

(RANT) watch out who is giving you a mgtow advice: 30yo incel vs. ex-alpha male

November 8, 2015 | 0 upvotes | by [hb8only](#)

[removed]

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

pirate6728 • 7 points • 8 November, 2015 10:13 AM

Another "Emperor of MGTOW" wannabe.

Frankly, if you're a fellow who scored 100 times and more with different women--- you're an idiot. Sorry to call it like that but there it is. Couldn't learn the first time, could you.

[deleted] 8 November, 2015 10:24 AM*

[deleted]

pirate6728 • 5 points • 8 November, 2015 10:37 AM

What makes you think I'm a virgin? You're wrong as it happens--- married and divorced several years back, celibate by choice since the divorce. Me---- I'm just tired of you "RP Alpha" characters coming in here to look down your noses at your "lesser brethren". If you've had that many women--- you're a fool. In today's age, doing that many women sets you up for a host of problems you could have done without.... but I suppose that standing on the hilltop, beating on your chest and screaming like Tarzan to show what a man you are is more important, eh?

[deleted] 8 November, 2015 10:54 AM*

[deleted]

pirate6728 • 2 points • 8 November, 2015 11:47 AM

He may have more credit than you do. He was wise enough to observe what happened to others and decided not to do that himself--- it happens, you know. You, on the other hand, come in here bragging of your conquests and declaring lesser mortals to be not worthy to speak. It may be that YOU are the lesser and just don't have wit to see it.

[deleted] 8 November, 2015 11:49 AM*

[deleted]

pirate6728 • 6 points • 8 November, 2015 12:00 PM

Nope. Filter by what the person is saying. All you have said so far is that you're an RP who came in here to put down people you think of as lesser beings--- namely 30+ year old virgins. That, in my mind--- makes you a lesser being. You haven't said anything yet worth the bother except that you think older virgins aren't worth your time.

RecQuery • 7 points • 8 November, 2015 12:05 PM*

More alpha and beta talk, thinking that scoring some tinder whore makes them an authority on the subject... is TRP leaking again?

The whole sexual prowess shaming tactics is usually a female thing, when I see I tend to immediately think bullshit.

How can you be a MGTOW if you give a women everything she wants, whether she knows it or not in an attempt to fuck her?

Also if you read the Bond books he really isn't MGTOW he idolises women it just doesn't come across in the movies because there are no internal monologues.

[deleted] 8 November, 2015 08:59 AM

[deleted]

pirate6728 • 6 points • 8 November, 2015 10:20 AM

"Wise men learn by reading about it, average men learn by watching others, stupid men have to touch the electrified fence for themselves."

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 November, 2015 10:24 AM

nice one. I read a lot.

Greetings1 • 5 points • 8 November, 2015 01:52 PM*

I am a 23 year old virgin. I had an ltr for 2 years during college. She was generally a nice person but displayed typical female behavior during that time so shaming tactics, manipulation, and false victimization are things I have experience with and can talk about. My experiences however are not as extreme or as severe as other gentlemen here who were pulled by their testicles through hell as their spouse took their home, their income, and their children.

According to you I have no right to speak. Or does that only apply to a virgin man who is 30 or over? I'm a mechanical engineer by trade and my income puts me in a more manageable lifestyle than most of my peers. By 007 lifestyle do you mean rich white guy who spends money gaming chicks but never commits? Well I guess I fail on all fronts because I'm nigerian and my money goes towards my hobbies and an international ngo that I am very involved in. Getting sex is extremely easy if you flash cash and text her back. Is that good investment of my time to you?

When i tell others that I am happy because not only do I understand women mentality but am living a fulfilled life without one, that's coming from a place of honesty. Not over compensating for lack of sex like it's revenge against women.

Are you suggesting that men who haven't gotten laid by 30 need to hurry up and get on that so we can understand women better and better inform other men about female mentality? Then I suggest you purchase a vial of H2SO4 and chase it down with rest of your bullshit so you can experience poison first hand. You can't tell others poison dangerous unless you've drunken it yourself right?

Alpha male wannabes will never learn. Don't cite 007 like it's some kind of model for masculinity. The fact that you base a lifestyle off of a fictional movie is so childish and immature it makes me wonder how you live your life. Are you always dressed nice making 30 an hour jumping out of planes strolling cocktail parties and getting exotic women who think you're 'mysterious' to sleep with you? Grow up.

pirate6728 • 4 points • 8 November, 2015 02:25 PM

While we're pounding on the 007 meme, this might be worth considering.

If James Bond actually did half the stuff he did in the movies and books, he'd be dead in the first week. No secret agent could risk blowing his cover by having such a flamboyant lifestyle. He might be killed in that first week by his own outfit-- because they couldn't risk the danger he could blow other agent's cover by his shenanigans.

The whole point of being a secret agent is--- being under cover so your enemy doesn't know you're there. Dating his daughter and stealing his best wines and trashing his secret underground lair won't make it--- and won't make you live long as an agent.

While we're pounding on the 007 meme, this might be worth considering.

If James Bond actually did half the stuff he did in the movies and books, he'd be dead in the first week.

[...] The whole point of being a **secret** agent is [Duh!]

I remember a quote from Richard Maibaum, the main screenwriter of *Dr. No*, *From Russia with Love* and *Goldfinger* who said... well I'll just let him tell it (a NYTimes article by the guy from 1964):

A bright young producer accord me one day with glittering eyes. "*I'm making a parody of the James Bond films.*" **How, I asked myself, does one make a parody of a parody?** For that is precisely, in the final analysis, what we have done with Fleming's books. Parodied them. I'm not sure that Ian himself ever completely realized this. Or perhaps I underestimate his perception. At any rate, he seemed happy with what we were doing.

What's even funnier... is that OF COURSE Fleming knew that's what they were doing. Why? Because Fleming's own books were "parodies". Maibaum essentially described it -- and even (in a previous paragraph in that same article) quotes a statement from Fleming that should have made it clear, but which apparently went "whoosh" straight over Maibaum's own head:

Fleming's tongue-in-cheek attitude toward his material (intrigue, expertise, violence, love, death) finds a ready mass response in a world where audiences enjoy **sick jokes**. Incidentally, it is the aspect of Fleming which the films have most developed. Sometimes, I think, far beyond what Fleming himself intended. He said as much to me once when he commented rather innocently, "**Somehow the pictures seem funnier than my books.**"

Which means Fleming was *surprised* -- that one COULD make a "parody of a parody".

Or again Maibaum's article just a few paragraphs later:

A case in point is a scene in "Goldfinger" in which Bond is strapped to a workbench and menaced by an approaching circular saw. Somehow in the reading, because Fleming writes so effectively, "The Perils of Pauline" do not immediately occur to one. **Vividly depicted on the screen, however, we were sure audiences would find the episode old-fashioned, hackneyed and ludicrous.** What to do? We substituted an industrial laser beam, a development as fresh as tomorrow, for the antiquated circular saw. Do I hear anyone asking sotto voce about the screenwriter's blushes? If he was the blushing type he wouldn't be doing Bond screenplays in the first place. Besides, it's all good clean fun, or so he tells himself.

Well DUH!

So, yeah the FIRST "Bond" film, *Dr. No* was intended to be a "parody" of the book.

But Fleming's books were themselves ridiculous parodies -- and the character of "James Bond" was an intentional farce, a send-up -- of the very idea of a "secret agent" (i.e. the whole OSS & MI# thing, which had been "beaten to death" in a series of films in the late 1940's, including one -- "O.S.S. (1946)" -- that Maibaum himself not only wrote the screenplay for but actually narrated), and a rather "absurd" farcical sendup of the "action adventure" genre (the aforementioned "Perils of Pauline" was originally an old silent-film-serial, and had been around since 1914)... basically Fleming was "taking the piss" out of the "old boy"

network, the affectations of the upper crust "public school" Etonians -- not the least of which was himself and his mates.

Heck he even referred to his original version of Casino Royale as a "dreadful oafish opus". And Bond wasn't supposed to be some swashbuckling hero, but actually a rather inept (really more of an "upper class" version of Forrest Gump) snarky, snooty, snobbish, but inevitably *lucky* "accidental hero"; as Fleming described him:

When I wrote the first one in 1953, **I wanted Bond to be an extremely dull, uninteresting man to whom things happened**; I wanted him to be a blunt instrument ... when I was casting around for a name for my protagonist **I thought by God, [James Bond] is the dullest name I ever heard.**

Also, one other little aside in that Maibaum article:

Still there is a point beyond which audiences will reject a film for too many abuses of actuality. In "Goldfinger," for example, Fleming has Goldfinger, a supposedly criminal genius, plot to break into Fort Knox and steal 16 billion dollars worth of gold bullion. **Fleming, bless him, in the best Hitchcockian tradition, never bothered his head about how long it would take to transport that amount of gold, or how many men and vehicles would be required.** Obviously, it would take weeks, hundreds of trucks and hundreds of men.

Actually I'm quite certain that Fleming DID think about that -- and didn't give a shit (why should he? People weren't taking his books *seriously* were they?) -- in fact I think Fleming was stretching himself into "absurdity" on purpose.

But funniest of all to me is that I wonder if the above note wasn't one of the "roots" of the whole *Die Hard with a Vengeance* thing -- which of course DOES kinda/sorta attempt to create a semi-plausible answer to how you would move some massive amount of gold.

(Although even there the filmmakers seem to either not understand -- or didn't care about accuracy & played "fast & loose" -- how much gold actually weighs, because a dumptruck, even one with extra axles, etc; could not be *filled* with gold bars, the engine would be unable to move the mass, and the tires would probably blow out. Cf: A single ton of gold bars would be just 1 layer thick across the bed of a full sized pickup, and 10 tons would form a "short cube" on a single pallet {though of course the pallet would collapse}.)

Oh, and of course Maibaum was wrong about not being able to create a "parody of a parody" -- as was Sean Connery when he was quoted as saying any further Bond films would be absurd because they would be a "parody of a parody of a parody".

We know in fact that you CAN successfully make parodies several layers deep (to wit: not just Bond films, but the Dean Martin "Matt Helm" films of the 1960's, the "Austin Powers" films of the late 1990's, and of course the more recent "Kingsman" film).

But what's hilarious (or is it just sad?) is that dipshits like the OP still take them *seriously*. (I suppose that's what happens when people grow up have less and less actual experience with the real world, and live their lives more and more in fictional/artificial even "virtual" worlds -- a life focused around Facebook, meme pictures, and of course whatever the latest crapfest shitpiles the media cooks up & dishes out -- even things that are or ought to be obviously farcical are taken at face value.)

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 November, 2015 07:37 PM

I never took it that way. I am going to rewatch dr no :)

OldRoad • 1 point • 8 November, 2015 12:37 PM

Hey, if you are saying that someone who has never been in a relationship doesn't know as much about them as someone who has been (on average), I'd say, yes, there is something to what you are saying. However, if you are saying that someone who doesn't attract a lot of women doesn't have anything to add, I'd disagree with that idea. They have A LOT to say about the unfairness and broken-ness of the relationship world. Such as when good guys get completely ignored by women because they didn't randomly inherit the genes that attract women. They already have to put up with the unfairness of that. Why add to that by saying that they don't have valuable things to say (if that's what you are saying)? I think it needs to be pointed out repeatedly that what seems to attract most women, before anything else, are things that really have little to do with how good a person is. I do agree with you that the guys who have had many relationships are definitely worth listening to, also. It's a whole different view. You learn from them that, even if you are one of the so-called lucky guys that women like, you still often don't get to be happy. "Men going their own way" is a state where you rarely, if ever, date or have relationships. People get there through different paths. You can learn from all types. Everyone has their story. I don't see the value in limiting who you listen to (other than you are right that a person who has had fewer relationships may not know as much about being in a relationship due to lack of experience). But that doesn't mean they don't have anything of value to say. Whether you had a bunch of bad relationships, or never were given a chance at one, you have reason to be disappointed. I don't think we need to criticize either group to add to their unhappiness. You're entitled to your opinion, but this is just my opinion too.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 November, 2015 07:39 PM

I should put it with a better way.. and dont insult virgins.

I just dont want some 20yo virgin to give up based on mgtow. he should first try to be successful with a ladies and then select his own destiny.

but thank you for your reply