

New York Magazine's cuckold probably a spinster's hoax.

125 upvotes | 24 July, 2015 | by redpillschool

Via [Heartiste](#):

She didn't present it as an issue of feminism to me, but after much soul-searching about why the idea of my wife having sex with other men bothered me I came to a few conclusions: Monogamy meant I controlled her sexual expression, and, not to get all women's-studies major about it, patriarchal oppression essentially boils down to a man's fear that a woman with sexual agency is a woman he can't control. We aren't afraid of their intellect or their spirit or their ability to bear children. We are afraid that when it comes time for sex, they won't choose us. This petty fear has led us as a culture to place judgments on the entire spectrum of female sexual expression: If a woman likes sex, she's a whore and a slut; if she only likes sex with her husband or boyfriend, she's boring and lame; if she doesn't like sex at all, she's frigid and unfeeling. Every option is a trap.

This paragraph is the crone giveaway. A bitter, lonely cat lady wrote this article as a hoax to fellate her scorched ego and lash out at all the men who pass her by or use her up. True, the lowliest of lowly men COULD have written such excrescence, but the way to bet is that an insol spinster with delusions of vengeance and... sexual agency (heh)... fantasized this whole scenario into existence. She hits too many jargony femcunt talking points too squarely on the whiskered nose. Madonna/whore double standard? Check. Alpha fux/beta bux strategy justification? Check. Anti-judgmentalism? Check. Patriarchal oppression? Check. Dismissing as cultural baggage the real, primal, biologically-founded fear men have for cheating wives who might get pregnant by another man and foist their bastard spawn on them as their own? Checkold.

[Read More](#)

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] • 188 points • 24 July, 2015 03:10 PM*

I once had a summer job at a breakfast stand and got bored. To pass the time, I started trying to sell customers whipped cream on their eggs. At first I just tried going to them with a normal sales pitch but they all thought it seemed unappealing and had absolutely no idea why I was trying to sell them such crappy dish. I wisened up pretty quick and changed my approach. Instead of selling to customers, I just offered it as if it was normal. Someone would order a breakfast sandwich and I'd just ask, "Whipped cream?" and then call out "Breakfast sandwich, no whipped cream." At first I got weird looks but eventually my coworkers got sick of my shit and stopped reacting. They treated my behavior as mundane and ordinary because it was.

When customers saw this, all they saw was some bored kid with an offer he seemed to think was normal and they saw nobody reacting weirdly. My customers were also repeat customers mostly so they saw this day in and day out. When they asked about it, I didn't try to sell. I just said it was really really popular. I'd *normalized* egg sandwiches with whipped cream. After a while, a few brave customers ordered the abomination of a sandwich themselves. Now, the sandwich made a mess and probably tasted like shit so we didn't sell too many and nobody ordered it twice, but I *did* get people to buy that sandwich by presenting the illusion that it was normal. That's what this magazine writer's doing with cuckolding. She's presenting it as normal and trying to alter public consciousness. She's not saying "Hey men, do this!" because she knows she can't argue it any better than I could argue egg sandwiches with whipped cream. She's just saying, "Hey guys, it's normal".

Btw, I plugged this into a gender analysis. It's a tough call to make if this is a hoax or not because it's a cross between formal/informal writing and those gender analyzers are only so reliable, but Heartiste's theory isn't too unlikely.

dr_warlock • 70 points • 24 July, 2015 04:21 PM*

This is exactly how indoctrination works. This is what Ex-KGB officer Bezmenov was talking about in the clip, "Demoralization". You keep repeating narratives and propoganda [MANDATORY], and eventually the new generation is born. Now from the perspective of these kids, this false information is normal. They've never heard anything else. As a matter of fact, how could you think otherwise? This is how SJW nonsense like feminism spreads its ideological disease. It hits people on all fronts: it starts at school (pre k to masters degree, ~ 18 years), then is reinforced mainstream news media outlets, magazines, advertisements, tv shows, hollywood, political speeches, and useful idiots (sjw's & feminists).

The matrix is **everywhere**...

Sarcasticus • 54 points • 24 July, 2015 04:49 PM

It's scary how insidious this is. 30 years ago, college students were the outspoken rebels challenging authority. Now, they're the new thought police. God help you if you challenge any progressive idea on campus.

dr_warlock • 14 points • 24 July, 2015 05:53 PM

Boy, do I have a video for you. Straight from the Red Pill Video Compilation Nuke.

vandaalen • 6 points • 24 July, 2015 07:19 PM

To me it's even more scary that this is planned well ahead. These people do not think in terms like

"next week" or "next year", but more like "next decade" or even "next generation".

Makes you wonder if there is even another hidden agenda involved.

[deleted] • 3 points • 24 July, 2015 08:32 PM*

You are only at the stage find the *how*. What we need is to find the *why*.

But I am amazed to see how the guys who pull the strings manage to be so stable over the centuries.

I would not be surprised if the motivation was some kind of revenge seeking.

cariboo_j • 5 points • 25 July, 2015 12:01 AM

Occam's razor, man.

Broad social trends are most likely the result of individuals acting according to their evolutionary programming.

You know how mobs of people appear to act as a single unit? Or how ants seem to formulate plans and carry out complex tasks even though individually they are fucking stupid?

It's the same thing with any "agenda" you try to extrapolate from social trends you are seeing.

Which explanation requires less assumptions? People act in their own self interest in their immediate sphere, and this large amount of small actions and agendas combine into a broader social trend?

Or the Jews are running the world with banking and they have some secret society that wears funny robes and has secret handshakes and shit. Jewish people can't even agree on whether or not Israel is a good idea.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 July, 2015 09:09 AM

Problem is that there is a feed back in your system as ideologies condition individual behaviours, But I agree on the theory of spontaneous organisation resulting of a group of people acting obeying to the same patterns,do the patterns come from their biology or their education.

fortifiedoranges • 1 point • 24 July, 2015 09:18 PM

Well people have been trying to exterminate Jews for centuries. Perhaps you should start there.

I_is_the_best • 1 point • 27 July, 2015 02:56 PM

There are two possible options:

A) there's something about jewish culture that makes people react negatively to them B) people hate them for no reason

IDK but logically it seems it's A.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 July, 2015 09:25 PM

You are designing a group of people, what we should looking for is an ideology. Only an ideology can be stable on such a long time.

fortifiedoranges • 4 points • 24 July, 2015 09:37 PM

Judaism is an ideology though, and it has survived centuries of turmoil. Why has the

hate for its practitioners not subsided? I have some thinking to do.

[deleted] • 0 points • 24 July, 2015 09:45 PM

Your point is interesting. I'm gonna try to study the tal mudic texts to see if I can find the answer to that question.

lachiemx • -1 points • 25 July, 2015 03:57 AM

People always hate what's different. And nothing is more different than intelligence, because it changes the way you think and act in almost every way.

They're hated because they are smarter, like the nerds at high school.

I_TRY_TO_BE_POSITIVE • -1 points • 26 July, 2015 12:25 AM

Well, for one, Judaic teachings are very insular, and historically despite what most people think, the Jews were a very violent, zealous people at different points in their early history.

Kool_Kings • 1 point • 2 August, 2015 08:38 PM

Democrats NEVER admit to accomplishing their goals, and you will NEVER give in to the point that they're satisfied. Just think of all of the things that they're doing now that they never would have admitted to 30 years ago.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

throwaway320_ • 1 point • 25 July, 2015 09:10 AM

I'm not American and this isn't really on topic, but I would love to get some TRP input on this.

What is the deal with the Trump hate? I'm assuming he does something that angers the leftist, and so the media is forced to jump on the guy. To me he's a self made man, that might be a bit arrogant, but that doesn't tell you anything about his governing abilities.

PaulAJK • 2 points • 25 July, 2015 08:50 PM

The guys a clown. His *wig* though, is *very* clever.

I_TRY_TO_BE_POSITIVE • 1 point • 26 July, 2015 12:20 AM

Was gonna say, most Trump hate is legit. If you look at pretty much anything about Trump, you are immediately aware he is not a good choice to run a company, let alone a country.

His business practices are not something I would like to apply on a national level.

Myrpl • 6 points • 24 July, 2015 07:27 PM

That is also the way they put kids into mandatory religion in my country. They force you to chant the morning prayer at school for about 6-9 years.

Few people will question or reject that down the line.

dr_warlock • 10 points • 24 July, 2015 07:56 PM

Like the pledge of allegiance in elementary school and the national anthem at sporting events.

MrRexels • 0 points • 26 July, 2015 12:24 AM

At least religion and nationalism are much better dogmas than progressiveness and globalism.

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 July, 2015 05:50 PM

"...in the big lie there is always a certain force of credibility; because the broad masses of a nation are always more easily corrupted in the deeper strata of their emotional nature than consciously or voluntarily." — Hitler

"A lie told often enough becomes the truth." — Lenin

fortifiedoranges • 9 points • 24 July, 2015 09:20 PM

"If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it. The lie can be maintained only for such time as the State can shield the people from the political, economic and/or military consequences of the lie. It thus becomes vitally important for the State to use all of its powers to repress dissent, for the truth is the mortal enemy of the lie, and thus by extension, the truth is the greatest enemy of the State."

Hitler's minister of propaganda, Joseph Goebbels.

trpSenator • 2 points • 27 July, 2015 05:03 AM

The nazi leadership wasn't able to get ordinary fresh soldiers to immediately jump in and start killing Jews. Instead, they slowly would desensitize them towards the idea. For instance, the first week, they'd just help with the records. The second they'd guard the line. The third, they'd be nearby when the shootings happened. Finally, they'd start doing the shootings themselves.

Normalizing things isn't always wrong, but it is extremely effective to inch it up a slope. For instance, the idea of legal weed was ridiculous 20 years ago. But they were slowly able to inch the idea up by starting slow with mmj.

GroundhogLiberator • 15 points • 24 July, 2015 07:21 PM

A bacon, egg, and cheese and whipped cream sandwich is almost as disgusting as cuckolding.

GayLubeOil • 8 points • 24 July, 2015 05:46 PM

This is really really good analysis

kingofpplives • 6 points • 24 July, 2015 05:19 PM

She's presenting it as normal and trying to alter public consciousness. She's not saying "Hey men, do this!" because she knows she can't argue it any better than I could argue egg sandwiches with whipped cream. She's just saying, "Hey guys, it's normal".

Also how they've gotten the public to accept buggery as "normal" behavior.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 12:21 PM

Just wanted to tell you. This post got weak female, and female in that same gender analysis.

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 September, 2015 05:53 PM

Would you like egg sandwich on your whipped cream?

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

longjohnboy • 1 point • 25 July, 2015 01:24 AM

(S)he's using this one: <http://www.hackerfactor.com/GenderGuesser.php>

(I only say (s)he, because plugging /u/CisWhiteMaelstrom's above post yields a "weak female" verdict. I don't know how reliable this tool is...)

[deleted] • -1 points • 24 July, 2015 06:46 PM

Google for gender text analysis.

FLFTW16 • 67 points • 24 July, 2015 02:43 PM

I thought "ocean of red wine" was the biggest give away. Not even the biggest cum guzzling faggot would write that particular phrase. Good catch!

Primemale • 6 points • 24 July, 2015 07:21 PM*

Remember there are some men out there which aside from being indoctrinated to behaving in a feminine manner, their brains can actually be more feminine due to things such as testosterone exposure on the brain in utero which affects the individual for life, regardless of later testosterone exposure or exogenous testosterone.(steroids)

A good book to read is testosterone, sex, power and the will to win, (Link on pirate bay) I'm mentioning this as I see it all the time, effeminate guys that clearly think and therefore act like women, I think there is more to the puzzle than just indoctrination, although that does play a massive role in modern day society, no doubt. One could then get into causes of homosexuality etc too, which I won't, although the aforementioned book covers it as well as transgenderism.

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 July, 2015 04:12 PM

lol that was a giveaway for me too. Although I've seen some super betas in real life who do talk about wine like that, so you never know

PaulAJK • 31 points • 24 July, 2015 05:44 PM

"if she only likes sex with her husband or boyfriend, she's boring and lame..."

No husband or boyfriend in the entire history of the world has ever thought this. Obvious fake.

Stayinghereforreal • 19 points • 24 July, 2015 02:41 PM

"Paolo?" Seriously?

That alone made me start laughing. The rest quickly then identifies as a knowing nod to places like this. The thing is what someone here would write as satire. My bet is this is just that, and not a true first person account.

[deleted] • 25 points • 24 July, 2015 03:50 PM*

Politically correct bullshit like non-American names and what not is the best giveaway of sjw fuckery. It can't even be a common non-American name. It's always gotta be Paolo. I once had a PM from someone in BP trying to pretend that they were RP to troll a bit. Even without looking to their less-than-impressive bastardization of RP theory and estrogenic language, the easiest sign of who I was speaking to was the

sensitivity towards gender neutral pronouns and politically correct language. It's like it's so ingrained in them that they forget to shut it off, even when they're trying to act like red pillers.

zapatosedemadera • 6 points • 24 July, 2015 05:13 PM

Seriously, would stereotypical hot guy "Paolo" would go for a married mother of two in her late thirties over the abundant single women in their early-to-mid twenties? This story is waaayyyyy too good to be true... and by good I mean cringe-worthy.

Stayinghereforreal • 5 points • 24 July, 2015 05:31 PM

Oh, that part I would totally believe. A married woman of any attractiveness above cave troll would find plenty of guys from 18-65 willing to have sex with her. A woman would have zero difficulty finding plenty of interest in that regard.

"Paolo" would just add her to the rotation, for a bit of passing fun.

LastRevision • 13 points • 24 July, 2015 03:39 PM

Paolo was it for me too. Not Barry. Not David. Not Jonathan.

PAOLO. Yeah, ok.

KyfhoMyoba • 6 points • 24 July, 2015 11:49 PM

And certainly not Chad. Never **ever** Chad.

The horror.

MattyAnon • 37 points • 24 July, 2015 03:06 PM

Monogamy meant I controlled her sexual expression

Yup. In exchange for the man's commitment. To get married and then declare it a trap is a *bait and switch*.

It's a bait and switch because having made the exchange (sexual fidelity in exchange for commitment) ... keep the commitment and cancel the sexual fidelity. No-fault divorce enables this and removes the man's option to cancel his side of the deal.

This is classic Briffault's law. The man now has no choice but to continue the financial commitment, therefore his side of the deal and indeed the man himself is now expendable.

Remember gentleman... it's not about what you bring to the table, it's about your control over what you bring to the table, and your other options. Never give up control, never give up your options.

SouthernPetite • 10 points • 24 July, 2015 05:25 PM

Monogamy meant I controlled her sexual expression

It's ridiculous to act like it's some assault on her freedom as both partners are limited in the exact same way, which they both agreed to when they became exclusive, and then further solidified with a marriage contract.

If these people are legit, they live in the Twilight Zone,

SouthernPetite • 18 points • 24 July, 2015 04:50 PM

If a woman likes sex, she's a whore and a slut; if she only likes sex with her husband or boyfriend, she's boring and lame; if she doesn't like sex at all, she's frigid and unfeeling.

I've said this in another post, but this line, with the exception of the third part, is complete bullshit. Even churches encourage an active sex life (within marriage of course).

If women enjoying sex was frowned upon by society, we would hear people comment on it regularly enough to *know* it's a taboo (after all, social norms are useless if hardly anyone is aware of them), yet I have failed to ever hear anyone state that position or know anyone else who has.

They conflate enjoyment of sex with promiscuity. They're not the same, and they know it.

skoobled • 2 points • 24 July, 2015 09:19 PM

It's a strawman. Men *want* a sexual woman, but within a serious long-term relationship they want fidelity. Think about how many women would be happy to mother another man's children. None. But men are supposed to provide for her spawn. Another disgusting double standard

nyrp • 15 points • 24 July, 2015 04:17 PM

By the way, I recommend going online anonymously and try writing as a woman. It's hard!! You realize there are so many mental movements that are caused by you being a man that it's hard to come at the writing, from the very first initiative, as a woman. What you realize is that men and women have vastly different worlds they navigate as men and women, though we live on the same planet.

I had to do this recently as I am setting up a fake female profile as a pawn in a documentary I'm making. So I have to create a believable female profile months in advance of the day I plan on actually using it so that it doesn't appear to have come out of nowhere and it's credible.

Besides it being hard to think and joke like a female, I was surprised when I wrote some idiotic feminine bullshit about can someone help me cause I can't figure out how to get dressed for work without changing my mind all the time and I end up late for work. And it got **three full, detailed responses**. You learn lessons there like the way females have no shame in asking for help and vulnerability is a real technique to get what you want. Whereas a man who was so stupid that he couldn't get himself to work on time as an adult because he lost time matching outfits would not be treated with as much respect.

BluepillProfessor • 8 points • 24 July, 2015 06:11 PM

I recommend going online anonymously and try writing as a woman. It's hard!!

Can confirm. I am writing a Romantic Fiction with my female cousin and when we exchange edits sometimes it is like reading something completely different. They think of emotional nuances and connections I cannot even fathom but at the same time their attention to detail and the actual physical world is practically non-existent.

Primemale • 2 points • 24 July, 2015 07:31 PM

The doc sounds potentially interesting, be sure to link. what's your aim with the doc, exactly?

nyrp • 5 points • 24 July, 2015 07:35 PM

Can't. Would give away my identity. It's months away from being ready though. Even a year or more.

[deleted] • 0 points • 24 July, 2015 09:56 PM

Wait, are you saying a male should be ashamed of asking another male for help?

If so, that's ridiculous.

nyrp • 4 points • 24 July, 2015 10:01 PM

About how to get dressed? Absolutely.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 July, 2015 10:10 PM

Ohhhh right. Yeah, I can agree with that. I thought you meant asking for help in general, in which case, sometimes it's worth asking another guy for help with something quite tricky.

nyrp • 4 points • 24 July, 2015 10:57 PM

Yeah no. I got the sense that more stupid and more trifling the request, the more it's read as a sign of seeking comfort and validation and the more girls will step in and respond.

CopperFox3c • 10 points • 24 July, 2015 04:27 PM

There was always something fishy about that article, I think Heartiste may have nailed it on the head. It was so fucking outrageous ... suggesting that "male feminism" has become in essence the complete emasculation of men. *And not only willing emasculation, but a sort of celebration of it by men themselves.*

Seriously, if that's the point we've reached, we're all fucked.

[deleted] • 11 points • 24 July, 2015 06:24 PM

I mistakenly wandered into Reddit's sex sub, which is a wasteland of cuckold-celebration and vengeful down-votes for "heteronormative behaviors".

libertypole • 4 points • 25 July, 2015 08:04 AM

it's awful. i remember reading some thread where a wife was upset she thought her husband might be gay.

all the top replies were along the lines of "yay! try pegging!" with a million upvotes.

this was a serious thread. the wife seemed completely devastated like her life was a lie and her world had come crashing down. could these degenerate progressive sex positive fucks in r/sex care one bit about this poor woman's feelings or viewpoint? nope. just throw objects up your dude's ass and be happy like it's normal.

darkstout • 9 points • 24 July, 2015 04:57 PM*

This reminds me of the Rolling Stone UVA hoax rape story. It seems with feminist journalism, the message is more important than facts. But then again, this is how feminism in general operates.

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 July, 2015 05:53 PM

That's how propaganda operates.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 July, 2015 09:04 PM

Feminist social media in general. Reading the court transcript for Greg Elliot is like a case study on how shamelessly manipulative sjw's are.

curiousthis • 1 point • 24 July, 2015 07:27 PM

There was a very good response that I forgot to bookmark which essentially boiled down that article to how women read it, which was:

:-) :-/ <3 :-(<3 :-< </3 :-)

or something like that. So when I'm trying to determine gender, I look to see - are they giving us facts ?

(>90% probability male writer), or are they using facts to heighten emotions? (>90% probability female).

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 July, 2015 03:15 PM

How dare you!

Cat prejudice disparages a person's pet choice and undermines their confidence.

[deleted] • 5 points • 24 July, 2015 05:27 PM

It's agitprop either way.

The intended effect is an overton window shift in the cultural narrative, whether written by an actual beta cuckold or spinster cat lady.

favours_of_the_moon • 3 points • 24 July, 2015 09:06 PM

We aren't afraid of their intellect or their spirit or their ability to bear children. We are afraid that when it comes time for sex, they won't choose us. This petty fear has led us as a culture to place judgments on the entire spectrum of female sexual expression: If a woman likes sex, she's a whore and a slut; if she only likes sex with her husband or boyfriend, she's boring and lame; if she doesn't like sex at all, she's frigid and unfeeling. Every option is a trap.

SHE's afraid that when it comes time to cash our checks, WE will choose someone else.

OneRedYear • 3 points • 25 July, 2015 04:44 AM

if she only likes sex with her husband or boyfriend, she's boring and lame;

No man feels this way. Most men hold women who do this in high regard as decent women. Also most boyfriends hold them in high regard as decent women. Most boyfriends and husbands look for that in a woman. Only women, particularly sluts, would call a woman boring and lame for not cucking her husband. This is the true giveaway.

battyryder • 1 point • 24 July, 2015 07:07 PM

just read that shit, it was shit by the way. drivel, no actual man would fall for it.

MikePatton-yakyakyak • 1 point • 24 July, 2015 07:17 PM

I knew something didn't smell right. In fact, I called it days ago when it was first posted here.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 July, 2015 10:56 PM

Notice that there has been no follow-up -- No other media outlets have managed to interview Mr. Cuckold. Fake.

sardinemanR • -1 points • 25 July, 2015 09:48 AM

I don't believe there is any proof that this is fake. In fact I think it's probably real, or rather it's based off of a real story with maybe some alterations.

The real red flag to me was that an old married carousel rider could get so many willing partners. But TRP claimed that wasn't an issue, and a bunch of dudes here got so thirsty they were writing how it's such a great thing. If even TRP is going to be thirsty for an old married hag, then yeah it's probably happening.