

The UK Might Be Putting an End to Divorce Rape in Their Nation

July 20, 2016 | 697 upvotes | by [antwonomous](#)

It's sad how shocking this story is. From the Telegraph:

"Rich wives are increasingly being told to go out and get a job rather than rely on maintenance from their ex-husband as judges lead what amounts to a clampdown on 'meal ticket' divorces, according to lawyers.

"Divorce lawyers say they have seen a marked increase in cases in which family courts agree maintenance only for a limited period rather than traditional indefinite settlements."

Perhaps things are starting to change? If they adopt this in the U.S. I'm going to go streaking in the streets.

http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/07/20/rich-wives-being-told-to-get-a-job-as-judges-clamp-down-on-meal/?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=twitter

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

MoneyStatusLooks • 342 points • 21 July, 2016 01:06 AM [\[recovered\]](#)

About time. The purpose of a divorce should be to make sure a child's interests are cared for, not to be a cash grab by a worthless whore.

Hitleresque • 224 points • 21 July, 2016 01:46 AM

Divorces should be simple, you go your way, I go mine. Women are equals now, if they need money they can get a job like any man has to. I won't be happy until the concept of alimony is gone entirely.

jim234234red • 9 points • 21 July, 2016 11:55 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

Alimony has been dying in the US for some time now, at least for GenX and beyond. There are only a few states (CA, FL, IL) that haven't yet made reforms.

But it is irrelevant. As alimony went away, child support took its place as the woman's 'get out of jail free' card.

You can find the CS calculator on your state's gov. website.

If you are a guy making decent cash (probably in your 30s and beyond - I know it's hard for millennial guys these days) you will see just how bad things could be if you got some average-earning woman knocked up. Marriage is irrelevant.

Most of the calculators split the difference by income, but it seems like it is not important to the courts should the new mother-to-be decide to become a stay-at-home mom.

If the man were to try that, it's jail.

So your income minus 0 divided by 2 is half your income. BEFORE TAXES. And it's not deductible.

So expect to keep about 25% to 20% of your gross pay (more ya make, lower it goes due to lack of deductions) for one kid in most states.

The rest pays for Applebee's take out, Chad's car insurance, and rent in the nice area.

You'll, meanwhile, be sharing a room off CL, while making 6 figures and babysitting your kid on weekends while the mother hits the clubs.

Hitleresque • 4 points • 22 July, 2016 02:05 AM

Yeah, I didn't bother mentioning child support but I know just how rigged it is. I have an aunt who's pulling 2k a month off her poor bastard of an ex. He makes good money but fuck, she never has to work another day in her life. Feeding 3 kids is no doubt expensive but it sure as fuck doesn't cost 2000 a month. Im positive that can cover all of her expenses for the month and to boot she's been leeching off her new hubby whom she also had a kid with. It's too bad because I'd love to raise a couple of kids some day, but just like marriage it's not worth the risk. The worst part about redpill is how bitter it goes down.

[deleted] • 27 points • 21 July, 2016 01:35 PM*

The concept of alimony makes sense in theory *if* the woman took off time from work or made tangible career sacrifices, but the way it's calculated (as a percentage of the man's pay) is fucking ridiculous. I'd be completely fine with alimony *if* we based it on lost pay and lost opportunity due to sacrifices made by a woman to manage the household and care for the children, and if it were equal between genders.

If a woman has made an actual sacrifice for the marriage (given up years of work to care for the children) she should be compensated in the form of lost savings. 10% of the lost earnings (based on her previous salary or minimum wage if she didn't have one) seems reasonable considering most Americans save/spend on assets about 10% of their pay (if I remember macro correctly). I can even bend and say they should be compensated for lost career advancement for up to half the time of the marriage (e.g. if she gave up 5 years of work, and she reasonably could've made an extra \$10K/year through promotions if she worked those 5 years based on averages from her field, then the husband pays 10K/year for half the marriage length, capped at 10 years and 10% of the man's salary). Seems reasonable. He's topping off the pay she could've gotten but didn't because she let him focus on his career while taking one for the team. She gets enough time to get back on her feet in her career and advance to what is likely the position/pay-grade she'll keep for the remainder of her career, or what is reasonable given the marriage length.

So the guy pays a lump sum in the beginning only applicable to years she actually took off of work. He then pays her yearly for half the marriage length the amount of money she could reasonably be making above her current salary had she never taken off time. If she never took off work, they go their separate ways and she thanks him for significantly raising her standard of living for the length of the marriage.

Everyone ends up basically where they would've been had the marriage never happened, minus the sacrifices (that they both share now) due to time off to care for the dumb little shits they brought into the world.

Edit: I should clarify that these are my financial opinions based on what would actually seem reasonable based on concrete evidence, not my actual opinions. Do I think the story actually goes this way? No. Fuck no. Just as often the wife stays at home, fucks the neighbor, and shuttles her kids around in the mom-mobile in between salon appointments. However, we can't use this argument. We don't have any concrete evidence of the hilariously tiny amount of work that most stay-at-home moms usually do in comparison to their husbands.

neveragoodtime • 29 points • 21 July, 2016 02:35 PM

You seem to forget that her sacrifice of "potential lost earnings" is more than balanced out by his "actual lost savings" in the marriage. Think of all the money he could have been putting into retirement if he didn't have to financially support his unemployed wife. When is she going to pay him back for all the money that went to her? In other words, he pays for her choice to stay at home by covering all of the household costs instead of half. But instead of focusing on that real and actual cost, we focus on some made up "potential loss of hypothetical income". Why does the government decide that she lost anything? Maybe she chose to stay home after being fired, maybe she works retail and was never going to move up any corporate ladder and would have made minimum wage the rest of her life. In her case, taking half of his income and giving up her tiny income was a financially sound decision for her.

juliusstreicher • 6 points • 22 July, 2016 01:25 PM*

Yep; she's a live in fuck, who takes care of HER house and HER family, and cooks HER food, same as husband's. Why should he pay for her to live a separate life? He's already given her a life that she cannot afford. If she 'gives up' an opportunity, then 'gives up' the marriage, she shouldn't be paid. If I quit a great job to get a fantastic job, and then quit the fantastic job, should the boss still pay me?

logicalthinker1 • 3 points • 23 July, 2016 03:30 AM

That's an excellent point. And if you really want to be honest, savings grow exponentially. So his

lost savings are big in real numbers, but absolutely fucking gigantic in unrealized income from savings.

wanderer779 • 6 points • 22 July, 2016 04:27 PM

I am a stickler for following laws and keeping agreements (I think I landed in the wrong century or maybe even on the wrong planet), so my argument against all of this is that marriage is for life. So we shouldn't even be arguing about divorces in the first place. After you blow the marriage up, then you have basically said that you don't believe in keeping agreements. It's already ridiculous enough that you didn't keep the vows, but now you want him to keep his by paying you money? And our society goes along with this BS.

Somehow we went from marriage as a lifelong commitment (which was actually working very well despite the smear campaign), to women leaving when they felt like it, to them demanding money after leaving, and now finally to men being demonized for not wanting to get involved with it.

CryptoManbeard • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 06:57 PM

I don't mind alimony on an individual basis and I think it's a much more palatable concept when viewed as rehabilitative rather than punitive for life. A stay at home wife who didn't work because both parties wanted her to take care of the kids shouldn't be dumped out on the streets if her husband wants to fuck his secretary. There are also circumstances (I have a family member in those boat), where she stayed at home watching the kids and was a homemaker for 35 years. They got a divorce and she had no marketable skills or experience with 10 years left before retirement, I don't think it's odd to expect that she gets a reasonable amount of money until she retires.

At worst, a husband should have to pay for his wife to get training, get a job, and have some time to get back on her feet on her own.

If this was status quo I think most guys would understand. What we are getting is LIFETIME alimony for young people that have job experience and work. Basically they get their whole lives taken care of because they spit out a kid (in addition to child support).

Natural_RP • 0 points • 23 July, 2016 12:18 AM

Sigh at you so hard. First and foremost the decision to stay at home is always hers. If a guy says that it's a red flag, end of story. But a man can't stop her from working so that is all on her.

Next a man has a natural right to as many women as he pleases (when they want him of course) when he pleases. This is the concept of alpha and as nature intended. You really need to take that red pill.

CryptoManbeard • 1 point • 23 July, 2016 05:31 PM

First off, you do realize that some men (I am one of them), actually WANTS the mother of their children to stay at home? My first marriage that was my intent, and I didn't want it any other way. That's how cave men operated for hundreds of thousands of years. Calling someone a beta because they want a traditional family is retarded.

You're confusing being an alpha with wanting an open, promiscuous relationship. They are mutually exclusive. The founder of TRP is married.

Natural_RP • 1 point • 25 July, 2016 02:17 AM*

Yep you WANT you wife to stay at home but you can't really force her can you? That would again have to be her decision and therefore she has to deal with the consequences of

that decision, good or bad.

In my experience women that really want to stay at home "for the kids" are useless lazy parasites that can't wait to get access to your wallet while the veg out on the couch. But hey you have to deal with the consequences of who you choose as a wife. I can see you made a great choice the first time.

No one owns the redpill deposite what you may believe. It's a way of thinking and an online lockroom/sounding board of ideas.

That said an ALPHA does what is good for his life which means doing as he pleases. Alphas have a natural right to as many women as they please if *you choose not to exercise that option* that's okay, but it's still a natural right.

Never called you beta I said you need to swallow the pill. Alimony in any form is slavery and I like any rational being find slavery abhorrent.

ronsoness • 13 points • 21 July, 2016 01:41 PM

i think alimony has its uses... but only to be used similar to unemployment insurance. i don't believe in the bullshit "courts decide when alimony ends" and i don't believe it should be used to enrich or maintain an ex-spouses lifestyle. if she lived like a millionaire, no way should she continue to do so after divorcing a millionaire.

Gadnuk_ • 10 points • 21 July, 2016 02:25 PM*

Right, she already lived the lavish lifestyle on his dime, if anything she should have to pay him back. She consumed his resources and time then backed out of a lifelong commitment.

If a man marries a young woman, uses up her good reproductive years, then kicks her to the curb for an upgrade, sure throw some cash. But that circumstance is very rare and the exception not the rule. In this rare case, civil litigation could be utilized instead of a general rule of thumb that women automatically get cash rewards for infidelity and branch swinging.

Nothing disgusts me more than the thought of an ex spending MY money to buy things for the guy whose turn it is next.

vengefully_yours • 11 points • 21 July, 2016 03:01 PM

I don't care what she does, I will not be paying her to do whatever it is due to the fact I am no longer fucking her, not responsible for her, and her debts should be hers, not mine. I had been divorced for five years and I was still getting bill collectors calling me about her shit incurred after it was final. She fucked my credit for ten years with that shit.

surfjihad • 5 points • 21 July, 2016 03:24 PM

Nothing disgusts me more than the thought of an ex spending MY money to buy things for the guy whose turn it is next.

That's the standard situation m8. Don't ever even think of marrying

TriggeringEveryone • 2 points • 22 July, 2016 07:27 PM

If a man marries a young woman, uses up her good reproductive years, then kicks her to the curb for an upgrade,

But that circumstance is very rare

It's common... except for the marriage part.

Gadnuk_ • 3 points • 22 July, 2016 08:10 PM

That's a good point, but in that case it's her choice to waste her fertility and I have no sympathy. A gal can ride the carousel as long as she wants, there is no expectation for lifelong commitment until some schlub puts a ring on it

cxj • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 08:27 PM

Agreed, but things like alimony should be decided upon in a civil contract enforced to the letter of what it says, not some judges opinion.

ronsoness • 2 points • 22 July, 2016 10:10 AM*

that would be an interesting idea, like an add-on to a pre-nuptial to help plan for contingencies.

juliusstreicher • 2 points • 22 July, 2016 01:20 PM

And, madness. Why keep paying for the cow when it's giving milk to Farmer Brown instead of you?

juliusstreicher • 2 points • 22 July, 2016 01:22 PM

Agreed, but things like alimony should be decided upon

Things like alimony should be abolished. It's money paid for...what, exactly?

juliusstreicher • 1 point • 22 July, 2016 01:03 PM

i think alimony has its uses... but only to be used similar to unemployment insurance

The contract is terminated; what madman from the pit says that the terms of the contract should continue???

What if the wife divorces the husband-should she come and fuck him every month because he needs the sexual fulfillment?

Natural_RP • 2 points • 23 July, 2016 12:12 AM

Exactly. This is one of the main reasons not to get married. Eventually someone will start asking why virtually no men get married anymore. When the universal answer is "alimony" then it will be gotten rid of. The state needs stable family units (constant population increase) that over consume. Mini vans, huge house, crazy vacations to Disneyland etc.

Once alimony is gone women will actually have to try at marriage or lose their meal ticket. This will of course will cause many of them to actually be good wives.

stawek • -13 points • 21 July, 2016 06:29 AM*

There are situations when alimony is well deserved.

If you spend 5 years of marriage working and building your career (investing in yourself), while your wife spends the same time taking care of babies and the house (investing in your children and yourself) she deserves some returns on your investment.

Edit: to make it clear, I mean small babies and toddlers that require constant attention, not school age kids.

Men bring money, women raise babies. This is a conservative approach to family which most of us probably agree with. Both parties do their jobs and a women who takes care of (small) children and house full time is not leeching on her husband.

Men, aside from salary, also acquire valuable skills, knowledge and contacts, as part of their jobs.

Women don't. This imbalance is the sole reason for fair alimony in some *specific* circumstances. If the man still has same shitty job after 5 years then he has no extra income to share. If however, during the 5 years his wife was taking care of the house he finished his degree and is now making 6 figures, there is clear reason for spousal support.

Of course, stay at home mommas who watch tv while kids are at school are a different story - they had all the time in the world to acquire a marketable skill.

Origami84 • 38 points • 21 July, 2016 06:35 AM

while your wife spends the same time taking care of babies and the house (investing in your children and yourself) she deserves some returns on your investment. Of course, stay at home mommas who watch tv while kids are at school are a different story

But that is the story. You did not pass those 5 years in a holiday, you passed them working and paying for the bills of everyone involved. Plus, it is illegal to forbid your wife to work... and it is notorious most women prefer to take care of their kids rather than working. Not surprising, as almost everything is better than working, we do it for the money. Consider it all, and there is no "investment" she should get a return of. She was living, and so was hubby. Imho, the right to be taken care of if she decides to stay at home ended together with the duty of staying in the marriage for good or worse.

TheRedThrowAwayPill • 40 points • 21 July, 2016 06:48 AM*

BULLSHIT

This is utter fucking trash logic. She was not *investing* in you. And not all men are investing in themselves.

Most men are *slaving away* at work without upward mobility and are spending **all their fucking resources** on her and the kids anyway.

Does he get back any of that? No? Why not?

Plus on top of spending all his resources on her for all those years you're saying he now needs to re-spend all that money again??

This is cuck blue pill rhetoric at its worst.

Listen, what you are looking for is a "lump sum" payment to put her on her feet since she is used to her lifestyle of not working. But do not make the mistake of using feminazi terms like "investment" that needs to pay a dividend for life.

That's the slippery slope reasoning that lawmakers use to keep alimony permanent and potent.

WhiteTrashKiller • -10 points • 21 July, 2016 08:36 AM

Why is it Bullshit? One can assume there was a discussion on being a SAHM, right? She didn't just say hey I am staying at home now to raise your babies. If she did and the door mat let her do it then fuck him, he is an idiot and shouldn't be procreating.....

If I may, What if she had a 6 figure job she gave up at your request(as dumb as it may be) to be a sahm. Are you legally obligated to help get her back on her feet?

Here is a better one. What if she gave up a career significantly more valuable than yours, however

it is finite a type of career that had a shelf life and she is now unable to get back in it, so she could have your babies?

Sounds like devils advocate right, but alimony is there to serve not the woman, but the government. You think Uncle Sam wants to foot the bill for your fat, old, lazy, unemployed possibly unemployable wife while you get to smile and go buy your middle aged, my dick doesn't work, corvette and cruise the highschool.....

This is the same shit I always say to all the stupid fucking men I know personally and on here that want a SAHM fantasy marriage(lets face it marriage in general is stupid nowadays). You're all a bunch of fucking idiots.....

The only insurance you have of not being ass raped is for your wife to work! No not at walmart you shitheads, a real fucking career. And if your picking an idiot to stick your dick in cause she has a tight ass and a pretty face, but provides zero value to you other than arm candy, you deserve every inch of ass stretching you get. In fact it should be televised, so eveveryone can learn from it.....

Trust me your foul mouthed little curtain climbers will turn out fine in daycare, maybe even moreso due to the early social education. They'll develop a sense of heirarchy, test the boundaries, all the things being protected by a bon bon earing peg bundy of a wife/mother wont do for you.....

You're wife working will make her burn calories, maintain her professional appearance, develop social relationships outside of your home and bring in cash.....

However, I've heard more than once "What if she meets someone at work"? Who fucking cares! Relationships end, but at least you wont get caught footing the bill while she gets plowed by the 23 yr old intern. Play your cards right and she may have to pay you to leave.....

Good day!

Invalidity • 4 points • 21 July, 2016 04:26 PM

All of your arguments are idealistic. They don't play out to the real reality of things.

1. When a wife starts working, if she's making more than her husband, there is a greater chance of divorce. Source
2. Even if you choose an ugly wife, there's no guarantee that she won't ransack you for all you're worth. The notion that tight ass and pretty face means you'll get dominated is nonsense. Any woman is capable of ruining a man, and more often than not, they will ruin a man who is not capable of being a man (ie. most men who want to get married).
3. Go ahead and stick your kids in daycare. What's the fucking point of raising a family if neither parent is around to bond with the child? That's exactly what the government wants you to do: pump out the slaves of the future.

WhiteTrashKiller • 0 points • 22 July, 2016 03:17 AM

1. A divorce is a divorce! I frankly would be much more upset at having the court steal my money every month and give it to someone that doesn't want to take care of themselves, just because the pretty girl conned me. Because the likelihood of a high earning wife causing a divorce goes up, doesn't mean the point isn't valid. If you were to marry(again don't)it behooves you to find a partner that limits your

downside in this financial transaction. It is a transaction right? That is what is often stated here. Exchanging your resources for sexual exclusivity or some bullshit like it.....

A woman that can match your earnings improves your lifestyle, means she is educated and can help raise your children properly and keeps her skin in the game.

1. I don't see the relevance to choosing an ugly wife. Are you saying that some people think there is some implied protection in choosing an ugly wife? Why anyone would choose an ugly wife, unless they too are of the same looks.

Getting dominated by a tight ass and pretty face kinda makes me think someone in that position punched above his weight. Again if you believe a lot of the readings here, the notion is that women don't marry down. So I agree with you, if you are a shlub you will be a bitch regardless of how your wife looks. Moral of the story, don't be a bitch.....

1. My kids have been in daycare and they have excelled in every area of life. Socially, education, leisure, sports, volunteering, church.

Now either I hit the goddamn genetic jackpot(unlikely) or they are proof that hard work and commitment goes a long way in raising your kids. If your kids turn out like shit, look in the mirror you'll see the origins.

Daycare isn't a prison, it is not a 14 hr confinement. You get what you pay for, put them in an institution built around a curriculum of higher education (as opposed to the sahm mom neighbor ignoring your kids) and they will excel. Does that give you the right to be lazy and not read to them nightly or check homework daily? You get out what you put in....

As for slaves and government, you kinda sound a lil bernie- esque to me. We are all slaves to the machine, you are too, don't kid yourself. The difference is where you are! I would much rather be in the top 5% of earners than fighting for scraps. The govt may take more, but my standard of living goes up and so does my childrens'. That being said, I will be quite happy once my children grow up and maintain the standard I have set. Hell shoot for the top 3%.....

CypherWolf21 • 4 points • 21 July, 2016 01:13 PM

I'm happy to say this logical well reasoned argument has changed my opinion. In particular I must say the straw men arguments and ad hominem were particularly effective. But I think it was the overall bitterness that really sold it. /s

TheRedThrowAwayPill • 1 point • 22 July, 2016 04:39 AM

No ya dumb fuck, you simply do NOT sign a marriage license with her.

You can do EXACTLY all the scenarios you mentioned with a girlfriend and you would be removed from the risk of divorce rape palimony.

What you are thinking of is a lump sum payment to help a person out. But that is not what is asked for. They are asking for you to *maintain* her life *as if* she were still married to you!

This is the American insane part that ruins marriage in America. Until they remove this notion of permanent maintenance at a permanent level, marriage will continue to decline.

WhiteTrashKiller • 1 point • 23 July, 2016 09:43 PM

I am assuming the dumb fuck was leveled at me. So I will bite....

Let us assume you can read and didn't just fire off a response after the first paragraph. Did you miss the parentheses? Where it is stated marriage in general is stupid nowadays. Most likely, so let me say this.

Getting married is dumb, however my marriage is quite good. Would I do it again? No. That being said. She is a 6 figure earner, a good mother, well educated and a quality first mate. There was talk of quitting her career when the first child came. My response was I am selling the house and we will rent an apartment. I was not going to work 16 hours a day while she stayed home. Just wasn't going to happen. She accepted this and after many children the subject has never come up.

Now you may be a quality man. Earning 6 figures, sub 12% BF, owning your shit, quality hobbies, quality friends. If you are, and you have this type of arrangement with a girlfriend please tell us the how to.

In my experiences, Good luck getting a woman with the above mentioned qualities to settle down with you and give you children without a ring. Any quality woman I have ever met, would never let themselves have a child out of wedlock. Then again you know how us Catholics can be.....

As for lifetime alimony few states do.

Here you go:

<https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alimony>

All I am saying is if you marry a woman that provides little value, you deserve what you get. Own up to your own fucked up choices. You made the choice, as a man you were a part of the decision to make her a SAHM, Now you get to eat it. Don't complain to me how it is unfair you got fucked because of your own stupidity.

Use feminism against them. They wanna be indepenent, great you can match my financial contrubution to this family. If you divorce the chances of paying alimony are almost nil.

One can assume you are young from your post, hopefully if this movement stays around you can come back and tell us how well your life at 40 is using your matrix. Hell it may become the standard for other men here, I'd wholly endorse that. IMHO there is no reason to ever let the govt into your marriage.....

However, most of the men in this world are rather shitty, and if we can safely deduce the fact that women are a product of their partner and most men are shitty, then the women will be just as shitty....

Good Luck to you!

Then again, I am not wrapped to tight and would live on the streets before I ever accept a courts decision on how my life should be lived.....

Rhunta • -6 points • 21 July, 2016 07:20 AM

There can be a situation where a wife was investing in her man. Maybe rare, but it can happen.

TheRedThrowAwayPill • 13 points • 21 July, 2016 07:34 AM

Which you can use for *that* situation.

But to stretch that exceptional state and *assume* it's the defacto rule to apply for all? No.

Rhunta • 1 point • 22 July, 2016 08:47 AM

But the men was talking about that situation and you bashed him because you act like you can't isolate that situation from the rest. In my point of view you cried because he said that in some situation it is deserved.

TheRedThrowAwayPill • 1 point • 23 July, 2016 10:11 PM

He is advocating for allowing the current status quo. We are saying that it is non sensible (and the market has adjusted accordingly)

Rhunta • 1 point • 24 July, 2016 07:28 AM

I don't know how bad it is their in the US. But I know that Americans love to exaggerate things. If you say that it is non sensible, to have the current status quo in some cases. Than I believe you because you have more knowledge about it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 01:10 PM

That is not the point of OPs post. I mean really if you want to plead single mom wimmins rights is this the place for it? Comments supporting wimmin's rights to alimony on this sub scare me. I know we are a toolkit not a cult but some of these comments legitimately scare me.

MrJaggedArray • 8 points • 21 July, 2016 10:01 AM

Nowadays it's the woman's decision to stop working. It's not an imposition by her partner. Usually it arises because she feels guilty about leaving a very small child in care and going to work. Very often, the family has the resources to place a child in pre-school, but the wife decides to stay home anyway. Fair enough, but then she can take the responsibility for any consequences to her career, assuming she had one to begin with.

Moreover, the man working full-time is not "investing in himself". Most jobs go nowhere in career terms - you just keep working and bringing in a paycheck every month until you die. And if your wife stops working, that actually causes significant financial hardship for the family. Most men with small children live hellish lives: outside of work you have to be home and pushing prams around - no friends, no outings, no sports; and your sex life is generally dead for a couple of years.

So I don't see any moral obligation to compensate the wife in the event of a divorce. Compensate her for what? Having children is hard work. It's difficult for everyone involved. Insisting that children are somehow more of a burden to mothers than to fathers is reverting to stereotypes.

AkaviriDragon • 8 points • 21 July, 2016 07:38 AM*

There are situations when alimony is well deserved.

Alimony: a husband's (or wife's) provision for a spouse after separation or divorce

....what? why?

she deserves some returns on your investment.

does she? isn't she just doing it because she wants? doesn't she have an incentive to raise the best offspring she can? why should she be receiving money?

when you mean alimony, do you mean government coming in and forcing you to pay? why should

the government intervene and force one of the sides to pay through alimony, are you incapable of conversing with her reaching an agreement yourself? which side is going to pay? and why?

if we're talking a voluntary allowance for your partner that you've both agreed on, hey, all the power to you.

every statistics i've seen shows that a nuclear family that takes time off to raise their child with free play leads to the best outcome for the child, if an allowance incentivizes that then go ahead. but forcing alimony is fucking crazy

thisishowiwrote • -7 points • 21 July, 2016 07:43 AM

when you mean alimony, do you mean government coming in and forcing you to pay? why should the government intervene and force one of the sides to pay through alimony, are you incapable of conversing with her reaching an agreement yourself? which side is going to pay?

No one would fucking pay, obviously. Divorces are rarely amicable. I 100% agree with alimony in some cases. If your partner genuinely supports you, irons your clothes every morning, cooks your meals, cleans the house, lets you bounce ideas off her, then yes - you owe her something if you suddenly leave, because she has no one to support her, and has spent 5 years making an investment in you as a meal ticket.

TWYW • 12 points • 21 July, 2016 08:06 AM

You owe her jack shit. During that period you supported her. You paid for her expenses while she took care of the house etc. Neither of you did anything for free. After the divorce there is no good reason why you should pay her (or viceversa).

thisishowiwrote • -6 points • 21 July, 2016 08:13 AM

That's fair, and I get where you're coming from. So let me add a caveat to my response - if it can be established that you had some success with her around, that can in some way be attributed to her assistance, then it's only fair she gets a cut. I also agree that it should have a time limit.

But fuck man, if I had a missus making my food, ironing my shit, raising my kids etc, I'd be happy to throw her some dosh at the end of it. Well, I wouldn't be, because no one is happy in a divorce, but I'd see the fairness in it.

Fadren • 8 points • 21 July, 2016 12:04 PM

Aren't you forgetting that she is already getting half your shit even without alimony? So if you actually were successful and invested/saved that money she is already getting a "fair" share of what she "helped" earn. What you earn after the divorce she hasn't got part in.

thisishowiwrote • 1 point • 22 July, 2016 02:22 AM

My statement was predicated on the fact that she wouldn't be receiving a bulk part of your individual assets - just anything that is co-owned.

PotatosAreDelicious • 3 points • 21 July, 2016 12:50 PM

Having someone iron your clothes doesn't mean your success was because of her. You could just pay someone else to iron your clothes or spend the 5 minutes doing it yourself.

thisishowiwite • 1 point • 22 July, 2016 02:21 AM

Yeah you could, but my point is you fucking didn't.

Say you go to macca's and get a meal. you could have paid someone else for a meal, or you could have made it yourself, but I don't live in the world of "coulds" and "should", I'm talking about reality.

Hussssy • 0 points • 21 July, 2016 10:36 PM

For all the people misunderstanding the above comment, have a look at red pill wives. I know the down voting of the above comment may be because many men have not had the pleasure of having or knowing of a wife who is truly invested in her man and knows that by embracing her femininity and fully taking care of his house and needs and children that he can succeed more in his business - whatever they may be- as he does not have to worry about these little tasks which are actually quite time consuming. There are women out there who know that and embody it or are working towards embodying it- the surrendered wife has a strong following.

AkaviriDragon • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 06:45 PM

Ok so you're saying Alimony is ok in some cases, such as if a woman is doing housework and taking care of the children. In that case, if they divorce, the government should come in and force him to pay (how much and for how long again?) since that's what alimony is.

Why didn't she make the agreement to be paid by the man (either daily, weekly, or monthly) while she was doing those things? Why did she choose a man she couldn't reach this agreement with?

Still don't understand the argument for government intervening and forcing payment. Sane adults can reach agreements, believe it or not.

thisishowiwite • 1 point • 22 July, 2016 02:20 AM

Mate, I don't know what planet you live on, but if "sane adults" could "reach agreements" we literally wouldn't have a civil legal system.

AkaviriDragon • 1 point • 22 July, 2016 02:33 AM

How is the civil legal system decided?

bluedrygrass • 8 points • 21 July, 2016 07:48 AM

Of course, stay at home mommas who watch tv while kids are at school are a different story - they had all the time in the world to acquire a marketable skill.

So, 95% of mommas? To be a housewife it's literally the best and easiest work in the world: you're paid for sitting on your ass most of the day, you can go shopping, you can go to the park, you can read, watch movies, eat whenever you feel like it, go to the bathroom all the time and without having to rush it, etc. etc. etc.

Find another job that requires less. There isn't, unless you're like the 0,001% of the population as a fashion model or movie actress.

real-boethius • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 08:16 AM

Yeah sure she stayed home and had the kids because that's what he insisted on. She reluctantly put her career on hold.... and other such nonsense.

She lived off him for 5 years and the divorce should put an end to it. Unless they voluntarily agreed otherwise.

TheRedThrowAwayPill • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 11:08 PM

For your EDIT:

You are *still* wrong.

You're reasoning is easily defeated by the following:

If the man had no wife and simply paid for a nanny to care for his child...does he owe her alimony?

stawek • 1 point • 22 July, 2016 08:01 AM

Let's go with an example of 2 babies taken care of till youngest is 3 and ready for some kind of preschool. Let's assume you outsource all of it with surrogate mother and nannies.

People reported costs of surrogacy at about \$50k, 100k for 2 babies.

Childcare cost for 5 years: 24hours a day, \$10 per hour, 365 days a year: \$88k in a year

We arrive at some 540k. Now halve it (cause she has 50% shares in the babies, so she covers half of it herself). 270k over 5 years.

Sex once a week (i did assume she was a *good* wife) at \$100 a pop 5200 a year (for anybody who argues that she gets sex too, so no paymnet here - she is a woman and can get sex any time she wants with better dicks than yours) - 25k over 5 years.

Total 300k over 5 years.

She has to pay you back for her room (equivalent for rental in shared accomodation), her food and half the expenses for food and nappies for baby. I don't know what the costs are in US, but i'm sure they cannot go over 30k a year (cause we know people live on 30k salaries with no big problems)

This leaves you with 150k bill for childcare at the end of 5 years period.

Having babies with your own woman, rather than paying for surrogate, is a good business.

Otherwise all the men would be hiring wombs and we know they don't.

You would not owe the nanny any alimony, no. But she would have 150k saved in her bank, which would be enough to live on for couple years while she is getting some work experience and education.

Again, i cannot emphasize this strongly enough: great majority of alimony payments are divorce rape. But there are some women, who do their wifely duties. They deserve to be treated fairly. It does not mean "maintaining the lifestyle she was accustomed to". It means support for her to get work experience that she gave up when raising the babies.

TheRedThrowAwayPill • 1 point • 23 July, 2016 10:08 PM

You're numbers are vastly unreasonable and unrealistic.

And yet ... they are *STILL* cheaper than losing 1/2 your net worth!! That says something doesn't it?

Plus the nanny won't be going to school - she'll be right back at work.

Again your example is just bad and unrealistic. Face it, the current rules of alimony and 1/2 your net worth make no sense and have no place in fairness, justice or logic in today's world.

[deleted] • 0 points • 21 July, 2016 01:07 PM

[permanently deleted]

stawek • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 02:38 PM*

If i was a mod you'd be banned for life for making argument of emotion, argument of disbelief and ad hominem ~~personem~~ attack.

This is not divorce rape apology. This is a statement that in some *specific*, rare cases the woman deserves support for limited time.

[deleted] • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 04:25 PM

Ad hominem is the latin phrase you are reaching for

bluedrygrass • 7 points • 21 July, 2016 07:45 AM

I'd say not even that, it should be optional if the male feels so. For example, if the child isn't his, or if he can't afford it. The female should have choosed better.

Also, aren't they always bragging about how they all "work and care for the house and childs"? So nothing would change, right?

MoneyStatusLooks • 11 points • 21 July, 2016 11:15 AM [recovered]

I strongly believe you shouldn't have kids if you can't afford to bring them up. Half of the problems the UK has is there is a fucktonne of state-sponsored kids, brought up on benefit money. There are fucking retards breeding like rabbits. The next Mozart isn't coming from a benefits family. After you have 4 worthless, waste of space kids, give it a rest, the world doesn't need anymore.

If the child isn't his, then there is no way he should be obligated to pay for it. Lying about paternity should have the same consequences as fraud, sadly it doesn't though.

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 23 July, 2016 05:05 PM

To be fair, it might be an exception, but Beethoven was born in even worse conditions than the ones you listed. Literally nobody could have predicted one of the biggest musical geniuses would have born from a mother like that.

ronsoness • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 01:45 PM

in an ideal world, we would all be neutered at birth and only reactivated once we want to have kids. would solve a lot of issues with state sponsored kids or homeless/foster/orphan children, who are likely to grow up and be a strain on the state again through being on welfare or landing in prison.

FoxIslander • 56 points • 21 July, 2016 01:07 AM

...I'll be streaking in the streets the moment a cheating spouse isn't entitled to half of everything. Too late for me however.

Eyes_Of_The_Dragon • 41 points • 21 July, 2016 04:27 AM

My female judge told my ex to get a job. The tide is turning.

LarryLove • 8 points • 21 July, 2016 03:39 PM

Still waiting for my female judge to tell my ex to get a fucking job. It's been over four years. Oh well, my alimony ends Sept 30th. Party in Vegas.

Eyes_Of_The_Dragon • 3 points • 21 July, 2016 03:43 PM

Did you get non-modifiable alimony? If it's modifiable there's a chance she can come back and go "I can't work, you need to pay more!"

LarryLove • 4 points • 21 July, 2016 03:52 PM

It's firm, she signed off on it. IDK how she's going to live on just child support, but it's not my problem.

Eyes_Of_The_Dragon • 8 points • 21 July, 2016 03:54 PM

I'm going to make a prediction despite knowing nothing about her.

She's going to scramble to find work. This will take time. She will constantly complain that she can't find work, and the Patriarchy(TM) is holding her back. You didn't give her enough time to look. Sexism! No one hires women for good jobs around here!

That's been my experience with my ex, so I'm projecting.

LarryLove • 8 points • 21 July, 2016 04:07 PM

You're right and I don't care. Her refusal to work was one of the many reasons we divorced. She had expensive spending habits and she said she'd get a job when our son entered kindergarten. Then she changed it to when he entered first grade. Then she said she needed retraining to enter to workforce. When we met she managed a spinal surgeons office and made over 75k USD. Needless to say, she made excuse after excuse not to work AND she kept a shitty home and couldn't cook to save her life. She kept telling me she was "busy" all day while the kids were in school. She never missed a Martha Stewart / Oprah / Judge Judy episode, however.

[deleted] • 123 points • 20 July, 2016 10:18 PM

[permanently deleted]

Toastlove • 42 points • 20 July, 2016 10:40 PM

Thank fuck that's only in Nottingham though, because they've managed to get some uber feminist police chief and its one of her pet initiatives.

recon_johnny • 33 points • 21 July, 2016 01:56 AM

Get the fuck out.

What the holy hell....why do people stand for this bullshit? Fuck that piece of shit, and her 'pet initiatives'. Why doesn't she go solve crime instead of this nonsense.

hhamama66 • 36 points • 21 July, 2016 04:11 AM

Why doesn't she go solve crime instead of this nonsense.

Because that involves actual work. You can't smash the patriarchy while doing actual work.

[deleted] • 9 points • 21 July, 2016 08:58 AM

Why do people stand for it? Virtually all women will support it. And then you've got apathetic, married men who think they've "made it" so don't care, and the hoards of white knight/SJW betas who think that being feminist will make women like them. That's a majority.

Caucasian-African • 6 points • 21 July, 2016 03:29 PM

That's the beauty and genius of the US Constitution. It acts as a fire-stop against the inevitable fascist tendencies of over-zealous politicians and the mob mentally.

Toastlove • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 10:27 AM

Because that's difficult and their funding is low.

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 01:13 PM

Because she is a vile cunt

Caucasian-African • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 03:26 PM

She's likely a manly skank who has latent fantasies of being cat-called.

LuvBeer • 6 points • 21 July, 2016 05:03 AM

Yeah well Theresa May's main platform since the beginning has been social justice and reducing inequality, guess what that means.

McLarenX • 1 point • 23 July, 2016 12:23 AM

Much more important than muslim rape, clearly.

aanarchist • 0 points • 21 July, 2016 05:40 AM

wait there's actually a nottingham in england? i thought that was just a made up town where robin hood was based in. learn something new every day.

Toastlove • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 10:26 AM

Yes, there's also a Sherwood Forest. Robin Hood's character is likely based on a few real people as well.

Freiling • 2 points • 22 July, 2016 06:20 PM

Wait, England is a real place?

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 07:53 AM

Robin Hood is based on a real character, you know

evil_misogynist • 30 points • 20 July, 2016 11:14 PM

Yeah isn't that insane. And of course the police chief is some fat bitch. Wonder how much wolf whistling comes her way? My guess is zero.

Swallowed_the_pill • 6 points • 21 July, 2016 05:14 AM

Pretty stupid that a police chief has enough power to get that through regardless of her views.

logicalthinker1 • 1 point • 23 July, 2016 03:35 AM

she secretly wishes it came her way.

stengang • 9 points • 21 July, 2016 03:07 AM

There are so many legal advantages to being a female, and having a penis does not disqualify you in any way. Go for it.

[deleted] • 6 points • 21 July, 2016 08:55 AM

What's amazing is they are calling it a "hate crime". Because those builders whistling at pretty women are obviously doing it because they hate them. It's unbelievable...

logicalthinker1 • 1 point • 23 July, 2016 03:35 AM

haha I tell you. I just hate it when a hot girl walks by. I hate hot women.

Caucasian-African • 4 points • 21 July, 2016 03:24 PM

I totally agree. It is so goofy.

I never have and never will cat-call a woman. It's among the cheesiest, most lame things men do, and I even concede that it's offensive.

That being said, "a hate crime"! Are you kidding me? That is just insane! Maybe Europe should keep their women from being molested and blown up by terrorists instead of enacting fascist legislation against boorish, harmless male behavior.

PrimaxAUS • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 02:04 PM

So... don't wolf whistle? Honestly it never gets anyone anywhere AND it's widely considered shitty, so why would you?

RavelsBolero • 1 point • 23 July, 2016 03:26 PM

Because we live in a free country. Is there something you don't understand about that? If you don't like it or understand it, that doesn't mean other people have to agree with you

victor_knight • 20 points • 21 July, 2016 02:18 AM

The deal included an annual allowance of £116,000 for handbags and £40,000 for fur coats.

Well, what's good for the economy is good for society. It's just too bad if one man doesn't like it. Fuck him.
<sarcasm>

[deleted] • 19 points • 21 July, 2016 04:16 AM

The same country that made "hitting on women" illegal.

[deleted] • 36 points • 21 July, 2016 01:39 AM

Maybe they should work on not having men who haven't been convicted of a fucking crime have to report to police 24 hours in advance of when they are going to have sex before we get too fucking excited here

bestpractice1 • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 03:07 AM

Thats a lot of cheeky Constables

grewapair • -14 points • 21 July, 2016 02:32 AM

There's usually a story behind that. It's not like they've done that to every man. They probably have an amazingly strong suspicion about this guy but nothing they can use to convict.

You see this sort of thing now and again. There's always way more to the story.

[deleted] • 25 points • 21 July, 2016 02:56 AM

Yeah and the story is that a man who has never been convicted of a fucking crime has to contact police before he can have sex. Any more to the story makes zero fucks whatsoever, and it is never acceptable for any reason. They can have an "amazingly strong suspicion" all the fucking want to, but it is not acceptable to punish someone who has not been convicted of a fucking crime.

CypherWolf21 • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 01:15 PM

Glad to see we still believe in innocent until proven guilty.

[deleted] • 7 points • 21 July, 2016 01:36 AM

I'm curious if this is because of changes in law? What might be driving this change?

[deleted] • 23 points • 21 July, 2016 08:03 AM

Women in Britian under the age of 35 are now earning more then men. Naturally once women start paying alimony so their husbands can bang sluts they see the negative side of alimony.

victor_knight • 4 points • 21 July, 2016 02:21 AM

Maybe they want to encourage British people to start breeding more, now that the powers that be are no longer scared to the marrow of their bones about the planet dripping people into space from the "threat" of overpopulation that was highly popularized in the 60s, 70s and 80s.

[deleted] • 7 points • 21 July, 2016 06:21 AM

Alimony in my state, per the court webpage, is usually limited to 4 years. It specifically notes that is the time it takes someone to finish college. I didn't have to pay alimony after my divorce

[deleted] • 6 points • 21 July, 2016 01:00 PM

I've long said that divorce settlements should be based on an estimation of lost potential earnings and sacrifices made for the sake of the family, and child support should be monitored by requiring the receiving parent to account for where the money was spent each month.

It's not that difficult a concept, and it would only be mildly difficult to set up. You'd think with the number of rich old men being taken to the cleaners this would be easy to push, but the fem-centered nature of our society has made that impossible.

If a woman was on track to become a cashier at a grocery store and then marries a contractor, gives up her job, and takes care of the kids for 5 years before filing for divorce, she should get 5 years of pay as a grocery store cashier plus whatever is required to keep the kids at a similar quality of life for the time she has them. If she works at an insurance company, takes no time off for the kids (aside from paid maternity leave), and just happens to be making 3x less than her husband in sales, she should get nothing aside whatever is required to keep the kids at a similar quality of life.

I just don't know where people got the idea that marrying someone entitles you to half their wealth. You didn't do half the work, you just sucked the dick of someone doing 100% of the work, and some of these women aren't

even doing that.

6of1halfdozenofother • 4 points • 21 July, 2016 03:10 PM

They got the idea because marriage is, and has always been, a property contract.

It's got fuck all to do with love.

KartagoPill • 31 points • 20 July, 2016 10:24 PM

UK is one of the strongest CuckNation.

CENTURIQN • 23 points • 20 July, 2016 11:45 PM

I'd say it's amongst the top 5. Others up there would be Sweden, Germany, Canada and France.

inspiron3000 • 14 points • 21 July, 2016 12:06 PM*

Norway.

Female PM + 8 female ministers.

The current, ruling parties (Conservative, Popular Liberal and Christian Popular) are led by two woman and one massive beta.

The (non-ruling) Labour party has ruled that their leadership has to be divided equally between the sexes. This party has run the country for most of the time since the 2. world war.

If you wonder what made Anders Behring Breivik go mental, he wanted to kill the former female PM (Gro Harlem Brundtland), you'll find that he was very much negatively influenced by feminism.

EriGorman • 8 points • 21 July, 2016 05:29 AM

Sweden is mainly just a mess right now. Highest taxes in the world which mainly go to fund "refugees" and "children". The swedes have had a massive right-wing rise though and the patience is running out.

Calling our country cucknation isn't wrong by any means, but we don't cater to the women nearly as much as most. Alimony is nearly non-existent if it even exists at all (major difference is needed and housewives isn't normal here). Child support is low and income %based post-taxes, and is very low due to papa state covering the largest support. We also don't have the BS laws making fathers unable to see their children.

Taxes are shit and our leaders are spineless narcissists, but at least we don't give the pussy free stuff

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 06:59 AM

Are you talking about the UK?

Pantek51 • 3 points • 21 July, 2016 12:21 PM

France? At least here if you don't say a child is yours you're never going to pay a cent for him. But yeah on the other hand DNA tests are illegal here so I see where you're coming from

CypherWolf21 • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 01:16 PM

75% supertax rate more than makes up for it.

Pantek51 • 7 points • 21 July, 2016 02:01 PM*

You mean the one that disappeared early 2015? Anyway most of the people who had to pay that tax got that rich thanks to all the help the government gave to their companies. I say that but I wasn't in favor of that tax anyway. Just saying.

I love TRP for the stuff about self improvement and women but that kind of blind alt right politics I often see here is kind of stupid. If you're really redpilled IMHO you'll see that all that political stuff is a fucking joke from one side to the other.

Edit : sorry Bro I got on a rant, the alt right part wasn't aimed at you

CypherWolf21 • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 02:51 PM

No worries. I wasn't aware the tax was repealed - it's my fault for not checking. It's an interesting point you raise about cronyism though, and I am in agreement. There's no such thing as capitalism at gunpoint.

Pantek51 • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 03:14 PM

And that's why I love TRP. Near anywhere else on reddit we'd be insulting each other at this point

CypherWolf21 • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 03:24 PM

There's very few places left where civilised evidence based discussion is no longer a "hate crime" it seems.

Thaweed • 3 points • 20 July, 2016 11:58 PM

Can confirm, Merkel is ruining a once so great Germany.

ROFLME • -2 points • 21 July, 2016 01:11 AM [recovered]

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4ztOV2wrrkY>

germany

great

pick one

LordThunderbolt • 0 points • 21 July, 2016 02:12 AM

There hasn't been a true Germany since 1945

ROFLME • 1 points • 21 July, 2016 11:13 AM [recovered]

Nazi Germany was pretty cucked

LordThunderbolt • 0 points • 21 July, 2016 01:09 PM

It was a joke. Fuck Nazi Germany.

RICCIedm • -7 points • 21 July, 2016 12:26 AM

When was it great? Maybe before WWI? Cause after that it got cucked by jews, hitler, now feminsm.

Source : Wikipedia and a 3 day visit to Berlin.

[deleted] • 15 points • 21 July, 2016 01:57 AM

Germany's bounce back from WWII to become an economic force in europe was pretty great.

bluedrygrass • 11 points • 21 July, 2016 07:58 AM

Pretty great doesn't cover it. They were literally levelled to the ground by carpet bombing. Raped, killed, burned. In few decades they jumped straight back between the highest producing nations, rebuilt everything while paying immense amount of money to the winners of the war.

Objectively speaking, it's insane.

sir_wankalot_here • 4 points • 21 July, 2016 01:22 AM

You realize that Hitler lost WW2 because of his insane policies against Jews ?

Interesting how history forgets to mention, Japan was against Hitler's policies against Jews. The Japs actually refused to cooperate with Hitler in this regard and actually saved many Jews.

yummyluckycharms • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 05:56 AM

Actually, what cost Germany WW2 was

not sending the tanks to wipe out the british at dunkirk - instead preferring to use the luftwaffe stopping bombing british airplane factories and switching to the cities
splitting troops to encircle the south instead of driving straight for moscow

The allocation of resources to round up dissidents wasn't a lot - hell - Germany never started rationing until the war was nearly over.

Dath14 • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 07:39 AM

There were a lot of mistakes that the German military made that would have changed the outcome of the war if they chose differently. I would also include invading the Soviet Union before finishing off Britain as a key factor, but also not supplying their forces in Africa with the necessary supplies to make the final push past the Suez canal. If Germany had all of that gasoline from the middle east, even the invasion of the Soviet Union would have been different.

The biggest fuck up almost certainly was declaring war on the United States though. There was almost no possibility of FDR getting a formal declaration of war against Germany from congress since they did not share FDR's hatred for Germany. Especially since most people would want to go mess up Japan after their attack on Pearl Harbor. But yeah, your points also were key factors in their loss of the war.

bluedrygrass • 3 points • 21 July, 2016 08:01 AM

The US wanted to enter the war since a while. They were just waiting for the right opportunity, because the public opinion didn't want it, only the elites. It's even argued the accident that caused the US to officially enter the war was staged.

Certainly the nazis had no interest in having the US enter the war

Dath14 • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 08:24 AM

I know, but they were never going to be able to declare war on Germany if Germany didn't do it for them. Hitler did it because he wanted Japan to open another front against the Russians and they stiffed him. Obviously Germany did not want to fight the US as well at the time.

yummyluckycharms • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 07:56 PM

America was entering the war sooner or later - has seen by the sale of

destroyers and other military goods to Britain, so Germany's thinking was of dealing with more immediate threats.

Also, while America was very powerful economically - it means nothing if there is no where to land the troops. If Britain fell and Hawaii fell (as it was supposed to), the closest military ports for America (St Johns and San Francisco respectively) would've made fighting the war very difficult - if not impossible.

CypherWolf21 • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 01:21 PM

There were a LOT more starting from before the war began: 1. Placing politics above national goals. 2. Convoluted hierarchies and in-fighting which was encouraged by Hitler. 3. Centralisation of the economy. 4. Failing to reinforce Rommel in Africa. 5. Declaring war on the U.S. 6. Operation Barbarossa overall. 7. Logistics.

QQ_L2P • 0 points • 21 July, 2016 08:32 AM

Germany lost WW2 because Hitler voiced a military opinion. If someone has stapled his mouth shut Europe, Russia and who knows where else, would be goose-stepping right now.

TheSelfGoverned • 3 points • 21 July, 2016 01:58 AM

They have a long history of self-oppression and mass brainwashing via the state.

surfjihad • 4 points • 21 July, 2016 03:23 PM

I was divorce raped several years ago and I recently started seeing a woman who has to pay her ex husband alimony. This is in CA. I actually have a glimmer of hope that this horrible male wealth stripping system just might correct itself.

[deleted] • 9 points • 20 July, 2016 10:56 PM

Common Law always leads to common sense results but sometimes it takes it's sweet merry time getting there.

Forcetobereckonedwit • 7 points • 21 July, 2016 04:22 AM

My baby momma and I split up when she was 3 yrs old. BM went batshit crazy (found out years later she thought I was banging the babysitter...I wasn't) and tried to destroy me for months. I finally fixed all that and she ran off with our kid, of course. She tried asking for money a few times. I always said "What, you kidnapped my daughter and now you want ransom? I'll take her any time you want, full time, and I will certainly never ask you for money." She never asked again. My kid came to live with me full time at 13 and never went back to live at her mother's. They fought like cats and dogs. Alimony? Fuck off! Goddamn vaginas think they deserve it all because they have an extra hole. (rant over, for now)

bluedrygrass • 6 points • 21 July, 2016 08:04 AM

My kid came to live with me full time at 13 and never went back to live at her mother's. They fought like cats and dogs.

At least your daughter has some sense. Often that isn't the case, they stay with their crazy mother and get brainwashed to absolutely hate the air you breath.

real-boethius • 5 points • 21 July, 2016 08:20 AM

My kid came to live with me full time at 13

Actually this is pretty common.... the kids get sick of Mom, new/abusive boyfriends, passive aggressiveness, self-centeredness etc, and go and live with Dad.

Unfortunately for Dad, Mom already got the house and stuff because she had the kids initially.

Eyes_Of_The_Dragon • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 04:32 PM

Batshit crazy moms usually become intolerable once their little baby girls start getting hips and breasts, and thus more attention than saggy old mom. When the kid can no longer be useful for welfare benefits, they get tossed out on their asses.

Where they usually start using their hips and breasts to get by in life, because that's the only skill mom taught them, and the cycle continues.

Forcetobereckonedwit • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 05:57 PM

Sad but true. Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned. My daughter is great.

TheRedStoic • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 05:46 PM

Worth a post as a reminder.

Would be appreciated if you've the time and find it worth while.

Reddthrown • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 04:47 PM

I hate to be the one raining on your parade, but that's just wishful thinking and is tainted by the position from which the UK is starting.

The UK is likely the worst place on earth to get a divorce:

Pre-nups are not binding and until recently were illegal;

All past and present assets are merged in marriage, including retirement funds (so she gets half your stuff/debts and you get half her stuff/debts - guess who usually has stuff and who usually has debt);

After divorce, the judge must allocate the future earnings of both parties to ensure that both Parties keep their existing lifestyle;

If that can't be achieved (and it can't, if only because there will be two houses), then the Party who keeps the kid has priority (so guess who ends up with most of the future earnings?).

In reality, that means that the wife usually gets half of the existing assets of the husband (including retirement accounts he can't access until 55), the whole house, and 40% of the husband's future income until either (i) kids turn 18 (that's option is almost always excluded); (ii) she remarries; or (iii) he dies.

The regime is so bad that the UK is now the "divorce capital of the world", the place where women go to divorce their wealthy husbands, even if they have no real connection to the UK.

Jedi5241000 • 7 points • 21 July, 2016 04:41 AM

Brexit aka leaving the union of the biggest cucks on Earth is the best thing to have happened to UK in modern times. I am excited to see how far the UK will go in uncucking themselves!

postreformedpua • 5 points • 21 July, 2016 05:38 AM

You know we have a female PM right now that wants to ban anything other than missionary sex...

Jedi5241000 • 4 points • 21 July, 2016 05:58 AM

What's it been like since Brexit? I am curious

_redme • 3 points • 21 July, 2016 06:41 AM

There hasn't been a Brexit and there probably never will be. The referendum isn't legally binding. Sounds fucked up but that's where we are at. The PM just stated yesterday that doing Brexit in 2016 is out of the question. As a result of said referendum however, the £ crashed and is slowly recovering, growth has stagnated but otherwise business as normal.

NietzscheExplosion • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 03:04 PM

Sounds like you have the only honest economy in Europe all of a sudden.

Ecclesia_Andune • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 09:33 AM

Constant, unending fear mongering by the media about how the world hates us, the economy is going to implode and we're all going to die.

No but seriously it's constant fear mongering.

And benefits of brexit aren't really being discussed much because it's hard to talk about yourself as a pro brexit person because that makes you a racist/bigot/idiot. For example, i haven't said a word about it at work because literally every person in my office including the CEO was incredibly vocal about how Brexit was literally just and i quote 'the result of too many stupid people who can vote'

[deleted] • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 10:32 AM*

Same here, the hysteria was astonishing. In fact, unemployment figures are better than for years with no sign of an issue as yet, FTSE 100 is within 2% of its peak earlier in the year, the world and its dog is knocking on our door asking for trade agreements (which can't be signed until we throw off the EU yoke, but can be negotiated in advance). IMF has lowered their growth forecast for the UK, but it is still higher than Germany, France and Italy. I figured there would be short-term economic pain, medium term about on par with what it would have been inside, and longer term far better for us when the Euro crashes. Looks like the short-term pain isn't as bad as I had thought. The pound has dropped against the dollar, of course, but that is very good for exports. Meanwhile, Spanish banks once again started saying they needed another bailout at the end of May, and Italian banks started saying the same in June; Greece is a powder keg waiting to go up in flames. The Euro continues in deep trouble. In spite of the tough talk by the idiot Juncker, the EU is not in a position to act tough on Brexit, and Merkel can see that. There will be a fairly amicable agreement, I think, since it is in everybody's best interest, and we should not give any ground on free movement, although we should spend the time on the rest of the world more than the EU, which is stagnant. With that done, I can foresee Denmark and the Netherlands leaving too and joining us, along with Norway and Iceland. The latter two have had to take far too much bullying from the EU for access to that market, but a better alternative can be set up, without the globalist agenda behind it.

The main issue was not economics, of course, but being able to separate ourselves from the suicidal state of the EU (not that we don't have a massive amount to do with our own population, it is astonishing how much feminism, cultural marxism and PC attitudes have become entrenched in the last 30 years). There will be violence and bloodshed on the continent in much greater degree than we are seeing now, with attacks on Paris, on Nice, and even in the last couple of days a guy attacking people with an axe on a German train and a French woman and her three young daughters being knifed at a ski resort by muslims. But with the unwillingness to stop the invasion

and unwillingness to stand up for our culture without being called a 'wacist' it will hit the point of civil war. The Visegrad nations are seeing this, it seems, but we will see whether Hungary is able to hold true to their ban on immigration in the face of EU threats.

Ecclesia_Andune • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 10:43 AM

See this was almost the cloak and dagger thing that i found so funny about the Brexit vote.

I voted to leave for the reasons you laid out in your second paragraph. Namely, wanting to be as far away from Europe's experiment with cultural marxism, open borders and progressive left lunacy. However you cant really say these things openly as you just get called a 'racist/bigot' etc.

So because the libs had created a culture of fear where noone would speak out, and then spent the last 20 years in their Guardian reading echo chambers, they actually thought everyone thought the same way about foreign policy and europe as they did. So then they thought, well it CAN'T be to do with any of that, it must be an economic thing, but look how GOOD the EU is for us economically?

Wheras 52% of us see that Europes policies are fucking suicide. I'd sign up into a heartbeat to an economical union with europe, but not a cultural one

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 10:51 AM*

I'd sign up into a heartbeat to an economical union with europe, but not a cultural one

A Common Market (but without enforced free movement), yes, me too. There are huge economic troubles in Europe because of the failed Euro experiment (which I foresaw when they announced it back in the late 90s), which means it isn't the golden economic egg that it previously was. The EU thinks we are so stupid that it can stab us in the back and nobody will notice. You might recall when Osborne came back from Brussels with a firm guarantee that we would not be called on to bail out a Euro nation. Less than a year later, when the bailout of Greece happened (more accurately stated as a bailout of the French and German investors, it did nothing for Greece), we found that 860 million sterling of our money was included. When challenged, Donald Tusk said that it was only a 'political agreement' not in a treaty, and therefore not legally binding. You would think they would at least pretend to be honest in the run up to the referendum, but they were so confident that we would be too scared to leave, they didn't bother hiding it, and didn't bother making any meaningful concessions on fixing the problems with the EU either.

But I see this coming century as being a bloody one, a clash of civilizations as Huntington said, and the EU is completely incapable of defending itself in that clash.

Ecclesia_Andune • 2 points • 21 July, 2016 10:56 AM

Yeah things are certainly looking messy.

The thing people are sleeping on is that not only is Greece on the verge of falling apart again but Italy is in a REALLY bad state and the banks are sitting on so much debt.

If Italy goes and Greece goes again guess who's going to footing the bill? The thing I find crazy is that France is still in the EU. They're having WEEKLY terrorist attacks there now, their prime minister told them they need to learn to 'live' with terror. It's lunacy.

The thing with Greece is tricky too, I understand that they got themselves into the mess

they're in, but the rate that Germany is demanding the austerity to go ahead is crazy. They can't even afford to buy enough syringes in their hospitals, it's awful. Their threats about how the UK is going to be left out is predicated on their current position of strength. I think if we get out before things start going sour, and maybe a couple of other nations leave I think we'll be in a good place

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 11:22 AM*

Full agreement, Greece and Italy will take the Euro down, and I think it shows how civilized the Greeks are that they haven't descended into total chaos and anarchy. They voted twice to reject the austerity measures that are crippling them, and still got hammered with it to satisfy their creditors. They should have left the Euro and defaulted. Russia and Argentina have both done it, and it wasn't the end of the world for them, but it would have meant primarily German and French investors lost money, so they are still on the hook. As you say, the Greeks got themselves into the mess when they went crazy with public spending after getting access to low interest rates on joining the Euro (which they should never have been allowed to do), but right now we are destroying people's lives. If you are unemployed for so many years in your youth you have no possibility of creating a good life for yourself and you only live once.

The Hungarian president has just said that terrorism follows along in the wake of immigration, which is just common sense, yet people are totally brainwashed and refuse to see it. I was speaking with someone about the latest couple of attacks (German train and French ski resort), and he immediately sought to make excuses. 'Do you know how many people were killed in the Iraq war?' So what? That was years ago, and the people in Nice or Paris were not in Iraq (nor were the attackers), and in Iraq and Afghanistan it is largely Muslims killing Muslims, as it is around the world. After getting rid of a vile dictator, they had a chance to rebuild a fair and democratic nation, but instead resorted to ongoing sectarian violence, truck bombs in markets, etc. After WWII that did not happen in places like Germany and Japan and Italy, why? Because of culture. That same culture is being imported into the West and nobody in public office is saying, 'no, this is incompatible, you can come when you change your culture'. Instead, when we have a full-scale invasion, the EU decides that they have to let people come in if they want, and instead will just enforce quotas to metastasise the problem. Madness. If the EU was robust in defence of its culture, I would have voted to stay in, strength in unity, but not strength in weakness.

We also need to stop talking about 'net immigration'. There really isn't a big problem if French guys live in the UK or Germany, or Poles live in the UK or Ireland, because their culture is compatible. But all around the world, we are seeing that Islamic culture is incompatible with all others (Chinese, Russian, African, Western, everything).

I recommend

https://www.amazon.co.uk/Clash-Civilizations-Remaking-World-Order/dp/074323149X/ref=sr_1_3?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1469100367&sr=1-3&keywords=clash+of+civilizations

Ecclesia_Andune • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 11:31 AM

The point you make about net immigration vs culture difference is so important. My dad who is hyper liberal is quick to point out that immigrants put more money into the economy than put out, and are less likely to be on benefits than nationals.

He misses the point, it's not an economic thing, i don't have a problem with the poor. Hell, i was fucking poor as hell. But i have a problem with mass influx of a culture that is not in line with western values.

Defaulting for greece would have been risky as hell though because they need to be able to lend money. But you're right, the kind of money they spent on public spending when entering the EU was offered irresponsibly. It's still greece's fault, but we hold lending agencies responsible for lending to vulnerable people, and the same logic should apply to nations.

nzgs • -1 points • 21 July, 2016 10:30 AM

Nothing changed, same old project fear in the media, and the shaming on social media of anyone who isn't a cuck socialist europhile.

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 12:40 PM

Brexit and now this?ç

Uk is again turning into the great Empire it was.

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 12:48 PM

Just hope this gravy train comes to a stop...for good!

Whores will have to find other ways to extract cash, or simply get a job!

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 01:03 PM

HALLELUJAH, HALLELUJAH, HALLELUJAH, Hallelujah!!!

RupsjeNooitgenoeg • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 01:56 PM

A step in the good direction, but a LOT more has to change on an international level before I could ever even consider marriage.

Moneyley • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 02:25 PM

Perhaps things are starting to change? If they adopt this in the U.S. I'm going to go streaking in the streets

Unfortunately, the UK offsetted the gain youve described with this.

<http://heatst.com/uk/british-police-hitting-on-women-is-now-a-hate-crime/>

kick6 • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 02:48 PM

Move to Texas. If she has a degree and /or employable skills.....no alimony.

hardtostarboard2016 • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 04:16 PM

with mores changed and women now equal, it's very good that the government is expecting more from them

[deleted] • 1 points • 21 July, 2016 05:02 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 points • 21 July, 2016 05:04 PM

[permanently deleted]

bloodfoxtue • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 05:47 PM

Has hell frozen over? Maybe there is hope after all

JP116 • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 08:43 PM

I got divorced 2 years ago. US resident.

My ex-wife's lawyer told her that she might not get any alimony because she is well educated and makes decent money (she could have been making more but she was working a job that gave her a lot of flexibility to take care of kids, house, etc.).

We agreed on alimony for a few years which I did mainly to be sure my kids could stay in the same house and not have to change schools.

Alimony, overall, is waning as courts recognize that women can and do earn. The days of the stay home mom who hasn't worked in 20 years and has no real skills is over and, accordingly, excessive, lifelong alimony.

Natural_RP • 1 point • 23 July, 2016 01:26 AM

As a Canadian resident (I know I know) that makes a relatively high income I can say this isn't the case over here.

Guys can't retire or stop working obscene amounts of overtime because they judge or alter their current alimony payments. This country is insane.

Never marry, Never have children.

OneInAZillion • 1 point • 22 July, 2016 03:37 AM*

Is there some sort of psychological damage that occurs when a woman isn't allowed to maintain the same lifestyle as she had when she was married? Why is this even a concept at all?

From the article:

The deal included an annual allowance of £116,000 for handbags and £40,000 for fur coats.

..because if she had to live without those things it'd be such a travesty to her well being..

If a woman marries a rich man and gets to bathe in his lifestyle for x amount of time until they divorce, why is it that she now gets to keep living off his dime? If a woman makes the decision to leave a man, she damn well should also be leaving his financial support. If he gets rid of her, he should be able to have her completely out of her life. Who he fuck cares if she ends up working some shit job because she devoted her time to trying to attract the right man rather than attaining life skills to fend for herself?

I think a very telling thing about women is that most of the time in divorce settlements, women take as much as they possibly can from a man, and rarely reject a lucrative settlement in favor of a lesser one. The greed is off the wall for these bitches and the fact that courts still allow them to get away with it is the real travesty.

By the way, this woman was a Perelli model which means even if she didn't get a dime she'd still live pretty goddamn good anyway, but nah, she wants to take a chunk out of him on her way out..

75 million euros.. divorce settlements are a joke. Congrats on all your hard work to earn that money though

babydoll.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 July, 2016 03:58 PM

Brexit was the start to something beautiful. Good luck and God speed

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 July, 2016 06:20 AM

It shouldn't even be maintenance for a short period of time - they were already being provided for during the marriage, why should they get a single cent more afterwards? If anyone pays anyone it should be the wife to the husband for the years of accommodation LOL.

Still good to see progress though.

MagmaiKH • 1 point • 29 July, 2016 04:47 AM

That's already law in the US.

In most states spousal support is limited to half the length of marriage with a 5 to 10 year vestment period.

welington1 • 1 point • 17 November, 2016 07:42 AM

An amazing testimony on a man who brought my husband back to me.. My name is Melissa Shears and I'm happily married to a lovely and caring husband, with two kids. A very big problem occurred in my family seven months ago, between me and my husband. So terrible that he took the case to court for a divorce. He said that He never wanted to stay with me again, and that he didn't love me anymore. So he moved out of the house and made me and my children pass through severe pain. I tried all my possible means to get him back, after much begging, but all to no avail. and he confirmed it that he has made his decision, and he never wanted to see me again. So on one evening, as I was coming back from work, I met an old friend of mine who asked of my husband. So I explained every thing to her, so she told me that the only way I can get my Husband back is to visit a spell caster, because it has really worked for her too even in winning her court cases. So I never believed in spell, but I had no other choice, than to follow her advice. Then she gave me the email address of the spell caster whom she visited. {hamzamalissolutioncenter @ gmail . com }. So the next morning, I sent a mail to the address she gave to me, and the spell caster assured me that I will get my husband back the next day. What an amazing statement!! I never believed, so he spoke with me, and told me everything that I need to do. Then the next morning, So surprisingly, my husband who didn't call me for the past seven {7} months, gave me a call to inform me that he was coming back. So Amazing!! So that was how he came back that same day, with lots of love and joy, and he apologized for his mistake, and for the pain he caused me and my children. Then from that day, our relationship was now stronger than how it were before, by the help of Dr Hamza. So, I will advice you out there to kindly visit the same website { hamzamalissolutioncenter @ gmail . com }, if you are in any condition like this, or you have any problem related to "bringing your ex back or winning divorce court cases. So thanks to Dr Hamza for bringing back my husband, and brought great joy to my family once again. { hamzamalissolutioncenter @ gmail . com } Thanks...

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 21 July, 2016 02:13 PM

"Divorce lawyers say they have seen a marked increase in cases in which family courts agree maintenance only for a limited period rather than traditional indefinite settlements."

Child Support Laws are a very recent invention and only were installed in the United States in 1950.

The English Law system had long **banned** any type of child support.

So this is returning to tradition.

Like Brexit it represents "waking up".

I hope they are successful in repairing this horrible male Slavery problem and can be an example to others who desire the adherence to Natural Laws above Blue Pill laws.