
Subject: Re: The Three, Which one are you?

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Thu, 10 Aug 2006 02:31:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Darker wrote on Wed, 09 August 2006 19:34: Everyones different mrpirate, some people read quicker and do not look closely at smaller things like that. But don't stress about it.

Quote: These people are more likely to try to make someone else look stupid, perhaps because they are a threat to them in a way or other unknown reasons. And more often not very considerate

A lot of this activity is coming from you, MrPirate. You know I'm not the Moe character, yet you have implied that you think I might be him.

Not to mention, you will not tell us what you think you are closest to. Afraid to admit is also a way of the Asswiser.

Just look at this. He was saying you reminded him of Moe? Is this bad? Why is it bad? What is he doing here that suggested he was making you look stupid?

Also, why is it the ways of the "asswiser" to not admit what you are "closest" too? You do not have any sort of qualifications to be putting traits into a system. Making it entirely invalid. A good system would be one that if a person was say, shy, might also enjoy working in an office, they might also try not to get into people's affairs that don't need their help. You cannot put traits into a good or bad category. An obsessive compulsive person could be considered bad because it involves a lot of unnecessary things, though, in a job like watching air traffic, scrutiny is of the utmost importance and thus it would be a good thing. Likewise, if a teacher tells you to do your homework and is failing you and corrects your grammar, that might be good. A random person on the internet can do the very same, but to you this is somehow different, why? If you're going to make something of a classification system, then do not include what is right or wrong or imply something is better than the other, seeing as how just one interpretation of something is so miniscule and doesn't mean anything.

So anyways, if you say someone is doing something that an asswiser would do, which is bad, you are putting them down. You don't have to specifically call them an asswiser to do it, you know. Thus, you are being, in a way, an asswiser yourself (by your definition) This however wouldn't mean I am being it. Since, all I am doing is pointing out to you is that by your own definition you are doing the exact same thing you think is bad. Just a statement and nothing more.

So if you would RATHER put up a classification for people who generally do good things or bad things, that's up to you, but this system of yours does neither. And I'm sure if you did do just the classification system for good-bad, that no one is ever pure good or pure bad, especially when there are different interpretations for each case. Would it be completely *bad* if a person wasn't willing to give up his life to save another's? or even two other lives? Not everyone is capable of giving up their lives for such a cause. From an objective point of view, it would naturally be better that two people survived than one, so does this mean if a person was to be good, he would be

willing to give up his life for two others? and if he wasn't that that would be bad?

To sum it up:

No. No at your classification system. Find one on the internet done by a psychologist. (Maybe introvert/extrovert) That might be something to ask. Though in most cases you'll probably find out that people are most likely introverts online. Though perhaps they once *were* introverts but are now extroverts. That might be something a little bit more solid than the foundations you are working on.

edit: Not to mention mrpirate has a solid point, I mean you are talking about moe/sensitive when you just registered today. That obviously means you either had an account before, and for some unknown reason you decided to get this new one. Or, you were banned and this is your new account, which is much more likely because I don't see very many people suddenly making new accounts. It's also a good point to mention the fact that the terminology "asswiser" was mentioned by moe/sensitive, which, as far as I know, only moe/sensitive/and apparently YOU know what it is.
