it's no surprise to see that the rest of my post was, shall we say, untouchable.
EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 18 May 2010 01:31Yes I've chosen who I think is a more
trustworthy ally. The one that listens to your arguments. (Hint: it's indeed not you.)
there you have it, ladies and gentlemen... EWD thinks 0x90 is "a more trustworthy ally" than
spoony is. what more needs to be said about you than that?

i listen to your arguments too, by the way. i listened to them and i'm appalled by them. but "you
aren't listening to me" is the kind of dumb thing people who're losing arguments always say. but
hey, let's say that wasn't the case, let's say i "wasn't listening to you" despite this thread proving
conclusively the opposite. even if that was the case, it would still say all we need to know about
you if you thought this made 0x90 more "trustworthy" than me.

Quote:Oh, and on the being useful, I'm sure you used BIATCH more than once. I haven't used
CW.cc more than once.
because you personally aren't interested in clan gaming, and yet the existence of a clan ladder is
necessary to the game... in which regard i was the only person to provide one. it's true we used
BIATCH but it didn't stop the worst cheats... the worst cheats in competitive play are, by definition,
the undetectable ones.

Quote:On the cheats, CW.cc died because of either mismanagement of just lack of players.
lack of players is due in no small part to the proliferation and undetectability of cheats, if this is still
a mystery to you.

Quote:Cheaters could be handled with ease, force XWIS, ban on serials, and don't allow known
pub cheaters.That is actually hypocrite, you allowed KNOWN PUBLIC CHEATERS on CW.cc,
because they 'only cheated in public servers'. Who supports cheaters.
firstly, i brought in a few changes to clanwars which took a firm line on "known public cheaters",
and the majority of the community thought they were too strict.

secondly, when someone said i should outright ban them (although i think fl00d3d is the only
person who ever did say that to me), i'd never dream of openly taking the cheaters' side over his,
and i'd never use the horrible argument that the cheating problem they cause would get worse if
we did something about it (even though i actually was doing something about it anyway, more so
than my predecessors)

thirdly, i would never embarrass myself by sympathising with cheat makers by saying it's the
renegade community's fault they act the way they do. you've said that a great many times and it's
obvious you don't realise how much damage you do to your credibility when you do.

fourthly, i can absolutely promise you that banning "known public cheaters" would have done
nothing to prevent the amount of cheating in clanwars, not the smallest thing. (though i will add
that i knew that at the time, but i didn't use it as a reason to defend any of them... it's just a
rebuttal to "cheaters could be handled with ease") the cheating that causes problems in clanwars
are precisely those that make the users unknown, the type that your new trustworthy ally 0x90 has

spent so much time trying to perfect, and says he will continue.