
Subject: Damn Counter Strike Source Hacker
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Sun, 20 Mar 2005 02:31:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Javaxcx

I'm not sure why you'd pick on Warranto for taking the side of someone who is technically correct (the best kind) over someone who is technically incorrect-- possibly because this person just so happens to be Aircraftkiller..

I'm not "picking" on warranto, I'm simply pointing out an observation which I've made and one that quite possibly, no one shares; but that doesn't mean I can't point it out, right?

warranto

simple solution. Ignore the derailment and continue with the topic.

I'm, perhaps the least biased person here. I simply argue in agreement with who's "in the right".

Amazing how in a forum based on the written word, people haven't gotten use to the idea of ignoring someone. It's completely simple. The post is there, but no one is demanding that you comment on it.

See here, I just have to wonder, if this is the solution, why was the person condemned as being "laughable and pathetic"? Why wasn't he simply ignored, and the main topic continued? But this is my point.. in most threads where Ack does this himself, the post is simply ignored. So, we either simply ignore it when others do it also, or risk appearing biased.

Javaxcx

Oh, and you're right. The proper term IS web site, not any variant thereof.

If we're talking "technically correct", than warranto didn't side with the correct person. Hasn't that always been the main consensus here? Sure it may be "accepted".. but that doesn't mean it's "correct".. Just because people have shortened it in to understandable slang, doesn't mean I can't correct them, or is that argument only valid when it supports specific people? More bias?

It's a Web site, running on a Web server, on the World Wide Web....
