Subject: Conversational Terrorism
Posted by IRON FART on Wed, 16 Mar 2005 04:59:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

This isn't anything to do with politics, and it isn't a hot topic, but it relates witht his forum a LOT.

http://www.vandruff.com/art_converse.html

I posted it here, because we've all been involved in those gargantuan threads that essentially are flame wars, and I think we've all experienced things that are mentioned on that link.

Subject: Conversational Terrorism
Posted by Doitle on Wed, 16 Mar 2005 13:50:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Good find there Iron. It's funny cause if you read it you can see certain things certain people here use. Your like oop! There's Nodbugger. Hey it's Aicraftkiller... SFE? Yep.

I know I see myself...

Quote:LUNATIC FRINGE:
If a person is making an imaginative or novel point, the approach here is to push the idea to a radical extreme generally agreed to be bad. The extreme can be either real or imagined. The hope here is that the other person will reflexively back off and retreat to a defensive position, thus short-circuiting the progression of the argument.

"So you think we ought to just throw out the whole system, then?"
"How is that different from classic fascism?"

"So you would just like to kill off anyone who disagrees with you, it appears!"

Subject: Conversational Terrorism
Posted by Jecht on Wed, 16 Mar 2005 14:33:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:THINK VS. FEEL:
A person will likely be off center of the ANALYTICAL/EMOTIVE SPECTRUM (an alternate name for this technique) in any heated exchange. By pointing out which side the other person is on, (either side will do) he/she is obliged to defend his/her temperament instead of the case at hand.

"Your cold, analytical approach to this issue doesn't take into account the human element."
"Your emotional involvement with this issue obscures your ability to see things objectively."

Its like me at one end, and Java at the other lol