

# **In South Carolina 13% to 16% of the jailed population are lower income father who cannot pay child support.**

January 23, 2017 | 927 upvotes | by [\[deleted\]](#)

---

Non-American here. While the feminist agenda seem to make life harder for men everywhere, there is no doubt that it is harder in America than other places. This was a very hard truth-pill to swallow. 13% to 16% of the jailed population in South Carolina are men with lower income who cannot pay their child support. The fact that finding an alternative system for these men are not a top issue for feminists, shows the hypocrisy of feminists and their allies as they claim they fight for “equality”. Imagine any law making 13%-16% of jailed population females, especially not paying a man (sexism, boyzzz) money. This is the “patriarchy” we are living in. One article has been written on the situation on California. It is rather long, [and can be read here](#). For those who cannot read through it without feeling utter anger, a lengthy quotes underneath is included that summarizes the situation of these poor men

Turner's experience with the child support system is all too common. Other poor noncustodial fathers report similar dystopian experiences. A noncustodial father who participated in a research study focus group explained: I'm just tired of getting locked up every so often, every eight months or so. I don't have no bad record, no record at all. But I keep getting locked up for child support, that's the main thing. In South Carolina, where Michael Turner was incarcerated, child support obligors imprisoned for civil contempt comprise approximately thirteen to sixteen percent of the jail population. It seems a pointless expenditure of state resources to repeatedly arrest poor fathers, jail them for nonpayment of child support, then later release them (when either the law requires their release or the court eventually concludes that civil incarceration is not succeeding in coercing compliance with child support orders), and repeat the cycle all over again.

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](http://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

redpillbanana • 109 points • 23 January, 2017 07:41 PM

Relevant: <https://imgur.com/gD33nq9>

[deleted] • 57 points • 23 January, 2017 08:00 PM

We have a skyscraper in the entertainment district in my city, designed for women with at least 2 kids. Was a really nice part of the city too.

It just seemed weird how in a booming real estate market, that single moms were given priority

redpillbanana • 68 points • 23 January, 2017 08:08 PM

The US government has been incentivizing single motherhood for quite some time now.

[deleted] • 25 points • 23 January, 2017 08:10 PM

Yeah, I know. Every now and again, I just get blindsided to the economic decisions around it. I mean, I sometimes its just a political money pit

HumanSockPuppet • 33 points • 23 January, 2017 11:34 PM

Women's votes are cheaper to buy. All you have to do to win them over is vindicate their self-entitlement complexes.

yomo86 • 27 points • 23 January, 2017 08:40 PM

Too bad that betas en mass donnot behave as planned. No one in their right mind is wifing up a single mom.

ovrsurge • 19 points • 24 January, 2017 08:19 AM

You dont get an option. Even if you live your life as a virgin. The average working man will produce way, WAY more for the government in tax money than they will spend on him.

Women conversly recieve way more tax money than they put in. This means that your taxes are being spent to make these womens lives cushy and keep them independent of needing betas.

Institutionalized hypergamy is how governments work. Women get a good chunk of the money they would have to marry you for just because you choose to work.

TheCoyPinch • 13 points • 24 January, 2017 04:38 AM

No one in their right mind is wifing up a single mom.

So betas are still marrying single moms then.

JackGetsIt • 4 points • 24 January, 2017 01:50 PM

But probably not at a rate that women like.

joh2141 • 36 points • 23 January, 2017 09:00 PM

Wow such hard life; women have it real rough. Tell that to the guy getting anally raped every night by some 20 inch penis dude because he couldn't pay his child support on time working 3 part time jobs,

right? That's so sickening to hear how women get a nice skyscraper while the parents get torn apart.

While I was at the gym today, they put this weird talk show on about girl power empowerment with all these modern feminist celebrities. Some of whom were celebrities or wealthy since they were children and lived on a pedestal all their lives. They then took in opinions of other women and would talk about it about something. This one talks about being unfairly treated at her new job. All her coworkers claimed she's slow, air-headed, can't do anything right. Instead of possibly thinking maybe she is indeed slow or simply air-headed, she hammers and says "It's because I'm a woman. We get unfairly treated."

Then the celebrity who was a celeb since she was a little girl goes "I felt that all my life too. I'm here for you girl." Like what? That celeb has never felt that in her life. She always felt above most people. Because she was filthy rich. I recognize her from sitcoms she was in back in the early 90s.

These women "role models" are blindly playing the average women's strife and suffering to their own advantage boosting their value in the eyes of the public. It's all a fucking game to these women. Meanwhile the guys (and some women I guess if they are fat and ugly) who actually ARE working hard are the ones that get screwed and no real credit.

Women believe getting slightly negative feedback means there is misogynistic behavior going on. Whereas guys consistently get shitted on and pissed on but are expected to never complain. But when you do, you're just some crazy guy. Society just has set it up so badly for men that you have to (pretend to) be transparent.

[deleted] • 11 points • 23 January, 2017 09:03 PM

Feel better?

no sense ranting about it, won't solve anything. Just take heed and avoid the pitfalls of their lives

joh2141 • 13 points • 23 January, 2017 09:04 PM

Yeah went on a little rant there haha no point bitching and moaning about it really. Just gotta deal with it.

cashmoney\_x • 1 point • 24 January, 2017 01:33 PM

You just contributed to it.

DashneDK2 • 215 points • 23 January, 2017 04:55 PM

Debtor prison. I thought we did away with that kinda thing. Apparently I was mistaken.

KnowBrainer • 75 points • 23 January, 2017 08:52 PM

I pulled 12 months and \$5000 in fines/costs for being \$6000 behind on child support. Was sentenced months after starting a new job and making regular payments.

Got out, bought a gun. Not going back. F the police.

wax\_idiotic • 22 points • 23 January, 2017 09:50 PM

I'm sorry that it's gotten to that, man. Best of luck.

Troll\_Name • 6 points • 24 January, 2017 05:52 PM

Debtor prison. I thought we did away with that kinda thing. Apparently I was mistaken.

The police are simply the government's hands - fuck the government. The police don't come to your

house if the courts don't tell them to, and the courts don't say so if politicians don't appoint crooked hateful judges.

Government claims sainthood from the pennies it gives, while it takes dollars at gunpoint. Family law is just another division of this infernal corporation.

MattyAnon • 145 points • 23 January, 2017 06:19 PM

It's been brought back, for the one specific case of men not paying women money.

Lucius-Cincinnatus • points • 23 January, 2017 08:08 PM [recovered]

Also they are imprisoning people who can not afford to make their student loan payments.

AcrossHallowedGround • 40 points • 23 January, 2017 08:18 PM\*

Someone tell me that isn't true. Jesus christ.

Edit: In most cases it appears it has to be delinquent for several years. And all of the articles I found in my in-depth search and analysis (3 minutes on google) are all referencing the same case in texas. So I don't think it's particularly common.

tio1w • 33 points • 23 January, 2017 09:30 PM

Did you know student loans don't "go away" if someone files for bankruptcy?

Fuknmods • 27 points • 23 January, 2017 10:03 PM

Did you know a study on approx 25% of all us colleges and trade schools revealed AT LEAST 50% of students with student loans have not paid back the minimum on their loans or a single dollar? The new cost calculated with these numbers (instead of calculation with the hopes theyll pay it back) is now \$3.3 Trillion.

Bubble burst when boys!?!?

FatStig • points • 23 January, 2017 10:36 PM [recovered]

I feel like a dumbass for paying mine off really early. This is how civilizations collapse...

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 January, 2017 12:39 AM

Yea I heard you should not be in any rush to pay back your student loans. I have like 7 more years of payments to go on mine, which at first I was like fuuuck I don't want that on my shoulders, but now I don't care, its like \$100 a month.

FatStig • points • 24 January, 2017 12:45 PM [recovered]

Yeah, but I can stop working and ride my bike around north america for like 10 years living off savings with no debts.

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 January, 2017 04:54 PM

So then you are glad you paid yours off already.

MelodyMyst • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 04:30 PM

At least you won't have to watch the collapse from a cell or under crushing debt. You got that going for you.

EDIT: this is supposed to be a comment on FatStigs first comment. Reddit is not

working with me today.

[deleted] • 8 points • 24 January, 2017 04:25 AM

I remember some "economist" in some old askreddit thread talking about how there is no bubble, because you can't get rid of it by declaring bankruptcy. He was the top comment. If I had any knowledge of how to bet against that idea I'd put my life savings into it.

-Golden • points • 24 January, 2017 05:54 AM **[recovered]**

You bet against the one funding / investing in the bad asset.

Short US Treasuries.

SeemedGood • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 10:44 AM

Short US Treasuries.

Gotta be *real* careful with that one. In crises (almost irrelevant which kind) US govies can catch a mean bid as a safe haven asset. And yes, even when the government is the backstop (see banking crisis). Remember, the US government currently has the world's best collateralization backing its debt - the US citizenry - and it can collect from its collateral anytime, anywhere (or at least it asserts the right to do so).

JackGetsIt • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 01:43 PM

There's really no bubble to burst because you can't declare bankruptcy and you can't 'recollect' the education. Therefore it will just depress the economy. It will especially hurt housing and car markets.

EGOtyst • 10 points • 23 January, 2017 11:11 PM

Of course they aren't.

If you were a fresh graduate with no assets and \$200k of debt, the obvious choice would be to declare bankruptcy...

Troll\_Name • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 05:57 PM

Student debt gets a special exemption from bankruptcy protections.

Just like all of your other debts to the government.

EGOtyst • 1 point • 24 January, 2017 06:29 PM

Well, like I said, if it didn't it would be incredibly easy to game the system.

untitled\_redditor • 11 points • 23 January, 2017 09:59 PM

Same with IRS debt. I sortof understand, but then I don't. Due to my ex wife handling all finances and not paying taxes properly I'm still paying \$40k back to the IRS. ...I made a lot, should have overseen that myself. But I didn't and post divorce I got stuck with that bill of course.

Edit: I worked, she didn't. Managing "our" money was basically her only job.

tio1w • 27 points • 24 January, 2017 12:14 AM

Managing "our" money was basically her only job.

What a recipe for disaster.

untitled\_redditor • 1 point • 20 February, 2017 08:13 AM

I'm older and wiser now :) Some of the most valuable lessons are also very expensive

drallcom3 • points • 24 January, 2017 01:19 AM **[recovered]**

I'd declare bankruptcy immediately after college otherwise.

Student loans would be something good to protest against instead of random Trump quotes.

Tingly\_Fingers • 7 points • 24 January, 2017 04:31 AM

That's what people used to do and why it's not allowed anymore. Kids would go to law school, rack up 100k in student loans, buy a car, pass the bar, then file for bankruptcy.

Troll\_Name • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 05:59 PM

Baby boomers bankrupted their way up and up for decades.

Student loans aren't blocked because they were abused - all of it was abused. Student loans are blocked because they are debts to the government and its cronies. You can still take a small business' every resource then bankrupt yourself out of compensating them for it.

BinaryResult • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 04:25 PM

Did you know that credit card debt does though? Once could hypothetically live entirely off credit cards while aggressively paying down their student loan debt and then declare bankruptcy once the student loan debt was paid off.

tio1w • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 05:14 PM

I'm sure a court would punish that by making some kind of mental gymnastics.

Troll\_Name • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 06:12 PM

Judges don't do gymnastics - that's lawyers. Courts quietly prejudge you then they toss your future into a bureaucratic meat grinder.

And that's why real lawyers cost so much - they get you out of this. Fake lawyers do nothing.

tio1w • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 09:37 PM

Judges don't do gymnastics

Yes they do. All the time!

This should go without saying in a redpill forum.

felipecbarroz • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 05:05 PM

As a non-american, I find interesting the US concept of personal bankruptcy. In Brazil, only firms can declare bankruptcy.

Troll\_Name • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 06:08 PM

There's restructuring and then there's liquidation - aka sell stuff pay debts.

Most personal bankruptcies are of the liquidation type. People are allowed to keep certain things, which usually adds up to about as much as broke people tend to have.

If banks want to stop holding toxic debt, then they need to stop issuing loans to toxic borrowers. If laws compel them to lend then said laws should be repealed. (They're not forced to loan; they're given a *convenient excuse* to loan where they shouldn't and it merely looks like they're forced after bankers wrote their own laws.) Houses would be half as hard to get if banking worked this way instead of how it works presently.

But when working-class families file for bankruptcy, usually they don't lose anything. Most of what they have isn't actually WORTH anything - official appraisals be damned - so the auctioneer can't actually make much money and therefore it isn't worth his time. Most people's possessions aren't worth 10% of what they were originally priced.

Houses are worth money, but bankers are only slowed down (not stopped) in repossessing them if families can't pay anymore.

kanyewost • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 03:36 PM

couldn't a person hypothetically take out bank loans or private loan and then use the money to pay off the student loan off to zero, then file bankruptcy as a big loophole??

tio1w • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 10:26 PM

I have no idea but these are good questions.

Troll\_Name • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 05:56 PM

delinquent for several years

This, guys, read the fine print.

If you're working for 10 years to pay for your government job, they just garnish your wages.

[deleted] • 6 points • 23 January, 2017 11:33 PM

This myth still persists? I first heard it when I started college in 1999.

flashbang123 • 3 points • 23 January, 2017 08:20 PM

Do you have a source for this?

dr\_warlock • 4 points • 24 January, 2017 03:56 AM

<http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2011/06/beware-the-us-education-department-swat-team>

GetaPoas • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 07:32 AM

So women can be jailed for cockriding and basket weaving degree? Awesome

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 January, 2017 09:33 PM

The Department of Education has their own personal SWAT team just for things such as this.

They once sent in their team to ransack a women's house while locking her 3 kids in the back of a



squad car for 3 hours while their dad was handcuffed in his underwear on the sidewalk.

She was suspected of student loan fraud. All charges were later dropped....

[deleted] • 8 points • 23 January, 2017 11:25 PM

Nah, that case was some supposedly ripping off a lender by lying or some shit. It wasn't a simple case of her not paying. It was more like she had some kind of scam going on, like claiming to be a different person and not even going to school.

tio1w • 2 points • 23 January, 2017 09:30 PM

And this is pretty much an American thing, far from universal.

Troll\_Name • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 05:53 PM

Family law is court-assigned welfare.

Orphans get their government railroad-from-birth, single moms get their permanent vacation, bureaucrats get their personal empires of cash and jackboots. Everybody wins!

joepaulpavlin • points • 23 January, 2017 11:05 PM **[recovered]**

I hate to break it to you and I am sure you won't like this but they aren't paying child support. The notion that the money is for the woman is absurd. Even if the woman spends it on herself the court didnt allocate that money to her for that purpose. Would you prefer a system where the money be handed to a child?

The issue isn't who is being paid, it's how its decided and at what amount. It is kind of disheartening seeing a response of it isn't working so let's give up. If I steal and steal and steal should our justice system just give up and stop holding me accountable? The consequence of not paying support should be altered as well. In no circumstance should anyone serve time for not having money to pay a debt, there are more effective ways to fix this. It should be considered who the victim is, the child. If the child doesn't receive the support required than they suffer. Are we supposed to feel bad for the kid that didnt have a choice in this at all or the guy who couldn't pull out? We all know that men paying woman child support is an almost certain in custodial arrangements, do we not have some responsibility to protect ourselves? Do we not have some responsibility to pay our child support? Might as well feel sorry for the guy that sticks a fork in the wall socket for the 10th time and dies. He knows what the fuck happens, maybe we should adapt and over come before passing our responsibility off on a child.

MattyAnon • 29 points • 23 January, 2017 11:22 PM

The notion that the money is for the woman is absurd.

The money is paid to the woman with *absolutely no accountability or checks being done*. I know a woman who said "I don't know what I'm going to do without the child support when my child leaves home". In other words - she's making a profit on the deal.

Would you prefer a system where the money be handed to a child?

I'd prefer a system where men get 50% custody. Failing that, the woman should have to provide proof of where the money goes, otherwise it's just a handout to her.

It should be considered who the victim is, the child.

Women are not even held accountable for being bad mothers. Bad father = jail time. Bad mother = the worst that ever happens is they lose their children. They are never actually punished. Men lose



their children AND have to keep paying AND go to jail if they don't.

joepaulpavlin • points • 24 January, 2017 12:16 AM [recovered]

Child support is not based on gender of the parents it is based on the income difference between the parents, money spent on medical insurance, and time spent with custody of the child.

In instances where the system fails like you have mentioned there is no excuse for it. In cases where that isn't the case its a non issue. There will never be a system that monitors how the money us spent. Suggesting that would cause the price of child support to rise. Under that concept there would have to he employees that monitor and check how the money is spent and no amount of checks is going to prevent fraud.

We are all well aware of the problems with the courts having a bias against men in custodial cases. There is also plenty of opportunity for the father to make their case against the mother. Using the extremes is never going to provide an accurate picture. All that I am suggesting is that if people see a problem, not to merely point it out but to instead discuss ways to solve that problem that are both realistic and fair to the child. Most States already charge processing fees for paying child support, adding more to the child support system is not going to go over well in terms of cost. It would also be incredibly difficult to enforce even if you where able to monitor purchases. The amount of things that could be purchased in support of the child are incredibly long. How can you validate a purchase was for the child or not? Let's say the child support receiver buys a tv, how do you prove that child support money was used for that? How do you prove that the child did/will not get use of that tv? The receiver could simply say rent was paid with the support and groceries where purchased with support and the TV was purchased with their own funds derived form other sources. If the child does not have a safe home or basic needs met than it isn't an issue of child support fraud its an issue of child neglect.

This issue is fought in your community, by getting your elected officials to review the process and use the information available to force a legal change. If woman aren't held accountable (not true they simply aren't accountable at the same rate as men which would make sense given that more woman are on the receiving end of support) the issue isn't child support, the issue is court room bias. You won't fix that bias by trying to nullify the support payers responsibility.

What is the suggestion for people that refuse to pay support? They aren't refusing to pay the woman they are refusing to be financially responsible for their child. I have seen both sides of this, as a child who father paid his support and didnt do anything else. As a brother to someone who's father would send \$8 in support when he was behind by thousands. (who eventually gave up all parental rights when my step father adopted my brother provided his bio father paid for the adoption) As a father who pays child support. I have witnessed woman use the money correctly to support their children and use it incorrectly. Either way, both parents have a financial responsibility to their children. Child support isn't where the fight is, the bias is the fight.

MattyAnon • 11 points • 24 January, 2017 03:08 AM

Child support is not based on gender of the parents it is based on the income difference between the parents, money spent on medical insurance, and time spent with custody of the child.

Bullshit because women are given custody by default. This makes men the CS payers in most cases.

Suggesting that would cause the price of child support to rise.

CS would decrease because she'd have to buy her own iPhone.

All that I am suggesting is that if people see a problem, not to merely point it out but to instead discuss ways to solve that problem that are both realistic and fair to the child

Yes. Equal custody.

How can you validate a purchase was for the child or not? Let's say the child support receiver buys a tv, how do you prove that child support money was used for that? How do you prove that the child did/will not get use of that tv? The receiver could simply say rent was paid with the support and groceries were purchased with support and the TV was purchased with their own funds derived from other sources.

Yes. Solution - document all child expenses. \$500 is paid as CS, \$500 is paid for child, no problem. Vs \$500 is paid for CS, \$250 paid for child, we have a fucking problem. But hey, it's nice that she doesn't have to go out to work and yet can afford brand new shit all the time.

Women treat CS like alimony because it's paid like alimony - directly to her for her to do with as she wishes.

If women aren't held accountable

Women are not held accountable simply because there is no enforcement and no punishment. Women know this and act accordingly.

I've had the rare "privilege" of being around mothers with young children. The kids are treated as an annoyance preventing mummy getting on with something more interesting (playing with the dog, drawing paintings, or playing computer games in the three examples I can think of). The idea that women are these loyal doting mothers is based on utter fantasy and wishful thinking.

) As a father who pays child support. I have witnessed women use the money correctly to support their children and use it incorrectly.

And when it was used incorrectly, what was the punishment handed out to the mother? I think I can guess ...

Child support isn't where the fight is, the bias is the fight.

Indeed. The real issue is that fathers are alienated from their families and children, and mothers are selfish and useless.

tardisgroaning • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 01:19 AM

I know a woman who said "I don't know what I'm going to do without the child support when my child leaves home". In other words - she's making a profit on the deal.

Then she's an idiot and in for a shock. Child support ends at certain ages in various countries. In my country it stops being paid out at 18. None of my siblings and I moved out of home before this age.

The real issue is that fathers are alienated from their families and children, and mothers are selfish and useless.

Actually when my parents split my father decided he didn't want to look after all five of

us, let alone any of us. He didn't want the responsibility. Though I get along with him now, it was his choice. You act as though every father is torn from their kids... if you're sharing anecdotes, I can't count the amount of times I've heard "My father took off when I was born" or "My father left us when I was little"... even on this sub alone.

Not every man is an angel, and not every woman is the devil.

Zerichon • 13 points • 24 January, 2017 01:32 AM

A woman can choose to kill the child in her womb. I should have the right to not finance it.

joepaulpavlin • points • 24 January, 2017 01:54 AM [recovered]

You can choose not to reproduce so yeah there ya go.

Tingly\_Fingers • 5 points • 24 January, 2017 04:35 AM

Are you intentionally this retarded or were you born this way?

ChristianRedpill • points • 24 January, 2017 02:20 AM [recovered]

get outta here you cucked faggot. You're in the wrong forum. Men's constitutional rights are violated every day country partially due to traitors like you, you simpering worthless lying faggot.

joepaulpavlin • points • 24 January, 2017 03:38 AM [recovered]

What part of paying child support is a violation of constitutional rights? Don't get mad cause you got banned for child support cause you couldn't pull your pecker out of crazy. If you can't make deal with the consequence of having a child, don't have one. You don't have a constitutional right to not provide for your biological children.

[deleted] 24 January, 2017 05:42 AM

[deleted]

Hillarysdilddo\_2016 • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 09:13 AM

Child support is not based on gender of the parents it is based on the income difference between the parent

I bet you believe in "institutionalized racism."

I bet you believe women don't have human rights.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 January, 2017 02:18 AM

or maybe if you're broke as fuck, DON'T HAVE A CHILD. boom, problem solved.

[deleted] 24 January, 2017 02:48 AM

[deleted]

tardisgroaning • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 01:21 AM

This. Don't want kids? Don't have them.

broodmetal • 5 points • 23 January, 2017 11:16 PM

They exist for more than just child support. Many fines if not paid could land you in jail.

[deleted] • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 01:29 PM

The reason they did away with debtors prison is because it was scaring people away from taking out loans. This was bad for business.

Since a man doesn't have to agree to do business with family court (he goes whether he wants to or not), scaring away customers isn't a concern

Omnibrad • 108 points • 23 January, 2017 05:12 PM

The worst part is the man can be married to a woman, do nothing wrong, and if the woman wants a no-fault divorce she will get it along with your kids, your money, and your future money.

Go into the courtroom to defend yourself and tell the judge that the father has rights. Watch what happens.

ksnyder1 • 35 points • 23 January, 2017 08:35 PM

It's a little different if he has his kids to defend him. When my parents got divorced I (11 years old) was taken to a judge and told him everything I could about my mom being irresponsible and is wanting to live with my dad. He got full custody of his 3 children and she has to pay child support. She's actually been arrested for not paying as well.

Omnibrad • 31 points • 23 January, 2017 08:48 PM

Oh sure, that happens 5% of the time. It's almost as high as the number of divorces filed by men. Coincidence?

BinaryResult • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 04:28 PM

Easy way around that for her is to just do it while they are still young, no judge will ask the opinion of a 5 year old for fear of traumatizing them.

razeus • 58 points • 23 January, 2017 08:05 PM

I've been preaching this to anyone who will listen.

THERE IS NO UPSIDE TO A MAN GETTING MARRIED. Men have all the power up until you say the vows.

I'm on my 2nd marriage (several years now), but I know if I ever get another divorce, that's it.

lelease • 21 points • 23 January, 2017 09:09 PM

I'm on my 2nd marriage (several years now)

Did that happen after you figured this out?

razeus • 16 points • 23 January, 2017 10:08 PM

No 2nd marriage, I went in like your typical male (alpha when getting the girl, then reverting to Mr. Provider in the LT).

For the last couple of years, I've been reading TRP, which help me frame myself as both a provider and the guy that will fuck her brains out.

BinaryResult • 6 points • 24 January, 2017 04:32 PM

My wife just ended our marriage of 10 years. We are separated with a custody decision finally after her trying to take the kids, (50:50 fuck you for wasting our time and money!) and a financial settlement, divorce incoming but cant happen for another 9 months due to state law. Have a gf now who knows her place, never getting married again, so glad I found TRP before taking that leap again.

[deleted] 24 January, 2017 01:35 AM

[deleted]

sassypaella • 7 points • 24 January, 2017 06:18 AM

That's LTR/married Red Pill.

BENDERisGRREAT • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 10:43 PM

Im pretty sure if he reframed it where he wasnt the provider she would murder him in his sleep

Novazilla • 0 points • 24 January, 2017 03:54 AM\*

THERE IS NO UPSIDE TO A MAN GETTING MARRIED.

I disagree. Having two incomes and the tax write offs can boost your retirement/financial goals exponentially. Problem is men not getting on the same page as their women and keeping themselves in check. There is no reason for the woman to stay with you so you have to provide a reason.

thatonemikeguy • 10 points • 24 January, 2017 05:56 AM

The solution is to marry a dude. A bro marriage would give you the tax breaks and you can each have girlfriends.

TomFoo • 1 point • 24 January, 2017 07:53 PM

I don't think you've seen how nasty a business partnership can be when falling apart, not to mention siblings suing each other. Don't be tied down to anyone.

yomo86 • 13 points • 23 January, 2017 08:37 PM

After I turned 27 people started to getting divorced. Even as BP I advertised thanks to the legal education to stay out of matrimony.

This is not some revenge fantasy seeing men who shamed you for staying out of this rigged game begging you for some change or a 20 bill to buy food - this is reality as blunt as it is.

randomperson123321 • 55 points • 23 January, 2017 04:53 PM

As a non American non activist I find this sickening.

VasilyZaitzev • 41 points • 23 January, 2017 07:51 PM

This sort of thing lets pols flex and pose in front of favored groups about how they are "GETTING TOUGH" on "DEADBEAT DADS!"

The problem is, you can't get blood from a stone, and if you don't have money, prison time isn't going to have any coercive effect, and it is *certainly* going to *prevent* a man from making any money.

Any guy who is thinking about getting married needs to watch **Divorce Corp**

Likewise, have a listen to Dave Foley's story.

Profdidddy • 12 points • 23 January, 2017 11:02 PM

I second Divorce Corp. Horror show.

IBAR\_ • 13 points • 24 January, 2017 03:36 AM

Ironically, women are probably most attracted to the assorted felons and institutionalized types most likely to *be* deadbeat dads and skip out in the first place.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 08:35 PM

Dave has a crazy interesting story, but his wife was certifiably mentally ill and also relates to Canada law not US. It's an interesting story for sure but not a norm. He talks about Phil Hartman and what he was going through with his wife as well. Those are pretty special and crazy cases. They are good intro's into yes women can be terrible but not much more than that, oh and Canada has even shittier divorce laws.

GayLubeOil • 65 points • 23 January, 2017 06:54 PM

Pretty sure people originally came to America to escape shit like this, which means that there is no shame in leaving the country to escape this situation.

maniclurker • 22 points • 23 January, 2017 07:51 PM

That's exactly what I've been thinking about the whole thing. If I every got wrapped up in a situation like this, then I'd just bounce out of the country. Fuck that noise.

OneRedYear • 26 points • 23 January, 2017 08:20 PM

If you don't have a passport and you owe more than \$2500 in child support, you aren't going anywhere.  
<https://travel.state.gov/content/passports/en/passports/information/legal-matters/child-support.html>

maniclurker • 22 points • 23 January, 2017 08:25 PM

Get a passport ahead of time. Check!

tio1w • 13 points • 23 January, 2017 09:33 PM

Passports can be revoked.

Plus, without a visa you usually can't stay longer than 90 days in one place.

maniclurker • 24 points • 23 January, 2017 09:36 PM

Stop shitting on my dream, man.

awalt\_cupcake • 25 points • 23 January, 2017 10:33 PM

plenty of people find ways in and out of countries without the 'correct way' of doing it.

[deleted] 24 January, 2017 03:39 AM

[deleted]

Bobwayne17 • 2 points • 6 March, 2017 03:52 AM

Do you know where these would be? I'm thinking of doing this and would like to know where I can go.

BoogersAreTasty • 15 points • 24 January, 2017 02:17 AM

Unfortunately, it's not all that easy anymore.

The left (in conjunction with the right) has been slowly but surely building a "Virtual Financial Berlin Wall" around this country.

Because of FATCA, it is very difficult, sometimes impossible to open up an account in a foreign country. If you do, it will likely have heavy US oversight.

A business partner is frequents this sub is a real expert on FATCA and can comment on it better than I. I'll ask him to try and pop in.

GayLubeOil • 11 points • 24 January, 2017 02:48 AM

That's why you get a foreign passport and open account via that nationality.

An\_All-Beef\_Engineer • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 02:02 AM

Please give me a heads up if he does. Eager to hear some discourse on that..

KnowBrainer • 11 points • 23 January, 2017 08:55 PM

They won't issue passports if you owe. Have to do the Mexican border hop and find a place that won't extradite.

[deleted] 24 January, 2017 03:40 AM

[deleted]

felipebarroz • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 05:07 PM

Almost no country would extradite someone over debts.

Okool74 • 31 points • 23 January, 2017 06:07 PM

In South Carolina 13% to 16% of the jailed population are lower income father who cannot pay child support

And, even with stories like this of tyranny and oppression, there will still be stupid men out there who get married and have kids. That will never change!

[deleted] • 5 points • 24 January, 2017 01:25 PM

Biology is a mother fucker. By nature we want kids. It's hard to fight nature even when you know the risks

NeoreactionSafe • 33 points • 23 January, 2017 07:28 PM\*

I've written many times here that in my opinion the Child Support Laws (passed in 1950) were the most destructive to humanity of any I can think of.

Basically the Family Court system is a **slave system** which takes the side of women to make men lose their basic right to freedom.

How a judge can go from Natural Law (which rejects slavery as being 666 master-slave thinking) to where we are now is amazing.

Child Support Laws are pure evil.



Officially slavery ended in 1865.

Child Support brought it back in 1950.

...so we were without slavery for less than 100 years. (85 years)

[deleted] • 17 points • 23 January, 2017 10:23 PM\*

Nah, we were always slaves of the system, any system. Some of them had a nicer makeup (capitalism), others not so much (communism in USSR). Slavery never ended, it just changed its shape and became less visible to the naked eye.

And if you think that 18 years of child support in US is bad, keep in mind that in some countries it's 26 years.

Future is fucked. Even if you come to certain age, and think about taking a risk and getting married and having kids, finding a girl that is worth risking is impossible. Recently I flirted with a cute 20 year old, and she told me how her grandparents keep asking her when she's going to get married, and she doesn't even have a boyfriend, and jokingly asked me if I'm going to marry her. I responded "well, it depends on how do you make spaghetti with tomato sauce (my favorite dish)", and smirked. She gave me a bitch look and told me "you need a cook, not a wife", and I responded "we can go to the restaurant every day instead... at your expense". Her response was "we would divorce in 2 months". Basically we came to the point where you can't expect any kind of performance from a girl, and it's even rude to ask. And I'm even in US, I live in the part of Europe where a lot western men come seeking their unicorn wife material woman that cooks, cleans, gives blowjob and doesn't exist.

NeoreactionSafe • 6 points • 23 January, 2017 11:03 PM

Eastern Europe is supposed to be slightly better but Western Europe is totally brainwashed.

Hopefully Western European countries will vote out the EU parties and install populists like America.

America from 1865 to 1914 was probably the best that humanity will see for some time.

The **Dark Age** (2001-2016) is over, but we will have a long trip out of the darkness before it's anything truly great again.

broodmetal • 4 points • 23 January, 2017 11:22 PM

White America? Because black history in that time was pretty fucking horrible.

NeoreactionSafe • 6 points • 24 January, 2017 04:42 AM

The last African American slave was free by 1865.

So it was a good time for everyone.

African Americans once had the lowest divorce rates... then the social manipulations happened and African American men are again of low value as all men have become.

There was a time when an African American man could marry an African American woman and expect a good life with her.

(this was before Child Support and Divorce Rape laws)

broodmetal • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 04:49 AM

Yes, but have you researched the laws enacted directly after slavery? A lot of "freed" slaves

were thrown right back into slavery under a different name. Look up black codes.

NeoreactionSafe • 4 points • 24 January, 2017 03:49 PM\*

*"Perfection is the enemy of good enough."*

In other words even when trends are very positive there are always imperfections.

Things recently were all negative... we were going away from Truth until recently.

The first reversal in direction occurred on Jekyll Island in 1910 when a group of the top bloodlines got together to plot to create a global government. Since then the Blue Pill had been increasingly bad each year.

So history has "improving" eras and "declining" eras.

The Manosphere, Red Pill and Trump are all part of a worldwide wakeup and the change in direction from "declining" to "improving".

*"Make America Great Again"* pretty much says the truth of the ambitions of this age.  
(improvement)

***Enjoy the Destruction*** of the Blue Pill mythology.

So basically enjoy this destruction we are seeing taking place.

Every beta that wakes up ("Kill the Beta") is a good thing.

These are to be (we hope) times of destruction of the Blue Pill (globalism, feminism) and the increase of Truth and masculinity.

All men of all ethnic association will be more free... it's all good... feels good man.

makeshift98 • 5 points • 24 January, 2017 03:36 AM

Let's not pretend that blacks haven't regressed since then.

broodmetal • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 04:41 AM

I meant the laws in place immediately after slavery and onwards. Black codes, not being able to get business insurance, stuff like that.

makeshift98 • 5 points • 24 January, 2017 06:52 AM

Better or worse than conditions in Africa?

broodmetal • 5 points • 24 January, 2017 01:50 PM

Why's that matter? This whole thread is about how current laws keep men down. He referenced the period after 1865 like black men had a fair shake immediately after slavery which wasn't the case.

broodmetal • -1 points • 23 January, 2017 11:21 PM

She just said that shit because she had no interest in you bro. Hate to break it to you.

[deleted] 24 January, 2017 01:33 AM\*

[deleted]

NeoreactionSafe • 5 points • 24 January, 2017 04:37 AM

That's likely actually true.

The goal of the Globalist Tyranny **was** to make a slave planet.

I guess we will see if we break their plan or if they strike back. (referring to Trump)

JackGetsIt • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 01:58 PM

Trump

Trump is part of the oligarchy. What in his past shows you he will ever do anything that doesn't directly benefit his immediate interests and needs? If there is a global slavery as you put it Trump immensely benefits from it. There are plenty of other men that would have actually drained the swamp if put in power. Trump is not your savior.

NeoreactionSafe • 5 points • 24 January, 2017 03:34 PM

The truth will be in what he does.

If he destroys, destroys, destroys... then he was honest.

If he goes soft and starts to give the Globalist Tyranny power he was dishonest.

So far he has destroyed but it's very early.

Remember:

***Enjoy the Destruction*** of the Blue Pill mythology.

[deleted] 24 January, 2017 08:05 PM\*

[deleted]

NeoreactionSafe • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 02:09 PM

The Blue Pill mythology is a slave thought process so in a sense you can go by subtraction.

In America if there are about 150 million men and of that number maybe half are Red Pilled enough to be free then the remainder are mentally Blue Pill slaves.

So maybe 75 million slaves.

Looks like the Red Pill has a lot of work to do... "Kill the Beta"... free the slaves.

drallcom3 • points • 25 January, 2017 02:34 PM **[recovered]**

Doesn't work. Take the 20% alphas and even in that subgroup women will go for the top 20%. There have been experiments.

NeoreactionSafe • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 02:42 PM

So by the 20% rule you have:

150 million \* 80% = 120 million slaves.

Either way it's a big number,

bt999 • 26 points • 23 January, 2017 09:12 PM

Cost of incarceration to the state \$30,000 - \$60,000 a year.

<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-cost-of-a-nation-of-incarceration/> It would be cheaper for the state to pay the woman directly. The man could get a job and pay tax.

wanderer779 • 19 points • 23 January, 2017 07:11 PM

If the media ever talks about this it will be made a race issue or class issue instead of a gendered one. Also, this will never be mentioned as a reason for low academic performance of poor children.

Feminists are definitely working to uphold the status quo on this. See what happened a couple years ago in Florida. This also won't be mentioned.

TheCoyPinch • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 04:48 AM

I don't think I've ever heard of something related to this happening in Florida (which suits your point), but do you mind filling me in?

wanderer779 • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 06:44 PM

In Florida there has been a bill floating around to end permanent alimony and women's groups have fought against it.

yummyluckycharms • 15 points • 23 January, 2017 09:35 PM

First of all, America isn't a patriarchy - women make up the majority of voters and vote the politicians in. By simple definition it's a matriarchy. Furthermore, when you look at the laws and how they are enforced, it makes it pretty clear that men are a second class citizen - men always get the short end of the stick. Again, this reinforces that America, like many western countries, are matriarchies - both in spirit and in practice.

Entropy-7 • 26 points • 23 January, 2017 05:51 PM

A number like 1-in-6 or 1-in-8 is astounding and frightening. America seems really fucked up in terms of the way child support is done. I was a divorce attorney in British Columbia and child support was generally reasonable, but in some rare cases a perfect storm could really fuck the guy up. Even then, contempt of court proceedings were rare and incarceration even more rare.

The biggest mistake guys made was not immediately getting a lawyer when their income dropped. If they ended up sick or injured or unemployed then get your lawyer on the job to apply to reduce your support obligations. Otherwise, it just accumulates and even bankruptcy won't get rid of it.

Hillarysdildo\_2016 • 23 points • 23 January, 2017 07:13 PM

You do realize how this makes no sense, right?

Lose income, spend thousands (maybe 10s) on lawyer.

It's fucked up.

Entropy-7 • 11 points • 23 January, 2017 07:35 PM

You will save money in the end. It really sucks to be unemployed and still obligated to pay 10% or 20% or 30% of what you *used to* earn in support payments.

IBAR\_ • 10 points • 24 January, 2017 03:37 AM

Saving money in the end requires up-front capital for legal assistance.

CrazedHyperion • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 01:03 PM

Why do you even have to go to court with a lawyer? The problem are the judges that IMPUTE large incomes to people whose life situation has permanently turned for the worse. These judges are the problem creators.

Entropy-7 • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 02:49 PM

I don't know about the USA but in Canada you can go into provincial court without a lawyer and the judges are used to dealing with people pro se. Superior court has more arcane and strict rules of procedure so it is a good idea to have a lawyer negotiate that for you.

The other thing is that if you are laid up you won't have the time or energy to fill out the forms and get your ass into court. Plus, lawyers have credibility with the other legal functionaries. All it took was a call from me and my professional word that I was bringing a motion to vary support and the government bill collectors would cease enforcement proceedings. For a regular guy with an outstanding support order, they won't believe it until they see it.

lonelliott • 11 points • 24 January, 2017 12:43 AM

Here in the US, it can take up to a year to adjust your child support to the proper amounts for a job loss or change. It happened to me via the Iowa CS system. Then, a year later, your in arrears for the year of low or non payment because of your job. All that money will of course need to be paid. I cant get a passport for my job because 9 years ago, I went 10K in arrears from being jobless for a year, waiting on Iowa to change my child support. Good times.

Edit: I now pay 1K a month for my 2 kids, along with 100 a month on the arrears. Oh, and my wife has 8, not even kidding, 8 more kids by the same guy she just married. First 2 were mine, next 8 came after me. They have a brand new home they just bought. Meanwhile, I work my ass off and live in a double wide trailer so I can pay my child support. System is fucked.

BENDERisGRREAT • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 10:52 PM

I think the problem here is that half the time, the man wants to be reasonable and help the kid and the mom goes full bitch mode in a selfish rage

dancingkungfy • 12 points • 23 January, 2017 08:59 PM

I am one of the very few and far between cases where I got divorced and granted primary custody of the children. I pay no alimony or child support. As a matter of fact, the mother can pay child support if I wished that to happen (a judge asked me this in court and I thought he was asking my ex at first, only to realize that the question was to me). You have to fight for your rights. I did. Essentially I was not divorce raped. Life is sweet right about now.

Bullfrog777 • 6 points • 24 January, 2017 01:19 AM

Why didn't you want the mother to pay child support?

dancingkungfy • 8 points • 24 January, 2017 02:00 AM

I kept that in my back pocket for the time when she acts up. Trust me she will act up and that's when I will Pull the trigger to recalibrate things.

That and end she was pretty much left broke, I was not gonna hit her when she was down at that point in time. Call it beta but I didn't want to do it then. She had suffered enough.

dr\_warlock • 25 points • 24 January, 2017 04:07 AM

That and end she was pretty much left broke, **I was not gonna hit her when she was down at that point in time. Call it beta but I didn't want to do it then. She had suffered enough.**

The difference between men and women.

swift\_phoenix • 7 points • 24 January, 2017 06:09 PM

Men have mercy for opponents, women will require opponents be killed at the hands of other men. Washing themselves free of the blood on their hands. E.G. Hillary Clinton.

Novazilla • 8 points • 24 January, 2017 04:03 AM

Since when has showing respect for a women you know would be placed in hardship had you gone through with requesting child support beta? Turning down child support and taking care of your kids yourself is pretty fuckin alpha imo.

GettingGains • points • 24 January, 2017 07:32 PM **[recovered]**

No, it is extremely beta. It only benefits the woman. The kids and the man are worse off. He could force her to pay for child support and put that money in a college fund for the kids.

Instead, this cuck is sacrificing the well-being of his kids for some pussy he used to cum inside. Definitely a beta-bob

Novazilla • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 09:31 PM

An alpha takes ownership of his situation. An alpha doesn't take fucking handouts. You should reassess your thinking of what an alpha is. The kids aren't worse off with him, they'd obviously be worse off with her. He knew this, made the choice for his children and owned it. He can always find another woman.

mcavvacm • 14 points • 23 January, 2017 10:52 PM

Soooo they get locked up for not being able to pay child support, thus significantly decreasing their ability to earn money? Seems like the most logical thing to do, surely...

[deleted] • 10 points • 23 January, 2017 10:02 PM

When will feminists arrange a big march for these men?

Zerichon • 8 points • 24 January, 2017 01:51 AM

Probably when they're castrated and willingly pay them 200% of their salary.

ministypill • 11 points • 23 January, 2017 10:35 PM

Women mumbling only 19 percent of women are on the board seats and CEO position.

Men should really tell women at least 50% of women should pay child support and alimony as well.

Hillarysdilddo\_2016 • 8 points • 24 January, 2017 09:32 AM

No. We need 50% garbagewomen, 50% coal miners, 50% ditch diggers, 100% casualties in war for a few thousand years.

Then maybe they can just take the cushy jobs.

[deleted] • 22 points • 23 January, 2017 07:22 PM

Is this why my girlfriend wants a baby more than getting marrieds, cuz she knows i dont want that but wants to tie me down some how.

maniclurker • 24 points • 23 January, 2017 07:52 PM

Bro, you better be buying your own fucking condoms, and not letting her handle them.

[deleted] • 9 points • 23 January, 2017 07:56 PM

Hell yeah I use condoms. I just graduated college, studied for a white collar profession, and I feel Imma bout to make the biggest leap in my out of poverty gutter I came out of. This transition I do not want to fuck up. Good point in the not letting her handle them. She doesnt want to get pregnant until i get work in this field. She is smart.

10211799107 • 7 points • 24 January, 2017 05:06 AM

Go in a "guys trip" for two weeks and get snipped. You're playing with fire.

franmonkey • 4 points • 24 January, 2017 02:01 PM

She sounds bad dude leve her

swift\_phoenix • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 06:12 PM

Dude you need listening to these guys. That bitch is border line personality disorder with some smarts. Worst combo bro. Get the fuck out, there are always other girls willing to fuck you.

Hillarysdilddo\_2016 • 19 points • 23 January, 2017 07:16 PM\*

## prison gap

**Take all women, find percent incarcerated.**

**Take all men, find percent incarcerated.**

Watch faggot feminists hamster away inconvenienc fact.

[deleted] • 12 points • 23 January, 2017 07:46 PM

Don't you know? Women are just better people, that's why there are less of them in prison./s

uber1337h4xx0r • 7 points • 23 January, 2017 08:50 PM

"That's our point. Men are criminals."

TomFoo • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 08:04 PM

"All men are violent rapists. AMALT."

rowingnut • 5 points • 23 January, 2017 09:49 PM

In Iowa they just take away your drivers license, which makes it near impossible to keep a job. Which makes it



harder to pay child support.

username--\_-- • 9 points • 24 January, 2017 01:11 AM

This is as stupid as it gets. Essentially they are putting you in a situation where the government pays for your living expenses and giving you no way to help the child.

Am I the only one who sees the irony in this?

Literallyoprah • 25 points • 23 January, 2017 07:10 PM

The overwhelming majority of issues with the black community are caused by systematic persecution of the black fathers and leaving entire generations in the hands of women who don't have the means to support their children.

drallcom3 • points • 24 January, 2017 01:39 AM **[recovered]**

It keeps them voting Democrats.

Roci22 • 4 points • 23 January, 2017 07:37 PM

Why make this about race? Does it apply to rich black communities? How about poor X communities?

maniclurker • 3 points • 23 January, 2017 07:54 PM

You're confusing blacks committing more violent crimes with blacks being persecuted.

Zerichon • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 01:49 AM

"Crimes" many of which are non payment of child support.

maniclurker • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 02:14 AM

Many, but not most. I'd say it's probably a very small percentage of the reasons black men are incarcerated would be child support, but I cannot find anything to verify that with a quick googling.

Regardless, I'm countering the argument that black people are persecuted. In reality, black criminals aren't incarcerated because they're persecuted. They're incarcerated because they committed a crime. The majority of violent crimes are committed by black people.

Just facts.

OneRedYear • 0 points • 23 January, 2017 08:27 PM

which blacks? rich black or poor blacks?

maniclurker • 5 points • 23 January, 2017 09:16 PM

Without checking the data, I'm going to go with poor blacks. Most likely the ones living in urban areas. Then again, most of the black population does live in urban areas, and most violent crime is committed by those in poorer socioeconomic conditions. Even without having verifiable statistics, you should have been able to infer that.

OneRedYear • 0 points • 24 January, 2017 03:43 AM

I did. As a none poor black I already knew that. I just wanted you to correlate crime and class for me. Thanks.

maniclurker • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 10:22 AM

Ah, no problem. I just want you to show me where the crime isn't their choice.

Go ahead. I'll wait right here.

OneRedYear • 0 points • 26 January, 2017 01:19 PM

Wait, you think I'm defending poor blacks. No I am not. I'm defending the rest of us. I made you be specific because you were painting me with a brush I didn't deserve to be painted with. Don't move the goal post to free will and choice. That was never the issue.

[deleted] • 7 points • 23 January, 2017 09:55 PM

US Fags are a bunch of cucks to have let it get this bad in the first place. USA = cuckold central for the last decade. Is now the time for change?

vanityflow • 6 points • 24 January, 2017 12:46 AM

I visit South Carolina yearly, i can vouch it is a lot easier to get some poon than a job

KennyF91 • 8 points • 23 January, 2017 04:51 PM

Poor states with no main attractions compared to say a Florida, will always screw you. Pretty sure GA/MS will screw you worse than Cal, CT unless there is a feminist movement.

50pluspiller • 5 points • 23 January, 2017 08:38 PM

Wait?! Didn't these bitches just have some big ass protest for "equal rights"?

Let's start with eliminating the support laws and alimony.

NibblyPig • 4 points • 23 January, 2017 11:26 PM

I can't fathom why they don't do it like student loans in the UK.

If you earn over X amount, student loan is automatically deducted from your pay. You never have to worry, think, or do anything about it (if you're a normal employee, like most people).

Can they not simply do that for child support? Automatically deduct it? A simple tiered system, earn <\$100 pay nothing, \$100-\$499 pay 10%, \$500-1000 pay 15%, etc. just made those numbers up but you get the idea...

You can go to jail for evasion or fraud or whatever if you work cash in hand etc. but you can't go to jail for not paying because it's impossible not to pay (as a regular employee).

segagaga • 1 point • 24 January, 2017 03:17 AM

But that would require logic.

brazzersjanitor • 3 points • 23 January, 2017 05:45 PM

Hey do you have a link to the article?

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 January, 2017 05:54 PM

I linked it above? JUst click where I said "and can be read here"

brazzersjanitor • 2 points • 23 January, 2017 05:59 PM

Reading on mobile. Can't find it but I may be blind. I'll check on a computer later though. Thanks.

FuckLibtardCucks • 3 points • 23 January, 2017 08:59 PM

If this doesn't prove women are more privileged than men, I don't know what does.

TomFoo • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 05:13 AM

The best part is a woman wrote this.

CrazedHyperion • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 07:16 AM

That's because at divorce time, judges "impute" just how much they think you should be earning. So the child support is calculated with fake, inflated numbers. It is extremely idiotic.

CptFizz • 3 points • 24 January, 2017 08:51 AM

Government: "Shit, that dude can't pay child support, so we have to step in. Best to incarcerate the dude, so we have to pay for him, too."

Returnofthemack3 • 2 points • 23 January, 2017 09:51 PM

Doubt we'll see men and women marching against this injustice any time soon lol

jChristopherj • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 02:32 AM

Do you have a source for that statistic? I don't see it in the article.

dejour • 1 point • 24 January, 2017 03:46 AM

It does say it in the article.

"In South Carolina, where Michael Turner was incarcerated, child support obligors imprisoned for civil contempt comprise approximately **thirteen to sixteen** percent of the jail population."

It would be nice to see where that stat comes from, but the footnotes were omitted. The article was published in an academic journal however, so I'm inclined to believe the number.

jChristopherj • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 12:48 PM

I searched '13', '16', and '%' and none pulled up anything, but now I see why. Thanks

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 09:48 AM

Women know this shit and behave accordingly. I remember when my ex quit her job and I suddenly became the sole source of income for our household. After several months of this I objected to the fact that I had to pay for everything. Her response was to tell me that none of that mattered because if she wanted to she could take me to court and get me for more money (her exact words). In her mind she was doing me a favor by letting me pay for everything.

Youbetripping • 1 point • 23 January, 2017 07:36 PM

I know if I was ever in this situation, out of principle, I would leave the country to somewhere that won't extradite. Otherwise, I would hide my money and take the prison time if I believed that the alimony was excessive.

But I'm in the UK, so not too sure about what likely child payments are required from the father.

awalt\_cupcake • 1 point • 23 January, 2017 10:31 PM

I know a lot of loser men who go to jail often for this. Keep in mind not every man has been wronged by the system. They do wrong themselves and decide to keep going back. They do not give a fuck.

chadleythunder • 1 point • 24 January, 2017 06:57 AM

We should start getting involved politically to introduce legislation to improve these conditions. Taking the MRM route or the loud activist approach and whining about it with posters and marches is not only ineffective but worst of all, it's very weak. The people who take this approach know nothing about power.

The way to make these changes is by running for office or backing a candidate that's running for office and influencing them to enact legislation to fix this child support issue. Even altering existing divorce laws that create a more equal splitting of assets should be something to look at as well.

If there has ever been an appropriate political climate for when to do this it's now.

Prime\_Tyme • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 01:31 AM

Any one figure out how to "game the system" so to speak from a man's perspective?

jackandjill22 • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 02:16 AM

God-Fucking-Damn. Christ that's intense.

enigmatic360 • 1 point • 24 January, 2017 06:17 AM

I imagine the vast majority of the population are black, as such, yes it pertains to men's rights but it's most likely due to the systematic oppression of African-Americans in the south and furthermore related to the lack of sexual education and accessibility of contraceptives in said region. The difficulty in this situation is unlike in bygone eras the oppressors don't acknowledge their racial disdain on any level because as one might expect they're generally polite and indifferent in day to day circumstances.

MinionOverLord • -1 points • 24 January, 2017 02:48 AM

Who cares.....what do you want to bet they're 90% Dim-O-Krats...the non-swimming kind!!

OrpheusV • 2 points • 24 January, 2017 02:57 AM

South Carolina is majority Republicans. I guarantee you a large amount of them fall under that.

BiggerFrenchie • -3 points • 24 January, 2017 12:45 AM

So go run for governor of SC and change it. Shit man. All talk and jabber in this subreddit. When do you mother fuckers do anything about any of this. You have a great idea, now run with it. Find a way to get these guys to make some money and take care of their kids.

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 January, 2017 05:53 AM

wtf are you talking about man? Do you know how people get elected? You'll have to have millions of dollars to bribe yourself to get things done.

nuesuh • -3 points • 23 January, 2017 08:48 PM

And 98% of the aforementioned men are morons.

[deleted] • 8 points • 23 January, 2017 09:47 PM

98% of women are morons. We don't jail them, do we? Being moron does not equal prison.

nuesuh • -1 points • 23 January, 2017 10:18 PM

For these men their idiocy lead them to be imprisoned. Not because of them being dumb, but because of them doing dumb stuff. Which is why I assume most of the men in prison for debt, or just in prison in

general, aren't very smart.

Is it okay for a judge to send you to prison for debt? Maybe..

Is it okay to demand child support? Absolutely not.

But that's how most of the western world is at the moment. If you knock a girl up and don't have money in the bank, you've had it coming. Of course, condoms break, men get spermjacked etc. But most of these men could have seen it coming.