**A moralistic take on introversion and extroversion**

There’s been a lot of talk the last few weeks with social life having been so massively touched on the structural level, about introversion and extroversion.

Introverts are loving the hibernation, and extroverts are languishing, so the story goes.

That’s a storyline folks that’s one dimension wide, and it’s boring, and it’s stale, because here’s the thing about intro/extro the way we tell that story:

It lacks capacity to tell us whether the person within the personality is really doing well, or that well, or some other way, or not. It doesn’t tell us what we actually want to know.

We don’t know what the strengths and weaknesses, or anything going on in or around the boilerplates concepts we’ve all already memorized.

But this is how we talk about our identities. Take introverts right now. As a psychologist I can tell you a lot of them as we know are enjoying the decrease in social expectation, which often causes a lot of pressure, leads to anxiety, is draining because of ambivalence or perhaps a more unified inclination such as being reluctant to engage.

With the decrease in pressure, and many of the nice trickle down effects therein, we would have a pretty strong case to say: this is pry good for them. Yes? Yes, yes indeed.

Now, even as this is widely happening within and across many of us right now, is there too a counter-argument to be made about *other* parts of introversion that are *simultaneously* going poorly? As a psychologist I can tell you, you betcha.

Are these personalities of ours then good, and also problematic, as something of a mixed phenomena?

Yes, exactly. One of the biggest problems in our purely descriptive discussions of personality is the lack of guidance and value, and frankly depth, inherent in a deterministic/value neutral takes on our persons. You know what’s even more mind-numbing is the sub-sect of personality discussion that says we’re all superstars and inherently good. Neither are true and you see it right now because, fascinatingly, introverts are struggling without social life, for the same reasons extroverts right now are benefiting from the value of private life, even as they dream of lots and lots of large parties. Meanwhile, introverts are also enjoying the isolation as we might expect and extro’s still sweat the sensory deprivation.

How to make sense of the dense, overlapping logic? Simple. Get moralistic, fast and thorough. For extroverts the undesired privacy of our everyday lives is every bit as good, problematically, as the same thing, on the conceptual level, is bad, potentially, for the person who naturally desires it so much say, they find themselves overdoing it, and withdrawing from something good for them until this too begins to harm, even while in other respects benefiting from it, because it’s good and they’re inclined to benefit.

Many intro’s are beginning to remember the painful virtue of having interaction, and this makes perfect sense in a value-driven conception of personality for the same reason a conversation about our psychologies without a sense of us being being good and bad has nowhere to go.

But why do we have go back to that old, moralistic way, do we ask? Because it’s good when it’s good. And here’s the key: good is better than neutral. Every time, in every way. Neutral is also better than bad, for the same reasons. We collectively have had such a bad time with the bad parts of valuing and evaluating and structuring our lives morally to where we’ve settled for the concept of neutrality that stretches from one side of our society to the other.

Our culture’s herculean attempt to hyper-subjectify and individualize life has significantly obscured for some of us everyday, profound, ontological, facts such as: being together is good for us in a way we now, by virtue of lack, are viscerally aware of, in the same way it is also bad for us, in the ways we are now viscerally aware of, alternatively, paraxodically, and consequentially.

The other side of the coin we are living, and the way in which it so interestingly comments on the strengths and weaknesses of introversion and extroversion, need to net out to cooler conversation, and for that we need morals. If we’re going to be our best selves, we need a way to actually get there. The best self is, ‘itself’, a moralism. It apparently is better - more good - than all these other selves kicking around.

If so, it’s time we moved beyond value-neutral characterizations of personality, back to evaluative takes, which whenever we got up the courage to re-enter morality never fail to free us up to do more good and less bad. And that’s better, and maybe even best.