

Twitter Thread by Zer0 H P Lovecraft



Zer0 H P Lovecraft

@0x49fa98



The other day I was accused: “you can’t just make up a new theory of gender based on your vague feelings of discontent.” Hold my beer.

The old "theory" of gender, (as if it had scientific grounding) the one you can literally lose your livelihood for opposing, though only if you are a man, seems to me to have been fashioned exclusively by women feeling vague discontent

Quite on my own I had been reading about some of the early feminist texts, and it happens that modern gender theorists mostly disavow them. Obfuscation and dissimulation are to women as violent imposition of will is to men

The view of xerstory laid out in such books as *The Second Sex* is such a powerful and compelling lens that nearly all moderns look through it. We don't even see it, the world now looks alien without it, and yet it colors everything

We must destroy the claim that women are “historically oppressed” and that this bottomless well of injustice demands a similarly endless ream of legislation to nullify all male advantages.

The counter-theory (rigorously scientific, I assure you) relies on rejecting the core metaphysical assumptions of feminism, which are in fact the core assumptions of leftism in general

<https://t.co/lciR2kEREe>

what is meant by emancipation? On the left it is imagined as an escape from hierarchy. It's the idea that no one is better than you. That it's morally wrong to be above someone else

— Zer0 H P Lovecraft \U0001f6e1 (@0x49fa98) August 1, 2018

There is no such thing as emancipation. Living in society is submitting to social control. Living away from society is submitting to nature's control. Nature is a harsher master than society.

That an obligation is joyous does not mitigate its imposition upon you. Friendship is a form of obligation, as is love, as is employment, as is participation in a hobby. Failing to uphold an obligation degrades a social bond. Continued renegeation will dissolve one.

We don't like these words: control, obligation, submission. Viewing human interactions in transactional terms is highly discouraged even though it is obviously correct. This is because people who try to quantify their social obligations too closely end up with a liquidity crisis

A person who is controlled is not free, a person who is not free is low status, is seen as less of a person, even though everyone from a billionaire to a bus boy is enmeshed in a matrix of peer-to-peer social control

Wealth and power are entirely contextual and if a powerful man ceases to follow the behavioral scripts that maintain his power, it will vanish. Ultimately, your power controls you. Anyone, high or low, has the freedom to exit, but it's a desperate, unenviable freedom

Women control men at all times. Man's power is physiological, Woman's power is psychological. Cleverness beats brute strength almost every time. Women have owned you so hard that they have convinced you that you are in charge!

"All of the ways that you serve me are oppression," she says. "You must redouble your service to atone for it". Once a man has this realization he can only pity those early feminist writers; no one let them in on the joke

That women are controlled by their social obligations is seen as evidence of male domination. That men are controlled by their social obligations is also seen as evidence of male domination. When every perception is a nail, you have a favorite hammer, my friend

What looks from a distance like the power of men is in fact mostly obligation.

The desire to be free of all obligation is the desire for total societal atomization, a collapse of all social capital. The only person who would desire this is one with no social capital in the first place

<https://t.co/MITpFUjMrA>

Such a person imagines that the opposite of freedom is slavery, when in fact the opposite of freedom is love, stewardship, nurture, and patriotism. All meaningful social arrangements necessitate a relinquishment of freedom

— Zer\u0335o\u0335\u0304 \u0336\u0300\u0347H\u0334\u0302\u0332P\u0335\u031a\u0354 Lovecraft \U0001f6e1 (@0x49fa98) October 11, 2018

This is a difference between men and women, perhaps immutable: woman does not perceive HER power as an obligation, in fact she makes a study of not perceiving her power at all. Obfuscation and dissimulation. The best salesman believes her own bullshit without question

Most dissident political opinion is driven by resentment of the opposite sex.

Leftwingness is primarily female and is driven by resentment towards men.

Rightwingness is primarily male and is driven by resentment towards women.

This is obvious when you look at voting patterns by sex. It turns out that while democracy is a terrible way to run a state it's a great way to reveal that our deep-seated hatreds cluster along biological boundaries

Women are drawn to and create leftist politics because they

- * try to nurture the helpless (sublimation of maternal desire)

- * obfuscate hierarchy (women prefer covert competition)

- * redistribute wealth (trading prosperity for security)

I know, YOU are a woman who isn't like that

If a man speaks his inner thoughts and compulsions in an honest way, it will sound to most women like the shrieking of a demon. They take pride in their empathy but have no notion of what empathy for men would entail

<https://t.co/xh3r7EhvaP>

A woman can never know of the consummate coldness of the universe, for man and woman alike feel the overpowering, all-consuming need to care for women; Woman thinks that she has been controlled by man, but in fact there is no difference between control and protection

— Zer\u0335o\u0335\u0304 \u0336\u0300\u0347H\u0334\u0302\u0332P\u0335\u031a\u0354 Lovecraft \U0001f6e1 (@0x49fa98) October 30, 2018

You want a theory of gender? Historically, for every one man who managed to reproduce, two women did. Let me write that another way, to seed your intuition. 20% of women and 60% of men never reproduced, ever.

For every 4 men who made it, bro, 6 men died alone. This model has something in common with the manosphere trope that sexual success is pareto-distributed, but it's a bit more optimistic.

Probably the failure of those men was eugenic. Probably war has served humanity as a cybernetic regulator of excess men. Probably the horrors of modernity are at least in part due to an historically anomalous surplus of men.

You want a theory of gender? We WILL make every concession necessary and then some to fix the grievous inequalities inflicted on women by men ONLY when women agree that the men's issue of the reproduction gap is a form of structural matriarchal oppression

No? I thought not

How do you think people get mixed up in far-right politics? The pipeline is this:

1. You learn a feminized social theory wherein men and women are functionally equivalent
2. you try to apply this model to dating; it doesn't work
3. you realize evolution doesn't stop at the neck

Most of you "dissidents" will mellow within minutes of getting a girlfriend. I don't blame you. Your ideology should serve you, not the other way around

Isomorphic to the male gaze is a faculty of women which has no name. We scrutinize and measure (with our eyes) every inch of a woman's body. She feels this is indecent. But she applies at least as much energy to the quantification of a man, only she calls it his "character"

We are told that the male evaluation of the woman is "objectification" and it is wrong, and yet we encourage female "agentification" of men. But a man can no more choose his character than a woman can choose her face
<https://t.co/UJQOzLjIFY>

Everything is 80% heritable. (I apologize for an earlier thread where I said 50; mea culpa). This is the reactionary's hidden revelation, his revolt against the modern world. From this grim realization, much follows

— Zer\u0335o\u0335\u0304 \u0336\u0300\u0347H\u0334\u0302\u0332P\u0335\u031a\u0354 Lovecraft \U0001f6e1 (@0x49fa98) November 28, 2018

Men don't want to be agentified. We want to be loved for our intrinsic nature, which is how we love women. (Men: you will never succeed in love unless you learn to excise this desire from your inner heart)

When, in choosing a spouse, a man looks for a profound, warm-hearted being and a woman looks for a clever, alert, brilliant being, one sees how a man is looking for an idealized man, and a woman for an idealized woman

If we can stop lying to men and women about the nature of love, then our politics will also settle down. Women must learn to perceive their own innate power, and stop coveting an idealized perception of male circumstances.