

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

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

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

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

Yes.

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

[\[-\]](#) to [X019](#) [\[M\]](#) via [/r/Christianity/](#) sent 53 minutes 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 52 minutes 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 47 minutes 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 47 minutes 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 45 minutes 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 44 minutes 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 42 minutes 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 39 minutes 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 38 minutes 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 36 minutes 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 33 minutes 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 27 minutes 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 21 minutes 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 18 minutes 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 17 minutes 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 5 minutes 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](#)