

v5k2c2.com

news about cooze that's always fit to print

Dalrock (The Neverending Screech)



Rollory says:

March 13, 2019 at 2:25 pm

I am really impressed with how thoroughly you've gotten away with this lie.

Since this is the reiteration post, I'll reiterate as well:

- 1) Dalrock posted the full email exchange between Dalrock and Nathan.
- 2) As can be seen in the plain text of the emails, Nathan's initial request was that he would send Dalrock questions, Dalrock would answer them, and Nathan would discuss Dalrock's answers on Nathan's podcast. Dalrock agrees to this, with no qualifications.
- 3) At no point does Dalrock suggest a change to this format.
- 4) At no point does Nathan suggest a change to this format.
- 5) Nathan repeatedly reiterates that he will be asking questions and discussing Dalrock's answers. Dalrock does not object.
- 6) Nathan does exactly what he has said from the start that he would do.
- 7) Dalrock announces that the agreement was for a debate and a back-and-forth and Nathan broke the terms. Dalrock provides non-specific multi-paragraph quotes as evidence, none of which contain any agreement to any debate nor any specification of different terms than those originally proposed by Nathan. Breaking out seven questions into nine does not constitute any fundamental change to the terms; the subjects covered by the seven and nine are substantially the same, and the basic format remains that Nathan will ask questions and Dalrock will answer them.
- 8) Dalrock, on the strength of vigorous unsupported assertions, announces that Nathan is obviously a liar.
- 9) Dalrock's audience, being incapable of reading plain English, choruses that Dalrock is right and good.

I covered the first 6 steps in more detail with specific quotations in the original post on this topic. Dalrock has never quoted any agreement to a debate on Nathan's part because no such agreement exists. He quotes all sorts of other things that do not constitute any such agreement, then asserts that they mean what he wants them to mean. I was not expecting that. I also was not at all expecting step 9. But that's how it has played out.

While this whole process has caused me to discover many objections to Dalrock's ethics and personal traits – regrettably so, as his message on the specific topics of marriage and female behavior is indeed correct – it has also caused me to discover two points on which I admit a singular admiration: he definitely knows his audience, and he knows how to play an audience of suckers.

Someone pointed me to [this comment](#), which seems to mesh well with Derek's local commentary.

Credit to Dalrock for not deleting this comment. I realize he's doing it merely to bait the usual suckers into dogpiling, but it's still admirable to allow your critics a voice.



7817 says:

March 13, 2019 at 10:03 pm

It's a full out gamma invasion. Rollory, same username at least, was banned from vox populi a while back if memory serves.

Vox Day, [a character best known for filing frivolous lawsuits](#) when people make fun of him on the internet, is apparently some sort of hero to the goons on Dalrock's comment section. Vox Day's accomplishments including [losing a debate](#) to a goony net-nazi, and writing an [insipid, whining screed](#) about Jordan Peterson's success. Vox Day would [never allow anyone to disagree with him on gab](#), much less on his own blog, so why he should be treated as some sort of authority is an unanswered question.

It strikes me that Warhorn Media has actually treated Dalrock far better than he has treated many of his own contributors. It's also becoming something of a farce to see this argument continue to steamroll on, though I'm sure it's successful in driving traffic to both camps.



Author: Boxer

Sinister All-Male Dancer. Secret King of all Gamma Males. Member of Frankfurt School. Your Fave Contrarian! [View all posts by Boxer](#)



Boxer / 2019-03-14 / General Nonsense

38 thoughts on “Dalrock (The Neverending Screech)”



Derek Ramsey

2019-03-14 at 11:44

“...it has also caused me to discover two points on which I admit a singular admiration: he definitely knows his audience, and he knows how to play an audience of suckers.”

Hat tip to Rollory for this keen observation.

“9) Dalrock’s audience, being incapable of reading plain English, choruses that Dalrock is right and good.”

Read [Dalrock’s response](#) and you’ll see more of the same. He selectively addresses a subset of Rollory’s points and brings out the **same quotes** as if they’ll suddenly prove [his invalid point](#) because he said it again. Right on cue, Dalrock’s audience, incapable of reading plain English, choruses what he says.

I see that Dalrock is now calling Nathan effeminate now for **complaining bitterly** and **nursing a grievance**. You just can’t make this stuff up.



necron48

2019-03-14 at 13:29

Haha!, once again Boxer, your keen sense of getting to the nitty-gritty of things, and being fair and Un biased makes you such a good blogger

Dalrock will always be a coward and not treat those who disagree with him with any grace because he’s simply not able to reveal who he is. He is a loose cannon, not accountable to anyone for his actions or the things he say

Any number of you people can pull me up in a heartbeat by DM, Gmail or my WordPress blog if I step out of line.... And if you’re reading this Dalrock, you coward,

that's how it's supposed to be.



ys

2019-03-15 at 09:01

Your blog and the old articles rule Boxer. I don't always agree with what you say, either, as you don't with others you read, but you bring a smile. Thanks.

I am also petty, so I enjoy watching any cheap shots, particularly true ones, directed towards Vox Day.

Pingback: [Judgy Judges Judging - Derek L. Ramsey](#)



seventiesjason

2019-03-16 at 09:19

Many of Dalrock's comments talk about Warhorn (and who ever else is the enemy of the month) as if they are talking to women. Their logic is "they are soyboys, betas, chumps, white-knights" and in that regard I can agree with them.

The problem is the solution. Name calling, treating them like a "bratty little sister" and of course using "negs" and all the tools and tricks that Rollo outlines in his "rational male theology" (which was mostly lifted from Nathaniel Bradshaw in the 1950's and early 1960's.....). These men are convinced Warhorn, Chandler, Prager.....are "women" and thus must be treated as such.

Fact is, they are men. Biologically....many are married. Many have been through a divorce. All have fathered children, and for all intensive purposes, probably many have decent marriages considering the times we live in. If you are going to talk to fellow men like you talk to a woman when "opening a set" or a PUA, or Gamer, or Framer, or chest-thumping "Me Claudius!" and the usual "Alpha/ Beta / Gamma / Greek Soup of terms" guess what, it's probably not going to work.

They end up doubling down....woking themselves into a fit about “who said what” and “look what they said today!” and “Now they are claiming this! Off with their heads!”

The methods they use to talk to these men or reply to them won't work because they are not women. Despite as much as they *think* they are. When it doesn't work, ironically many in the Dalrock comment section end up behaving like women that they bemoan.



That Brotha Pedat

2019-03-18 at 15:48

But the people are Warhorn DO ACT like little bitch ass niggas, whether they are devoted Fathers, leaders, teachers, husbands or not. They probably are good at ALL of the above.

However, whether or not it's absolutely NECESSARY to engage them so extensively is another matter altogether.

The fact of the matter is, the Warhorn people had an agenda to fuck with Dalrock from the giddy up. Now nitpicking their podcast and making fun of their juvenile shenanigans is a matter of one's choice to “redeem the time”. I couldn't care less.

Disagree and keep it moving. Acting like hoes just isn't a good look, for MEN – at least.



entropyismygod

2019-03-19 at 16:29

Boxer,

What the fuck? Look you don't know me from Adam and don't owe me a damn thing, but what is your initial take on this? Dalrock is a guy i have been reading since 2010. I didn't see this shit coming. Is this a deep and long psyop cuck job?



Derek Ramsey

2019-03-19 at 19:38

@entropyismygod

“Dalrock is a guy i have been reading since 2010...Is this a deep and long psyop cuck job?”

In early February, Dalrock [refused to deadname](#), self-censoring to appease the feminist overlords at WordPress (and society at large). If this isn't typical cuck behavior, then I don't understand what cuck means.

I've been reading since 2017, and IMO, the **clues** have been there for at least that long. While Boxer has (mostly) defended Dalrock since I first commented here (early 2018?), recently he stated the following:

“He has directed his hatred toward my brothers, almost exclusively, for about a year now.”

Dalrock has engages in sealioning behavior: giving a pretense of civility and politeness and then making unreasonable demands on critics he targets. It's entitled behavior typical of Millennials. Other clues that tip you off: subtle plagiarism; heavy-handed moderation; refusal to reign in the insanity in the comment section, despite using moderation; close ties with Cane Caldo; frequently declining to engage in rational debate with critics (including Rollory); [bizarre comments](#); unconventional theology; and extreme paranoia / anonymity.



Boxer 🧑

2019-03-20 at 03:51

Dear EIMG:

| *Is this a deep and long psyop cuck job?*

It might be. It might also be cheap opportunism. At some point, Dalrock found that his stats inflate whenever he indulges in some meaningless squabble with some internet nobody. If I had to guess, I'd put my bet on that number.

| *close ties with Cane Caldo*

Is that fool acting up again? You can spank him, but as a confirmed masochist, it'll just thrill him.

Boxer



honeycomb

2019-03-20 at 05:17

| *Is that fool acting up again? You can spank him, but as a confirmed masochist, it'll just thrill him.*

It's too bad I can't *double* "like" this quote / post .. heh



Derek Ramsey

2019-03-20 at 05:40

| *"Is that fool acting up again?"*

Like death and taxes, if you ever write anything thoughtful on Dalrock's comment section, you're sure to get insults and irrational points from Cane Caldo. I almost never directly address his comments anymore, but still they come. Similarly, Dalrock often writes posts touting something on Cane Caldo's blog or something he

said in the comment section. Have they ever said a single critical word against one another? It's a strange relationship.



honeycomb

2019-03-20 at 10:23

Same person .. or secret lover? Tune in next week post to get the 4.1.1.

..

..



ys

2019-03-20 at 13:37

Not sealioning, but what is meant by the question and response,
“Is this a long, psyop cuck job?”



earl

2019-03-20 at 22:02

@honeycomb

In my consperitorial mind I've often wondered if one is the alter ego to the alter ego. I mean with the clownworld we have now is it that far fetched?



Sharkly

2019-03-21 at 21:52

well, after sticking up for Dalrock, to the point of being labelled one of Dalrock's bots, he boots me. LOL SMH

<https://dalrock.wordpress.com/2019/03/20/loud-and-proud-complementarians-holy-homosexuality/#comment-314565>

He put me into moderation saying he wasn't sure if I was intentionally trolling his website.

Then today he bans me from posting due to his hunch that I'm trolling his site. I can't even figure out a theory of how I've trolled him.

I do know that the cunt worshippers at Whorehorn Media called him out for having bad fruit, and specifically quoted my comment. Apparently I triggered them.(as intended) It is like Dalrock is still trying to be friends with the world, and get those mainstream churchian cucks who pissed all over him, to like him, by obeying them. Oh well, I've been shoved out of the nest, so I guess it is time to fly on my own.



Boxer 

2019-03-21 at 22:10

Sharkly:

He put me into moderation saying he wasn't sure if I was intentionally trolling his website.

Last year I noticed he singled my regular readers/contributors out for "good treatment" whenever they commented over there. Derek is a prime example.

Then today he bans me from posting due to his hunch that I'm trolling his site. I can't even figure out a theory of how I've trolled him.

If you'd like to post a critical article, submit it via the standard protocol. I'm happy to host critical theory about our friend Dalrock. Most of the men in his comment section read here regularly, and there isn't shit he can do about it.

Boxer



honeycomb

2019-03-22 at 05:23

I mean with the clownworld we have now is it that far fetched?

No



honeycomb

2019-03-22 at 08:26

I've responded ..

<https://dalrock.wordpress.com/2019/03/20/loud-and-proud-complementarians-holy-homosexuality/#comment-314821>



honeycomb

2019-03-22 at 08:29

If it gets removed .. here's what I said ..

[D: I binned it. I can't tell if you are an intentional troll or just don't understand what you are doing. Either way, it saves me work to move you from the moderation list to the blacklist, so I'll take you up on your suggestion.]

Echo chamber it will be has become .. so shall you reap.



seventiesjason

2019-03-22 at 08:53

Okay.....if Sharkly is a “troll” or may be considered one.....well.....I don’t know what to say or think. The slavish defense of anything he says by the peanut gallery bothers me.....I’ve noticed on a few occasions I will say something, and be told by the cool kids: I am wrong, Scripture says, you are defending Warhon / Driscoll / Chandler / Parkinson.....and then one of the cool kids will say exactly what I said and the compliments abound “good insight” and “that is something we all need to keep in mind”

Same on Deep Strenght.....I won’t go into the situation there but I was given the “righteous scolding” by DS and then another commenter said what I said further down and he was told “Yes, excatly...this is a good point”

It depends on who is sayin’ it

Thankfully I left Jr. High in 1985 and if these men want to grow believers in this Christian manhood, bring more in or at least teach them their points for them to ponder.....

Our faith is supposed to be uplifting, and many in the comments areas will scold you for not being as smart, or as wise, or as cool as they are. They are putting up a new fence and playing reindeer games with people they don’t know, like or deem unworthy to bask in their manhood.



honeycomb

2019-03-22 at 08:59

edit strikethrough missed in repeat post ..

Echo chamber it ~~will~~ be has become .. so shall you reap.



Sharkly

2019-03-22 at 17:14

Okay.....if Sharkly is a “troll”...

Thankfully I left Jr. High in 1985...

Dude! stop trying to be young and hip. No way you weren't out of there by 1984. LOL I just had to troll you, since we are exactly the same age.



Sharkly

2019-03-22 at 17:55

Hey, thanks for sticking up for me honeycomb. And thank you too Jason.

I think Novaseeker is probably exactly right in his assessment. It makes perfect sense, and seems in line with exactly how things went.

Novaseeker says:

Erm ... Sharkly has a history here of derailing threads with his — to say the very least — “eccentric” exegesis. Dalrock has a very light hand at moderating, as everyone who reads here knows (it’s one of the main sources of criticism of his blog from his enemies), but some people really do more damage than good — like Artisanal Troll and now Sharkly. If you’re worried about censorship, this isn’t the blog to worry about, to be very frank.

I have frequently been pointing out that the answer to many questions is the foundational truth, that the Bible never tells us that women are in God's image, while it repeatedly tells us that men are in his image, using more than one word for man, and in two different languages. Also, the Bible basically tells us women are not the image and glory of God, but the glory of man, in 1 Corinthians 11:7 and surrounding verses.

Women and men are not equal. Men were created first in the image and glory of God, and women were then created from the man as a second class of humans.

If you believe that, it destroys the foundations of Feminism, answers hypergamy, and answers a lot of other questions. This was the belief of the early church fathers. The idea that women are equally in the image of God, and therefore equal, and therefore getting a raw deal by being put under the man, is a later heresy. I believe it came about to bolster the heresy of worshipping Mary as God. How could she, a

woman, be God, if she wasn't even in the image of God? So they added women into the image of God to bolster their goddess worship of Mary. I think this following post is what really toasted the shorthairs of the folks over at Whorehorn Media:

<https://dalrock.wordpress.com/2019/02/08/warhorn-interview-male-responsibility-and-female-agency/#comment-303333>

my closing two quotes specifically have early church fathers saying that women are not the image of God. And all four quotes imply that women are lower than men. Furthermore I called them for exactly what they are and made "American" ROFL four posts below mine. They don't like to be laughed at for what they honestly are. What really must hurt though is seeing that they're the ones who have strayed from the Bible into cunt-worship, while I just plainly read it and came to the same conclusion as the Fathers of the early church, some of whom knew the people who had been with Jesus and written the New Testament. They didn't have 2000 years and 100 generations to get way off from the truth on matters that were then not controversial.



Sharkly

2019-03-22 at 18:41

I have argued strongly and convincingly for the Bible only ever telling us that men are in the image of God, and that 1 Corinthians 11:7 and surrounding passage make it clear to all but the most resistant reader that women are not. I have also pointed out that that is how the early churches where the Apostle Paul preached believed after having been taught by him. Oddly enough Dalrock never weighed in on the subject, and that led me to believe that he is still unconvinced. So what happens? He throws me out for being more Red Pilled because of my childlike faith in the words of God. He censors me at the behest of the cunt-worshippers at Whorehorn Media. Dalrock is harping about how Chivalry started the goddess worship while ignoring that early churchians stole the image of God from men alone to give it to Mary, and all other women, launching the "great whore" or false church, with a false image of God, so as to have their goddess worship, long before chivalry added its wicked cuckolding of men to the already whored out medieval church.

You don't have to believe what I'm saying is in the Bible, to see how others react to it. Nobody likes what I'm preaching, from the cunt-worshippers, to Dalrock. And they really don't like that their idea of "Men and wimmens equally in the image of God", is on the blue pill side of the fence from me and the Fathers of the church. They don't care to even run the thought through their minds and see what all it clears up. They just hurl kooky assertions around like that, then women can't be saved, or then women are animals. It chaps them that their might be a spot lower than a man, without the image and glory of God, yet still fully human. They'd rather censor me than hear me share what I and the early church fathers find the plain reading of the Bible to say.

some people really do more damage than good

Yeah, but who am I damaging? Was I thrown out for damaging your enemies at Whorehorn, who are already wrong, or was I thrown out because I was damaging your belief that; "men are equal, but mistreated, considering they have a delegated office that is not fully respected"? How about: Men alone were created in the image and glory of God, a first class of superior being, and it is only natural that a righteous God would give the more Godly class rule over the lesser ones. And when the image of God is rebelliously shown demonic contempt, it is an attack on God's image, and therefore a demonstration of contempt for God Himself.

1 Corinthians 11:7 *For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man.*

Come join the remnant!



Derek Ramsey

2019-03-22 at 19:09

@Sharkly

I've previously disagreed with you on this very topic. I'd agree that you have "eccentric" exegesis. Of course I'd also agree that *I* have eccentric exegesis, which may be why I'm on Dalrock's moderation list.

However, it's pretty hypocritical that Dalrock will block you for heresy while simultaneously allowing all manner of heresy and sinful statements by other commenters. It's also hypocritical that he'll ban for heresy and claim (or allow his commenters to claim) he isn't censoring and uses a light hand at moderation. You said this to Dalrock...

"If my comments are not welcomed here, just let me know, I'll contribute elsewhere."

...and he, rather uncharitably, replied:

"...it saves me work to move you from the moderation list to the blacklist, so I'll take you up on your suggestion."

He could have asked, respectfully, for you to drop the subject of whether women are made in God's image (or whatever else bothered him today). Instead, he treated you like a troll without even knowing for sure if you were a troll. I didn't find his snark about your 'suggestion' to be gracious either.

The funny thing is, back when I started commenting on Dalrock I asked him to let me know if I wasn't welcome. He never did, he just left me in moderation.



Sharkly

2019-03-22 at 20:35

Thanks Derek,

I'm actually less disappointed that Dalrock banned me, than I would have been at him if he had asked me to stop sharing what I feel to be the truth of God's word. In a way, if Dalrock wants women to be considered the image of God, and his God to resemble a woman, then I can see how I was repeatedly trolling his site with my patriarchy of human creation, men made above the woman, not just placed above the woman, and all that. It really is liberating to know there is no chance God will be having a period the day I'm to be judged.

I need to get off my butt and start my own blog. I have unfortunately chosen to stay as computer ignorant as possible the last 30 years or so, since I was a young prodigy in silicon valley. I decided I didn't want to spend my life sitting behind a computer screen, like a geek. I wanted to work in aerospace. LOL Now I sit behind a computer screen all day and night, only I get paid a lot less. Anyhow if you could make any suggestions, or have a way of helping me to set up a good blog, I'd be quite interested in any help or advice you could give me. Dalrock didn't kill the fungus by stomping me, he just released a cloud of spores. LOL I'll be forced to set up a platform to spread the idea that men are gods, idols to be shown reverence, as images of their Eternal Father. I'll share the antidote to pedestalizing vain women who are merely carnal creatures with an eternal soul, the glory of man not the glory of God, and the image of neither. And of course I'll share red pill stuff, and other things of interest to me. But mainly I'll be an offense to the enemies of the cross especially the great whore, who is drunk with the blood of the saints.



Derek Ramsey

2019-03-22 at 21:21

“Anyhow if you could make any suggestions, or have a way of helping me to set up a good blog, I'd be quite interested in any help or advice you could give me.”

You got it. Give me some time.

Pingback: [How NOT To Get Banned – v5k2c2.com](http://v5k2c2.com)



feeriker

2019-03-23 at 01:40

Sharkly:

I've got a blog that's 90 percent set up that I've been procrastinating putting the finishing touches on. "Unorthodox" as some claim your exegesis to be, you offer insightful and well-reasoned arguments that need a platform and this is a good reason for me to launch the blog.

Very disappointing move by Dalrock. Alas, I'm discovering more and more that the truth is less palatable to most people than they would like others to believe it is.

Pingback: [Waxing Theological \(An Anselmian Plea\) – v5k2c2.com](http://v5k2c2.com)



seventiesjason

2019-03-23 at 09:52

I did a "datamine" of Dalrock..I know how to do this.....and aside it from being a town in Texas.....there really isn't too much.....not enough for "world impact" so to speak.

The man-o-sphere, Christian or not is still a small corner of the Internet world considering the big picture. Remember that Gillette boycott? A few days of posts all over the place, and now nothing. Back to the usual: women suck, it's a great time to be a man, men need to be leaders, men are awesome, men are smart, men are amazing, how to get jacked and fit in two months by sitting around all day.....

Derek.....ah, yes....MGTOW John.....how could we forget? Ummmmmm, it looks like we already have 😊

That guy was doing "prepping" videos for a long time and some of them were good. Really good. Then suddenly, wife leaves....and "he's a MGTOW, always has been a MGTOW, and speaks for men and things they like.....like sex, whiskey, good coffee and cigars...." Just send him some money so he can "keep on making content, and so he can afford whiskey and cigars"

He gets this interview that ten Americans watched, and the whole sly thing about it was not that he was STUPID for agreeing to go on the “mainstream media” that he “despises” yet, yet thinking and believing that he and he alone was going to “turn the tide” and make all women stop, agree that they have been “behaving badly” and “change their ways” and give him a blowjob because he’s the most alpha guy in the room.....

In the MGTOW scene this now the second time someone has tried to “co-opt” the scene and indirectly declare themselves the “leader” of it (not really...but you know.....I got on TV...so you know, I should be the spokesman for it). Paul Elam tried the same thing when he realized his MRA was sinking, people were not “giving him money” to “fight” for mens rights. He then writes a book called “MGTOW” and somehow decides that he’s the leader, and MRA / MGTOW mean “the same thing” and he should just naturally be in charge.....

The way MGTOW is setup as a philosophy of sorts.....it can’t be co-opted, and there is way, way, way too much infighting inside about who is more MGTOW, what it is, and isn’t for anyone to claim leadership (it’s a penis measuring contest now in 2019)

Dalrock honestly believes that he is the future of Christian masculinity, and hey....he may very well be....but when you spend all your time telling the echo chamber “who isn’t a real Christian man” and “who lied, said this or that and when”

A bit of chick behavior.....

Also, lots of posturing and few real solutions. I think he’s got a good thing going overall.....but for growing a genuine Christian band of brothers? No way. He doesn’t want that.



Sharkly

2019-03-23 at 14:42

feeriker,

I almost always was in 100% agreement with your posts on Dalrock's blog. I'm also glad to see you having a positive influence on readers of Lori Alexander's blog. I think it is a good idea for many of us to have blogs, and link to each other, so that there is a smorgasbord of variety to choose from, and every man can find places to contribute and be sharpened that are suited to their taste and situation. I've got a pretty demanding schedule, and I don't have as much time to write, or moderate, as somebody like Dalrock apparently makes the time to do. So I imagine my blog will initially be kind of spotty as far as posting goes. And like Lori's blog, moderation may not get done until the next day. However, unlike Lori, I think I'll trust most folks, if I recognize them, or after a few comments, and allow posts to go through immediately. While I think guest posting is a great idea, if I'm going to put in all the effort to produce really quality content, as I feel I should, I'd like to host it at my own site. However I can also see how it would be wise to reach a wider audience if given the opportunity to guest post at the New York Times or some blog with a much greater readership than my own. I think my initial postings may center around aspects where I feel I'm most unorthodox. Sharing first what I think is not being offered as much elsewhere.

Women are not in God's image.

Women should cover their heads when entreating with God, because they are unlike men, who are the image of God.

Women should submit to their own husbands in everything lawful, and like men, they should be ready to bravely endure abuse to the point of death in testimony of their faith.

We are to condemn and despise the sins of all others even as we ourselves are seeking further sanctification by learning to despise our own iniquity. It isn't hypocrisy for sinners to condemn sin, it is necessary and loving. Not as the world loves, but as God tells us to love. Love with no standards, is not really loving at all.

Anyhow, if you are OK with posting rough drafts of stuff I may later refine and re-post on my own site, I might be persuaded to generate some posts and try out some material on your new blog, to help us both get started, so we can join the fine community of these like minded folks who are already blogging with red-pill enlightened minds.



Sharkly

2019-03-23 at 14:44

Jason,

You are quite a good writer. Are you at some point going to get back into blogging?



seventiesjason

2019-03-24 at 08:59

Sharkly.

I tend to write better narrative fiction or historical essays, and as Jack London said “you can only write about what you know” (the sixties, camping, architecture and modern design from the post-war era.....ie, stuff that means nothing or doesn't matter or very, very dry information on how to setup your Enterprise Storage Server or splicing LUNs and configuration of your new database.....wasted twelve years of my life at IBM with that...manuals, dry research on user centered design (UCD)). I have had a very interesting life in San Francisco, to finding Christ.....youth in the rural mystics of the Adirondacks.....college in Vermont.....an interesting journey. Now, I won't see how “unique” my journey is because all have quite a trip. I know this. Not putting anyone down for their own personal journey.....mine has a tinge of interest for the fact mine was done alone. No gf, no fb, no dating.....no live in girlfriend. No children. It was and is a solo trip which is something that is a “tad” different from others. Adding to this is that I wanted all the above things....

When I try to convey concrete ideas like I have on Dalrock.....I get frustrated very quickly because trying to convey concepts of attraction, or my observations quickly make me upset. I can't break down “looks” into concise thoughts because like wine, or coffee....very subjective. I also don't know the Bible inside and out. My faith is simple and humble....and I understand that I need to learn more.....but I am way over my head in most conversations on Dalrock, or Deep Strength.....and this causes anger, because I want to know.....and it comes off as bitter. I'm not. I'm just

not as smart as the rest of the crew there in those matters. I aslo don't have an Ego the size of God (which a few there indeed do have).

My writing is for me. I am using it to "write myself out of a labyrinth" that I was placed in.....much of which was no fault of my own. I cannot help genet, or stop my age at this point. There was hope for me when I was younger.....but not really now in the matters of women, dating.....

I don't need pity. I need just an understanding, or at least a Christian sense of men trying to understand or at least help me clairify what I am trying to say in these matters.

I don't think I'll blog again for awhile. Thanks for the compliment though.

I read an excellent biography about Bonhoeffer recently.....and it really helped me put my Christian walk in perspective. No, I am "no Bonhoeffer" but I liked how an ordinary man...ordained.....devout.....and yes, some talents and skills was really the only man who said "no" to the NAZIs and he paid with his life. He was not good looking. He wasn't married. He didn't have it all figured out...but he had the "gonads" to do what he did even when fellow Christians just did what they were told by the NAZIs and the church in Germany at the time.



seventiesjason

2019-03-24 at 09:18

Also.....what made Bonhoeffer decide to pursue theology? Become a pastor???????

It was 1921, and he saw a Bramwell Booth from the Salvation Army do an "open air" street preaching in Berlin. He was astounded at the ease Bramwell Booth could speak to the common man about Christ, without the frivolous arrogance that was in the German church at the time. And he was awestruck at the organization on how the Salvation Army soldiers dispersed prayer, encouragement, food, medical care and

HOPE to the masses on the street (Germany was in a Great Depression in 1921.....it was really bad there).



Boxer 👤

2019-03-24 at 11:02

Dear Jason:

My faith is simple and humble....and I understand that I need to learn more.....but I am way over my head in most conversations on Dalrock, or Deep Strengh.....and this causes anger, because I want to know..... and it comes off as bitter. I'm not. I'm just not as smart as the rest of the crew there in those matters. I aslo don't have an Ego the size of God (which a few there indeed do have).

I've come to suspect that your journey to sobriety paid collateral dividends. My guess is that you've taken a certain sort of red pill that leaves you immune to the desire to suspend the disbelief that is required to chase cunt.

Whether any MGTOW bro admits it or not, or even whether it comes into conscious awareness, that suspension of disbelief is an absolute necessity.

Every time I pursue and fuck some ho', it is only through a latent fantasy that she is capable of returning love and affection. Every single time. If that fantasy weren't kicking around someplace, I'd just jerk off, because solo masturbation is easier and just as satisfying as patronizing a skank's hole.

I don't actually believe it will happen. That's what makes MGTOW different from a regular simp. Even so, the delusion is always available, and it makes a bitch attractive enough to pursue and fuck.

You may just be too experienced at conquering your own self-deception to ever be good at "game." That's not me kissing your ass or stroking your ego. That's my best

attempt to describe a 6'4" 40-something who dresses well and dances, who can't find a wimminz.

Boxer

 Swanny River

2019-03-24 at 18:28

Sharkly,

I didn't see that exchange at Dalrock. I will really miss you there.

It's been a while since you've given an update. Wife still seeing a counselor? It's been a year or more since the separation. Are your sons starting to wise up?



Sharkly

2019-03-24 at 19:54

Thanks Swanny River,

I'll miss you also. You were quite helpful, like Bee. And I really enjoyed the fellowship with everybody, even with the unnecessarily contentious dingbats. However, I'm still allowed on the internet elsewhere, you'll see me around.

This last week I asked my wife when she was going to be ready for joint counselling.

The court has been giving us time to go get it. Here is her exact reply:

We have tried joint counseling numerous times. It never works because you have yet to get help for your abusive ways. That needs to be taken care of first before joint counseling will work. So, you ask me when...well, the answer is after you acknowledge that you have abused me and get help for yourself. That is WHEN I will be ready for a joint counseling session.

Anyhow, she has Intimacy Anorexia, and intentionally sabotages the relationship through intentional "distancing behaviors", and then says I'm being abusive when I call her out for her evil behavior. And I'm spiritually abusive if I show her in the

Bible what God thinks about her actions. I haven't responded back yet, maybe I could get some suggestions from all of you. She is in the midst of some pretty strong denial about her behavioral addiction. She cannot admit she is flawed, everything has to be my fault. The churchians go along with that, even though even they admit that her claims of abuse, are not valid. They can't find anything I've done, but I'm a man, so it must be all my fault, so they try to say I must just generally be a mean person.

And some of the counselling has worked for a while, but then her behavioral addiction kicks back in. The way I observed it, the counselors that came down on her the hardest, had the most positive effects, in direct relation to the forcefulness of their condemnation for her wicked behavior, then to try and not seem one sided, they'd make some general comment to me about "just try to be nicer".

I didn't figure out that she had Intimacy Anorexia until a year ago, and she divorced me when I tried to get her to go with me for couples treatment for it. However she isn't going to get the "love dare" from me. I told her she could try the "respect dare" if she wants thing to be right. I do however feel obligated to try to endure her insane shit for the sake of the children. I've had plenty of women hitting on me at work.

But, as it stands she is still unhinged from reality, getting horrible Feminist advice, and putting the kids through needless torment while blowing our savings, all while telling everybody she is trying to reconcile.

I think my boys are starting to see some things. They really want to be together again as a family, and pray for that. They love their mom, but I think they are beginning to understand the separation is entirely her choice, and that she is using me for money, while giving me nothing but grief in return. Everybody thinks they can have a better marriage than their parents, but I wonder if my sons will ever want to get married at all, when they get old enough, and realized what happened to me, and the current state of the playing field.

Comments are closed.