

↑ 21 ↓



# Can we as moderators (finally) take a stand against inactive top moderators and under-modded subreddits? (self.modtalk)

submitted 22 days ago by TunicSongForKaren

I am not necessarily talking about defaults, though a lot of them also have big problems with inactive top mods squatting top mods and stunting the progression of a subreddit by having the power to rollback any decisions made by lower mods.

A good example would be a subreddit like /r/depression. This should be a well-modded, safe environment for people suffering from depression. While a few lower mods are doing a good job at that, a lot of top mods are inactive. I decided to check out each user's profile, starting with the top mod, progressing down the list. It took until the 7th mod on the list until I found an active account. The first 6 (!) mods in the mod list are inactive. I think this is a fucking disgrace for a community of thousands of people looking for help. A rogue mod can fuck with the sub any day - and there is no way of knowing when that will happen.

104 comments save hide give gold report

all 104 comments

sorted by: best

search

this post was submitted on 18 Mar 2015

21 points (76% upvoted)

shortlink: http://redd.it/2zgygu

Submit a new link

Submit a new text post

## modtalk

unsubscribe 927 readers

~11 users here now

you are an approved submitter on this subreddit. (leave)

Show my flair on this subreddit. It looks like:

go1dfish POLITIC ModerationLog RemovedComments (edit)

for mods to discuss various stuff. Bans, reasons for bans, spam, etc?

## IRC Webchat you must auth to services

- IRC Webchat
- IRC Help
- 101 guideline for connecting to and registering on IRC so you can get modtalk chat access.

irc://irc.snoonet.org/#modtalk

Know of someone who wants access to r/modtalk? They can message r/modtalk\_advisory for consideration.

Current minimum is 25,000 subscribers, can be a total of all of the subreddits they mod, and must have been a mod of the same amount of subscribers for a month.

## Modtalk rules

- Be courteous. This is a place of friends. Even if you disagree with someone, respect their opinions.
- Don't post deliberately inflammatory posts.

save

reddiquet

- Don't leak, and don't engage in witch hunt behavior. We are moderators, we are supposed to be above this
- Failure to follow these rules will result in a warning. Second violation will result in removal from the subreddit.

[-] krispykrackers [A] 30 points 22 days ago

So, this is something that is definitely a failure on our part. A little history on [/r/redditrequest](#), the formal subreddit we use to request subreddit takeover, removal of inactive mods, ect. I was hired 5 years ago to do sales and community support, and one of my tasks was monitoring [/r/redditrequest](#). From first hand experience, I can tell you that very little has changed since then. We've added some new rules and a bot, but it's essentially still the remnants of an easy fix that was thrown at a problem that didn't seem as significant 5 years ago, nearly half of reddits overall lifetime, and is now obviously broken.

And now that it's an *incredibly* significant problem, we still don't have the manpower to figure it out. And that really sucks. So this is an apology as well as an encouragement to brainstorm solutions. We're not actively working on it at the moment, we've prioritized some other tasks now that we have a community engineer, so this isn't a "we're working on it" either. Just a "we're aware" that it's a sucky situation that we want fixed just as much as you do.

permalink save report give gold reply

[-] davidreiss666 Supreme President 7 points 21 days ago

I think you guys let the perfect be the enemy of the good way too much. Implement a good system that works more than the current inactivity and don't worry about the perfect solution in all possible situations (both real and imagined). The prefect solution can't actually exist.

permalink save parent report give gold reply

[-] sarahbotts /r/literallyhitler 8 points 22 days ago

:/

We've had really active mods kicked by inactive top mods in some of my subs that makes it really harder on the rest of the active mods. Nothing can theoretically done with the inactive mods because they are active on other subreddits and it is really frustrating to deal with.

created by qgyh2

a community for 6 years



discuss this ad on reddit

### MODERATORS

message the moderators

- qgyh2
- kn0thing
- spez
- ketralnis
- KeyserSosa
- jedberg
- Paradox F7U12, Android
- avnerd
- creesch toolbox
- Lurlur EarthPorn, Gadgets, SROTD

...and 1 more >>


I don't really have any solutions right now, but just wanted to let you know that this has happened in multiple subreddits (userbase: 600k+) of mine.

---

Though a note about this could be moderator burnout.


[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [soundeziner](#) 5 points 22 days ago\*

 Why not have a bot that checks each moderators activity every three months? If an account has zero mod actions, then they would be removed as a mod. This at least gets us past a major fault of the current system which is a lack of distinction between active on Reddit versus activity as a mod.


[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [OBLIVIATER](#) [OutOfTheLoop](#) 8 points 22 days ago

 The bot would have to be mod on all subreddits. Unless they code it into reddit itself.


[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [soundeziner](#) 8 points 22 days ago

 Name it TheTerminator and I'm good with it.


[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [rotorcowboy](#) 6 points 21 days ago

 Admin accounts (with admin mode on) are automatically moderators of every subreddit, independent of whether or not they are on the list. All they would need to do is give the bot admin powers and check each subreddit's logs.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [Eat\\_Bacon\\_nomnomnom](#) 3 points 21 days ago

 Oh god. Please, no. I don't need a bot or anyone else to make decisions for the subreddits I mod. The current mod teams are doing a great job.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [deleted] 21 days ago\*

[deleted]

 [-] [soundeziner](#) 2 points 21 days ago

↓ I can see your point regarding small subs so perhaps even the 1000 subscriber mark might be a good threshold. This would also prevent the system from demodding folks from the subs they create and use for testing CSS / layouts and such.

Any way this is dealt with, the admins are probably going to have to slaughter one of their sacred cows. It's time to just do it and move things forward.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ ↓ [-] [astarkey12](#) [/r/music](#), [/r/listentothis](#) 2 points 21 days ago

Even in my primary, most actively moderated sub ([/r/listentothis](#)), I still don't look like an active mod just by checking the log. Most of my work is coordinating AMAs, compiling mod posts to promote interesting content, etc., and all the typical mod tasks are handled by a bot or delegated to lower members of the team. I'd rather have either a system to formally vote out an inactive, top mod or different [/r/redditrequest](#) rules for that type of situation.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ ↓ [-] [RedSquaree](#) [mildlyinteresting](#), [thatHappened](#), [NorthernIreland](#) 2 points 21 days ago

Am I the only one that sees a problem with squatters? You don't even care about show because it hasn't been created, you just want to be a moderator on a popular subreddit... People like you are what got us into this mess. Partially anyway.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

[-] [deleted] 21 days ago\*

[deleted]

↑ ↓ [-] [RedSquaree](#) [mildlyinteresting](#), [thatHappened](#), [NorthernIreland](#) 3 points 21 days ago

It's clear that your focus is on moderating subreddits that are active or popular. I just had a

#### RECENTLY VIEWED LINKS

↑ ↓ [Can we as moderators \(finally\) take a stand against inactive top moderators and under-moderated subreddits?](#)

24 points | 104 comments

↑ ↓ [Someone is leaking my statements blatantly from this subreddit and they should be banned.](#)

1 point | 10 comments

↑ ↓ [Feds Demand Reddit Identify Users of a Dark-Web Drug Forum](#)

16 points | 27 comments

↑ ↓ [The U.S. Government's \\$800 Billion Gamble on Student Loans](#)

14 points | 2 comments

look, you're moderating about 80 subreddits ffs. People with this philosophy are why we have a lot of subreddits which fail to evolve, either people abandon subreddits or they can trump everyone else's ideas because they happened to get there first.

As for the "I care about ever single one", oh please. You can't moderate that many subreddits unless (this isn't a personal insult aimed at you, or really any attempt to be personal with you!) you sit on reddit for 18 hours 7 days a week. Hell, it takes me about an hour per day to moderate two of my subreddits. Active subs that I actually care about.

Maybe this strikes a nerve with me because I mod a sub with squatters who don't give a fuck about the sub and add friends as mods and shit, even though we take votes on removing inactive people etc. the head mod doesn't give a fuck. So I don't mean to take frustration out on you, I don't believe that's what I'm doing, but either way squatting is bad for communities. It is. Why are people so obsessed with modding 100 different subreddits? Pick five and nurture them, why do people have such a need to be so involved with so many things?

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#)  
[reply](#)




[\[-\] RedSquaree](#)

mildlyinteresting, thatHa  
NorthernIreland

-1 points 21 days ago

In fact, I don't even care about your answer to why you want to mod so many, I don't

 [/u/go1dfish](#) got banned from [/r/protectandserve](#). Some might say he is taking it personally after being told "Your butthurt does not matter."

62 points | 141 comments



[clear](#)



even know why I asked. I'm really just interested in sorting out the subs I moderate.

Sorry if I came across as rude.


[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#)  
[give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [\[-\] go1dfish](#) POLITIC ModerationLog RemovedComments 1  
 point 16 days ago

Some of us don't need to do mod actions every 3 months to keep our subreddits from falling down. Does that mean busy work to keep our subreddits out of the hands who find that sort of thing necessary?

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [edit](#) [disable inbox replies](#)  
[delete](#) [reply](#)

 [\[-\] soundeziner](#) 1 point 15 days ago

 Sure there may be cases where mods with an aspiration to do as little as possible to help the subreddit have not at the same time caused its demise. Just because you didn't kill it doesn't mean you helped it. Do you consider it possible that having moderators who make some kind of actual effort might be a more likely way to help a subreddit improve or grow?


Okay so you might not be "the Great Subreddit Cultivator!" but one mod action in three months is not an unrealistic threshold. It's a pretty pathetically low one to me. if in a three month span you can't be bothered to change the header color, add a relevant quote to the sidebar, update the sub description, remove a SPAM post, distinguish your own comment in the sub, make a sticky post, update the sub wiki info, or any other thing that counts as a "mod action" and consider it too burdensome... if the half second it takes to simply approve a post is just too much to ask of someone who signed up for the position, *then why be a moderator at all?*

If helping the sub is perceived as "busy work" then maybe that is the signal it's time to move on.

Is the purpose of a moderator to hold a title (and do nothing) or to help the subreddit/community?

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [\[-\]](#) [goldfish](#) POLITIC ModerationLog RemovedComments 1 point 15 days ago


 My bot in [/r/POLITIC](#) does mod actions more frequently than probably any other entity on reddit I expect.

But that doesn't mean I have to. Sure [/u/PoliticBot](#) is the top mod and I could keep reinventing myself, but that's kind of a hassle.

Would responding to modmail and inviting mods count as moderator activity? That might actually include me; but even then there might be times I go a long period without it.


[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [edit](#) [disable inbox replies](#) [delete](#) [reply](#)

 [\[-\]](#) [soundeziner](#) 1 point 15 days ago\*

 Some bot does work in the sub. Good for the bot. Anyone can add a bot to a sub so no you don't get credit for the bot's work. From your responses you find it to be a hassle, bothersome, and busy work to actually do anything yourself. Three months time is not enough for you to do any of the identified mod actions (none of which requires reinventing yourself to do). Why are you a mod then? That is the crux of this post after all; Inactive mods aren't *helping* so why not have a system to deal with them.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)


 [\[-\]](#) [goldfish](#) POLITIC ModerationLog RemovedComments 1 point 15 days ago

 I spend my time focusing on developing the bot and coordinating the actions of the other moderators. The concept of the subreddit, and bot were my idea and I've developed them to this point and plan to continue.

This proposal is wanting to impose your ideas about how subreddits *should* be moderated on all communities and that seems like a bad approach.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [edit](#) [disable inbox replies](#) [delete](#) [reply](#)

 [\[-\]](#) [soundeziner](#) 1 point 15 days ago\*


 Given that the admin's have provided a list of mod actions and a way to assess each moderator's activity of those actions, I'm pretty comfortable with my beliefs of what moderation should be and what Reddit intended. Obviously from [/u/krispykrackers](#) response here, it is something they are thinking about (along with many mods who are obviously frustrated with those who are mods in name only) I'm also pretty confident in the concept that having an active moderation team is always more beneficial than an inactive one.

Have a happy do-nothing day!

*edit - okay that last line was snarky and I do apologize as you claim you are doing things. My suggestion to you is that you consider the things you are doing and how "the system" might identify them as mod actions as it does with the ones already identified. There seems to be a growing frustration with mod inaction. Folks are also not happy that mods are only being removed when inactive on Reddit. The admins recognize this obviously. The next logical step is to base off of identified actions hence my suggestion to you to quantify how you are helping. Best of luck.*

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [go1dfish](#) POLITIC ModerationLog RemovedComments 1 point 15 days ago

 My suggestion is that you need a way for other mods and the users to both agree to kick a mod out, and that it shouldn't be based (in predefined, rigid ways) on activity at all except for a mod that is completely inactive on reddit.

If the other mods, and the users of the sub all wanted to kick me out, then that makes perfect sense. But the users have no visibility into moderator activity because reddit refuses at every turn to provide any transparency into it for non moderators.


My suggestion to you is that you consider the things you are doing and how "the system" might identify them as mod actions as it does with the ones already identified.

That's exactly what I tried to do a couple of comments ago:

Would responding to modmail and inviting mods count as moderator activity? That might actually include me; but even then there might be times I go a long period without it.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [edit](#) [disable inbox replies](#) [delete](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [soundeziner](#) 1 point 15 days ago

 Absolute transparency and democracy all at once? That's overly idealistic. Because of admin reaction (and non-reaction) to existing suggestions behind what your idea requires, I just can't see it happening here. One small sacred cow to the slaughter maybe but more than one major cow at a time? No way.

IDK about your actions. Ask the admins if they go with something based on it.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

[continue this thread](#) →

 [-] [nallen](#) /AskScience /science 4 points 22 days ago

 Thanks for the honest answer [/u/krispykrackers](#)

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)



↑ [-] [Jakeable](#) [/r/Politics](#), [/r/AskReddit](#) 3 points 21 days ago

↓ I think you guys need to take each subreddit case by case. Obviously small subs don't require much moderation, but the big subs do. I think that you'd determine if someone is inactive by checking the log, modmail and maybe even ask the current mods(?). If you do change the process, I'd like the ability for modteams to elect the replacement. There would definitely be some issues, as every team runs differently, but I think that this is an important thing.

At the very least, I think that having inactive people at the top of a subreddit could be disastrous as a large subsection of a site is at the whims of someone who doesn't care much.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [allthefoxes](#) [foxes](#) 2 points 21 days ago

↓ I'm not an expert but this doesn't exactly seem like an extremely difficult problem thought wise.

Implementation is another story.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [x\\_minus\\_one](#) [nottheonion](#), [trashy](#), [facepalm](#), [youdontsurf](#) 2 points 21 days ago

↓ I guess one issue I have with [/r/redditrequest](#) is that we have no way of knowing whether someone is truly "active" or not. Being able to log in occasionally with no real activity seems to be a gaping loophole, and they should at least have to post or perform a mod action or something.

If that's not possible, it would be nice if redditrequests that are denied because someone logged in once to remain "active" didn't count against you for the month. It seems kind of unfair, like we're being punished for something we had no way of knowing.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [evilnight](#) [listentothis](#) 2 points 20 days ago\*

↓ There's no perfect solution to this problem that's going to make it into a zero-administration issue. Admin arbitrage is still going to be required in extreme cases, and you need to be willing to step up and take ownership of the reorganization when that happens. That should mostly be in vote-of-no-confidence situations where an entire subreddit wants a completely new mod team. You can handle that with threads, and thankfully these are rare.

That said, there's an easy upgrade you can implement that will work for most of the site's moderation teams.

First, axe the arbitrary first-come hierarchy. Who was there first is no longer important. Concentrate on who has permissions for what using the permission system - that's the *natural* power hierarchy you should be using. In particular, we're interested in people who have full moderator permissions. That's your voter pool.

You must be familiar with votekick systems - they are nearly ubiquitous in multiplayer online games. A simple votekick system would solve most of your moderation team problems most of the time.

- mod Y calls for a votekick against mod Z
- mods A through X have 48 hours to cast a vote either way

- when a quorum is reached and majority vote identified, action is taken immediately
- if quorum not met, after full 48 hours all cast votes are tallied as quorum
- abstentions/failures to vote are ignored, if people were inactive and didn't vote, fuck them and their opinion
- if the majority of the tallied votes are for kick, the mod is kicked
- if the majority of votes are for keep, that mod remains and is immune to votekick for some period (30 days?)
- mod Y can cancel the vote at any time but cannot cast a vote himself
- mod Z *loses all mod powers*, but not mod chat, until after the vote concludes
- mod Z cannot cast a vote himself, he's basically on suspension until it's over

You may need to set it up so that this votekick system only goes active when there are five or more full moderators on the team... it doesn't really make sense if there are only two or three people, use the old hierarchy model for those subs.

You might also add an expiration feature the mods can set. Inactive for more than X days (no moderator actions) means that account gets automatically dropped from the team. This might be useful in places like [/r/science](#) where there is a literal army of moderators.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [thoughtfulandkind](#) [/r/raisedbynarcissists](#) 1 point 12 days ago

↓ This would be amazing.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [nty](#) 2 points 19 days ago

↓ Let's take a moment to appreciate [/u/Ocrasorm](#), [/u/Sporkicide](#), and all the other admins who have served that subreddit.

Also, I would like to apologize for misreading [/u/Ocrasorm](#)'s username as [/u/Orcastorm](#) up until now.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [KrabbHD](#) [/r/TheLastAirbender](#) 1 point 22 days ago

↓ I would suggest a bot that mods can message to remove top mods who neglect the subreddits. It opens up a private (group) chat between the mods and this person and if he doesn't reply in x time, while still being active, he gets removed. We have this problem on [/r/TheLastAirbender](#) as well, and we wouldn't mind helping you brainstorm solutions.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [spinnelein](#) 0 points 21 days ago

↓ Wikipedia has varying access levels that allow them to have volunteers do a majority of the community support tasks.


If reddit gave some admin permission to a small group of trusted people it could really help take the load off and reshape the communities. On the spam side, it would be amazing to be able to see what IP a user is posting from and do shadowbans. On the redditrequest side, we could write a bot that would check for inactive users and make lists of unmoderated subs.

Also a new class of users would help bridge the gap between mods and admin in terms of communication and goals.

You have a massive human resource at your disposal that doesn't cost a dime. Use it.


[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [EightRoundsRapid](#) 3 points 21 days ago

 I don't agree with the idea of mods being able to shadowban. There are some incredibly petty people on modlists who aren't shy about using automod against people they don't like. Bad enough that they "shadowban" across the subs they mod, but going on a vindictive banning spree and nixing accounts permanently would, I think, be to much temptation for some to resist.


[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [spinnelein](#) 1 point 21 days ago

 I'm talking about a different level of volunteer position. A small group of people with limited admin access, not expanding the permission for all moderators.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [EightRoundsRapid](#) 2 points 21 days ago

 So who gets decide who the "trusted moderators" are, and how is it determined that they're suitable? It also even further blurs the already blurry perception that users have of the difference between admin/mod in my opinion.

For me, what you're proposing is not something a volunteer moderator should be doing. It strays to far into a "paid employee" situation with responsibilities above what we should be expected to deal with.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [spinnelein](#) 1 point 21 days ago

 It would be closer to Wikipedia's Administrator and Bureaucrat access levels.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:User\\_access\\_levels#Administrators\\_at](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:User_access_levels#Administrators_at)

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [relic2279](#) [TIL-Videos-Space](#) 1 point 11 days ago

 I don't agree with the idea of mods being able to shadowban.

I don't think you have much of a choice unfortunately. Mods can *already* shadowban using bots to ghost comments and submissions as soon as they're posted. It's functionally the same thing.

Mods need tools like that to help grow their communities, keep them functioning well and to keep the quality high. They don't need protected or coddled because of what a few bad apples might do. Holding back vital tools because you're afraid of what an insignificant select few might do will do much more harm than the alternative.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [go1dfish](#) [POLITIC ModerationLog RemovedComments](#) 0 points 19 days ago

 Bring back </r/reddit.com> or something like it (not </r/stuff>) as a default

That fixes most of the problems reddit currently has by making the market of subreddits functional again.

It's easy. You don't have to build anything. Just let the community work.

↑ [-] [Werner\\_\\_Herzog](#) /r/chickenhater 15 points 22 days ago

↓ | A rogue mod

I have a feeling that people that like to squat a subreddit partly stay in that position because they're worried that their subreddits might go in a direction they don't want once they quit. Basically they have the same fears about mods below them those mods have about them. Those fears might be irrational and there are certainly other motivations coming into effect, but I'm not comfortable playing the rogue-top-mod-who-will-inevitably-ruin-everything card. The real problem is people making final decisions who (potentially) have nothing to do with the day to day of a subreddit. I'm saying potentially, because I'm pretty sure even people not doing any mod action and / commenting can still be looking at the sub everyday.

All that being said, squatters are kind of a problem and the 60 day rule is not always fair.

permalink save report give gold reply

↑ [-] [captainmeta4](#) automoderator, futurology, xkcd, gadgets 3 points 21 days ago\*

↓ The 60 day rule should have a caveat of "...unless it's obvious that you're functionally inactive and logging minimal activity for the sole purpose of preventing redditrequests against you."

(edited for clarity)

permalink save parent report give gold reply

↑ [-] [Jakeable](#) /r/Politics, /r/AskReddit 4 points 21 days ago

↓ Literally this. This would solve all issues. [/u/krispykrackers](#) here is your solution.

permalink save parent report give gold reply

↑ [-] [captainmeta4](#) automoderator, futurology, xkcd, gadgets 2 points 21 days ago

↓ It would take care of [/u/qgyh2](#) for sure.

permalink save parent report give gold reply

↑ [-] [Jakeable](#) /r/Politics, /r/AskReddit 3 points 21 days ago

↓ Probably IlluminatedWax and S2S2S2... too

permalink save parent report give gold reply

↑ [-] [allthefoxes](#) foxes 1 point 21 days ago

↓ Well according to q, they stay at the top to be there if shit goes down.

So he technically wouldn't fall under that since he's not just logging to avoid reddit requests

permalink save parent report give gold reply

↑ [-] [astarkey12](#) /r/music, /r/listentothis 3 points 21 days ago

↓ | if shit goes down

They are the shit that all the other mods want to go down. What could/would they do if shit did indeed go down? How is an out of touch, inactive mod more qualified to handle "shit going down" than someone who is actually moderating the sub? That argument is absolutely hilarious.

permalink save parent report give gold reply

↑ [-] [allthefoxes](#) foxes 2 points 21 days ago

↓ Ask q. I'm just repeating what he said some time ago

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [astarkey12](#) [/r/music](#), [/r/listentothis](#) 3 points 21 days ago

↓ Factran has actually said the exact same thing in [/r/music](#). He agreed to rearrange the mod list to reflect who was most active (except leaving himself at #1) - that was almost two months ago. He doesn't respond to PMs, and I assume he's abandoned that plan. [/r/music](#) has basically had no major changes since like... 2010. It's depressing as fuck when it could actually be a legit default if it had an active team.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [davidreiss666](#) [Supreme President](#) 2 points 21 days ago

↓ Which is bullshit. Because he is ALWAYS the #1 cause of the bullshit when it goes down.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [Algernon\\_Asimov](#) [/r/DaystromInstitute](#) [/r/Help](#) 2 points 17 days ago

↓ | Because he is ALWAYS the #1 cause of the bullshit when it goes down.

Not true. In [/r/Australia](#) about 6 months ago, [/u/qgyh2](#) actually *fixed* bullshit that went down when the number 2 mod went rogue, demodded all other mods (except q, who is number 1 mod), and appointed a troll as his co-mod. In that case, the *only* person who could fix things was qgyh2 because he was the only person who could de-mod the number 2 moderator and the new number 3. Which he did. And then re-added the previous moderators.

There's at least one example where qgyh2 was the solution rather than the problem.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [davidreiss666](#) [Supreme President](#) 3 points 17 days ago

↓ Even a stopped clock is still right twice a day. He's still more of a problem though. As there are now high ranking mods of default subreddits who deny the Holocaust ever happened because Qgyh2 willingly added them to his mod teams.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [Algernon\\_Asimov](#) [/r/DaystromInstitute](#) [/r/Help](#) 1 point 17 days ago

↓ | Even a stopped clock is still right twice a day.

True. I was merely pointing out that qgyh2 is not "ALWAYS the #1 cause" of bullshit.

( I dislike absolute statements like that! "Never say 'never' or 'always'." is a sort of principle of mine. :P )

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [davidreiss666](#) [Supreme President](#) 1 point 17 days ago



↓ For you I will amend it to "He is the the #1 cause of bullshit on Reddit".

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

[continue this thread](#) →

↑ [-] [qgyh2](#) 0 points 17 days ago

↓ Who are you referring to here?

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [AsAChemicalEngineer](#) [/r/askscience](#) [/r/dataisbeautiful](#) 2 points 20 days ago

↓ To add, the threat of rogue mods are quite real. [/r/astrophysics](#) is a destroyed subreddit because of it and people have moved on to [/r/astrophys](#) instead.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [Werner\\_\\_Herzog](#) [/r/chickenhater](#) 2 points 20 days ago

↓ Admittedly some mods have shown themselves to be really unpredictable. I still refuse to see maliciousness in anyone keeping a subreddit, doesn't mean the outcome can't be catastrophic.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [db2](#) [freebies](#) [zombies](#) [eFreebies](#) [coupons](#) 8 points 22 days ago

↓ By some definitions I would be considered as "inactive", yet the subs I moderate in are important to me and it would be rather crushing to log on one day to find out I was on the business end of a surprise coup. (I'm not worried about this myself though, my co-mods are awesome)

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [neko](#) [tomt](#), [pets](#), [anxiety](#) 5 points 21 days ago\*

↓ This is me on one off the support subreddits I mod. I mostly just track spam and trolls, but since it's so small, not much happens. Of course a mod below me is trying to get me removed since I don't reply to the good posts. That's what multiple mods are for.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [DrJulianBashir](#) [videos](#), [cooking](#), [food](#), [DeepSpaceNine](#), etc. 7 points 22 days ago

↓ Can't lower mods use reddit request to gain control of subs like [/r/depression](#)?

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [love\\_the\\_heat](#) [babyanimalgif subs](#), [ImaginaryJedi](#), etc 6 points 22 days ago

↓ The first active mod could request it if the top mods have truly been inactive for three months

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [roionsteroids](#) [/r/Drugs](#) 6 points 22 days ago

↓ Yeah, it sucks having 3 mods on top who haven't done anything in more than a year, are active in other subreddits and ignore all PMs and what not :(

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [love\\_the\\_heat](#) [babyanimalgif subs](#), [ImaginaryJedi](#), etc 1 point 22 days ago

↓ Agreed. It would be nice for another solution. As others have said, the mods would just play by the new rules and probably create a new problem. Keep brainstorming

though

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [TunicSongForKaren](#) [S] 3 points 22 days ago

↓ In theory they could, but a lot of these top mods are either *almost* inactive (i.e. they make a comment every two month or so), or they even just do a mod action every month to keep their mod status (this is what [/u/qgyh2](#) does)

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [Bartiemus](#) [/r/DCComics](#) [/r/Doctorwho](#) [/r/Squaredcircle](#) [/r/Funny](#) 1 point 21 days ago

↓ How many people actually know of this feature though?

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [CedarWolf](#) [DualGender](#) [genderqueer](#) [TransSpace](#) [transgender](#) [questioning](#) [AskGSM](#) 6 points 22 days ago

↓ We've had issues with that in the past... On some of our LGBT subs, we've had top mods spam their personal websites and businesses, make transphobic commentary on the transgender sub they mod, be known across reddit for being reddit's biggest asshole, threaten and abuse our readers then drop a personal ban on them when they speak out, remove and ban lower level mods, outright threaten lower level mods... And of the five examples I've provided, four of those users have retained their subs.

So yeah, it's a mess.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [soundeziner](#) 3 points 22 days ago

↓ The head mod of r/nutrition was using a second account on the mod team to ask people to compensate him in exchange for being allowed to post in the sub. But because he did it with an alt account as another mod, the admins left his head mod account in place. The top mod account is one he rarely ever uses but does keep active just enough to camp the sub. The admins know he's the same person but their policy is to only deal with the individual accounts which are abusive and NOT the person.

There really needs to be a major policy change to deal with people like this.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [CedarWolf](#) [DualGender](#) [genderqueer](#) [TransSpace](#) [transgender](#) [questioning](#) [AskGSM](#) 2 points 22 days ago

↓ Mmm, and yet with users, their policy is to smack all of the user's accouts...

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [x\\_minus\\_one](#) [nottheonion](#), [trashy](#), [facepalm](#), [youdontsurf](#) 2 points 21 days ago

↓ That's a loophole so big, you could steer a cruise ship through it.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [exoendo](#) [r/politics](#), [r/documentaries](#) 5 points 22 days ago

↓ I see both sides.

on the one hand, I can see a strong argument that a subreddit one creates belongs to them. I recently have started a smallish sub with around 800 subscribers. I created it, it was my idea, I've put the work into it. Who is to say I am not allowed to take an extended break from it if I want? If I added another mod and went on vacation for 6 months, who says they get to take it over? Maybe I specifically want my sub to be super inactive, why don't I get to make that call?

So yeah..


However, I do see the issue with communities that could be very instrumental to peoples health, or highly visible 'faces of reddit' type subs having inactive mods. Clearly that's an issue.

One idea might be that you are only allowed to be top mod in so many subs over a certain threshold of subscribers. This was partially accomplished via the 'you can only mod 3 defaults rule' but I think it could be easily expanded to the criteria that I just mentioned. That way you can still be in charge of super niche subs or pet project subs, but if you are at the level where you have a lot of subscribers, you can't just camp important (on a site-wide scale) subreddits. The admins could also designate some other choice subreddits they deem too important to just be modded by inaccurate or incompetent mods (i.e. [/r/depression](#) )

I think that solution of mine presents the best of both worlds

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [OBLIVIATER](#) [OutOfTheLoop](#) 5 points 22 days ago

 We're trying in [/r/videos](#) to remove S2S2 but I doubt it will work.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [TunicSongForKaren](#) [S] 3 points 22 days ago

 He is inactive, right?

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [OBLIVIATER](#) [OutOfTheLoop](#) 5 points 22 days ago

 For a little over 5 months, and he hasn't done anything in [/r/videos](#) for longer


[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [TunicSongForKaren](#) [S] 4 points 22 days ago

 Then you can ask in [/r/redditrequest](#) for a removal.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [OBLIVIATER](#) [OutOfTheLoop](#) 6 points 22 days ago

 Already tried once, an admin said he had been active once in the past 90 days (he logged into reddit) so I'm trying again.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)


 [-] [Werner\\_\\_Herzog](#) [/r/chickenhater](#) 3 points 22 days ago

 | past 90 days


wait, I thought it was 60 days.


[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [astarkey12](#) [/r/music](#), [/r/listentothis](#) 2 points 21 days ago

 I usually send a PM to an admin I trust asking if they can check on a mod's activity *before* I make a formal request. It saves yourself from wasting a request.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

 [-] [davidreiss666](#) [Supreme President](#) 3 points 21 days ago

 I always assumed S2S2 was a stand-up enough guy who would stand down if just asked by everyone (on the mod team) to do so.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] **OBLIVIATER** [OutOfTheLoop](#) 4 points 21 days ago

↓ I've messaged him twice in the past 3 or so months, no response. I think he is completely afk.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] **BAOK** 4 points 21 days ago\*

↓ Ok fine I'll bite, I as a joke requested [/r/askreddit](#) a few years ago because the top mod, 99names or something like that was inactive for 6 months, they were removed by the admins shortly after that request. If mods are not active in the mod log for over a month how are they considered active moderators on reddit? A simple rule change "like active on reddit" to "active in the modlog" would make a huge difference for [/r/redditrequest](#). I've had to hold back on requesting removal of the top mods in 2 different subs because the top mod posts a pic of a corgi in [/r/corgi](#) once a month and never does anything in the actual subreddit they're supposed to be moderating.

I honestly don't care anymore, it's just frustrating dealing with the [/r/redditrequest](#) process. Thank you krispy for giving us an honest answer

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] **thoughtfulandkind** [/r/raisedbynarcissists](#) 2 points 12 days ago

↓ A simple rule change "like active on reddit" to "active in the modlog" would make a huge difference for [/r/redditrequest](#)

This is a very good suggestion.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] **angrypotato1** [/r/meme\\_irl](#) 3 points 20 days ago

↓ How do you suggest we do that?

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] **TunicSongForKaren** [S] 3 points 20 days ago

↓ Petition. Show the admins en masse that we are fed up with the status quo.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] **angrypotato1** [/r/meme\\_irl](#) 4 points 20 days ago

↓ change.org ayy lmao

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] **TunicSongForKaren** [S] 3 points 20 days ago

↓ ayy

but yeah most of this is p much a pipe dream

I am considering stepping down from my mod positions except the NPS network, so that I can focus on NPS. I'll still continue modding IPF tho.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] **astarkey12** [/r/music](#), [/r/listentothis](#) 3 points 21 days ago\*

↓ Hey [/u/factran](#), you might want to take a look at some of the comments in this thread. I know you agreed we were due for a rearrange in [/r/music](#), but this post just shows you how frustrating it can be when you're at the bottom of a mod list under several inactive mods who are inadvertently inhibiting the growth and improvement of a sub.

permalink save report give gold reply

↑ [-] **One\_Giant\_Nostril** Imaginary 4 points 22 days ago

↓ The only way to "take a stand" is to create a new subreddit. That's your take a stand right there.

permalink save report give gold reply

↑ [-] **TunicSongForKaren** [S] 11 points 22 days ago

↓ This has been said so many times, and I disagree. There are several reasons why it is incredibly hard to start an alternative subreddit:

- many subreddits attract subscribers by the name alone ([/r/science](#), [/r/skyrim](#), [/r/canada](#) are good examples)
- it is hard to advertize a new subreddit on reddit. Often, it is impossible to advertize on the original, badly led subreddit. Just look at the [/r/xkcd](#) debacle.
- community splits lead to fragmentation and a weakened community.
- the larger a sub, the more likely people are to subscribe (up until a certain threshold). It is pretty hard to break that first 0-1000 barrier.
- if something happens to the new sub, the whole process starts over again
- many subscribers don't accurately realize the impact of undermodded subreddits

To sum it all up, this attitude of "just create a new subreddit" is lazy and dismissive of the problem.

permalink save parent report give gold reply

↑ [-] **jippiejee** r/travel | r/thenetherlands 8 points 22 days ago

↓ The problem is that nobody knows the solution. If the admins would demand more activity for legacy mods to stay on, these people would just go and do exactly what's needed. One mod action per week? They'll come in once week then to click on something in the spam queue. They might also become more hesitant to add new much needed mods to the teams if it would undermine their positions when the admins would introduce something like 'mod removal votes' in mod teams.

permalink save parent report give gold reply

↑ [-] **TunicSongForKaren** [S] 5 points 22 days ago

↓ The solution imo would be more proactive case-by-case action from the admin's side. The whole "communities are independent" is destroying Reddit. Inactive mods, "palace coups" in major subs ([/r/thenetherlands](#), [/r/HistoricalWhatIf](#), [/r/morbidreality](#), [/r/me\\_irl](#)), extreme hate subs, undermoderated subs, random decision making and rampant mod abuse.

permalink save parent report give gold reply

↑ [-] **jippiejee** r/travel | r/thenetherlands 6 points 22 days ago

↓ There are also examples of legacy mods being a stabilizing factor though: when an r/australia mod went rogue, it was q who restored the situation. It's just difficult to generalise the effects of having legacy mods in the top of teams, so I think the admins will prefer to stay out of it. Personally I wouldn't mind if the reddit community managing admins would step in and judge the situation per subreddit.

permalink save parent report give gold reply



↑ [-] [TunicSongForKaren](#) [S] 1 point 22 days ago

↓ That's what I am trying to convey. Legacy mods are relatively fine, as long as admins remove them if they judge them to be not of value to the sub - which means they should be removed if they become almost inactive (up to the admins to decide).

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [demmian](#) [/r/Feminism](#) 1 point 20 days ago

↓ me\_irl was had a palace coup? It shows that devtesla created it, and their second account is the top mod.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [TunicSongForKaren](#) [S] 1 point 20 days ago

↓ It was briefly hijacked by [/u/DonQuixoteReference](#), but the situation was resolved after some diplomacy.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [demmian](#) [/r/Feminism](#) 1 point 20 days ago

↓ Ah. The more you learn...

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [One\\_Giant\\_Nostril](#) [Imaginary](#) 2 points 22 days ago

↓ | lazy and dismissive

I must disagree (well, of course I would, to back-up my assertion). Creating a new subreddit - as a counter to an established subreddit - is definitely fraught with difficulties. As a recent commenter in another sub pointed out, there're maybe 5 or 6 communities that've grown beyond the original subreddit. But at least you're in control. I'd rather have 100 subscribers of a well-maintained subreddit than be a mod of a sub that had 100,000 readers under the control of absent moderators.

I've perused the comments in big subs and all I see are one-line toss-offs, half-hearted puns and 'reminds me of' statements. There's no future there. The community has been set. Everyone knows what to expect and will regurgitate the same old mindset.

Ah, but starting a new subreddit... Now we're talking. A fresh page, a new landscape. And now suddenly you're the top mod. It doesn't get any sweeter than that.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [astarkey12](#) [/r/music](#), [/r/listentothis](#) 2 points 21 days ago

↓ I have been trying to do just that with [/u/qgyh2](#). I [mentioned him in a thread about this exact same topic](#) like a month or so ago. He showed up acting like he didn't understand basic reddit mod features, which only infuriates me more. What a child.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [TunicSongForKaren](#) [S] 2 points 21 days ago

↓ I PM'd him a a while back about giving up his mod spot in [/r/depression](#) and removing the five inactive mods. He responded that he is "quite harmless", without adressing any point I made about how [/r/depression](#) needs to be modded well.

Dude's a manchild.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [astarkey12](#) /r/music, /r/listentothis 2 points 21 days ago

↓ Wow, what an asshole. He has no idea how toxic and counterproductive his inactivity is. Seriously, the dude is clueless as fuck. Thankfully, I don't mod with him anywhere, so I'm not afraid to username tag him when he's the subject of discussions like this. [/u/qgyh2](#), please stop dicking over good subreddits.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [djimbob](#) 1 point<sup>†</sup> 22 days ago

↓ I think reddit could come up with a system of users reclaiming a subreddit from bad/inactive mods.

I don't think it should be easy, but something that could solve the xkcd debacle (where the old mod of xkcd was big into "[Mens Rights](#)", [anti-semitism](#), [conspiracy theories](#), etc).

1. Mods of another community of over 1k on the same topic requests control of a subreddit through some process. Has to make a formal argument on why they deserve control of other subreddit.
2. Admin does a quick sanity check to see that the request is legitimate. Gives current mods up to a week to draft a counter-argument.
3. At the top of the subreddit, there's a stickied post for a week showing the formal argument and counter-argument. This referendum listing the reasons. If some super-majority of voters (e.g., 2/3) are in favor of over-throwing the mods, the new mods are given the reins. Tampering with the voting process (e.g., CSS to hide the stickied post), results in mod account altering the CSS being banned.

Obviously with any new tool this could be abused where minority viewpoints get crushed, which wouldn't be the intention, so admins use their oversight. For example, if [/r/atheism](#) has 2 million subscribers and [/r/christianity](#) has 95,000; you wouldn't want atheism mods to use their size to takeover [/r/christianity](#). These sorts of hostile takeovers would ideally be stopped by admins when reading the argument. Trolling takeovers (e.g., takeover looks legitimate, but then when it happens just troll the subreddit) result in users getting banned.

But then again, this is a sort of rare problem.

[permalink](#) [save](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

↑ [-] [demnian](#) /r/Feminism 2 points 20 days ago

↓ For example, if [/r/atheism](#) has 2 million subscribers and [/r/christianity](#) has 95,000; you wouldn't want atheism mods to use their size to takeover [/r/christianity](#). These sorts of hostile takeovers would ideally be stopped by admins when reading the argument.

How? I mean, this is pretty obvious, but how do you do it otherwise? Say, competing communities in the political spectrum?

[permalink](#) [save](#) [parent](#) [report](#) [give gold](#) [reply](#)

about

[blog](#)  
[about](#)  
[team](#)

help

[site rules](#)  
[FAQ](#)  
[wiki](#)

apps & tools

[Alien Blue iOS app](#)  
[reddit AMA app](#)  
[mobile site](#)

<3

[reddit gold](#)  
[reddit store](#)  
[redditgifts](#)

[source code](#)  
[advertise](#)  
[jobs](#)

[reddiquette](#)  
[transparency](#)  
[contact us](#)

[buttons](#)

[reddit.tv](#)  
[radio reddit](#)

Use of this site constitutes acceptance of our [User Agreement](#) and [Privacy Policy](#). © 2015 reddit inc. All rights reserved.  
REDDIT and the ALIEN Logo are registered trademarks of reddit inc.