
Subject: For Warranto
Posted by [fl00d3d](#) on Thu, 11 Jan 2007 22:23:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Re: <http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=22647&start=0&rid=1> 400

That is a perfect example. You didn't have to lock that thread. There were no rules being broken and I was asking a question about a valid concern. It also did not continue to stir up further arguments related to the other threads. So why was THAT one locked? Please don't make these forums turn into a G rated mod-abuse festival.

There are so many people on these forums that try to contribute to the community, and the more you ignore and irritate them - the less likely they'll be willing to help advertise and support eachother. And that will destroy us all. I'm just trying to put things on the table that people try to avoid (like the a0 nick discussion in the server owners thread). I do it because no one else has the balls to. These things won't fix themselves.

Please do not confuse my genuine interest and care for the community with anything else. I'm extremely determined to see this community go on in any way that it can. Even if it means replacing incompetant leadership (which right now, I dont think anyone deserves to be replaced but I do see it heading in that direction). I support BHS and do what I can with them and for them. I regularly direct people to their sites and these forums - as well as !forcerg suspected cheaters (knowing that RG doesn't do anything, but having the hope that it will soon). So please don't look at me as a bad guy. Because I surely am not.

Subject: Re: For Warranto
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 11 Jan 2007 22:26:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Look, neither Spoony or I will be commenting on these issues, so why have the thread open?

Subject: Re: For Warranto
Posted by [fl00d3d](#) on Thu, 11 Jan 2007 22:29:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I know I've kinda given up on that argument (at least publically). This particular thread was only for Warranto - so I could see his logic. Again, I'm not trying to be a pain in the ass (though it may seem that way).

I'd also like to add something from a different thread:

INTJ

<http://www.typelogic.com/intj.html>

REF: <http://www.renegadeforums.com/index.php?t=msg&th=22609&prevloaded=1&rid=1400&start=0>

^That's sooooo me

Subject: Re: For Warranto
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 11 Jan 2007 22:30:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Also, you do not have the right to free speech on an internet forum. The right to free speech is afforded to you by the US Government and does not cover private property, which websites qualify as.

Subject: Re: For Warranto
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 11 Jan 2007 22:35:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

fl00d3d wrote on Thu, 11 January 2007 15:29I know I've kinda given up on that argument (at least publically). This particular thread was only for Warranto - so I could see his logic. Again, I'm not trying to be a pain in the ass (though it may seem that way).

Warranto, and the other moderators, act as they believe I would want them to handle a situation. And since I had said that Spoony and I have both agreed to stop discussing it and locked the threads, he naturally assumed that if anyone tried to bring it up again, it should be locked as I locked the original threads.

Subject: Re: For Warranto
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 11 Jan 2007 23:04:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Fine, I'll address the concerns directly.

Quote:There were no rules being broken

There do not have to be broken rules to lock a thread. A thread being locked simply means the moderators do not want it to continue.

Quote: I was asking a question about a valid concern.

Pointless concern, you mean. Your initial post that I locked was for the sole purpose of starting another argument.

"You can't just keep closing their threads because they don't agree with you."

Not a valid reason for opening a new thread. It would have only continued the argument that was being ended in the previous 3 or 4 threads that were locked. Hence, I locked that thread as well.

The issue was to be DROPPED, as in suddenly come to a stop, do not pass Go, do not collect \$200.00.

Quote: It also did not continue to stir up further arguments related to the other threads. So why was THAT one locked?

Ah, but it did, because if I had started in on the ideas presented, the connection would have been made as the history of the other threads would have to be used.

ie. The threads were not locked because Crimson thought she was losing (other pipe in to counter that) Nor is she doing it to hide the truth (others return to refute that)... argument continues.

And, I'm sure you can guess what will happen to this thread. Right, locked.

I do not care what you have to say in response to this. Any further threads about it will simply be locked. This time I will not be courteous enough to leave a response first.

Edit: As Crimson has stated, I'm locking the threads because there was the appearance given for this whole Spoony-Crimson stuff and related matters to cease. If she wishes to allow this to continue, then she can unlock and future thread about this subject matter (this thread included) and I will cease to lock subsequent threads.

Why do I try to act on her behalf in matters such as this?

'Cause she's the boss.

Subject: Re: For Warranto
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Fri, 12 Jan 2007 00:29:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

fl00d3d, instead of addressing Warranto through topics that you know will get locked, just private message him for heaven's sake.

Subject: Re: For Warranto
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Fri, 12 Jan 2007 01:10:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

File Attachments

1) [hdr_weknowdrama.gif](#), downloaded 435 times

WE KNOW DRAMA
