

[-] to [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 3 hours ago

Hi Mods,

We recently had a moderator from this forum request that our forum remove links to the recent Mormon AMA. We complied in good faith by removing full participation links. We decided to allow the non-participation links (np.reddit.com) as the only request made was to be direct and polite in any interactions

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[-] from [curious_mormon](#) [+50] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

Part of this message was cut off, so I apologize for the double submissions. Continued and paraphrased below:

Despite our good-faith compliance, we quickly realized that our forum was being targeted, and only our voice was being silenced. Other forums that landed elsewhere on the belief spectrum was not asked to remove posts, even those that acted as [a call to arms](#) which told people what to say and where to link.

What I'm trying to discern is if this is an action from a rogue mod, or the beliefs of [/r/Christianity](#) as a whole.

1. Do the rest of the mods at [/r/Christianity](#) share in [/u/brucemo](#) 's statement of, "I want you all [our forum members] to just go away, because our threads [/r/Christianity](#) are for our subscribers".
2. In reference to #1, does this apply equally to all forums, or is it just our forum. Are we being targeted based on the primary beliefs of the members that participate in our forum?
3. Is the AMA's purpose, as [shown here](#) no longer accurate (bullet #4)? Do you want people who are familiar with the history, are currently counted as members, and have first hand experience with a religion to cease talking about it because they aren't on an approved list or pushing an approved agenda?

For your reference, I've included the entire [mod-mail interaction here](#)

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[-] from [RevMelissa](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

Before the AMAs were set up this year it was decided it would only be led by those currently in the faith tradition being raised up. This was because of an issue that happened last year. Every AMA contributor is supposed to be from the faith tradition shared. Therefore, bullet point number four is learning, from people *still in the denomination in question*.

Also, other subs were asked to take down their posts too.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[-] to [RevMelissa](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

Which subs, and where does it say this in your AMA post?

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[-] to [RevMelissa](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

Every AMA contributor is supposed to be from the faith tradition shared.

Can you clarify this as well. Take my posts, for example. I currently do not believe in the religion, but I am very much still a part of it due to family necessities. My name is still on

the rolls, and I have a lifetime of experience with this tradition. Would I be excluded by your unwritten rules?

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from RevMelissa [M] via /r/Christianity/ sent 2 hours ago
<http://redd.it/36moyp>

It wasn't unwritten. When we were finding people to lead the AMA we made it clear.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from X019 [M] via /r/Christianity/ sent 2 hours ago

Hello, I don't know if I'd say I'd agree completely with how Bruce phrased it, but on the whole I would. We've had a lot of issues with ex-anything during the AMAs. Last year we had an ex-JW on the panel and that went really poorly. As I'm sure you're well aware, we have quite a bit of varying inputs in /r/Christianity and it can be a struggle to maintain civility. It's even more of a struggle when we have members of a subreddit planning on going in with the intention to disrupt a particular AMA, as seen by [this](#) post.

You brought up the [LDS post](#) as a call to action. I wouldn't disagree that it can be described as a call to action. But I will say that it's opposite of the intention of your sub. They go in with the intent of helping the AMA panel and to be wary of trolls.

In reference to #1, does this apply equally to all forums, or is it just our forum. Are we being targeted based on the primary beliefs of the members that participate in our forum?

You are not being targeted, you are being responded to. Any subreddit that comes to ours with ill intent is treated equally.

Is the AMA's purpose, as shown here no longer accurate (bullet #4)? Do you want people who are familiar with the history, are currently counted as members, and have first hand experience with a religion to cease talking about it because they aren't on an approved list or pushing an approved agenda?

It is accurate, but that post was given to our subreddit, not to reddit wide. We encourage people to ask questions and to debate points, but coming in with the intention of disruption is the AMA is outside the audience of who was addressed in the points of the AMA announcement.

We complied in good faith by removing full participation links. We decided to allow the non-participation links (np.reddit.com) as the only request made was to be direct and polite in any interactions

[Looks like you missed one.](#)

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] to RevMelissa [M] via /r/Christianity/ sent 2 hours ago

So your intention was that only people on the panel would actually answer the questions or participate in the discussion?

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from RevMelissa [M] via /r/Christianity/ sent 2 hours ago

Yes.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] to X019 [M] via /r/Christianity/ sent 2 hours ago

It's even more of a struggle when we have members of a subreddit planning on going

in with the intention to disrupt a particular AMA, as seen by this post.

We allowed the post you're referencing because it used a non-participation link. By definition, that's not an intent to disrupt.

You are not being targeted, you are being responded to. Any subreddit that comes to ours with ill intent is treated equally.

It's unfair to assume ill-intent simply because of the belief system of the person you're talking to. From that very post, "Let's do our best to be polite, concise, logical, and direct." And unlike the posts you seemed to have no problem with, we did not allow any post to remain up if it had talking points or instructions as to what to say or where to link.

Looks like you missed one.

We did not. That post was mod-removed over 17 hours ago. Immediately after it was requested by brucemo, in fact.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] to [RevMelissa](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

So your intention was that only people on the panel would actually answer the questions or participate in the discussion?

Yes.

Where is that stated?

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from [curious_mormon](#) [+50] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

And while we're having this discussion, I'd like to point out that we did ask if there were any objections **before** the AMA.

[/u/AnotherClosetAtheist](#) [+49]: I understand that there is going to be a Mormon AMA tomorrow. You might want to anticipate a presence of [/r/exmormon](#) input. If this AMA is really going to happen, I will talk to the [/r/exmormon](#) subreddit and ask them to please be factual and polite in their interactions.

[/u/Zaerth](#) : Thanks! We'll keep at tight eye on it. We've had Mormon AMAs in the past and nothing too disruptive has ever popped up. Of course, a friendly reminder to [/r/exmormon](#) wouldn't hurt, either!

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from [LuluThePanda](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

The nature of an AMA, coupled with the idea of a 'panel', would surely mean that panelists are the ones answering the questions. Why else would we have signups for a group of people tasked with responding to questions?

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from [X019](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

We allowed the post you're referencing because it used a non-participation link. By definition, that's not an intent to disrupt.

Looking over the comments in there, you can see most of them can be interpreted as an intent to disrupt with ease.

It's unfair to assume ill-intent simply because of the belief system of the person you're talking to. From that very post, "Let's do our best to be polite, concise, logical, and direct." And unlike the posts you seemed to have no problem with, we did not allow

any post to remain up if it had talking points or instructions as to what to say or where to link.

I don't care about the belief system of who posted it, I went by what I could infer by their writings.

We did not. That post was mod-removed over 17 hours ago. Immediately after it was requested by brucemo, in fact.

I can't see anything that would tell me it was removed or not (since there aren't any comments), so I will just accept that you are being truthful here.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[\[-\]](#) from [RevMelissa](#) [\[M\]](#) via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

Once you volunteer, I'll send you an invite to [/r/ChristianityAMAs](#), which we use as a staging/planning area where you can discuss your upcoming AMA with your fellow panelists.

This is from the sign-up. It was implicit as the sign-up was looking for the panelists, or the people who would be answering the questions.

I think this experience has taught us we need to make the panelists answering the questions more explicit.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[\[-\]](#) to [LuluThePanda](#) [\[M\]](#) via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

The nature of an AMA, coupled with the idea of a 'panel', would surely mean that panelists are the ones answering the questions. Why else would we have signups for a group of people tasked with responding to questions?

We asked. It was stated no where to the contrary. It's how AMAs on reddit usually work. The panel was more of a introduction than exclusion. It made for an interesting discussion. It's how other AMAs in this series turned out.

The real question here is why this unspoken rule was suddenly enforced on this AMA, and what appears to be only this AMA (And perhaps the JW AMA you mentioned earlier).

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[\[-\]](#) from [LuluThePanda](#) [\[M\]](#) via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

Where did you ask?

We made it pretty clear that those who were not current member in good standing in their churches could not be on the panel-and that means those who used to be in a particular church. This rule has been enforced since the beginning of AMA signups, and several users, having asked if they could be a part of a denomination's AMA they no longer belonged to, were told the same and prohibited from being on the panel.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[\[-\]](#) from [RevMelissa](#) [\[M\]](#) via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

AMAs I've always seen are meant to be exclusively answered by the panelist(s). I haven't seen examples of the contrary.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[\[-\]](#) to [LuluThePanda](#) [\[M\]](#) via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

I quoted the message from one of our mods to one of yours. I'm unsure if it was in mod chat or as PM. Check with him.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from [LuluThePanda](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 2 hours ago

Is this what you are referring to?

I understand that there is going to be a Mormon AMA tomorrow. You might want to anticipate a presence of [/r/exmormon](#) input. If this AMA is really going to happen, I will talk to the [/r/exmormon](#) subreddit and ask them to please be factual and polite in their interactions.

I saw that message, but I'm not seeing where you asked to be a part of the AMA. Is there another portion that you didn't quote, maybe?

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] to [RevMelissa](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent an hour ago

AMAs I've always seen are meant to be exclusively answered by the panelist(s). I haven't seen examples of the contrary.

[Example 1](#) - first question, top response.

[Example 2](#) - second question, top response.

[Example 3](#) - second question, top response.

That's three random samplings from the AMA list. Some have far more than others, but every single AMA has non-panelists responding. The larger the religion or the closer it is to christianity, the more non-panelists seem to respond.

I don't like feeling like new rules are being created simply to target our forum.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] to [X019](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent an hour ago

Looking over the comments in there, you can see most of them can be interpreted as an intent to disrupt with ease.

I don't see how you're inferring that. The most highly upvoted comment is about mild curiosity, with no interest to join in.

The second comment (1/3 less upvotes) was about how they are a member in good standing in the religion, and should have a right to express their opinions. What those opinions are is not stated, but it shouldn't have to be spelled out for access to or awareness of the thread.

There are a few scattered comments with less than 5 votes over a 24 hour period in a 20,000+ subreddit. That's hardly a brigade.

I can't see anything that would tell me it was removed or not (since there aren't any comments), so I will just accept that you are being truthful here.

You don't have to take my word for it. Look at the screenshot of the thread that I linked to in my original mod mail. Second comment from [/u/AnotherClosetAtheist](#)

[\[+49\]](#) referencing the removal. Search for that thread from [/r/exmormon](#), you will not find it.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] to [RevMelissa](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent an hour ago

This is from the sign-up. It was implicit as the sign-up was looking for the panelists, or the people who would be answering the questions.

So you're saying we should have paid attention to an implicit sign-up sheet from last year, when the links in the AMA and explicit answers to explicit questions contradicted it?

I hope this emphasizes why I feel that this is a targeted response for some undisclosed reason.

I think this experience has taught us we need to make the panelists answering the questions more explicit.

I think that's a good idea. If this is your rule then you should specify it and **consistently** enforce it.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from [LuluThePanda](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent an hour ago

We've already established that new rules aren't being made to "target your forum"-we've already cited the very specific instance of ex Jehovah's Witnesses requesting to participate. Your subreddit's description is "A forum for *ex-mormons* and *others who have been affected by mormonism* to share news, commentary, and comedy about the Mormon church." By it's very definition your subreddit is in conflict with the rules we have made about who can be part of the panel.

Is there anywhere specifically where an [/r/exmormon](#) mod has identified themselves and asked if their sub can partake in the AMA? I'm having trouble finding that, and I know you mentioned that you did ask.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] to [LuluThePanda](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent an hour ago

We've already established that new rules aren't being made to "target your forum"

I don't understand how you can say this.

- You referenced an ex-JW panalest that you had to remove because they weren't a current member, but you seem to be ignoring the multitude of non-panelist responses that were acceptable for all other threads.
- You claimed that other forums were contacted, but you have offered no information as to which forums this was, and you have openly turned a blind eye to other forums who have brigaded (as non-panelists).
- You're arguing that an entire forum should not be allowed to reference an AMA simply because it was setup as a safe haven for ex members, even though it appeals to all groups.
- You seem to be ignoring the actual members who claim a right to talk about their experience because they no longer follow the orthodox belief systems.

Is there anywhere specifically where an [/r/exmormon](#) mod has identified themselves and asked if their sub can partake in the AMA?

Seriously? You yourself responded to the post where this was provided, but cut off the response from your own mod. I'm trying to get a screenshot you can't edit, but this wasn't my account. Stay tuned.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from [LuluThePanda](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent an hour ago

I can say it because we've had the rule and enforced the rule before your sub came to the Mormon AMA. Thus, it was not created just for you.

People have a right to discuss their experiences, sure. Sometimes the venue is inappropriate, and I think it's important for people to respect that. If I hopped up in a

church and started yelling about my poor experiences with Christianity, I would be removed.

If you'd like to set up an AMA about how you left Mormonism and what your experiences are, I'm sure we'd love to help you put that together.

Yes, seriously. I responded to that post, sure, but I still fail to see anywhere where an exmormon mod has introduced themselves as such and *asked* if the exmormon sub can be a part of the AMA. Is there anywhere where that has occurred?

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[[-](#)] from [RevMelissa](#) [[M](#)] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent an hour ago

That sign up sheet was from this year

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[[-](#)] from [Zaerth](#) [[M](#)] via [/r/Christianity/](#) to [LuluThePanda](#) [[M](#)] sent an hour ago

It's in modmail and any other mods can see it, but here it is in any case:<http://i.imgur.com/sFAQ5xr.jpg>

I saw this as a warning "heads up" that there might be brigading from [/r/exmormon](#). There's no possible way we could prevent ex-members from responding, but we could at least key an eye on being linked to by other subs (which we did, hence this whole thread.)

[Here is the sign up post for this current AMA series](#). The very first bullet point: "Only current adherents of a denomination are allowed to serve on an AMA panel." As other mods have mentioned, this is because of experiences with last year's AMAs.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[[-](#)] from [LuluThePanda](#) [[M](#)] via [/r/Christianity/](#) to [Zaerth](#) [[M](#)] sent an hour ago

I saw it as a warning as well. I didn't know AnotherClosetAtheist was an exmormon mod either.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[[-](#)] from [RevMelissa](#) [[M](#)] via [/r/Christianity/](#) to [LuluThePanda](#) [[M](#)] sent an hour ago

I too saw it as a warning.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[[-](#)] to [LuluThePanda](#) [[M](#)] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent an hour ago

I can say it because we've had the rule and enforced the rule before your sub came to the Mormon AMA. Thus, it was not created just for you.

Which other forums were asked to remove links to the AMA thread?

If I hopped up in a church and started yelling about my poor experiences with Christianity, I would be removed.

Just so it's clear, this is not what I'm questioning. Extending your analogy, it's like you are offering a Q&A with active believers, but then go to other churches and ask them to take down the notice because you don't want them there. You reference some implied rule in a back-handbook inside your group, and then you selectively ignore that rule for the other churches you like. What's worse, this group that you're trying to exclude has previously asked for and received permission to announce it.

That's the problem. That's what I'd like to see fixed. Maybe it's consistently enforced and well-documented rules. Maybe it's ceasing to target groups because of their name or beliefs.

You can reference *potential* problems all you want, but I didn't see that in this thread. The regulars of [/r/exmormon](#) were polite, on point, and direct. Occasionally, they helped to clarify some misinformation using actual sources. In fact, the most argumentative threads appeared to come from those completely unaffiliated with Mormonism or frustrated because they felt a need to defend their beliefs in a hostile manner.

I can say it because we've had the rule and enforced the rule before your sub came to the Mormon AMA.

I would be willing to do that if you thought it was helpful to your forum. I could recommend other panelists who I believe to be well-versed in the history, well-spoken, and calm in presentation. I would not be offended if another forum shared links to such an AMA.

Thus, it was not created just for you.

Perhaps, but I don't have visibility into any other censoring save the one ex-JW panelist you removed. I don't see any other forums asked to remove links. I don't see any other forums being told to stay away by your mods.

For what it's worth, this thread turned into something I didn't expect. It wasn't meant as an attack on the forum or you, but it was an attempt to highlight injustices that I expected were not shared among the rest of the mods. It turns out I was wrong, but I still hope it's something you'll address.

@/u/brucemo . I just realized something that is most likely unrelated, but I thought to ask. Out of curiosity, does or did the **mo** at the end of your name stand for mormon? I expect not, but a confirmation would be helpful.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[[-](#)] to [Zaerth](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent an hour ago

As other mods have mentioned, this is because of experiences with last year's AMAs.

Just to be clear, that doesn't change that all AMAs have non-panelists offering responses.

I too saw it as a warning.

I can see how it would be read like that, and I'm sorry it was misconstrued; however, I would point out that [/r/exmormon](#) was not disruptive to the AMA.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[[-](#)] from [RevMelissa](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent an hour ago

We are going around in circles.

We said we gathered current adherents for all the AMAs this year. We also said your "question" was taken as a warning.

If you are angry with us because you wanted us to make an exception for the Mormon AMA, I'm OK with you being angry.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[[-](#)] from [LuluThePanda](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 59 minutes ago

it's like you are offering a Q&A with active believers, but then go to other churches

and ask them to take down the notice because you don't want them there.

I don't think that's an accurate analogy. A more accurate analogy would be if we are offering Q&A with active believers, and then went to other churches and asked them to stop implying that their parish members would be a part of the panel if they wished. After all, we didn't request that you delete all links to the AMAs-just the ones that weren't .np.

Maybe it's ceasing to target groups because of their name or beliefs.

That's an interesting implication you're making there.

I would be willing to do that if you thought it was helpful to your forum.

That's wonderful! If you feel that it is important for your members to have an outlet to share their experiences here (as it seems you do), then we'd be happy to set that up.

It seems as though the misunderstanding rises from the message one of your moderators sent us about [/r/exmormon](#)'s participation in the AMA. In the future, it might be helpful to identify one's modship, as that offers an opportunity for a different manner of communication. We saw the message as a warning ('just a heads up,' for me, is what led me to believe this), while it seems you saw it as a request.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[\[-\]](#) to [RevMelissa](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 58 minutes ago

If you are angry with us because you wanted us to make an exception for the Mormon AMA, I'm OK with you being angry.

Fair enough, but for the record, I'm more upset that [/r/exmormon](#) was made the exception.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[\[-\]](#) from [X019](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 49 minutes ago

Which other forums were asked to remove links to the AMA thread?

I didn't see any other links from other subreddits yesterday.

Just so it's clear, this is not what I'm questioning. Extending your analogy, it's like you are offering a Q&A with active believers, but then go to other churches and ask them to take down the notice because you don't want them there. You reference some implied rule in a back-handbook inside your group, and then you selectively ignore that rule for the other churches you like. What's worse, this group that you're trying to exclude has previously asked for and received permission to announce it.

I'll keep with your analogy. Imagine there's an ex-Christian club and they see that a church is going to do an open-forum Q&A for their members. The club decides they're going to go to it and ask pointed questions with the intention of making the church look poorly. Now imagine there's another church that has some members that sometimes go to church 1, so church 2 posts a little notice saying that church 1 is doing this Q&A and the members of church 2 should check it out if they want to. This is how I see the situation. I'm really curious why "We don't want people coming in and disrupting our event" needs to be spelled out. I would imagine that sort of rule would be inferred by nearly everyone with any semblance of social skills.

Perhaps, but I don't have visibility into any other censoring save the one ex-JW panelist you removed. I don't see any other forums asked to remove links. I don't see any other forums being told to stay away by your mods.

[/r/atheism](#) used to be a big problem for us. They would link to us all the time. [/r/subredditudrama](#) can be a problem at times. You seem to act like we let everyone waltz in here any time they want and interact however they please. we censure anyone who doesn't adhere to the Community Policy.

For what it's worth, this thread turned into something I didn't expect. It wasn't meant as an attack on the forum or you, but it was an attempt to highlight injustices that I expected were not shared among the rest of the mods. It turns out I was wrong, but I still hope it's something you'll address.

Things like this are common for us and we react to them in similar manners. We don't have the time desire or teamwork to target any specific subreddit for any reason.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] to [LuluThePanda](#) [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 42 minutes ago

I was ready to walk away from this, but I couldn't help respond to your thread, LuLuThePanda.

After all, we didn't request that you delete all links to the AMAs-just the ones that weren't .np.

That's not true, but it makes it clear that you didn't look at the threads bruce asked us to pull. Both AMA threads over 48 hours in our sub. One without an NP link and one with.

and then went to other churches and asked them to stop implying that their parish members would be a part of the panel if they wished.

Also not true. No one claimed to be or that they could be part of the panel. Your other AMAs also show acceptance of non-panel responses.

In the future, it might be helpful to identify one's modship, as that offers an opportunity for a different manner of communication.

Solid advice. It's unfortunate that the message was misconstrued, but I don't think non-mods have the opportunity or means to shape a forum's communication. I personally wouldn't have read it the other way, or wouldn't have assumed a non-mod status without quickly looking at the sub.

That's an interesting implication you're making there.

Then correct it if you can. Name the other forums you keep referencing to that were asked to remove links to the AMA.

As [/u/X019](#) responded, "I didn't see any other links from other subreddits yesterday."

This is at odds with what [/u/revmelissa](#) claimed: "Also, other subs were asked to take down their posts too."

Imagine there's an ex-Christian club and they see that a church is going to do an open-forum Q&A for their members.

I would ask that you at least read the introduction to [the club you're trying to ban](#).

"In part, the subreddit serves as a support group for those who have officially resigned or completely severed ties, or for those in the process of disassociating themselves, **or for those who maintain membership and attendance, or for those at any stage in between.**"

It's responses like these that leave me with a sense of distrust. Either decisions are being made hastily without much thought, and/or there is active deception when questioned after the fact.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] to **X019** [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 38 minutes ago

I'm really curious why "We don't want people coming in and disrupting our event" needs to be spelled out.

Because that's not what happened. Because that's not why the posts were requested to be pulled. Because a mod told us, and what appears to be only us, "I want you all to go away, because our threads are for our subscribers."

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from **RevMelissa** [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 37 minutes ago

Yes, I see I was wrong, and admit I was wrong. There were multiple threads, and I see they all lead to [/r/exmormon](#).

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from **LuluThePanda** [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 37 minutes ago

No one is trying to ban a club, so I'm not sure where you're getting that idea.

I'm more focused on the phrasing just previous to what you've quoted: *The exmormon subreddit is largely populated by those who have left the church or are questioning the truth claims or doctrines of the church. It is intended to be a place where participants can discuss grievances, humorous anecdotes, and topics of interest from a non-faithful perspective, as well as heal from the trauma that leaving one's belief scaffolding causes. Active members are welcome to participate in discussions here, but they should be aware that their beliefs may be contradicted or treated with irreverence.*

That's pretty telling, especially the fact that the quote cites those ideas as the majority. Which is specifically why I offered you an opportunity to put together an AMA about how you left Mormonism.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] to **RevMelissa** [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 26 minutes ago

Yes, I see I was wrong, and admit I was wrong. There were multiple threads, and I see they all lead to [/r/exmormon](#).

Thank you for your integrity.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] to **LuluThePanda** [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 21 minutes ago

No one is trying to ban a club, so I'm not sure where you're getting that idea.

RevMelissa: Yes, I see I was wrong, and admit I was wrong. There were multiple threads, and I see they all lead to [/r/exmormon](#).

That quote is the most succinct way of showing we're getting this impression. This is especially true in light of the non-disruptive influence [/r/exmormon](#) had on the AMA.

I'm willing to take you up on the AMA pending a few other panelists that I would like to join; however, I think it will be closer to the Mormon AMA than you may be imagining.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[–] from **LuluThePanda** [M] via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 18 minutes ago

I'm not entirely sure that it was completely non-disruptive. I personally received a

handful of snarky responses to my questions about mormon theology. And today I see a handful of threads on your sub mocking users who answered questions/users priding themselves on pushing the mormons answering questions to admit they don't know or to contradict themselves.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[\[-\]](#) from [curious_mormon](#) [\[+50\]](#) via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 17 minutes ago

Final thoughts: Thank you for the discussion. I didn't intend for this to go in the direction it did or turn into what it turned into. I wanted to highlight what I saw as a problem, and I hope I have done that well enough. I also hope that this will result in change for the better.

I don't see much more that I feel I need to bring up. Feel free to add any closing thoughts you want to send me away with, or ask any direct questions, but otherwise I won't be responding as means of closing this loop.

[permalink](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[\[-\]](#) from [brucemo](#) [\[M\]](#) via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 14 minutes ago

You said this:

Because that's not what happened. Because that's not why the posts were requested to be pulled. Because a mod told us, and what appears to be only us, "I want you all to go away, because our threads are for our subscribers."

As a result of my submission to your mod mail, which was this:

I have no interest in the feud between yourselves and the current Mormons, and I certainly don't want us to be brigaded by them in preference to you. I want you all to go away, because our threads are for our subscribers. You guys don't want to work with us and that is fine. Next time I'll recommend we let admins sort things out rather than wasting time trying to talk to you.

I'm not interested in involving myself or us by in some apparent feud by responding repeatedly to accusations of favoritism toward groups that I have no interest in and would rather never think about.

It should be pretty clear that my statement above applies to people who are brigading from either side of this.

As far as I can tell, you guys left up a direct call to brigade our thread after I asked you to take that down, and instead tried to engage me in an argument about fairness because I didn't notice another thread and take pains to deal with that in a way that satisfied you. Talking to you didn't work. If by chance we were doing another AMA today, and someone in your sub posted a thread similar to the one at the root of this, I would just ban OP and suggest in our mod mail that we go to the admins, since your mod team is not interested in enforcing Reddit's rules.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)

[\[-\]](#) from [brucemo](#) [\[M\]](#) via [/r/Christianity/](#) to [LuluThePanda](#) [\[M\]](#) sent 11 minutes ago

Last year we had an ex-JW on the panel and that went really poorly.

That guy offered to help, his offer was taken up, and as far as I can recall he did fine. He asked again this year if he could help, and ended up getting grilled here in mod mail. I

feel like I should write something in his defense because I don't want him to be known as the guy who wrecked the JW AMA, and be treated like, if he posts in our mod mail again, when all he did both years was try to help.

[permalink](#) [report](#) [block user](#) [mark unread](#) [reply](#) [full comments](#)