

---

Subject: Re: Looking for a new gamer  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 13 Nov 2009 18:24:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 10:13

Yes, everyone deserves a chance, but generally speaking, what that chance is, is pretty damn important. Going through every single person to find a few good people can be an arduous process,

That's life.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 10:13 and often times unnecessary if you establish a connection of certain aspects to general personality traits. For example, if someone smokes pot, more than likely they're pretty chill but also not very responsible. I'm sure you're going to go into another ragefit saying I shouldn't generalize like that, but again, this is based on personal experience, the experience of others, and general facts to draw my own conclusions rather than a full on study.

Firstly, who's ragefitting?

And secondly, I don't think you can compare gender to a personality trait.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 10:13 Going by that, I may or may not still be friends with them, depending on the chance I'm giving them. If that chance is "well I'll see if they stab me in the back", well shit, that's inviting the opportunity of them stabbing me in the back. I could go into that whole philosophy, but I'm sure you're aware of how it works so I won't bother. But instead, if I give them the chance of "well, I'll see if they're pretty chill and calm", then learning that they do pot early on (and then going by the reasoning that most potheads are calm/chill), I can say hey, they're probably pretty chill, so I'll try and be friends with them.

However, if you don't generalize at all to make that connection between pot and being chill (example of course), then you have to basically give them the chance to fuck you over big time to see whether they do or not. In doing so, you'll more than likely find negative aspects of this person as well that you hadn't thought possible before being friends with them.

Yeah. Again, that's life. Sometimes people stab you in the back. You live and you learn

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 10:13 Now, to how heavy a degree you make this generalization also matters- if I were to make the generalization that blacks steal and therefore don't befriend any black people, I could potentially pass up some decent friends. But to make a smaller generalization, such as that if a girl wears a lot of make up they probably (probably being a key word there) care a good lot about their appearance (although that depends how they apply it lol, but you get what I mean). It's then something to consider into whether or not I'll be friends with them.

That being said, I don't think "female gamers" (on the general scale of things) are really as important as considering females altogether to be friends with, or a race or etc. Especially with Oblivion's other criteria, which generally are asking for a heavier gamer. Even "heavy" female gamers still have that annoying aspect that general female gamers do, so yeah. And if he's wrong,

so what- then he's passing up a potentially good friend and it's his problem. Personally though, I think it's a smarter idea to say "Women need not apply" since that stops pretty much any of the annoying types (which I guarantee there are plenty of). If a female gamer really wanted to have a gaming buddy in the same sense as Oblivion and saw that, I'm sure she'd fill out the rest of the criteria, apply, and ask if it's still ok aslong as she practically is genderless in terms of how she acts, despite him asking for no females. If she's true to her word and is convincing, I'm sure Oblivion would still consider it just as much as any other applicant.

If he still refuses soley on the basis that she's female, then yeah, that's definitely a problem.

Well then, I'm glad we agree.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 10:13

51%=more than half. I COULD say "Above 50% and below 100%", but "51%-99%" is the same thing.

No, I get that. What I mean was I'll choose not to nitpick as to if the percentage of female gamers who are attention whores is actually above or below 50% (since neither of us know).

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 10:13

If the numbers were that close, I'm sure Oblivion wouldn't care nearly as much. Personally, I'd estimate roughly 75% of female gamers are attention whores. Again, just an estimate, and I'm sure you're going to go on some retarded nerdrage about it, but yeah.

Who's nerdraging? I like how in this thread there are two people, one of which makes lengthy posts organized with the quote function and another just posts the same picture over and over again and calls the first guy fat, and yet for some reason the first guy is perceived as nerdraging.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 10:13That's true, but when a fairly large majority of a group of people are something you pretty much hate, I wouldn't want to have to deal with the probability that the very thing I dislike to a great degree/hate would force me to deal with it.

But this begs the question of wouldn't it be more efficient and more morally correct to directly target the thing you hate/dislike strongly, rather than target groups which may or may not exhibit those qualities and hope for the best? We've already gone through this, and we've already agreed.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 10:13Perhaps so, but it's pretty much true.

"pretty much" being the qualifier that gives you a leg to stand on here.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 13 November 2009 10:13And you're using no reasoning. You've yet to make deductive reasoning on the same subject as mine (that most female gamers are attention whores). Instead, it's just LOL UR WRONG.

I'm not the one who's making a claim. I'm merely tearing down someone elses. Of course I haven't given any deductive reasoning--what would I give it on?

---