

(Re: "Presumption of Whiteness" comments)

My greatly belated replies, first to "Guy123456789", then to Tenzin.

First, "Guy"... why no "Ø"? Despite the digital omission, I still really appreciate your words! As you can see, it's now late-July 2023 (August by the time this posts), and you wrote in what, March? For some reason I never received either of these 2 comments on "The Presumption of Whiteness." A friend finally sent me a copy of Tenzin's unfortunate comment, but I had to ask for yours from BTB, which these fine folks promptly provided.

So, it looks like your comment here is sort of a general reply to ALL the comments Tenzin left on various posts (This one; "Parent Test (Addendum)"; "So Hey, What Time do the Riots Start?"; and "After all these Years, I finally had to say something..."). Is that about right? You wrote this so long ago, you must think I just ignored you. Sorry for that. I try not to ignore any comments, but especially not ones so supportive as yours.

You asked Tenzin why she's so sure I'm not the person portrayed in my posts. I assume you mean her attacks that seem so oblivious to the values I espouse, which if sincere would be incongruous for someone who'd hurt people the way she claims I did. You wondered where she'd seen the things she's "heard about me." Since she didn't answer you (unless she did, and I never saw that comment either !!), I'll offer that she probably just googled my unique last name and found the treasure trove of hit pieces and prosecutorial propaganda that invariably arises with cases like this, rather like liquefied turd sludge following a septic leak. The truth is thoroughly irrelevant to "true crime" crusader types - they only want the salacious and system-supporting sound bites, which is why their "reporting" only ever has one source: police & prosecutors. (You might say, "That's 2 sources!", but no... they're merely two sides of the same single coin). I was certainly never contacted by any "reporters", nor were my family, friends, or anyone else remotely connected to real life events in this case. None of my 4 worthless lawyers were asked for statements, and ESPECIALLY none of the central witnesses or their families were ever asked a single question... god forbid an alleged "victim" were to give a wrong answer on record! No, only pigs and pigproxies were ever asked for their safe and predictable statements. See, it's not ~~entirely~~ the fault of Tenzin and others that their views are so distorted from reality, as they often have no access to anything but the highly processed, filtered, manipulated, and manufactured versions of events provided by the

GIGO, as
they say: Garbage In, Garbage Out.

Very people who are paid to make such stories appear as one-dimensional as possible. ~~say: Garbage In, Garbage Out.~~ I appreciate your recognition of the gulf between the person who is evident in these posts and the cartoon villain portrayed by the media, the courts, etc., as well as by the many who prefer simple caricatures to complex humanity; folks who readily assume that a mere charge or conviction is all there is to a story. I am, as you suspected, absolutely "the person in these posts." Thank you.

Oh, incidentally, it does seem at least some of Tenzin's information must come from a ~~more~~ creative source than simple police-report-based stories, given her apparent commitment to some wild ~~claim~~ ^{"350 victims (sic)"} claim. Just as a matter of sheer arithmetic, that one is absurd. From the age of 18 to today I've spent less than 6 years in the real world, about 70 months. To accumulate 350 "victims" in 70 months, one would have to "molest" more than one entirely new person ~~each week for that time.~~ Even for a Master "Groomer" (the primary boogieman of sexual paranoids today), that would be some astoundingly efficient work, wouldn't it? (Question: In this context, is a Master Groomer synonymous with a Master Baiter? I'm just wondering.) In any event, you'd think anyone with such extraordinary social finesse would find some lucrative way to capitalize on their skills. Myself, I worked on bikes, trimmed trees, and answered phones for money, all of which seem like tragic wastes of the prodigious talents one must necessarily possess in order to bed a brand new partner every single week — and sometimes more — for six full years without a hiccup. Wouldn't a person eventually catch a cold and slow down for awhile? Anyway, something to ponder when you consider what makes a person credible, or otherwise.

Now to address Tenzin's comment in this one reply, for economy's sake. Tenzin, this post I titled "The Presumption of Whiteness" was, more than anything, meant to invite critical examination of the assumptions we make about "race" and police violence. I'm really at a loss as to why you thought I was ~~saying I'd never~~ suggesting that "black" inmates never get beaten up in prison, period (which truly would be an incredibly stupid thing to say) ... the post pretty clearly said, over and over I believe, that I've not seen "black" prisoners beaten up disproportionately BY COPS, as they ~~plainly~~ are outside the walls. I'm genuinely sorry to hear about your friend who was stabbed in the neck and killed. I've seen plenty of that type of violence up close, and it is horrifying. But what you described was surely an incident of inmate-on-inmate violence, right? Even I don't believe a cop would do that, though they are capable

of nearly any atrocity. Most of that sort of violence I've witnessed has come down to gang rivalries and drug debts, with a significant minority portion connected to fragile wanna-be alpha egos in relation to transgender prisoners on the "SNY" side.

Since you brought up "SNY", let me clarify for the uninitiated. It means "Sensitive Needs Yard," and in California it's long been a watered-down version ~~of the~~ protective custody" that was traditionally reserved for the very highest profile and endangered inmates. "Protective Custody" ^(PHU) in California prisons has never held more than about 100 prisoners of the +/- 100,000 inmate population. "SNY", on the other hand, has outgrown the "mainline" facilities as these once rare yards have been expanded and filled with "drop outs" (ex-gang-members) and others wanting to escape the violence and ~~politics~~^{politics} of the "mainline". It's gotten so unbalanced, in fact, that those things all crept into SNY, which is now rife with gangs as well, and the system has converted all Level I's and most Level II's to "NDPF", or Non-Designated Programming Facilities... ie, they're eliminating the General Population ("GP") and "SNY" labels altogether and mixing everyone whether they like it or not. PHU still exists (true protective custody), but the only inmates there are in serious, constant danger, and they usually don't even get that protection until they've had a few holes put in them, sadly. It's all quite sickening and really nothing to make light of.

That said, it's interesting that you assume I'm "P.C." (protective custody) or "SNY". Maybe your experience on RTB has taught you this rather arcane distinction as well as that Mule Creek, where I'm held, is a known SNY prison (though the level I and level II are now "NDPF", of course, ~~with~~ with a growing number of non-drop-out "mainline" prisoners). But I suspect your assumption comes from the conviction I've suffered, leading you to jump to conclusions about the nature of the case, about my character, about the others involved (who you harmfully label and degrade as "victims"), and now also about where I'm held captive. You discounted my observations about police abuse in prisons due to your presumptions... about the limitations of my experience here. In fact, though, I spent nearly 8 years on "the mainline", no "SNY" or "soft yards", no concessions at all. I've been at every prison level, including a level III "I80", akin to a "supermax" where many "mainliners" go after leaving the "SHU" (Security Housing Unit, or long term "hole") while they debate how they want to move forward. I've seen a LOT of prison violence among a smorgasbord of ethnicities, colors, and criminal convictions. This yard I'm on now is easily the "softest" I've seen, even softer than the level I I spent a year at, but even here the demographics closely mirror the prison

population across the state. In this 66-inmate unit alone, we have 19 "black" inmates; 18 "white" ones; 25 hispanic, and 4 "other". Perhaps you'll reconsider your assumptions about prison demographics in light of these facts.

When I said I hadn't seen any "black" inmates gratuitously roughed up by guards, I qualified that by counting only indisputable physical violence by guards that was NOT in the course of breaking up a fight or defending themselves. Anyway, since then I've remembered 2 incidents with "black" inmates, one clear and one perhaps debatable, but my point still stands: with a prison population far higher than in the real world, ~~caged~~ "black" people do not ~~seem~~ to experience commensurately higher levels of police abuse on the inside, but instead are abused roughly equal with "white" inmates, suggesting that the "race"-based disproportionality of pig aggression is diminished or eliminated in an environment where, to a cop's evil eyes, all non-cops are equally deemed "niggers" and open for abuse. ~~Put~~ Put another way, the concept of "whiteness" as social privilege has little meaning within a population of confirmed "criminals", which further suggests that police may generally be not so much "racist" as they are "coppist", i.e. preferring and protecting their own porcine brethren first; the presumably non-criminal public second; while treating all others with a blanket contempt.

You wrote, "there's no such thing as coppism". IF you mean it's not a household word yet, then of course you're right. But then, until relatively recently, ~~racism~~, sexism, and ~~ageism~~ weren't words in that sense either. Neither was "blog", for that matter, yet here we are. The idea that "coppism" refers to is unquestionably real. It's another manifestation of our human tendency to embrace exclusive identities and then dehumanize those outside our circles. A form of "groupishness", perhaps (also "not a word" in common usage yet, but one which — I agree with Dr. Jonathan Haidt — should be).

Speaking of words... wow. "Serval predilections"? Nice phrase. I've never seen "Serval" used as an adjective before, though — are you sure it's a word? Well, maybe it's a noun-modifier, I forge the rules on that. Anyway, a serval is a beautiful creature in every sense, and as I'm deeply partial to cats, I'll thank you for the comparison. Many of my friends called me "Squirrel" though, not serval, a nickname I'd always taken as a reference to my edge-of-control riding style, but which I suppose could've worked as well as a cheeky ~~allusion~~^{allusion} to a fondness for nuts. Now that's a predilection I'm not inclined to dispute, and it may just explain my continued engagement with

you... a fondness for nuts as well as the ~~deftly~~ executed multiplication of entendres. :)

Oh, last thing, sort of related to "Serval" (as an adjective)... I may write a post soon about the emotionally manipulative ~~misapplication~~ ^{misapplication} of zoological terms to human behavior, but whether I do or not, I thought I should tell you that as I endeavor to evolve from the merely "half-assed" warrior for justice that you've noted into an unmitigatedly complete and total ass (for justice), I will undoubtedly write more posts you'll consider "improper and misguided", just as you predicted here. Of course, you're welcome to continue reading and even commenting, but since you explicitly said that the posts where I'm "showing my ire" tend to "make you very angry", I wanted to give you a friendly heads-up. Maybe there can be less anger and more constructive engagement going forward, I don't know.

I need to get back to work, collecting statements in memoriam for people who knew Whispers. So far, despite enthusiasm to talk about him, getting anyone to put it on paper is like herding cats. Assembling servals? Something like that.

-Dymtri