B" may also suddenly appear as "A B B B" (after user A deleted his last 2 comments) thus making user B appear as harassing A (to the detriment of B's reputation), even though B wasn't necessarily doing so...

Often, people delete a comment or a post they previously contributed when they realize that they were 'wrong', or when they fear 'looking bad' (e.g. for asking a question, or providing a naïve answer quickly shown as such in the rest of the conversation, or manifesting some anger...).

The difficulty, in relation to **learning**, is that the desire to preserve one's reputation (or to suppress a conversation that didn't comply with one's expectations) then leads to erasing a contribution which *other people* might have made — don't think you're so special as to have unique thoughts! And these *other people,* too, would benefit from seeing the counter-arguments, from learning the drawbacks of such a view, from enquiring into the associated cultural prejudices, from going deeper...

Suppressing evidence of one's mistakes thus leads to suppressing "educational content for the good of the many"... which is unhelpful and unfortunate, to say the least, on a platform geared towards learning!

So, if we want to facilitate a 'safe space', **where it's OK to make mistakes**, to ask naïve questions, to answer erroneously, then the platform benefits from a capability to **anonymize** all of one's contributions to a thread, leaving the content intact except for the identity of the poster.

This anonymization is offered as a possible alternative to any dramatic edition, and to "pure and simple" deletion. It works "per user, per (whole) thread".

Such a feature preserves a dialectical educational contention that arose on the platform *without* keeping it "personal": **it keeps a conversation about the messages, not the messengers.**

Such anonymization doesn't prevent continuing the conversation (additional, new comments by the user having requested anonymity will simply appear as coming from the anonymized label)!

Of course, the most senior practitioners strive towards freedom from the "8 worldly winds" (thus strive towards *not* letting a fear vis-à-vis one's reputation dictate one's behaviour (e.g. destroy pedagogical threads))... but the anonymization capability might help the more junior practitioners have less anguish vis-à-vis their projected 'self'.

[For the sake of clarity: anonymization is tracked at the server level, for moderation purposes... hence, moderators remain able to know the 'true' poster, if needed. Anonymized insults won't remain without consequence.]

Example of thread:
    original post by @userA:
        (some content...)
    comments:
    @userB: I think this is not accurate, because (...)
    @userC: Hmmmm... I cannot decide who's right about this! Help please!
    @userA: Thank you for your remark, **@userB**. Maybe I wasn't clear enough, @userC, indeed.
        However, here is why I think **@userB**'s objection isn't valid: (...)

Let's assume userB now wishes to delete his comment, having received a constructive answer from userA and having understood a weakness of his initial argument.
    Such deletion would be a loss for other learners on the platform, though... Realizing so, UserB thus requests anonymization instead!
    The thread would, from then on, appear as such:
    original post by @userA:
        (some content...)
    comments:
    @individual{96ae}: I think this is not accurate, because... (anonymized, but visible!)
    @userC: Hmm... I cannot decide who's right about this!
    @userA: Thank you for your remark, **@individual{96ae}**. Maybe I wasn't clear enough, @userC, indeed. However, here is why I think **@individual{96ae}**'s objection isn't valid: ...

Note that the "96ae" from "@individual{96ae}" is only an example, of a randomly generated identifier. It is therefore difficult to track someone between threads. Yet, the anonymization allows this thread to remain coherent and readable, it allows to preserve any logical progression in the argument.

Of course, userA and userC (and maybe some passive readers too) might remember who the now-anonymized commentator was... There's no escape from that, but userB deleting his comment wouldn't change such a recourse to one's memory either. The most 'shy' among members may request anonymization *immediately upon posting some content,* thus virtually preventing anyone from ever knowing who they are.
    The key difference is for **posterity**: future readers of the thread (be it because they simply join the conversation late, or be it e.g. after a search on a particular topic and the retrieval of an old post...) will benefit from a readable debate, without any harm to userB's reputation.

It works best if members "play by the rules", of course.
    Most notably, it works best if replies use tags ("@userB") to designate people: using e.g. "Ben" instead of "@userB" in a reply would obviously impede the system, which in turn might push userB (aka. Ben) to delete his contributions instead of 'only' anonymizing them...
    We **all** participate in creating the 'safe space', by favouring tags.

The **Audience** feature, favouring social interactions **towards learning**:
it's OK to privately seek the advice from specific people.

Any content is associated with an audience.

The widest audience is **'public'**: the content is visible to anyone, even non-members.

Next comes **'members'**: the content is visible to any (*logged in*) member of **Dharma.direct**.

Then come **user-defined audiences** (similar to 'circles' on g+). A user-defined audience is built by a user explicitly adding / removing other members to it (by going to the member's profile, where it's explicitly possible to add / remove the said member from existing circles, as well as initiate a new circle with this member). Users can define multiple audiences (e.g. 'friends', 'experts', 'Zen'…), and put anyone in multiple audiences (e.g. someone might be in both 'friends' and 'experts').

Every time you 'reply' to some content, you'll be asked whether you wish to **restrict** your response to a specific audience, or to **inherit** an audience (which you might then **restrict** further).

To **restrict** your response to a specific audience allows you to privatize a portion of a conversation thread. You might thus e.g. discuss with 'friends' about a post, directly on the post's thread, without such a private discussion being visible to others.

You may expand an audience (by **restrict**ing your response to a wider audience than the one you'd naturally inherit from what you're replying to) *but* be aware that this might result in weird visibilities for your targeted audience (e.g. your reader may see your comment, and even receive a notification about it, *without* being able to see the content you were commenting on!). So, remit expansion is *not* recommended; audiences should be conceived as *cascading* restrictions, protecting privacy.

Note that, should the visibility of some content be *later* edited by its author, any 'inherited' visibility will also be affected.

For 'public' content, there's little danger induced for privacy, since the visibility can only become more restrained. But a post initially visible to 'members' could be amended to become visible to 'public'. Hence, inheriting audiences benefits from a capability to *add* restrictions.

Hence, if you commented on such a post with *'inherited'* audience, your comment would automatically pass from 'members' to 'public', along with the post.

However, If you commented on such a post with *'inherited, restricted to members'* audience, your comment would remain visible solely to 'members' (thus guaranteeing you some privacy).

And, if the initial author was to amend his post from 'members' to a specific audience instead, then your comment *'inherited, restricted to members'* would naturally become visible only to the audience now set by the initial poster (there's little point in your comment being visible more widely, since what you comment on isn't!).

Restrictions are cascading: if userA posts —or comments— with a user-defined audience 'A1' (in which userB is included, so that userB can indeed see such a content), and userB then comments on this content with audience **'inherited,** restricted to B1' (with B1 being one of B's user-defined audiences), then the comment by userB would only be visible to users belonging simultaneously in 'A1' *and* 'B1'. The *actual* audience for some content is always the *intersection* of all the audiences that apply (*not* their union).

By default, upon creating a **post**, the audience is **'members'**. Feel free to untick, or pick 'public'.

By default, upon creating a **comment**, the audience is **'inherited, restricted to members'**. The precise inheritance is based on which content you 'reply' to (you might thus inherit from the post, or from another comment).

At inception of **Dharma.direct**, you can only restrict to *one* circle at a time (although nothing prevents you from replying to your own comment, and restricting this response further… note however that the first comment shouldn't be 'emptied' or the system would simply delete it, killing the visibility of the second comment —which inherited visibility from the first).

Example of thread (with the supposed content describing the effect of a chosen audience):

original post by @userA, audience **'public'**:
> This is visible to absolutely *all,* incl. the general internet.
> This is the default audience for posts, but userA could have restricted the audience.

comments:
> #0 by @userD, audience **'inherited(post), restricted to members'**:
>> This is the default audience for comments. Although the post is public, only logged-in members can see this comment. However, userD *could* have overridden this to 'inherited' only.
>
> #1 by @userB, audience **'circleB1'**:
>> This is *only* visible to those in userB's user-defined 'circleB1' audience.
>> This would have benefitted by inheriting from the post though, in case userA later amends the audience to a rather small group.
>
> #2 by @userC, audience **'friends'**:
>> This is *only* visible to those in userC's 'friends' audience. Would have benefitted from inheritance.
>
> #3 by @userA, audience **'inherited(#1)'**:
>> • This is only visible to those in circleB1 [and if userB later changes who's in this user-defined audience, this will *equally* affect the visibility of comment #1 *and* of comment #3].
>> • This is most useful if userA was specifically replying to comment #1, thus allowing consistent visibility of any logical progression: readers see either *both* #1 *and* #3, or neither.
>> • If userB later amended comment #1 to a 'public' audience, then comment #3 would also become 'public' though, which userA might not be so happy about. To protect against this, userA could have kept his audience to the 'default' provided when she hit 'reply' in relation to comment #1, i.e. *'inherited(#1), restricted to members'*
>
> #4 by @userA, audience **'inherited(#2), restricted to experts'**
>> • Such an audience might allow userA to call on his user-defined audience of 'experts', to ask for opinions on comment #2 [Unless userC is part of the 'experts' audience defined by userA, userC will never see this private part of the thread].
>> • If userA had set his audience to 'experts' instead (without inheriting), then calling the experts *not* among userC's 'friends' would probably have been pointless, because these experts would *not* be able to see userC's comment!

If some content is deleted (in spite of the existence of the *anonymization* feature!), any related reply 'inheriting' its audience from said content (directly or indirectly) will *also* be deleted.

If a user-defined audience is emptied or deleted by its creator, any related reply 'inheriting' from said audience will become invisible (except to its own author).

Hence, if 'circleB1' is deleted by userB, comment #3 above becomes visible to no one; if comment #2 above is deleted (not merely anonymized), comment #4 is deleted too (even though it wasn't from the same author!).

Whether a reader belongs to a user-defined audience, or not, is tested *at the time of reading* the relevant content, not the time of writing the content. Readers may thus gain, or loose, visibility on some content, when authors alter their user-defined audiences.

No one can see *who's in* someone else's (user-defined) audience, hence inheritance is *blind*: you don't chose your parents!

But, if you banned someone belonging to another's audience, inheriting the audience is safe: the ban applies anyway. In fact, a ban always has priority, so if you ban someone you had in one of *your own* user-defined audiences, this person will lose visibility on your content, even if you don't update the audience definition (This might be useful when *temporarily* banning someone, e.g. due to a heated conversation. You might be OK with keeping this person in your audiences, for when things have calmed down).

If you use restrictions to a large audience you defined (let's call it 'trusted', e.g. listing all the members you know personally and trust), then inheriting another's audience is safe: only the people you've put in your large audience can see your content (with audience 'inherited, restricted to trusted').

It remains that **members are encouraged to trust other members by default.**

A constructive use of this feature does *not* lie in getting narrower and narrower audiences, as a thread goes on... which is exactly what might happen if each commentator adds restrictions!

The best use is obtained when restrictions are used to have a "side conversation" on some content with one or few people (e.g. audience set to 'inherited, restricted to teachers')... while also adding other, more general, comments as part of the main thread.

Example:

original post by @userA, audience **'public'**:
<little-known quote, which might at first appear non-Buddhist>
comments:

#0 by @userB, audience **'inherited(post), restricted to teachers'**:
Is this a true quote?

#1 by **@userC**, audience **'inherited(#0)'**:
Definitely! Here's a matching link on accesstoinsight: ...

#2 by **@userC**, audience **'inherited(post)'**:
It might have been helpful to provide a reference for the quote: it's ...

#3 by @userA, audience **'inherited(#2), restricted to members'**:
Thanks, @userC, I wanted to, but had no time since.

Except to @userB's audience labelled 'teachers', this thread would just appear as:

original post by @userA, audience **'public'**:
<little-known quote, which might at first appear non-Buddhist>
comments:

#2 by **@userC**, audience **'inherited(post)'**:
It might have been helpful to provide a reference for the quote: it's ...

#3 by @userA, audience **'inherited(#2), restricted to members'**:
Thanks, @userC, I wanted to, but had no time since.

On **moderation**, free speech and privacy… towards favouring **learning**.
Learning is best achieved *without* indulging trolls, bullies, clans or cliques.

Let's be clear that moderators are *not* affected by audiences, *nor* by bans, *nor* by anonymizations. Hence, 'private' conversations (through narrow audiences) are not 'safe' from moderation. Banning moderators only flags your content as 'suspect' by default, thus increasing scrutiny. Moderators know which initial account created some content, even after anonymization.

Moderators don't spend their time spying on people, but they *do* have all the tools necessary to ensure that this site doesn't host unwholesome activities, hateful speech, etc. And while some direct interaction with some moderators *might* be covered by confessional secrecy, overall it's safe to assume your 'speech' on this platform isn't protected from judicial powers, because moderators do *not* need to be monastics or priests to be promoted as moderators.

So, if you're looking for a platform where "free speech" is just a poor excuse for "unhindered abuse", or if you're looking for a platform where privacy and cryptography imply a lack of moderation (with the platform rejecting any responsibility on how it's used, thanks to such a design), you'd better look for another platform.

Your privacy *vis-à-vis internet's general public* (incl. spammers, search-engines, robots), *and vis-à-vis other members* of the platform, is treated as seriously as possible… but this is not a blank check to be shielded from legal pursuits, or to be protected from official investigations.

It's not even a blank check to be shielded from permanent ban from this (privately-owned) site. And as most financial movements related to the site will be considered donations and freely-given support, not transactions to 'buy' services, any refund is likely to be either minimal or simply inexistent. **You *cannot* buy your way to abusing others.**

Trolls are a waste of time for everyone… Even if they have *tathāgatagarbha* (and are thus not *icchantika*), some engagement is better kept "postponed until better circumstances arise".

The primary consequences of being 'moderated' out, as a member, are in the all-or-nothing kind:
- you won't see comments (even public comments, even your own),
- you won't be able to post anything (posts or comments).

i.e., basically, you can *only* read *public* posts (by the authors who didn't *personally* ban you)… That's almost as if you just weren't a member at all.

Moderation decisions are all *reversible,* so you can appeal them to the owner of the site, by sending an email to *appeal @ dharma.direct*
Any decision in appeal will be considered final.

If you're discovering this late, do not agree with it, but already have created an account, then please delete your account (see next page of this document).

Deleting your account

You can request the deletion of your account, and all associated data, at any time.

There's no restoration available though, and any deletion is effective immediately *upon confirmation* of your intent, so —if you've ever posted any content (post *or* comment)— there's a "cooling-down period" policy: after requesting deletion on the site, you'll receive an email asking for confirmation, but such an email will only be sent 24 hours after your initial request. In the meantime, you can start by 'anonymizing' any thread you'd like to immediately be out of (a relevant list of threads is available via your profile).

If you *do* use the link provided in the email, and thus *confirm* your intent to delete all data, then and only then will any data associated to your account (i.e. posts, comments and profile) be deleted. Moreover, any tag (@userA) mentioning you in others' content will be anonymized.

The link sent to you by email, if unused, will become inactive after one week... but you can always log back in, to issue a new deletion request, if needed.

You might *also* choose however —and you're kindly requested to choose this option, if at all possible to you— to delete your profile data, *while* letting posts *and/or* comments in place.

Letting 'posts' in place would manifest *dāna* (or generosity), through content that others might find valuable, might have linked to, might still regularly search for...

Letting 'comments' in place would manifest *dāna* (or generosity) by preserving the readability of conversations you participated in, and the logical progression of arguments... qualities which will always be valuable to others.

The options to preserve posts *and/or* comments is given to you when you use the link sent by email to confirm a deletion request. Whatever you agree to leave on the site will be **anonymized.** Moreover, any tag (@userA) mentioning you in others' content will be anonymized.

Notifications

In an asynchronous dialogue, what's new (and what was edited)?

It is possible to request notifications on any post / conversation thread, simply by using the "notif." toggle button on the top right corner. And *in the same way,* it's possible to turn off the notifications, per thread, with the same button.

Notifications are also received when someone 'tags' you, anywhere (incl. in conversations you've not read, let alone participated in), by using your @handle. These *cannot* be deactivated, for now.

When opening a conversation thread *via* a notification, any new content since your last visit on *this* thread will be highlighted: usually, this will mean new comments, but this might also include any new edit / update to some earlier content (please note that, for now, it will highlight the whole piece of content —whole post, or whole comment,— *not* just the change *within* it).

Hence you might receive a notification because an early comment was just edited, even though many comments had been posted since, and you had already seen these later comments. In such a situation, only the edited comment will be highlighted, not the later (but already seen) comments.

By construction, visiting a page will remove (for the future) the notifications associated... your 'last seen' version of the thread will, next time, become the current version.

Hence, if you close the current view of the thread, re-opening it immediately will show no highlight (as there's no change since you —just— closed it).

If you reply on the thread (to the post or to another comment), this will trigger a reload of the page, in order to include your new content... thus removing all highlights (except on your own, new content, as the sole item you had not seen until now!). You might wish to anticipate that, if you plan to reply to several distinct comments.

If you 'miss' some notifications because of this behaviour, you can fetch your recent notifications from the "details" section on your profile page... and find those you missed.

When you post a comment on a thread you do not yet follow, the system will *propose* to turn the notifications 'on' with regards to this thread... so you might see any response, with or without a tag to you. By default, the proposal is towards turning notifications on, but you can untick the relevant box.

Formatting your content

Structured texts deserve supporting visuals.

Various codes can be used when you input (or edit) a post or a comment. This might seem complicated at first, but it's really easy to use after the learning curve.

The important delimiters are '**{**' and '**}**', and *they cannot be nested*: a code will always start with a '**{**' and it will stop at the *first* '**}**' that follows. If you absolutely need these 2 special characters within your text, please replace them by '{' and '}' respectively, and they'll appear as you wish.

~ (tilde) denotes a non-breaking space.
(thus, if you need to use '**~**' as a character within your text, please replace it by '∼')

{i text**}** puts the text in *italic.*
{b text**}** puts the text in **bold**.
{c text**}** puts the text in SMALL CAPITAL letters.
{s text**}** ~~strikes through~~ the text.
{u text**}** <u>underlines</u> the text.
These can be combined (**only** *in order* i,b,c,s,u though… hence ib, ic, bc, ibc, ibs… up to ibcsu).

^text**^** puts the text (without any space except **~**) in ^{superscript}. If you need the **^** sign, use '^'

Please note that all the above codes can also be used when inputting the 'title' field for a post.

Other codes include:

An empty line implies a new paragraph. If you want to jump a line in between paragraphs, use an empty line (new paragraph), a paragraph limited to "**~**" (an invisible space), then another empty line.

Moreover, starting a paragraph with an immediate > (great-than sign) will indicate a block quote, ending where the said paragraph ends. Successive block quote paragraphs will appear as one large block quote, with multiple paragraphs.

{li http://address text**}**
{li https://address text**}** creates a hyperlink (pointing to the indicated address) under the <u>text</u>
                        The address can only be http or https, without space.
Variants exist as {li **i** http…}, {li **b** http…} and {li **ib** http…} (italic, bold or both; respectively). Hence "**bold₁** <u>**link_in_bold**</u> **bold₂**" can be achieved by inputting "**{b** bold₁**}{li b** http://address link_in_bold**}{b** bold₂**}**"

{im http://address**}**
{im https://address**}** will insert an image, using the link provided. This allows to insert large image files (large images and/or high-resolution), which would not be hosted directly…
A priori, images are aligned to the right, and any text wraps around them. It is strongly advised to insert an image *prior to* the text which relates to the image, so the wrapping performs correctly.
However, you might add a '**c**' option, hence **{im c** http://address**}**, to move the image to the centre, make it larger, *and* disable wrapping (this is better for images which are not just 'decoration' but actual documents themselves related to the post/comment).

{vid code**}** will embed a *youtube* video, based on the address
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=code

Moreover, the following codes are particularly powerful (and allow some nesting):

{ab text1 text2**}** creates an abbreviation (text1 cannot have any space within it, except **~**, since text2 is defined *from* the first space found), and the abbreviations will appear at the end of the post. Within the body of the post, the {ab …} block is displayed as text1.

The above formatting codes (i, b, c, li) *are* accepted *inside* text2 (not inside text1). As for {li…}, variants {ab **i** text1 text2}, {ab **b** text1 text2}, etc., exist, in which case the formatting applies to text1 (only) within the body (only) of the post… This doesn't prevent adding formatting codes inside text2 *as well.*

Please note that, for any 'text1' there can only be *one* 'text2', per post/comment. If multiple definitions are provided (within the same post/content), the *last* provided will win the day.

{fn text**}** creates a footnote, and the text will appear as a footnote at the end of the post. Within the body of the post, the {fn …} block is replaced by a superscript counter: [1],[2],[3]…

All the above formatting codes (i, b, c, etc., li as well as ab) *are* also accepted *inside* the footnote's text.

{ul {}} and **{ol {}}** start lists (**u**n-ordered —or bullet— and **o**rdered, respectively)… which will end with the appropriate **}** (after dealing with any nested code from those above, incl. ab and fn).

Additional list items are defined by the use of '**{}**'.

Nested lists are *not* allowed.

Hence « **{ul {}** a **{}** b**}** » will appear as:
- a
- b

Note that when creating a post, you can set it as "**draft**".

You can see all *your* current drafts on the <u>Conversations</u> page, at the top.

A "draft" post will *not* become visible to others, until you tick this "draft" status off… which you can do by opening the said conversation and using the relevant toggle at the top right corner of your article (on the right hand side of the title).

Complicated example:

This second paragraph may not be the most readable, as it uses a (typographically altered) abbreviation, *within* a (typographically altered) footnote, *within* a quote... Few people are likely to be so precise or specific.

Commonly **{i**, **{b**, **{c**, **{li**, **>** and empty lines will cover most needs and remain simple. Even direct abbreviations (e.g. the « **{ab** AN Aṅguttara Nikāya**}** » below) and footnotes are simple, as in the first and third paragraphs.

«
On January 21st –430, the Buddha taught.
He mentioned a "specific causality" (**{i** idappaccayatā**}{fn {i** ida[ṃ]-(p)paccayatā**}**: causal relationship, the "having **{i** this[=idaṃ]**}** as a cause"**}**), in the **{i** vera sutta**}** (**{ab** AN **{i** Aṅguttara Nikāya**}}~**10.92):

>**{b** When this exists, that comes to be; with the arising of this, that arises. When this does not exist, that does not come to be; with the cessation of this, that ceases (...)**}~{fn** [**{ab c** Bod12 Bodhi: **{i** The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha — A Translation of the Aṅguttara Nikāya.**}** Wisdom Publications (2012)**}**, p.**~**1463] from **{i** "Iti imasmiṃ sati idaṃ hoti; imassuppādā idaṃ uppajjati. Imasmiṃ asati idaṃ na hoti; imassa nirodhā idaṃ nirujjhati (...)"ti.**}}**

The next day... (a paragraph's first line is **{li** https://www.google.com/search?q=indented indented**}**, except in quotes)
»

will appear similar to

On January 21st –430, the Buddha taught.
He mentioned a "specific causality" (*idappaccayatā*[1]), in the *vera sutta* (AN 10.92):

> **When this exists, that comes to be; with the arising of this, that arises. When this does not exist, that does not come to be; with the cessation of this, that ceases (...)** [2]

The next day... (a paragraph's first line is indented, except in quotes)

Footnotes:

[1] *ida[ṃ]-(p)paccayatā*: causal relationship, the "having *this[=idaṃ]* as a cause"

[2] [Bod12, p. 1463] from *"Iti imasmiṃ sati idaṃ hoti; imassuppādā idaṃ uppajjati. Imasmiṃ asati idaṃ na hoti; imassa nirodhā idaṃ nirujjhati (...)"ti.*

Abbreviations:

AN   *Aṅguttara Nikāya*
Bod12   Bodhi: *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha — A Translation of the Aṅguttara Nikāya.* Wisdom Publications (2012)