

---

Subject: Re: Looking for a new gamer

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 15:48:36 GMT

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

---

For once I actually agree with JohnDoe- there really isn't a large scale, accurate, deductive study of female gamers and their likelihood of being attention whores, and really, the chance of that ever happening is about as likely as scrin not being a massive faggot. Therefore, the next best thing is to rely on your own personal experience, aswell as the experience of others. Really, what more is a massive study of the behavior of someone than a small group of people experiencing- through a proverbial glass window- whatever it is they're studying?

Someone had to take a look and see how much an elephant shits enough times to conclude that elephants shit a certain amount of times on average. That person experienced seeing an elephant shitting multiple times, therefore he's more credible as a source, no? And in order to back up his claims, surely different people also studied and experienced an elephant shitting numerous times, and their data more or less matched.

That's basically all a study is really- a person intentionally experiencing something a good lot of times in order to make an average. The "intentionally" does not make or break that study, though. It just makes it go by quicker. So if someone were to live around elephants enough times- maybe at a zoo or an elephant farm, I don't know- surely he would come up with his own average that would more or less be pretty accurate because of how long he's been around elephants.

If anything, I'd go so far as to say studying something to a great degree can often lead to shit happening that wasn't intended- maybe if the same guy watches the same herd of elephants shit a ton of times and the elephants see him a good lot of times, the elephants would feel uncomfortable, and wouldn't shit as often, and when they DO shit, they shit alot more or alot less, thus interfering with the data.

Yes, I know, you can study something to a greater degree and ensure that there's not really any interference, thus getting accurate data... but to truly do that in our specific situation of girl gamers being annoying attention whores, would be nigh impossible. Therefore, if there ARE any "studies" of girl gamers and their likelihood of being annoying as hell attention whores, they're either inaccurate, biased, and/or retarded.

Really, applying a scientific method to studying humans almost never fucking works. Science in whole is pretty much the wikipedia of studies- unlike math or more solid subjects, it changes every damn day because of new discoveries. Sure, history and such changes a little, but it's pretty solid that Abraham Lincoln was assassinated. The only thing more you could attempt to find out is how long he lived after getting shot (I'm sure there's some morons willing to spend their life finding this out), what exact type of gun his assassin used, what he was sitting on, etc etc. But the basic principle remains- he died. The same is not true for science- it RELIES on all those tiny little details to make up its core. And the fact is, it's almost impossible to come up with some 100% accurate knowledge of humans. If we had that, evolution would have been proven or disproven the second it happened, we'd be able to cure any disease, etc etc.

Thus, your whole argument of "well inductive reasoning is bad because it's not deductive!" is pretty retarded because there is no fucking way to fully research whether or not the majority of

women are attention whores. And truly deductive reasoning practically relies on that, otherwise it's inductive reasoning with a mustache ("THIS GUY SAID THIS AND THAT HAPPENED SO THIS MUST BE TRUE" as compared to "I SAW THIS AND THAT SO THIS MUST BE TRUE").

Plus, I don't see why it's such a bad thing to rely a little on your own personal experience. Just because some jackass with a degree from who the fuck cares college said "oh yeah this is totally true/false" does not mean it's more credible than a large majority of people who, through their own personal experience, have drawn a conclusion (possibly with facts thrown in, which I'm pretty sure there are for this case). Unless there is a largely deductive alternative to this that numerous people of the same (and possibly different) fields of studies have come to the same conclusion of, it's pretty likely that the largely accepted through personal experience thing is pretty accurate (maybe not 100% accurate, but hey). Religion really being the only thing excluded from this argument, of course.

Basically, what you're saying here is "but there's no deductive reasoning behind this therefore your personal experiences and personal wants are rendered moot because there is no deductive process behind it", which is a bit retarded.

Let's say for the sake of this discussion science could not figure out why fire hurts people (again, for the sake of this discussion). However, numerous testimonies from numerous people say fire will hurt you if you touch it, through their own personal experience. Therefore, is a largely deductive process really necessary to conclude that fire will fucking burn you and hurt you? No, because numerous people already agree. Really, the deductive process is only useful for disproving something, not for proving something. So if anything, you're the one that has to come up with a huge study to disprove my opinion that the majority of female gamers are usually attention whores.

TL;DR: shut the fuck up, Dover.

---