Twitter Thread by Polina



Polina
@RealPorina

Apply a material outlook.

A lot of these women make a claim to be defending the ways which men might woo a woman. To help the men get a woman and heal a fracture between the two with the eventual goal of children.

A material outlook ignores what is said as it's assumed it can't be trusted or known by itself to be sincere. This includes any verbal displays of hatred towards men as frustration may overtake one and lead them to speak what they may not believe.

So what's actually occurring here?
The purpose to which the words are put in the long term are uncertain and always a distant. In the short term, directly, they take to defending a very specific behavior that often falls under what is called "simping".

The dedication by a man of his positive attentions, affections and or funds to a woman that is someone he is not directly involved with and has no relationship or reciprocated romantic connection too.

It is generally assumed the woman has no real interest in him and may be using him. But without the assumption, this is naturally of course very similar to the actual ways relationships may begin.

The background context in which this discussion most often occurs is, however, not actually interpersonal relations between two people. It is most often in a buisness transaction of a sexual nature that does not involve sex between two, itself.

Generally it just pornography with most of the middle men removed.

(It's worth noting that most of the women here are not usually fond of pornography in the hands of men and have at times blamed it for numerous failings in societies romantic relationships, by secondary means)

The environment in which this transaction generally occurs is, however, indirect. The woman (and it is almost always a single woman who may or may not be in a relationship) has formed around her a consumer base composed largely of men.

These men do not directly interact with her but do so through various media platforms, almost never having a direct one-on-one connection at all, either.

Aside from this the closest interaction is between bank accounts.

This may be generalized of course to remove the buisness transaction and indeed, the pornographic background entirely, to simply a woman who's affections many men are competing for.

But by the fact of where we are especially, it remains that these men are most often interacting through social media accounts and their posts. It's rare they are actually present, near, or even within her notice.

Of course, a relationship may still form through such a thing, but we shouldn't pretend that almost all of them are just noise. The woman may or may not even be interested in any or even in taking on a relationship.

It's also common that these women are doing something or making something (creating some form of content) that does not even contain nor imply a pretense of romantic interests.

Money may or may not change hands in this context, but most often today there is a way to "donate" funds to a person doing such a thing. It is of course obvious that the higher the number of regulars in this sphere, the more likely ones willing to donate will appear.

In these contexts, to an almost super majority occurrence, these conflicts occur. The intent is always stated as defending, though perhaps not the men themselves nor men as any group, a practice or behavioral set by which a man may win over a woman.

Generally it is stated it is being given as a contrast to a variety of behaviors that range from insulting women in some perceived way to, at it's most extreme, defending men who raped women as "pimps".

Some groups here are more well defined than others but most as a whole are generally nebulous.

Intents aside, what are these groups actually doing though?

This excludes things like "fermenting" the hatred of women or men as those are assumptions based upon presumed outcomes.

They may be true and they may result but we don't know if that is what is intended and discerning outcomes is more complicated and currently beyond the scope of this understanding.

There are men mocking men who displays behaviors who's intent is to woo women, that are perceived as being ineffectual, weak, pathetic or most often, parasitic of both their attentions and money.

Specifically of women who have many such men forming around them and do not take actions of actual romantic interest to any of these men (though the appearance given off may or may not imply such things as a pretense or as an appearance itself)

To be investing ones time, affections, emotions, interest and money in romantic interest to a woman that has no interest in reciprocating such things with any of these men and only holds interest in the means by which he attempts to realize a relationship with her.

The buisness transaction makes this plain and puts it upfront as a given before any such things occur.
You are buying something from this woman or donating towards her producing more of it. In pornography this is as plain as it can be.

Any such affections are part of the act and must be assumed so. That is to say that (That stripper doesn't actually love you dude, that's her fucking job).

You might also know this as the "Hooker with a heart of gold".

Which is media where she turns out to be a good woman, who wants a better life, and can be changed by the man into a decent woman.
The observation of attempts at this in real life is summed up in the joking statement of "I CAN SAVE HER" (The usual attitude of these men).

That these things are mocked and almost always have been is no accident.

Cue the bar scene and "I LOVED HER, MAN" with a hand on the shoulder.

These men seem to be single, in a relationship, or may often be married themselves.

There does not appear to be any sole group amongst those mocking.

The mocked may contain both men who are indeed trying to win affections, but also (by a wide net, both at times intended and not) men who are there solely for what is being provided and nothing more.

Their behavior is simple buisness (in the case of pornography) or patronage (of a sort)/support (in the case of nonpornographic content).

Though these are far from the men at the heart of this and far from the men who are mocked most.

The men here need not their behavior described to any further depth. Both groups seem well aware of their behavior but break on it's outcomes and usefulness.

There are men who are giving their time, money, affections and attentions to women who may or may not hold any interest in them and with whom they have no direct or real world contact. That they are seeking their affections is denied by none of the groups.

There are women on the receiving end of these things who may be pornographers, non-pornographic content producers, or may even simply be personalities.
None of which inherently contains any interest or desire towards a relationship or future with those men.

Some may be directly pursuing these things invested by these men, some may be receiving them without direct pursuit, some may be pursuing solely money and some may be pursuing the benefits attention brings.

But those aren't the women at the heart of these conflicts.

The conflict under examination stems from women that may or may not be involved in this process and may or may not be pursuing something from the men, but often don't seem to have any place in the women just discussed.

The chief concern of these women is stated as the perceived misogyny displayed by the men who mock and the defense of the men who pay. Often the claim is said to be because it makes the men hate women and then there is less chance at relationships, marriage or otherwise,

and no chance of children, let alone children that could be raised in a two parent home. Or at least that is the appearance often given, one of interest in either acquiring this for themselves or with the health and chances of this for a race.

There are women who you may call the core of this and there are other outlying women who grant it support at times for fear of the same things and perception of a hatred of women that denys all future.

Regardless of their shared intents, the actions of the outlying women are radically different from those of the core. The outlying hold concerns and will even at times be more clearly focused on reconciling the two than supporting either.

The cores actions do not concern solely these things and often they can be seen engaging in a similar behavior of the men who mock, but of both them and men outside any of these groups. Their chief concern is both the protection of the perception of women and the behavior of men.

Perhaps the perception is that no woman would ever want such men and the men must change, which may be a healthy thing but also may not. But this is a perception.
The actions attempting to dictate behavior are not and this is what draws their attentions.

Alongside this these women also curtail influence, a necessary currency in what is occurring. But their followers are not by and large, women. Their interactions that do not engage targeted men are not largely with women

(though their most constant interaction is within a small group of women who are consistent regulars within this and form what is referred to be the core, though are not it's sole inhabitants)

Their interactions that do not target "bad behavior" men are largely still with men. Largely men who's own actions place them into what is referred to as "simps" and these men make up the whole of followers. Mostly spending their time praising and granting them their affections.

Some of these women in fact make it no secret that they largely act to this end. These women, surprisingly, give the pretense of such affections and wear the appearances of almost divine aesthetic art of women as their avatars and profile banners.

Some of them I've noticed even have "pet names" used to refer and talk to the body of their followers, indirectly. Sometimes they don't even see themselves acting as independent and specifically make it a show to these followers and use "we" and "us" and other group designations.

Though these ones are often the overtly paganistic ones and adopt handles and names that are not shy about it. Unironically using things like "goddess" in conjunction with common terms of neopaganism.

Of the other ones in this core, the group displays and shows are still present. Though not so gaudy and ridiculous.

The followers are not distinct between the two.
You will find those regular women in the comments, very consistently, but even more consistent are the men making a show with praise and agreement to an exaggerated degree.

Whether these men are appealing to these women or are just eccentric and insane, is not clear and a perception (both are common here)

But the main actions of these women is cultivating this large body of men and their attentions while curtailing the behavior of other men.

It should be noted that what is often curtailed (for good or bad) is usually behavior that attacks women who are specifically doing this with unclear intent but obvious awareness of this body of men and behavior that attacks such men.

This is not to say that other behaviors are not targeted in nearly as many efforts but these are what the most regular and common of engagements are over. Other behaviors (such as men who are cheating or shaming of women for cheating) are also present in high degree as targets.

The former is not a complicated engagement and involves targeting, highlight, attacking and presenting as Casus belli for everything else.

The latter seems to be present in a higher degree, is more complicated of an engagement and more often involves the followers and a rather blatant drop is semantic skills.

What the intent of the argument is is stated to be an attack on double standards and misogyny. The reason given for the disparagement in the topic (Cheating is itself not attacked) is a presumed and "given" disparity between how often men are shamed and how often women are.

Again, it need be stated that infidelity is never itself attacked and only denounced when the other person makes note of the disparity in the argument. This is accepted by them.
When the targeted person does the same, it is not.

That is, when the targeted person states that it's bad no matter what, this commonality isn't accepted.

Cheating itself is never directly attacked. Denunciation of it only occurs some time after the argument has begun. Both stating this does not cause them to break off nor seek some middle ground as an opening to make the argument.
The arguments only end here when either

blocks or stops responding, or in the rarer case, specifically denounces the shaming and targeting of women for cheating.

The only time when the act of cheating is directly attacked by them is when it is made clear that a man cheated.

Here another discrepancy forms.
When attacking the shaming of a cheating woman, often the argument stated is that "it takes two to tango".

The incident though almost never makes it clear that the other person was involved in their own relationship or even knew that this woman was.
This is an assumed.

This assumption is not stretched the other way.
When attacking a man having cheated, this is never said by them but has on some occasions been said by others.
The response is also the reason regularly given for the discrepancy.

That there is already a present discrepancy within these circles.
Within these circles when the act itself is attacked and denounced, this still pulls them.

No explanation is ever given why and instead the denunciation and attack by the targeted person is framed in a context more useful to them.

It does not seem to matter to what degree it may be misrepresented. The followers do not acknowledge that it is or do not look.

In this form this is identical to the principle of feminist theory and rhetoric that, there is no neutral representation of these in society and so there can be no neutral feminist theory. The pretext and it's targets must be chosen in a fashion as biased as what is perceived.

If one removes the narratives here (that this is improvement of men, for fairness to women and (the more unique) the betterment of the race) there is nothing distinguishable about these women from the same women that provoked this entire thing.

In action it is the same.
Without the narratives, even the targets are the same and nonwhites are not intentionally targeted for their efforts. Only white men.

In my own experience, the discovery that I am only part white, was enough for all of them to break off from the argument.

Again; the narrative that it is for improvement of White men to facilitate more relationships and more births and to the defense of white women, does not change the underlying actions or differentiate them from the same mainstream feminism.

Even the acts of shaming nonwhite women for cheating earn their presence.

Nonwhite men are avoided from their efforts entirely.

To my knowledge, no one has ever reconciled this with their apparent goals and pro-white attitudes and one or twice when someone has noted it, it's avoided.

The men who mock and the men who pay and even the women who are paid are all clear and present in their actions and stated motives as well as who they target.
Only one of these groups is not.

Let alone that it's only secondarily that it's argued that attacking simps is attacking women.

A very specific kind of white man is protected, a large body of white men is attacked. Nonwhite men are not engaged with or are disengaged with when this is discovered.
White women are generally protected, but so are nonwhite women.

When a white women opposes this, she is mocked and derided with very bitter and typical insults of cattyness.

>Oh you're so special. You're not like the "other" girls. Those whores. Right?

This is personal experience as at other times, they've thought I was a white woman.

But they disengage with nonwhite women who oppose this when they are discovered to be such.

While a perception can be drawn from nearly all of this, simply looking at their actions and what is consistent as their rules for engagement, disengagement and what is to be argued and isn't, none of it is inline with what it's intention is stated to be.

That there are women who are frustrated, hurt, or angered by mockery of women and other such comments, among them does not change this as the rules by which the most active, dedicated and well known of them work.

That one may note this difference at all may say something itself, but by action this difference is stark itself.

Without the rhetoric of being pro-white and the framing of these things as "good for white people", the actions themselves do not in any way stand apart from anti-white feminists.

The latter of rhetoric is not unique to them either and is also employed to manipulate by the same women they present themselves as opposites to.

The only real difference is that they are more controlled in picked their targets, but said targets whose behavior they want to change are the same and the statement that they are "pro-white".

Wignats once mocked conservatives as "racist liberals" in an attempt to highlight that they were really no different from many stripes of leftism, except that they also pushed jews and bombed arabs.
I found this started in the same "pro-white liberal" part of twitter.

This argument itself never really held (partially due to the semantic similarity to "THE REAL RACISTS" and it's general awkwardness) and was easily brushed aside by something everyone here acknowledges. They embrace the fuck out of arabs and import them all the time.

This pro-white liberal section often presents itself as seeking reconciliation and solidarity to the benefit of the political landscape for whites.
Considering ideas is one thing.
Seeing the same ideas held by mainstream liberalism re-framed to be white friendly while

no actual changes have taken place and attempting to insert them and disseminate them through various ports of access in our part of twitter is no different from subversion.

While I argued over the racist liberal thing once before, I let it go eventually as just turbulence in a forming dialogue.

It wasn't heavily enforced and wasn't hostile all the time. It was also open and malleable and the idea changed somewhat to input.

This has been none of those things.

This has not been about a political party either but directly deals with white people, the race as a whole.
It also does nothing but berate the men further in all the same ways while promoting the kind of man who is completely indistinguishable from the soyboy.

Not even only the kind that might say "White people aren't evil", but in general.

Many people in that part of twitter hold ideas that are similar to many found in leftism, but do not exclude white people.
Perhaps the biggest difference is as to how it benefits or helps the race and racialism in general.

That and the overt disdain for capitalism that liberals are so quick to suddenly love and embrace at the drop of a hat.

That is to say that, they don't really hate it and rush to it's defense when it's useful.

Even the ideas that appear to be shared are not often shared and not in their entirety. But a simple re-framing and the pleasantness you feel wash over you at the idea of further white togetherness, are more then enough to take care of that.

i.e. hide them from sight.

You are, despite all appearances, very trusting people. But also very eager. Together, you know very well how those have only hurt you down the road.

I know how you feel.
It's arrogant and presumptuous of me in ways that cross lines of deep insecurities and fears but, I also can't just do nothing when I think something is not occurring honestly and it may harm you.

This relationship with them needs to be reexamined. There are too many contradictions and too many bad similarities and since they have entered the pictured, these women, those divides and lines you so worry about have only been exacerbated. It has only gotten worse.

The two have only been driven farther apart since their entrance and the conflict between groups seems near endless.

I don't know what answer to give to the women who are sincerely concerned that they would find satisfactory or even helpful, but since these other women have come along, those answers only seem more distant and impossible.

I feel like I fail them every time their concerns flare and no better answer is found. I feel like I fail the men every time I fail to get across that love is dangerous and this danger is implicit in investing oneself in another and allowing them in, but that there's

no other kind of love. There is no safe and protected love. The only kind is in what people call a "loveless marriage" and that's not love.

That it was always this way, no matter the times and it always will be. But that if you don't go and do it anyway, things will never change back to what you both evolved to find comfort in over these millennia and that eternal presence between you two will die.

Along with it, your race.

And if you don't find concern in that connection dying and aren't willing to risk the pain, then you can't hold claim to concern for your people and they will die.

And all you were really concerned about then was entertaining yourself until death remove the problem entirely.

But it's not enough.
And I don't know the answer and I can't seem to help my own brothers. I fail them again.
I only know that more of the same is not an answer either.

And things have only gotten worse for it's presence.

The mind, this material, is not up to par it seems for the answers the spirit desires. I fail my family.

Again.