

Germany taking a big step against Cuckoldry

August 30, 2016 | 965 upvotes | by [CHAD_J_THUNDERCOCK](#)

tldr: Women in Germany could be legally forced to reveal to their husbands if their children are the product of an affair with another man *if new legislation goes through*.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/08/29/germany-to-force-women-to-disclose-if-children-are-from-a-n-affai/>

The controversial measure will force women to divulge acts of adultery or infidelity during a relationship.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-37215684>

The measure would apply when men who had supported a child, believing that they were the father, sought financial redress in court.

Germany has already been taking similar male paternity rights steps recently. In April, Germany's courts ruled that children cannot force men they suspect of being their biological fathers to undergo a DNA test. They can only oblige their legal fathers to undergo testing.

There wasnt much response on Twitter to this news. Most were positive including women. Though there were a few of these tweets, all from women:

| @BBCWorld @BBCNews wow, if he already formed a long relationship w/the child.He basically adopted the child.Not fair2 the child to back out.

I suggest shorting any stocks you have in the Daytime Talk-Show industry.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Rodear • 257 points • 30 August, 2016 12:24 PM

Not fair to the child to back out? wtf?! Usual 'think of the children' crap. I know why not put the shame instead on the bitches who deliberately let their husbands support and grow to love a child that was not his. NOT the same as a childless couple knowingly adopting a child at all. No man should ever be forced to support a child that is not his; if a man wishes to because he cannot help but love a child he *thought* was his -fair enough but NEVER forced by the state to do so.

[deleted] • 22 points • 31 August, 2016 04:27 AM*

It's Happening!

Exodus!

To remove all the comments you've ever made on reddit, overwriting them with a message like this:

Chrome: TamperMonkey

Firefox: GreaseMonkey

Safari: NinjaKit

Opera: Violent Monkey

IE: AdGuard (in Advanced Mode)

... then add this GreaseMonkey script. Go to your comments, and click the OVERWRITE button! Repeat for every page of comments you have.

[deleted] • 3 points • 2 September, 2016 08:03 AM

Now let's see if that applies when a dad wants to be in a child's life.

No, it doesn't? The wheel keeps spinning.

TheReformist94 • -6 points • 30 August, 2016 06:10 PM

These women are on the same moral plane as male rapist.this is the true female equivalent of rape.just remember,only 40% of men got to reproduce compared to 80% of women, which means 40% are rapists if they could pull it off not getting caught.let that sink in.

sir_wankalot_here • -60 points • 30 August, 2016 12:48 PM

You are the stupid one, why do I say this ? The woman has an extremely weak hand so she is attempting a reframe. The reframe distracts from the fact she cheated to the welfare of the child, this then clouds the issue with emotions.

Not sure if it is true but a male lawyer posted on twitter the highest paid lawyers in USA are now women. It is plausible, a lawyer reframes an explanation why their client was caught doing something that appeared illegal. Women are masters at reframing.

Rodear • 38 points • 30 August, 2016 01:14 PM

I honestly do not see how anything I have said is stupid. Shame the mother instead of father? Yep. Seems to be the correct thing to do. NOT be forced to support a child he later finds out is not his? Yep, seems reasonable. It is obviously in the best interests of the mother to cloud the issue with emotion: I am not stupid, I get that. All I am saying is that the emotional blackmail 'ball' of 'think of the child!' should be

kicked back to the feet of the guilty party: the mother and any man who refuses to pay for a child that is not his should have full support of doing the correct thing. But, dream on, it won't happen I guess.

sir_wankalot_here • -39 points • 30 August, 2016 01:28 PM

You are stupid because you are using logic to argue your point. Women inherently understand *game* which is taking a weak hand and using rhetoric to make it into a strong hand.

Don't I used to be stupid also.

Rodear • 11 points • 30 August, 2016 01:48 PM

Yeah, fair comment. Lol. No room for logic. I fully appreciate your comment about taking a weak hand and making it into a strong hand, I am totally and utterly aware that women have been doing this for absolutely years; hiding behind their children to get access to that which they want. The societal pressure for a man to take care of children that he later finds out is not his is strong, I mean society KNOWS it is wrong but does not give a damn about it-and that includes men themselves. Many men say 'oh well you did raise them to this point' Myself? I would not blame any guy who just said 'fuck it' and walked away. Maybe I am odd.

Overkillengine • 11 points • 30 August, 2016 02:19 PM

I would not blame any guy who just said 'fuck it' and walked away. Maybe I am odd.

Nah, it's not weird at all. I only get pissed when men walk away from children that are actually theirs, because then they end up costing *me* via taxes-to-welfare money.

Fuck paying for someone else to get pussy. Where is my pussy welfare?

sir_wankalot_here • 6 points • 30 August, 2016 06:42 PM

No room for logic.

This is why MRA is getting their ass kicked. Women inherently know how to reframe arguments, by reframe I mean place in different contexts and appeal to emotion.

The *Progressives* are winning because they are better at reframing and have the best neurologistic experts working for them. The two best examples of this are

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Lakoff and his exwife who is editor of HuffPo.

Notice how Liberal has been renamed to Progressive. Liberal from the 1960s has negative connotations, reframe it. Anyone who opposes you can be reframed as a backwards, ignorant redneck.

The purpose of logic is to justify the emotional impulses of the argument.

Rodear • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 07:15 AM*

Think there is a misunderstanding here, but I get what you are saying; to logical people-then my comments seem fair but the 'enemy' thinks differently and in order to play *their* game which obviously is getting the right results *they* want i.e. 'think of the children!' perhaps reframing needs to be done by the logical people too. How about reframing the man as the victim here? I mean he IS of course but that is kind of besides the point.

Ranting and raving about the (obvious) injustice does not work. Victimhood seems to be a masterstroke with them. You've taught me something today that I think can be applied to any situation in life.

Oftowerbroleaning • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 12:42 AM

You are stupid because you are using logic to argue your point.

Fuckin lol. Please tell me you're either a woman or you're trolling.

sir_wankalot_here • -2 points • 31 August, 2016 12:53 AM

I cited sources to back up my point, read them.

Oftowerbroleaning • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 12:59 AM

Sources to say that using logic to argue a point is stupid? Nah, I'm good.

sir_wankalot_here • -4 points • 31 August, 2016 01:08 AM

Well, I guess yoy will never learn game.

[deleted] • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 11:11 PM

holy shit, this is *really* a tell how badly this subreddit has declined, when this comment gets downvoted.

sir_wankalot_here • 6 points • 30 August, 2016 11:44 PM

Possibly I am being attacked by SJW downvoters again, it happened around 1.5 years back for a couple of months. I found a gist with a list of TRP names on it which looked like it was made to be fed into a bot.

What is interesting is even my comment where I cited the work of Lakoff was downvoted. Lakoff's exwife studied under Chomsky another linguistic expert. Lakoff advices fhe left on how to use emotion and reframing for the purposes of pushing a leftist agenda.

You read the enemies strategy books so you can learn what the enemy is upto and his tactics. Lakoff and Chomsky are experts.

Gettingaware • 7 points • 31 August, 2016 02:40 AM

no its cause you called him stupid, i bet you could have made the same post without that first sentence and it would have been taken very differently.

thats my take.

DannyDemotta • 4 points • 31 August, 2016 03:22 AM

Its downvoted because its unrelated slop. It has little or nothing to do with OPs post - which is to say a man should not be forced BY THE STATE to support a child that isnt his. You're on this pointless rant about how the woman did what she thought was right - which is inconsequential, because you never tie it back to why that means a man should have to pay up just because a woman was dishonest.

Then you have the nerve to call OP the stupid one when you're the one with shit reading comprehension.

sir_wankalot_here • -1 points • 31 August, 2016 04:35 AM

Fun watching the BP hamster spin wildly.

one when you're the one with shit reading comprehension.

Do you understand what the words "influence" and "reframing" mean ? Obviously not.

You're on this pointless rant about how the woman did what she thought was right
Statement shows you are BP. In RP there is no morality, only achieving objectives. She reframed her argument which was a smart move.

DannyDemotta • 1 point • 1 September, 2016 07:52 PM

You sound like a Markov chain. You're quite literally arguing with yourself - nobody is disagreeing with your arguments, only their appropriateness to the discussion.

TheDialecticParadox • 1 point • 30 August, 2016 11:20 PM

Don't know why you got downvoted to hell, this is basic biology. Men use logic and rhetoric to get what they want, women use emotions and manipulation.

stoicismexpress • 53 points • 30 August, 2016 12:14 PM

Wait...how the fuck is this not already a thing?

CHAD_J_THUNDERCOCK[S] • 154 points • 30 August, 2016 12:18 PM

In France its still illegal to do a paternity test to determine if your child is actually yours.

<https://www.ibdna.com/paternity-testing-ban-upheld-in-france/>

French psychologists suggest that fatherhood is determined by society not by biology

Biological paternity is a social construct!!

Rodear • 54 points • 30 August, 2016 12:27 PM

Given their tendency towards adultery this does not surprise me.

Jaereth • 25 points • 30 August, 2016 04:03 PM **[recovered]**

French psychologists suggest that fatherhood is determined by society not by biology

Or in other words: It's better you don't know when you are raising Chandler's kids so you will be a better father to them!

Funny society doesn't seem to determine maternity the same way. Like you accidentally knock up some slag, why wouldn't the kids just get to come live with you and you're current girl because hey, that's their real mother right?

razormachine • 9 points • 30 August, 2016 11:19 PM

Funny society doesn't seem to determine maternity the same way. Like you accidentally knock up some slag, why wouldn't the kids just get to come live with you and you're current girl because hey, that's their real mother right?

Woman hamster how it isn't really important who the parent (father) is. However when hospital fucks up and couples get children who are not their own they are utterly shocked.

[deleted] • 13 points • 30 August, 2016 11:42 PM

Note to self- go knock up married women in France.. The perfect reproduction strategy

QDodge • 5 points • 30 August, 2016 08:30 PM

Germany has a similar law. You need both parents' consent to do a paternity test. Which honestly renders this proposed law useless, because women could simply deny that they cuckolded their husbands and there would be no way to prove that they did.

razormachine • 33 points • 30 August, 2016 12:48 PM

French psychologists suggest that fatherhood is determined by society not by biology.

Psychology is a pseudo-science. While it would be hard for a complete moron to hide among scientific community, they do seem to prosper in pseudo-scientific community.

wanderer779 • 20 points • 30 August, 2016 01:37 PM

It is one of those fields where you can't prove yourself wrong or right with experiments unlike physics.

A great example of what happens when bullshitters venture off into hard science can be found in the history of Indiana state government. Their legislature once tried to pass a law that would establish that pi be valued at 3.2. They actually invited a science professor to meet the author of the bill, who replied that he already knew enough crazy people.

[deleted] • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 03:47 AM

[permanently deleted]

wanderer779 • 2 points • 31 August, 2016 01:01 PM

You are right I know next to nothing about psychology. I think I have always been turned off by them saying things like fatherhood is not a matter of biology. You don't see governments coming up with nonsense policies and supporting them with opinions from physicists.

WASPandNOTsorry • 0 points • 31 August, 2016 04:32 AM

<https://www.theguardian.com/science/2015/aug/27/study-delivers-bleak-verdict-on-validity-of-psychology-experiment-results>

razormachine • 5 points • 30 August, 2016 04:59 PM

I didn't know about that, but it's a great example.

Let's just imagine for a second that one of those bullshitters had passed the whole $\pi=3.2$. Every engineer out there is obligated to calculate the Pi as 3.2. From that point on the industry steadily goes to shit, a lot of parts are faulty, a lot of engineers try to avoid circular shapes as much as possible, some engineers cheat and still use the 3.16... pi for their calculations, but when they risk being labeled as fascists for doing that...

That's exactly what's happening in society right now. Bullshitters had managed to pass on their B.S. as facts and truths. And our society steadily goes to shit.

AcrossHallowedGround • 15 points • 30 August, 2016 08:39 PM

3.14159... If you use 3.16 your stuff still goes to shit.

razormachine • -1 points • 30 August, 2016 10:38 PM

As a kid I memorized pi as 3.16... and even after all those years sometimes I pull the wrong number -.-

[deleted] • 5 points • 30 August, 2016 11:38 PM

o_o; ITS 3.14. NOT 3.16.

You've got to be mistaken...I mean, no educator is going to claim that PI is 3.16. With 3.14 you are rounding down slightly, but for most math this is probably fine. Personally, I use 3.1415, but I'm sure others go even further.

Sabremesh • 8 points • 31 August, 2016 12:06 AM

Personally, I use 3.1415, but I'm sure others go even further.

Actually, for four places of decimals, rounding up to 3.1416 would be more accurate.

Rawrination • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 01:48 AM

which is probably where the person got 3.16 in his memory from.

razormachine • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 11:57 AM

As I had said I had memorized the wrong number. Your communication skills are almost as crappy as my math.

[deleted] • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 04:29 AM*

It's Happening!

Exodus!

To remove all the comments you've ever made on reddit, overwriting them with a message like this:

Chrome: TamperMonkey

Firefox: GreaseMonkey

Safari: NinjaKit

Opera: Violent Monkey

IE: AdGuard (in Advanced Mode)

... then add this GreaseMonkey script. Go to your comments, and click the OVERWRITE button! Repeat for every page of comments you have.

LordThunderbolt • 7 points • 30 August, 2016 04:56 PM

Psychology is not a pseudo science. Just because your mind is unable to wrap itself around the unseen it doesn't make the unseen unreal. Psychology is a very powerful discipline in the right hands. It borderline transcends the physical. Don't go around saying what you just said because any intelligent person hearing u say that will automatically quality you as an elite level moron who wouldn't be given anything else but tools to work land on a farm.

Admiringcone • 11 points • 31 August, 2016 04:40 AM

It borderline transcends the physical.

Ease up turbo. It doesn't transcend anything. It's a physical study of mental conditions.

LordThunderbolt • -1 points • 31 August, 2016 10:52 PM

You're very ignorant to the nature and power of psychology. Psychology borderline transcends the physical. You don't know what you're trying to talk about. It's about much much much more than mental conditions.

Admiringcone • 4 points • 31 August, 2016 11:57 PM

Wow. You are a supercilious twat. I think you are very ignorant to the nature and power of those around you to see through your "I R Smarts" routine.

frenchbloke • 2 points • 5 September, 2016 09:19 AM

Psychology is more an art than a science. It's actually very difficult to do rigorous scientific testing in psychology. This isn't anyone's fault. It's just the nature of the subject.

Psychology is a very powerful discipline in the right hands.

Yes, "in the right hands" psychology can be a very effective discipline, but this actually makes the discipline very dependent on the practitioner in question, which in my opinion, also reinforces the fact that it is more of an art than an actual science.

razormachine • 5 points • 30 August, 2016 05:33 PM

Mater is composed of small unicorns that are having an orgy. Prove me wrong.

Gender is a social construct. Prove me wrong.

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 04:32 AM*

It's Happening!

Exodus!

To remove all the comments you've ever made on reddit, overwriting them with a message like this:

Chrome: TamperMonkey

Firefox: GreaseMonkey

Safari: NinjaKit

Opera: Violent Monkey

IE: AdGuard (in Advanced Mode)

... then add this GreaseMonkey script. Go to your comments, and click the OVERWRITE button! Repeat for every page of comments you have.

razormachine • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 11:10 AM

Really really tiny horny unicorns.

Admiringcone • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 04:40 AM

Well you raised those points..so the onus is kind of on you to prove those..

razormachine • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 11:15 AM

Yes I agree, I should prove those.

bluedrygrass • 5 points • 30 August, 2016 07:14 PM

Psychology is a very powerful discipline tool of control in the right hands.

Psychology isn't any different from astrology, in how it's used to manipulate people in believing things that are convenient to other people

probpoopin • 5 points • 30 August, 2016 09:16 PM

Microbiologist here. Psychology is what people study when they suck at math. Quackery at it's finest.

[deleted] • -1 points • 31 August, 2016 04:46 AM

The amount of biologists I know that believe in homeopathy and body energymakesme think that you guys raise idiots too

probpoopin • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 06:05 PM

Uhh, I don't know a single biologist that believes in homeopathic medicine. Maybe some redditors believe it, and then try to say they have a degree in biology, which they don't actually have. Biology is a science like any other. Everything is based on evidence and observation. There is no evidence that homeopathic meds work at all beyond placebo. I know that in my school the humanities people had to get a few lab credits. They would take bio 101 and then say they were studying biology to other people. In reality, they took a single course to satisfy the need for lab credits, then go back to psychology, sociology, or gender studies thinking they have a grasp on biology as a whole. Biology doesn't get really technical until you start doing major cell bio and micro bio. Shit gets real and it is based very heavily on mathematics, physics, and chem. My 200+ level biology was pretty much indistinguishable from organic chemistry and physics of living things. Like, how molecules react inside of cells, KREB cycle, vit C cycle anx all that. It gets technical very quick after 101.

Tldr, those "biologists" are god damned liars. They probably don't have a degree.

[deleted] • 0 points • 31 August, 2016 06:19 PM

That's pretty much to read for the assumption that I "know" these biologists from reddit. I know 2 biologists (1 of them molecular biologists) who told me to put some homeopathic remedy shit on my scar (from an operation). The thing is, both work in biomedical research as managers. They are not even bad bosses but they somehow believe in this shit. Still, they both have masters degrees and one has a PhD. What's even the point in thinking that biologists don't have these people, if a fucking huge amount of MDs think this stuff works, which isn't that far of from biology anyway. Life Sciences are trenced with idiots. Psychology isn't the only science which seems to be a meeting point for esoteric cunts who pander to nice sounding "hypothese".

probpoopin • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 06:48 PM

I personally haven't seen them. Most of my professors have openly ridiculed those types of medicine as non evidence based. There are however plenty of natural medicines that work. What do you call natural medicine that works? Medicine. One that comes to mind is senna extract or senna tea for constipation. Homeopathy is complete BS though and again, while studying and briefly working in that field, never came across people with those views. I'm sure they are out there. I would still say that it isn't science though and almost every university in existance is going to teach based on evidence.

I suppose every group, even intellectual circles, have radical ideas that occasionally float around. There are mathematicians who believe numerology. Plenty of physicists who have other thoughts on the big bang and the universe than mainstream. However, I still think these types of individuals are a tiny minority in those fields. Honestly, I can't think of any branch of science that doesn't have a few quacks associated with it. I just don't think it speaks to the vast majority of that population.

[deleted] • 0 points • 31 August, 2016 07:03 PM

I never fought against that. I didn't want to say that homeopathy or these things are science. I just wanted to say, that while it is understandable that psychology has a bad rep because of much nonsense, these idiots are within other not so hard sciences (as physics for example) also. I studied psychology, i got my master, I hate it for being a big shithole of circular reasoning, non-testable hypotheses and PC-bs but this is more a problem of the people within it as for the science itself. It can be a science but it's easy for quackery. I still worked to get some expertise in stats... makes more sense to me than most of the psycho-babble.

Gawernator • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 06:33 AM

This doesn't sound like my AP psychology class at all.....

ven5 • -1 points • 31 August, 2016 06:10 AM

They meant psychology, the institution, not psychology, as in the intricacies of the human mind. Psychologists have proven so many times that they're incapable of conducting a proper study. It's either bullshit statistical analysis of 100-1000 person groups or a professor's philosophical take on someone else's statistical study. I.E. Do you see a physicist throwing 1000 balls by hand at a bunch of cars of different makes to determine how much force it takes to bend a piece of metal? These crappy standards for studies are what makes it hard to prove, and a pseudo science. As with any pseudo science, it's not always wrong, but it mostly is.

LordThunderbolt • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 10:55 PM

No, they meant psych as a whole. Because of their limited limited understanding of the nature of the science. When people think psych, they see therapy, and little bullshit like that.

AFPJ • 13 points • 30 August, 2016 04:47 PM

Step (1) move to France. Step (2) stay single and fuck around. Step (3) Profit.

Or it would be, if France wasn't basically the new fucking Nigeria / Jamaica.

[deleted] • -10 points • 30 August, 2016 10:16 PM

Nigeria or Jamaica? What a retarded moron you are. If you know nothing about Europe and European countries, keep your comments to yourself. Americans should shut the fuck up from time to time, everyone's got an opinion but you seem to have no knowledge.

[deleted] • 7 points • 31 August, 2016 12:24 AM

He is not wrong. So many shitskins and blacks, especially in the bigger cities. And yes, I'm from

Europe.

WASPandNOTsorry • 2 points • 31 August, 2016 04:33 AM

I just visited France. I agree with him.

[deleted] • -1 points • 31 August, 2016 01:25 AM

[permanently deleted]

oxnd • 2 points • 31 August, 2016 11:15 AM

LOL @ quoting the Dailymail GTFO

probpoopin • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 06:09 PM

Telegraph and the daily mail? Haha haha haha haha haha haha haha haha!!!

Osoto_Gari • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 05:29 AM

I read that if the father denies the child is his the chick is shit out of luck

newName543456 • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 10:04 AM

No wonder they are getting overrun by Muslims with weak crap like that. And in a way that's an improvement.

ODERINT-DUM-METUANT- • 1 point • 30 August, 2016 08:42 PM

Hopefully they abolish that disgusting law.

[deleted] • 0 points • 30 August, 2016 08:05 PM

I hope I live long enough to see the long-term effects of this law. In theory, their society will degrade because the average man has less incentive to produce, knowing his children may not be his.

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 08:47 AM

The thing is that the father can send in samples to a lab and know completely for sure for himself.

The bullshit is where that evidence is inadmissible in court because you didn't get the mother's permission.

I would go on a fucking family-court shooting spree if that happened to me. Starting with my wife.

getRedPill • 1 point • 1 September, 2016 02:36 PM

That's a lie that have perpetuated successfully. Society won't melt because a few men know that kid isn't his. If anything this gives a peace and certainty, which brings positive effects.

Sunshine12e • 1 points • 30 August, 2016 01:49 PM [recovered]

The laws were old, before paternity testing was even a possibility. In the old days, the husband was considered the father no matter what.

Overkillengine • 30 points • 30 August, 2016 02:20 PM

In the old days, the husband was allowed to retaliate against cuckoldry too.

SpeakerToRedditors • 20 points • 30 August, 2016 03:54 PM [recovered]

Exactly, in the old days you could raise the little bastard to the age of 5 then force it to work at the glass bottle company or sell it off to slavery in the coal mines. Getting a return on your investment.

razormachine • 6 points • 30 August, 2016 11:30 PM

You can still fully legally indoctrinate the kid into the blue pill, taught the kid about the nazi war crimes and plant deep guilt and self hate for it. Learn the kid about fluid genders and offer to pay for the hormonal therapy.

Extra points, you get to brag how liberal and open minded you are :)

loddfavne • 7 points • 31 August, 2016 08:56 AM

After reading what you wrote, I'm starting to think that kids were better off in the coal-mines than in modern society.

getRedPill • 1 point • 1 September, 2016 02:38 PM

Exactly the same I thought

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 12:53 PM

Laws against cheating while married should also be a thing. Coming in contact with a third party's bodily fluids without your consent is a form of rape.

[deleted] • 65 points • 30 August, 2016 12:38 PM

Wait wait wait. This is a proposal. "...It will require parliamentary approval".

Yashugan00 • 36 points • 30 August, 2016 12:59 PM

yes, we all know it won't be passed into law. Too many complications. And you know the state will have to either pick up the tab for the child, OR spend effort finding the actual father OR force the father (now demoted to being the child's guardian) through administrative process. This will cost heaps of money and slow down the legal system even more. Hence, it won't be passed.

[deleted] • 41 points • 30 August, 2016 01:42 PM

Not to mention the nightmare of "forcing a woman" to disclose her sexual history, something most men know is something women go to their graves with.

TheRedThrowAwayPill • 1 point • 1 September, 2016 08:06 AM

Add a grandfather clause.

Now it acts as a deterrent for future infidelity.

r3v3r • 12 points • 30 August, 2016 04:09 PM

Lol bullshit this law is introduced by the great coalition who have the most seats by far. It will be passed. Also this law has been introduced after the courts ordered the laws to be modified. So this is not unexpected and something has to change anyway

Horus_Krishna_2 • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 08:27 PM

they have angela merkel in charge. she ain't gonna sign this into law.

chasethecake • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 10:52 AM

If she doesn't she'll take a lot of flak at a critical moment for her reputation (immigrant policy), I don't think she will decline unless it's some sort of political suicide goodbye she's planning.

getRedPill • 1 point • 1 September, 2016 02:40 PM

She could get away with it. Too much blue pill mentality, that's why she is there first place

loddfavne • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 08:58 AM

Womens feelings will be the main argument, but the motive to discard this proposal will be that it makes it harder to for the state to grab mens money. You are so right.

[deleted] • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 07:19 PM

What part of the title or the post suggests otherwise?

Horus_Krishna_2 • 6 points • 30 August, 2016 08:29 PM

says taking a big step . . . but wake me when they actually do, article says and I quote "Women in Germany could be forced to reveal the names of the biological fathers of their children under a proposed new law.

The controversial measure will force women to divulge acts of adultery or infidelity during a relationship.

It has already been dubbed the "Cuckoo Kids' Law" by the German press, after the German phrase "

0xdada • 77 points • 30 August, 2016 12:34 PM

Women love their children, yet aren't above using them as human shields when it comes to "what's best for me."

awalt_cupcake • 54 points • 30 August, 2016 04:42 PM

As the son of an abusive mother, I truly don't believe women love anything but feelings. They sure do know how to act like it though. They are professional actors.

bluedrygrass • 23 points • 30 August, 2016 07:08 PM

100% support to that. Women don't love childs, they love that childs give them: 1- social validation and attention 2- feelings, of any kind, lots of 'em 3- make them feel like they have power over someone's life 4-make them feel special and unique

[deleted] • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 01:39 AM

This right here. The truth.

bbmc7gm6fm • 92 points • 30 August, 2016 11:24 AM

And what would they do to those women who cheat? Prison?

I bet nothing!

[deleted] • 227 points • 30 August, 2016 01:00 PM

Stone them if current migration trends don't change.

ManInAFunnyRedSheet • 56 points • 30 August, 2016 03:00 PM

Sounds about right. I love the "religion of peace"

allrandomworldnews • 27 points • 30 August, 2016 04:49 PM

Does not sound too bad either considering the shit those women try to pull.

Edit: fuck snackbars though

iLLprincipLeS • 12 points • 30 August, 2016 06:07 PM **[recovered]**

Woman's world is her husband, her family, her children and her home. We do not find it right when she presses into the world of men.

Funny enough, according to some sources, if Germany won the war there was a possibility they would have had made up a strange mixture of Islam, Christianity and Paganism.

..in the future, who knows how white islamism would look like if done right. Lovable punishment can go a long way.

razormachine • 29 points • 30 August, 2016 12:53 PM

They will have to pay a hefty fine of 50 euros.

guyinaltr • 20 points • 30 August, 2016 12:13 PM

Now not only husband will provide for her and her child but also lovers lol

bbmc7gm6fm • 18 points • 30 August, 2016 12:18 PM*

Yes, I bet the law is a feminist law disguised as men's rights to know what and what.

First of all, the woman may deny it all in the first place. Secondly, if the husband insists and through genetic tests it becomes clear that he's not the biological father- wife lied- the relationship is already ruined.

Let's suppose the wife admits to having affairs. Would that make the relationship secure? No, if the husbands knows his shit. If the husband is a Nice Guy, yes- she may feel sympathy for the child and his wife and...

EDIT: Still I don't know if the husband has to pay for his wife's child regardless of being his biological father or not! Anyway, the husbands are doomed!

razormachine • 16 points • 30 August, 2016 01:19 PM

Well woman is (theoretically) not losing anything with this law. If this law is implemented the "cuck" has the right to find out who the biological father is, and he also has the right to sue the biological father for the money he had spent on raising his child. She is going to "lose" if the biological father is earning less and can provide smaller alimony.

In a system that is about justice, a cuck should be able to sue the woman for the money he had spent on raising the child. (She was the one who fraud him, not him).

And the woman should be able to sue the biological father. (He might have (but didn't necessarily) fraud her.

However this kind of law should lead the single fraudster mother to bankruptcy, and we can't have that can we?

Sonny1989 • 20 points • 30 August, 2016 02:13 PM

Don't think any man should ever be sued for child support. If a cunt spermjacked him she should not get cash and prizes at all. If he knew he got her pregnant he should be able to sign a form

saying he opts out of raising the child then it's the woman's (her body her choice) if she has it or not. If she has it the father should not have to pay a cent as when a cunt decides she doesn't want to have any responsibility for her actions she can just legally murder the child.

razormachine • 13 points • 30 August, 2016 03:22 PM

When a woman get's pregnant she should inform the father about her pregnancy before reaching the gestation period when abortion is illegal. The father should accept/reject the responsibility before she reaches the gestation period when abortion is illegal (if he fails to do so, he is responsible) If she fails to inform the father before that period he is still free to accept/reject the responsibility (if he fails to do so he is not responsible).

A father who had accepted responsibility is responsible for child support. A woman who had carried the child full term is responsible for the child support. In the case of a divorce the parent who get's the custody (or larger share of the custody) receives child support from the other parent.

If "father" finds out that he is not the biological parent (a case when woman lied to him) he should be able to sue the woman for the damages that he had by raising the child. And that woman would be able to sue the real father only if he had accepted the responsibility himself.

And there you go. A system where everybody has FAIR rights. However this kind of system is never going to be implemented because family law is not about justice, it's about protecting children. And woman get to use those children as a meat shield.

NietzscheExplosion • 10 points • 30 August, 2016 03:51 PM

Yea maybe in 20 years when the misandry bubble flames out civilization, if we survive it.

razormachine • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 05:22 PM

Don't be so pessimistic, we have atleast 25 more years before that.

Overkillengine • 3 points • 30 August, 2016 05:29 PM

I'm just sayin' the "preppers" aren't totally nuts.

Having a chunk of land you can live off of while concealed is not a bad idea.

[deleted] • 5 points • 30 August, 2016 09:53 PM

The more I look at the situation in North America. Spiralling out of control spending and the decaying of family life is common place. The more I see, the more I think these people aren't completely insane. The one which we see are the extremists of the movement and our opinions are shaped by it.

truthyego • 3 points • 30 August, 2016 08:51 PM

Thank you. Rare to see someone give the only logically correct answer for the closest we could come to fairness in all this crap.

Usually people just argue back and forth only ever seeing half the answer, and then just give up.

Only disagreement, family law is not about protecting children. It is about enslaving men, forcing children into indoctrination camps, and incentivizing women to destroy the family.

razormachine • 6 points • 30 August, 2016 11:00 PM

Only disagreement, family law is not about protecting children. It is about enslaving men, forcing children into indoctrination camps, and incentivizing women to destroy the family.

I still think that the original intention was to protect children. However the original intention doesn't matter, the results matter. And I fully agree, the results are enslaved man, indoctrinated fucked-up children from single mom families, and a lot of broken homes.

[deleted] • 3 points • 30 August, 2016 11:42 PM

This. How is lying about a child not considered felony fraud?

It'd be like buying a house, making the mortgage payments for a few years only to find out the realtor never did the transfer and the old owners still are the legal owners. Then you get kicked out and lose the house, the old owners get to keep it but you are legally obligated to keep paying the mortgage.

And that's what being married is like today.

maniclurker • -1 points • 30 August, 2016 03:58 PM

However this kind of law should lead the single fraudster mother to bankruptcy, and we can't have that can we?

Not if you give a shit about the kids welfare. The question then becomes: Do you? Or is your only concern that the man gets the "win" in this situation?

Rodear • 11 points • 30 August, 2016 04:07 PM*

Actually, it might be good to teach a child that shitty female behaviour gets punished. Obviously, as it is not the kid's fault that their mother is a lying bitch, the child has to be provided for somehow and, yes, sadly the state has to step in if the mother cannot. I don't want to see any kid starve. Whatever, there's no way a man who has already suffered the cruel blow struck by the mother should pick up the tab directly-he has suffered enough already as it is what with her lying to him and making him believe he has a child. Though everybody picks up the tag indirectly through taxation-guess that is insolvable.

TheRedStoic • 7 points • 30 August, 2016 04:48 PM*

Sometimes in order to make an omelette, you have to break a few eggs.

In this case, an entire generation of single parent children.

I'm not advocating this, I'm pointing out that down in the real world, sometimes we're faced with ugly choices. Ones that would destroy even yourself in the short term occasionally.

My perspective is, you reduce welfare support over 30 years while implementing the aforementioned system. Slowly pushing a generation to take responsibility for its failures. Also paternity tests should be automated and mandatory before a birth certificate is signed.

Overkillengine • 8 points • 30 August, 2016 05:34 PM

Also paternity tests should be automated and mandatory before a birth certificate is signed.

Even this alone would made a huge inroad on the worst of female behaviors like paternity fraud. It removes that particular deception as an option.

Rawrination • 6 points • 31 August, 2016 01:56 AM

I have to wonder why this isn't already a thing.

razormachine • 5 points • 31 August, 2016 12:12 PM

If paternity tests would be mandatory the whole thing would be dirty-cheap because huge number of these tests would drive the prices down, just as serial production of the cars drives prices down.

razormachine • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 12:14 PM

My perspective is, you reduce welfare support over 30 years while implementing the aforementioned system. Slowly pushing a generation to take responsibility for its failures. Also paternity tests should be automated and mandatory before a birth certificate is signed.

That's what I keep saying. Stop handing out welfare checks and things will fix themselves. The philosophy is really simple, people tend to act way more responsible when there is no safety net.

Noramia • 1 point • 1 September, 2016 06:26 AM

"Sometimes in order to make an omelette, you have to break a few eggs."

Yep. I don't think it should be the man's responsibility to fix a bastard child's life. Go blame the mother.

TheRedStoic • 1 point • 1 September, 2016 12:01 PM

Very strongly agreed.

There are men who are just... Ingrained to parent somehow. Let them *choose to* Do not force any man's hand. It results in situations like the sexodus.

Overkillengine • 4 points • 30 August, 2016 05:33 PM

Actually, it might be good to teach a child that shitty female behaviour gets punished.

More like an absolutely good idea.

Though everybody picks up the tag indirectly through taxation-guess that is insolvable.

This would give individuals within society more incentive to enforce certain social contracts. Also, offer a bounty for information leading to the true father if the woman does not identify him.

maniclurker • 3 points • 30 August, 2016 06:14 PM

Don't get me wrong. Fuck women that do this shit.

I'm just trying to find a way to have my prior humanist ideals, and my new-found interest in TRP, coexist.

Women have shitty behaviors that we, as a society, reinforce for them. We should find a way to break that behavior, or adapt it to our benefit.

I just don't feel it's right that children suffer for the mothers shittiness.

BlacknOrangeZ • 11 points • 30 August, 2016 04:11 PM

Fewer children being born to sociopaths in broken homes *is caring for the welfare of children*. Remove the incentives for dysfunction and women will magically return to more responsible choices around pregnancy because people *always* respond to incentives.

Yes, there may be people faced with uncomfortable realities in the interim, but that's no reason to maintain the toxic status quo. Condemning someone for not caring about children because they want to correct a destructive legal and welfare system is like condemning someone for not caring about heroin addicts because they want to wean them off their drugs. It will be rough, but they'll be better for it.

maniclurker • 1 point • 30 August, 2016 06:23 PM

I can agree with that. That still doesn't change the *current* situation, where a real child is now going to suffer for the mothers poor choices. Either we adopt a darwinistic stance, and forsake it. Or, we pick up that burden and carry on.

Something needs to change, that is clear. Does the change have to come at the expense of, literally, the only innocent party involved?

razormachine • 4 points • 30 August, 2016 05:22 PM

Not if you give a shit about the kids welfare. The question then becomes: Do you? Or is your only concern that the man gets the "win" in this situation?

Yes I do care about children welfare.

In case of bankrupt mothers who cannot provide for their kids the state has the option to take kids away from her and put them up for adoption. There... kids are taken care of. And we did all of that without having to rob some innocent guy of his money, and giving that money to a woman.

It's hardly a win.

By the way... good luck trying to shame me for wanting a law system that provides justice for everybody, no matter the color of the skin or sex. I'm on a moral high-ground here bitch :)

feminists_are_dumb • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 12:56 PM

I'm pretty sure the idea is that if the wife didn't disclose the affair, then the husband is able to get his child support back when it turns out the kid isn't his.

oosnoopy • 7 points • 30 August, 2016 02:20 PM [recovered]

Cheating isn't a crime. That voice in your head is just you moralizing. Sexual strategy (yes even women's) is amoral.

bbmc7gm6fm • 5 points • 30 August, 2016 07:00 PM

Now there's a distinction between what women are prone to do evolutionary and biologically, and what they can learn to do or educate themselves to do.

If men can rid themselves of the destructive influences of the blue pill, women too, can learn more about themselves by studying the Red Pill. If a woman learns that she is biologically and evolutionary prone to cheating and different sexual partners, then, she can discuss the matter with her mate and prevent herself from overacting her instincts.

Bhiim • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 01:32 AM

isn't a crime just you moralizing

Aren't crimes defined by morality?

nuferasgurd • 2 points • 31 August, 2016 04:25 AM

Well, they are the morals of society (or should be), but every person needs to define their own ethics and morals. Is it morally wrong to smoke marijuana? The government would have you believe so.

tallwheel • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 06:57 AM

Make the biological father pay the child support.

bbmc7gm6fm • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 07:03 AM

The biological father is probably a junkie who dwells in the bars and has no job but knows how to score women!

Submissively_yours • -1 points • 30 August, 2016 02:33 PM

I don't want there to be precedent of the government being able to punish anyone for having multiple partners/cheating

NeoreactionSafe • 45 points • 30 August, 2016 01:54 PM

This looks very good.

Such a law will end slavery for cuckolded men, but not empower a woman to track down the true Chad Thundercock and enslave him.

That's a win-win.

Remember that they used to call children born outside a legally recognized marriage with DNA that wasn't "licensed" by the name:

Bastard

[deleted] • 15 points • 30 August, 2016 03:02 PM

So Germans got tired of being called cucks - so they want to outlaw cuckoldry.

There's a glimmer of hope in this world.

strat_op • 13 points • 30 August, 2016 01:50 PM

This post is misleading. This law is not a big step against cuckoldry. The duty to reveal has been settled case law and just recently the German Civil Court has ruled that a written law is necessary to continue his rulings.

This law is actually NOT an improvement as it will include a limitation on how much child support can be recovered; only TWO years. Will look for a non german source on this.

officerkondo • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 07:30 PM

The duty to reveal has been settled case law

I find this to be a novel statements because Germany is a civil law jurisdiction and therefore case law is not a source of binding legal authority except in the case of the Federal Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht).

strat_op • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 09:49 PM

I simplified. In the German Civil Code there is a catch-all clause for the principle of good faith, § 242 BGB. As it is an abstract catch-all clause the Federal Civil Court (Bundesgerichtshof für Zivilsachen) has developed case groups for which he applies this principle. The revelation of the real father was one of the duties constructed from this clause, see for example (in german): <https://openjur.de/u/703070.html> But recently the Federal Court changed its rulings and laid down that the catch-all clause is not sufficient to derive the aforementioned duty. Thats why the old court practice is now translated into a written law.

MattyAnon • 10 points • 30 August, 2016 03:07 PM

Women in Germany could be legally forced to reveal

Forced how? With what punishment if they don't?

Society does not lock up mothers.

He basically adopted the child. Not fair to the child to back out.

As always, supporting the female reproductive strategy at the expense of the male.

Men need to be legally supported because *we do not know for sure who our children are.*

PanzerBattalion • 6 points • 30 August, 2016 05:17 PM

This needs to be higher. This article means absolutely nothing.

You're gonna FORCE a woman to tell you the truth? You and what army? What are we going with here? Pinky swear?

People lie all the time when it suits their interests. If no one is around to provide any evidence to the contrary, they get away with it as well.

Forcing anyone to tell you anything is always tenuous at best. That's why torture is ineffective for information, and if torture is ineffective as a method, what does a courtroom have at its disposal to extract the truth?

MattyAnon • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 06:14 PM

You're gonna FORCE a woman to tell you the truth? You and what army? What are we going with here? Pinky swear?

Exactly .. make whatever rules you like, but how are you going to actually enforce them? You can only do this socially, with fines or with imprisonment.

[deleted] • 5 points • 30 August, 2016 05:49 PM*

-I would imagine thru DNA paternity testing. However from the first article, it sounds more like the court asks the woman "pretty please?"

-"Not fair to the child." Yeah, what I read is, "Let's guilt-trip the 'sham' father as a last-ditch effort because

any self-respecting man would leave my ass."

UrsusG • 154 points • 30 August, 2016 11:01 AM

Germany won't need this.

Mehmet and Fatima don't need haram technology to ensure paternity, while Hans and Greta aren't breeding anyway because yeah.

sir_wankalot_here • 109 points • 30 August, 2016 12:13 PM

Got this part wrong

Mehmet and Fatima

Mehmet, Fatima, Bashima, Akliha and Alloza won't need this. Meanwhile Hans and Greta will be working hard to support Mehmet's 20+ kids.

Red_August • 133 points • 30 August, 2016 12:21 PM

Surely you mean: Mehmet, Fatima, Bashima, Akliha, Alloza, *and Greta* won't need this. Meanwhile Hans will be working hard to support them all.

sir_wankalot_here • 67 points • 30 August, 2016 12:36 PM

Sorry I stand corrected. Also since Hans will be working extra hard, Greta will probably be banging Mehmet also. If she gets caught banging Mehmet she will scream rape. Mehmet will get off because he was oppressed and needs to rape women or something.

[deleted] • 73 points • 30 August, 2016 01:23 PM

As a german I don't know if I should laugh or cry.

Come over with a redpill helicopter, throw a ladder down and get me outta here.

AFPJ • 20 points • 30 August, 2016 04:49 PM

1/8th German here, visited family a decade ago and then very recently. You need guns.

m1lh0us3 • 5 points • 31 August, 2016 06:01 AM

there is no such thing as a 1/8 German. Either you have the nationality or not, stop this bullshitting.

getRedPill • 2 points • 1 September, 2016 02:51 PM

Lol. I wonder where this guy is from. US people usually are crazy about this fractions of rationalities, races, genders.

AFPJ • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 05:00 PM

I know life can be difficult and confusing sometimes, so let me help you:

If both of your parents are German, you are entirely German.

One of your parents is German: you are 50% German. (1/2)

One of your grandparents: you are 25% German (1/4th)

A great grandparent - you're 1/8th German.

Sometimes great grandparents will have kids - more than one kid, and their kids have kids. These people, while not your ancestors, are still family. Here are materials to print out, color & doodle on while you're learning the basics.

Best wishes to your (and whoever up-voted you) continued survival in this fast paced and complicated world,

-- AFPJ

vandaalen • 6 points • 30 August, 2016 08:25 PM

I am German and that is bullshit.

I want a gun, but at the moment I surely do not need it. We are still one of the safest places to be at on this planet.

That might be subject to change in the future if things evolve the way the elite wants them to evolve, but right now that is not the fact.

Onewinged • 1 points • 30 August, 2016 08:50 PM [recovered]

We'll talk again after the next new years eve.

vandaalen • 12 points • 30 August, 2016 08:53 PM

I even live in Cologne.

This is laughable being posted in a community which is mainly US-American.

There is no chance you'll find a place even remotely as dangerous as certain areas in Chicago, Philly, LA, Detroit, just any major US city, here.

Just go and compare the statistics on homicide for our countries.

Onewinged • 3 points • 30 August, 2016 09:09 PM [recovered]

Don't want a safe country compared to other countries. Want a safe country by any standard.

I live in the netherlands and i am more carefull around blacks. Not because i'm racist but because the chance of facing human garbage instead of a person has increased enough for me to consider personal safety. Comparing my own situation with that of other countries will only create a false sense of safety.

Knowing africans die of hunger won't make my hunger vanish. Food will.

I do admit that the gun step might be too american for the current europe, but means to defend ourself are becoming more important.

Machismo01 • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 12:33 AM

You are about to experience Sharia law, friend. In the next generation, more and more legislators will be representing this new population of conservative Muslims as they push through new legislation enforcing their own peculiar brand of justice. By that time, it will all be lost.

Thaweed • 1 point • 30 August, 2016 11:07 PM

I thought so too, then france stuff happend.

AFPJ • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 05:04 PM

I am *part of the reason* Germany is *fucked* ~~and that is bullshit~~.

Fixed that for you. I get it, you're a fellow E.C. here, due respect given, but you're

fucking abysmally clueless if you've actually been in Germany for more than a week in the last year, stepped outside & did not notice signs of social decay.

vandaalen • 2 points • 31 August, 2016 06:13 PM*

did not notice signs of social decay

Where did I state that. I said that this country still is one of the safest places you can be at on this planet and that it is superior by far in regards f safety compared to the US. Nothing more.

Edit: Also if you don't nozice social decay practically everywhere in the western world, you are a special kind of blind.

AFPJ • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 09:39 PM

Where did I state that.

You're right, you didn't. Apologies. Alas my point is, even if it isn't showing up as murder rates (yet), when you begin to import a culture that sticks together very tightly to the point of groups of muslims roaming around together, it changes the "mood" of walking out and about near refugee heavy zones, which has a cascading effect that resonates into almost every aspect of a society. It's slow to uptake, as I'm sure you know, but the end result is devastating.

The_DogeWhisperer • 1 point • 17 September, 2016 06:03 PM

Wait 20 years for all the migrant's kids to be young adults. Immigrants descendants are always significantly more violent than their predecessors. And there are more of them.

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 12:41 PM

I want a gun, but at the moment I surely do not need it.

You get a gun *before* you need one, because if you start looking for one when you need it it's already too late. Especially since crime tends to overtake an area all of a sudden, not gradually and with plenty of warning. You think you are safe because crime is confined to the bad parts of the city, but it only takes a bolder gang and a weakness of the police force to turn your neighborhood into one far more dangerous than you think it could be.

byrdcall • 1 point • 1 September, 2016 10:36 AM

There is no cc in Germany if you're not a politician or a highly endangered person.

And while you're not awake you can not have a gun within your hands reach, because it has to be locked away seperated from the ammunition in a safe.

Police here are weak, they are miserable shoots.

But other than that if you're a sports shooter or hunter Ar15s are still legal and as a hunter you can even get supressors in some states of Germany now.

getRedPill • 0 points • 1 September, 2016 02:52 PM

Is amazing how germans are brainwashed, even RP germans...

Brave_Horatius • -1 points • 31 August, 2016 09:41 AM

There's a psychological effect on a society that gun ownership yields.
People when they talk about guns focus too much on the individual.

vandaalen • 2 points • 31 August, 2016 09:48 AM

I don't even understand what this means.

SetConsumes • 4 points • 30 August, 2016 06:21 PM

I'd want to gtfo of Europe. Unless you're looking forward to the WWII party.

ThereAndBlackAgain • 17 points • 30 August, 2016 04:32 PM

needs to rape

Wow shitlord it's called a Sexual Emergency!

sir_wankalot_here • 9 points • 30 August, 2016 06:43 PM

Sexual Emergency is the ultimate reframe. One cannot make this stuff up.

Overkillengine • 6 points • 30 August, 2016 02:15 PM

"Stop oppressing his culture, you Islamophobe!"

Goomich • 3 points • 30 August, 2016 06:56 PM

Yeah, Idiocracy 2 will be called Sharia.

ventdivin • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 07:08 AM

Is it that hard for you to come up with 4 different Arabic real names?

NightwingTRP • 14 points • 30 August, 2016 11:44 AM

Of all the bloody countries to take action....

allrandomworldnews • 1 point • 30 August, 2016 05:02 PM

Maybe you get even more on 2017 after elections.

HAL-9000 • 1 point • 30 August, 2016 08:14 PM

TIL: In the woods is house made of baklava...

Thaweed • 1 point • 30 August, 2016 11:05 PM

Hans and Greta are 50 years outdated here, but good try :D

Rather sad that i can only dissagree with you on the names.

frisch85 • -34 points • 30 August, 2016 02:48 PM

Hans and Greta

If you are referring to Hänsel and Gretel, atleast use their real names and yes they aren't breeding because they are siblings... fucking our siblings is forbidden here, guess that's something new for you.

;)

gtypoDD22 • 9 points • 30 August, 2016 05:33 PM

You are on the next level of stupid. He is not referring to Hansel and Gretel dumbass, he is just using german sounding names to make a point. By "not breeding" he is referring to Germany's low Birthrate.

You are austistic.. i've never seen somebody so bad at understanding humor.

afkb39sdfb • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 08:21 PM

Don't feed this troll guys.

Supr3mat • 3 points • 31 August, 2016 07:54 AM*

On a side note: I'm german myself & when I told German women that the CURRENT law was totally insane 100 % of their replies were : NAWALT / relax, it's only a fringe minority / think about the children !!!

Never ignore the solidarity between women when it comes to cover up their mistakes.

If you know you've been cuckolded, you can't force the woman, who cheated, to pay back the money. You can only force the other man to pay you back.

There is **NO** financial punishment for female cheating, not to speak of any shaming policy.

casemodsalt • 5 points • 30 August, 2016 05:41 PM

Only skanks will dissaprove of this.

[deleted] • 5 points • 30 August, 2016 04:47 PM

german here.

we have a think called Bundesgerichtshof (BGH), which is basically the highest court of justice. it regularly invalidates new laws because of them being unconstitutional. let's see if this new law makes it past the BGH. in the last years, BGH-decisions often have been anti-common-sense (for example, lots of child rapists had to be released from prison, because preventive custody wasn't a thing when they did their raping).

keep in mind, its germany we are talking about. they country which is getting fucked by middle class arab and african males, for which austria wasnt nice enough.

yummyluckycharms • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 07:28 PM

What about the children is a common refrain from the matriarchy. Of course, logically speaking, if it really was all about the children, then everyone involved would want to know who dad was - if only just for the medical history for the kid. Suddenly - the refrain changes from - what about the children to what about mommy and her cash flow. That gentlemen, is what the real issue is.

I highly doubt this law will pass - too many vested interests have a stake against it, and the matriarchy doesn't benefit. Always follow the money

Grischl • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 09:19 PM

This law - even if it gets passed - is a dud because it cannot be enforced. The woman just needs to say "I've met this guy at a bar and fucked him on the toilet after a few glasses of vodka - I have no idea who he is or where he lives" and that's the end of it.

Frogtarius • 2 points • 31 August, 2016 05:10 AM

Any claim for child support should have a paternity test to back it up.

AirBacon • 2 points • 31 August, 2016 08:28 AM

At that point it should be 100% up to the man.

Some kids are totally cool and you would be lucky to have them as a kid even if they weren't your biological child. And some women are pretty cool after the divorce.

On the other hand... Kids are people too. Some of them are assholes. Sometimes crazy women poison the kid against the father. If the little asshole isn't biologically yours and the mom is a crazy bitch then you should be free to kick both of them to the curb and get on with your life.

RPthrowaway123 • 3 points • 30 August, 2016 02:45 PM

Germany seems to be flying in two different directions at once. I'm not really sure what to make of it. Clearly there is support for measures like these, but then they are also one of the biggest feminist countries out there and are also letting refugees flood into their land. Somewhere there's a disconnect happening.

FinallyRed • 3 points • 30 August, 2016 08:54 PM

The pendulum is losing momentum but is still travelling in the same direction.

byrdcall • 1 point • 1 September, 2016 11:23 PM

It is election time next year, other than filling the country up with immigrants they want to have something to appease the male voter.

[deleted] • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 03:27 PM

This won't pass, cuckoldry is their future. Germans are a dying people, world war losses sealed their faith.

LordThunderbolt • 4 points • 31 August, 2016 01:31 AM

There hasn't been a true Germany since 1945, am I right Mein Fuhrer?

[deleted] • 0 points • 31 August, 2016 01:40 AM

I mentioned both world wars. And yes Germany was split in two after WW2 and has basically been was American/Russian colony since then.

I'm not even white and this is obvious.

Menigguh • 2 points • 30 August, 2016 06:51 PM

Why not just pass a law mandating paternity tests at birth? Add option to decline (for the beta bux cucks). I'm sure most intelligent father's will have no problem footing the bill.

Unholy_VI • 1 point • 30 August, 2016 10:30 PM

Good on you Germany, good on you.

cozgw • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 09:02 AM

Controversial? Are you shitting me?

PantsonFire1234 • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 12:14 PM

Sounds reasonable enough, I hope allot of cheating Ho's get the Shiv through this new piece of legislation.

Ali_s1987 • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 01:02 PM

How the fuck is a strangers child my responsibility! How about making it fair for both the parents and the child....

Nergaal • 1 point • 1 September, 2016 02:21 PM

"Studies differ on the number of children who grow up believing the wrong man is their biological father, with estimates varying from fewer than 2 per cent to as many as 10 per cent."

To me 10% seems a kinda low. I wonder how many kids know they are not raised by their biological father.

Also, I would not hold my hopes high for this to be passed through. Considering how cucked Germany is I am pretty sure it will be blocked somewhere along the path. Still, at least somebody is mentioning it.

getRedPill • 1 point • 1 September, 2016 03:14 PM

You are hoping too much for a law isn't that good as it sounds.

Still not a law. Must be approved first and that means it can be modified upon unrecognizable and giving a law completely different of what we reading here, or just not approved at all.

Law can't force anybody to divulge information about their past How they will force her to do so? Torture her by hiding all her make up? By forcing her to eat unsweetened Baskin Robin's? Come on. This sounds childish. A law can't force to do this, and if a law does so it's a shitty law, because you don't need (**dont need**) to know all her past to have justice.

If forced to revealed her past: RAPE! Think about it for a while, you have been reading RP for a while and you have grown wiser. If she's forced to reveal her infidelity she will claim RAPE. She will pass the burden to other man, either the Chad by claiming he raped her or the cucked beta by claiming he *magically somehow* made her do it. What a tyrant!

The most important one and worsr is: **Cucked father still has to ask for approval to have peace of mind, certainty of his descendant and justice served** What a shitty law if you cant scape cuck slavery and stop being laugh stock of society. Father can't act by his own, he must first ask a judge if he can know (this requires time, energy, lawyer, money) and judge can't deny him justice, pretty possible in today's feminist courts and postmodernist age.

summersss • 1 point • 11 September, 2016 04:03 PM

what will be a really game changer is when tests are so easy and cheap that one could use a phone like device to do it. But this law is a big step. It's one thing to cheat, that's personal shit.but tricking a man into raising another's child is seriously messed up.

popthatpill • 1 point • 30 August, 2016 06:22 PM

Why don't they just repeal their ban on paternity testing?

I mean, this is good too, but it strikes me as being at cross-purposes with the ban on paternity testing.

JohnnyRaz • 1 point • 31 August, 2016 08:28 PM

I fear that Germany has already sealed their fate and no coup or any change will ever save them, Jews / Globalists have spent the last 60+ years transforming their men from this:

<http://i63.tinypic.com/347u14l.jpg>

to this:

<http://i64.tinypic.com/3089m2o.jpg>

German men (actually most white men) are not allowed to have a shred of pride or any form of identity. We cant even sneeze without being called racists. We have been beaten down and betafied to the point of no return. It will take a miracle to save us as this point. Every day I pray for some sort of violent takeover in Europe. People coming to their senses and throwing the fucking ropes up to hang all the poisonous leaders by the neck that are serving us up to the globalist agenda as we speak.

Heinseverloh • 0 points • 31 August, 2016 12:49 AM

If the germans want their country to survive, better vote AfD.

blackfin • 0 points • 30 August, 2016 01:14 PM

The irony of this is mind blowing.

hyperkinesis247 • 0 points • 30 August, 2016 05:55 PM

Why would a cuck trust information from @BBCWorld & @BBCNews? Isn't her need for BBC the source of the problem?

pusangani • 0 points • 31 August, 2016 12:49 AM

I'm more surprised that this is coming from Germany, they're the kings (queens) of the eurocucks

Hektik352 • 0 points • 31 August, 2016 03:45 AM

If you compared it to rape then woman wouldn't complain. As it is financial rape by a leech of a woman and her offspring.

victor_knight[] • -1 points • 31 August, 2016 01:56 AM

Well, when the kid is unusually tanned, there may be cause for concern.