

---

Subject: Damn Counter Strike Source Hacker  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 20 Mar 2005 03:40:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

msgtpainJavaxcx

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....

I concur; I don't believe you're picking on me either (just so this issue is cleared). Hence why I'm attempting to explain why I do what I do, rather than completely ignore it altogether.

Perhaps this "ignoring the post" idea should be explained better. Being able to ignore it doesn't mean it has to be ignored. completely ignorant posts such as the one that I commented on initially is one that I chose not to ignore, simply because of it's stupidity. The same goes for Aircraftkiller's idea that cheating on one game has no implication on being labeled a cheater if the initial accusation was based on a different game, and the subsequent irrelevant post to my comment later (more on that in a bit).

If someone does something that I feel is worthy of a response to correct it (in this type of circumstance, and not posting in general), I'll do it. I've completey stopped posting in regards to

the generic Reborn insults, and most subsequent insults against Aircraftkiller simply because the entire thing has become old and predictable.

"Reborn sucks"

"random insult to Aircraftkiller"

rinse, wash and repeat.

The only time I've done it recently (I think) was when people started attacking the idea of texture being the proper word, which I then posted regarding only that.

In relation to who siding with whom, what I corrected was the idea of insulting someone based on a simple keyboarding error of missing the "b", not on whether it was one word or two (though as I pointed out earlier, both are now acceptable and interchangeable, etc.)

And Aircraftkiller: I never once said cheating in one game would lead to cheating in another. What I said was cheating in one game makes you as much of a cheater as cheating in another. Even more so when it occurs on-line. And as such, makes DaveGmm's comment legitimate.

---