

# Classic worst case divorce scenario with Dave Foley on JRE

60 upvotes | 4 March, 2014 | by puaSenator

---

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SaC-2lj6HNg>

As brutal as the whole thing is, two parts are especially bad:

The first is where in Canada, you can't get divorced for one year after filing the paperwork -- I suppose this is a way the state tries to make you work it out. However, in this case, she went full cunt. Since the courts force the banks accounts to stay shared, she had full access of it. She ends up spending over a million dollars within that year, doing things from travelling around the world to redecorating the house from end to end multiple times. All while he lives on his small boat.

Another is the after effects. He divorced at the height of his career so his alimony and child support was pegged to that income. So even after he goes on making less and less money, he still has to pay the same. The courts don't care if you're broke working as a waiter, you still have to pay that alimony of 50k a month, or as the judge said, "I don't care, you still have a legal obligation." And on top of all that child support, he has to pay for EVERYTHING the kids need from private school to clothes and health insurance. She literally gets to pocket all the child support and ends up using it to travel around the world with the kids with a hired nanny.

Meanwhile, he's broke and struggling, and she never has to work a day in her life ever again.

What incentive do women have to make marriages like this work out when they know they can just go on and live never having to work again. I suppose the only downside is she can't get married again. But for 500k a year, I'd be okay with just committed relationships from then on for the rest of my life.

What incentive do men have to get married again?

Marriage laws are archaic. They root from a time when a divorced woman was unmarriageable, a time when there weren't even any unmarried around her divorced age, but even then, the single men saw a divorcee as toxic and not wife material.

So it makes sense for the time. If the marriage was going downhill, the woman would try her best to make the marriage work in fears that she'd never be able to find a quality partner again. And the man would try to make it work in hopes of saving all of his money. Which is why marriages were thought out, and divorce rates were low.

But now things have changed, for the better on the social level. These stigmas no longer exist, cool. But the laws haven't changed in relation. And soon as you try to advocate for a change in marriage laws, the feminists jump on you for being an evil MRA.

Don't get married, and if you do, DO NOT have a stay at home wife. The stay at home wives are the ones are the ones that turn men to suicide via divorce.

---

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

---

## Comments

---

TheRabid • 28 points • 4 March, 2014 04:26 PM

I remember hearing about his wife and their divorce case. It's like that old Chris Rock line...

"I'm not saying that I support OJ, but I understand."

[deleted] • 29 points • 4 March, 2014 04:37 PM

One of my favorite bits by any comic ever.

*"So let's get this shit straight: I buy you a car, and you let another man drive around in my fucking car? Are you out of your fucking mind? You gotta think about OJ's situation: another man driving around in his car, fucking his wife, in a house he's still paying the mortgage on. Now I ain't sayin' he shoulda killed her.. but I understand".*

southernmost • 9 points • 4 March, 2014 04:59 PM

By the numbers, hiring a killer to wack your soon-to-be-ex is a better option than divorce. Much lower cost if you're not caught, shorter prison term (vs. non-payment of support) if you are. Plus you might get some yard respect for having the cojones and means to contract a killer.

I'm not saying anyone SHOULD do that, just that it makes good economic sense.

bicureyooz • 6 points • 4 March, 2014 05:22 PM

I'm not saying anyone SHOULD do that, ~~just that it makes good economic sense~~ but I understand.

FTFY

TheRabid • 0 points • 4 March, 2014 07:45 PM

True enough. You don't want to see this appearing in the Snowden files.

SigmaMu • 3 points • 4 March, 2014 08:06 PM

The odds are ~99% anyone who touts themselves as a hit man will be a cop. If you want to get something done...

antihostile • 3 points • 4 March, 2014 09:20 PM

Another great Chris Rock bit about marriage/divorce:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PsSD7CP5hxQ>

[deleted] • 13 points • 4 March, 2014 04:33 PM\*

I'm a very dumb man in most respects but you need to be stupid, or perhaps just an addicted gambler, on a level I can't even begin to imagine to still think marriage is a good idea for a man, or even simply not a terrible idea, in this day and age.

Divorce laws served a reasonable purpose in the 1800s. There's still 4 or 5 people alive today born in the 1800s, so maybe these laws are left over for them. Just for the benefit of the Misao Okawas of the world.

What I'd like to see is this: okay, fine, you can use what for all intents and purposes are laws from an alternate dimension to rape men financially. We all know this is the case, but some men are getting married anyway.

Their mistake. We can keep these laws on one condition: we do *everything* like it's 1850.

I don't like your cooking? Enjoy your broken jaw. I can drive my car at 200mph down the street because hey, it's 1850 and there's no speed limits for horses. I say something you don't like, you say something I don't like, and we Game of Thrones now! You sir, have offended my honor. As consenting adults we now recognize our right to duel. It's probably gonna hurt really bad if you slice off my arm, and even if I win I'm too squeamish to look at your blood and guts, but hey, it's 1850! So let's party like it's 1799.

Well, we didn't manage to kill each other, but you did hurt my tooth a bit, so pass me that bucket full of legal heroin while I cool off by fighting a boxing match against a kangaroo. Get me my gloves, bitch!

Thank God we live in this time.

What's that sweetie, you miss 2014?

No shit.

libglip • 4 points • 4 March, 2014 05:22 PM

I can drive my car at 200mph down the street because hey, it's 1850 and there's no speed limits for horses.

Actually, there were. US President Grant was locally infamous in DC for his fast driving. The cops couldn't arrest him while he was President.

The guy was about 100 years ahead of his time in that respect.

[deleted] • 2 points • 4 March, 2014 06:07 PM

Thanks for keeping me honest. I swear I used to know there were speed limits for horses.. maybe that knowledge was pushed out of my brain when I learned the staggering realization there are still people born in the 1890s alive today.

Strongproudwoman • 10 points • 4 March, 2014 05:36 PM

If I'm not mistaken here in Canada some guy was ordered to pay like 2500 a month and he only made 2000 a month. He then went to his vehicle and blew his brains out on the sidewalk so the court revised the pay structure and now it's based on what you currently make and changes as your pay changes.

Also here in Canada if you live together for more than 6 months you are considered common law. And I think it has Almost the same rules as divorce.

And finally, I only causally date. No way in hell I'm risking my condo and life for that shit.

rdpllm • 8 points • 4 March, 2014 09:53 PM

This is my plan as well. Except to do it in a more visible way.

Come back the next day to the courthouse, high as fuck on morphine. Douse self in gasoline, and set myself ablaze on the courthouse steps.

That's how you do a protest suicide to get things changed for the future.

[deleted] • 7 points • 4 March, 2014 05:45 PM

The laws in Ontario are typically stupid regarding common law marriages.

In Ontario, the Ontario Family Law Act specifically recognizes common law spouses in §29, dealing with spousal support issues; the requirements are living together for no less than three years or having a child in common and having "cohabited in a relationship of some permanence". The three years must be continuous, although a breakup of a few days during the period will not affect a person's status as common law. The law apparently doesn't require both parties to give informed consent to incurring

responsibilities to another's debts, or losing control over one's wealth.

I.e. if you've let her sleep on your couch for 3 years and she wakes up one day and decides she wants your money, too bad for you.

Not that this would be a problem for any man on TRP, but it's still fucking nonsense. From what I've read, the way "the community views your relationship" can help enforce this law, which unless I'm misreading that essentially states that if some random shithead living in the apartment across the hall says "Yeah, it's like they're married or something", in the eyes of the law, you put a ring on it.

TerryYockey • 8 points • 4 March, 2014 08:48 PM

When it comes to divorce, Rod Stewart said it best:

"Instead of getting married again, I'll just make things simpler next time by finding a woman I don't like and giving her house."

robesta • 7 points • 4 March, 2014 04:26 PM

This has been posted before. It really is the worst case scenario. I agree with what you said. Incentives have a lot to do with the amount of divorces. Marriage is never easy, but when you get half+ a paycheck of your ex if you don't work it out, it makes financial sense. It's not a coincidence that divorce rates skyrocketed when child support laws and no fault divorce became commonplace.

KyfhoMyoba • 5 points • 5 March, 2014 12:06 AM

Divorce correlates better with adoption of the pill, adjusted for a 5 year lag. The pill makes women crave the beta, after 5 years or so when they decide they want a kid, suddenly "He doesn't understand me. I'm not ha-a-appy." etc. Saw a post from Rollo's or Roissy's site from a guy whose co-worker split from her 14 LTR. He asked if she just went off the pill. She said how'd you know?!

We Are Magik.

boscoist • 2 points • 5 March, 2014 10:52 PM

The pill makes women crave the beta...

I'm a bit of a skeptic, and new around here. but that is a rather good hypothesis, with some solid anecdotal evidence. If memory serves, the pill fools the body into thinking its already pregnant (or something like that with hormone levels) so the beta crave is to support the non-existent baby. Curious indeed.

boogalooshrimp1103 • 5 points • 4 March, 2014 07:54 PM

i listened to this a few weeks ago and sent it to my friend trying to subtly talk him away from the edge of marriage. his fiance doesnt make much money despite possessing a bachelors degree, she doesnt cook (because she cant) she doesnt clean much doesnt do laundry. eventually they plan on having a kid. i feel like hes headed for brick wall in a indy car.

randomdude600 • 6 points • 4 March, 2014 09:17 PM

I understand the reasoning to protect the poor frail lady who can't ever get another job (but feminism fixed that didn't it?) but 50K a month is more than most people make in an entire year. I'd never work another straight job if I got 50K a year for doing SFA (sweet fuck all). I can't begin to imagine what I could do with 50 K a month.

It's sad because I remember watching Kids in the Hall growing up.

"This nation has an epidemic of gold digging whores" "How many good men have to get cut in half before we do something about this" - Bill Burr

randomdude600 • 6 points • 4 March, 2014 09:21 PM

I'd be more sympathetic to "women's plight" if there was some kind of reasonable cost of living cap on alimony/child support but this story shows it for the "legal" robbery it is. No reasonable person could possibly need 50K a month.

boscoist • 3 points • 5 March, 2014 10:59 PM

Its not just a womens plight, spousal support laws exist to help those who don't work in a relationship and as a result have been left behind on their former career paths. I don't agree with the insane levels of support that have been asked for/given, but they are given so that the poorer spouse can 'maintain the same quality of life' that they had while married.

EDIT: I believe that's the phrasing for the CA, USA law.

bama79rolltide • 4 points • 4 March, 2014 05:15 PM

The only solution, in my opinion, is to live abroad.

rdpllm • 3 points • 4 March, 2014 09:43 PM

They take away your passport if you owe more than \$2,000 in unpaid child support.