

# The Redefinition of Marriage.

August 11, 2014 | 145 upvotes | by [Whisper](#)

---

I think there is no group in America quite so awful at explaining its point as the so-called "Religious Right", that group of Christians-with-a-capital-C who are the populist voice of social conservatism in the American political landscape.

Their grasp of apologetics, outside of a few voices like Dalrock, is so bad that no one outside their community even understands their talking points.

When they said "family values", everyone else thought it was a code word for hating sex. When they say "defense of marriage", everyone else thought it was a code word for hating gays.

But the truth is more complicated.

The core of religious values, for almost all religions, not just christianity, is reenforcement of existing social structures. Now, the construction of a mythological framework for that is just what most religions DO. But when that framework becomes the only reason for those values that people understand, then they cannot explain the values to anyone who doesn't share their supernatural beliefs.

CCs (conservative christians) can't explain their values, because they don't themselves understand the real reasons behind them.

It never occurs, not only to cultural Marxists, SJWs, and other ultra-liberals, but also to the average moderate, that these values are wrapped around a correct idea.

**This idea is that the basic unit of a society is not an individual, but a family. A society composed of weak, disconnected, or broken families is a broken society.**

And the way *our* society has traditionally formed families is marriage. (Followed by children).

Now, marriage, at its core, is a contract. (Just like pretty much any human relationship that is formalized.) Contracts have a couple of things that distinguish them.

- They have terms. (These theoretically benefit both parties.)
- They have consent. (Both parties agree to the terms.)
- They have enforcement. (Some negative consequence to the party that breaks the agreement.)

Now, in the idealized version of the past that CCs want to return to, all these things supposedly worked.

- The wedding vows were the terms.
- Informed consent was obvious, because both parties recited the terms out loud.
- Enforcement was a social act by the community, because the vows were spoken in front of that community, who would socially enforce them.

Now, CCs think wedding vows are spoken in front of "God", but when was the last time you saw god punish a cheating wife, or a neglectful husband? No, the real enforcers of wedding vows were the tight-knit local communities people lived in. If the marriage contract was broken, the community would judge who broke it, and ostracize that person. Effective.

But because marriages have consequences in civil law, the government needed some notion of who was married. And this was the thin end of the wedge. Once people started having to sign papers declaring that they were married before the law recognized it, the enforcing authority passed from the hands of the community, and into the hands of the law.

And the law, in its need to standardize everything, began to standardize the contract.

So now, what do we have?

- The wedding vows are just poetry. The law defines the terms of the contract, and it can and will retroactively redefine those terms at any time.
- Informed consent is impossible, because the papers the couple sign don't contain the terms, which occupy volumes of lawbooks unavailable to most couples, and which can change at any time.
- The law does not enforce the marriage contract (no-fault divorce), it simply recognizes the dissolution of the contract, and divides the assets of the partnership (money, property, children) without any regard to who broke the contract.

**So, when the modern couple gets "married", they are agreeing to terms they don't know about, breach of which will not be punished, and the dissolution of which will be handled by a templated process that someone else has decided is fair for everyone.** Is it any surprise this doesn't work? The favoritism courts show to women doesn't even enter into it. The problem runs deeper. **When the government defines the terms of a contract, the parties to that contract do not know what they are agreeing to.**

This is what CCs are on about when they don't want to let gays get "married". They have no idea of the reasons underlying their own values, and they're closing the barn door decades after the horses have fled, but they have some vague notion that the government mishandles the institution of marriage, and they want to resist that somehow.

So how should we fix this problem....?

....

....

We shouldn't, you fool. We can't. Have you forgotten where you are? You're reading TRP. We are not here to fix society, because our society *eats self-sacrificing heroes* for breakfast, then demands they buy it lunch.

We are here to *survive the collapse*.

So how do you do *that*? **DON'T GET MARRIED, DUMBASS.**

- It doesn't matter if you want children.
- It doesn't matter how much game you have.
- It doesn't matter how ironclad your prenup is.
- It doesn't matter how high your SMV is.
- It doesn't matter if you could have another her in thirty seconds.

You are still signing a contract you don't get to read. Would you hand a stranger a signed blank cheque? It's just retarded. There is nothing that all the redpillian advice in the world can do for you, if you are such a rube that you sign things without reading them.

---

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

---

## Comments

---

Invalidity • 43 points • 11 August, 2014 08:40 PM

More and more men will continue to opt into the whole marriage spiel because of the way they've been feminized in school growing up. Not just that, but also media and their peers. Girls look forward to getting married, because they think it's all glamorous and glitzy. Truth be told, ceremonies usually are, but marriages are terrible.

Kids grow up believing that girls want to get married; they want the ceremony. Marriage at some point will become so horribly unfavorable that the majority of men opt out of the system altogether. When society crumbles, it can begin again, and the cycle will repeat itself.

JP\_Whoregan • 29 points • 12 August, 2014 12:40 AM

Most women, if they stop deluding themselves, don't really want a marriage. They want a wedding. And it's only **supposed** to happen once in a lifetime, which is why there is all of the pomp and circumstance surrounding it.

shiteonakite • 14 points • 12 August, 2014 01:24 AM

I Agree

It's the wedding, the diamond, feeling "amazing" even if they can never see themselves as good looking.

manwhy • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 08:14 PM

I'm not so sure about that. There was that woman a week or two ago who had a man willing to settle down, have kids, and even give his woman a wedding ceremony...but he wouldn't sign the marriage contract. She was pretty pissed about it. Certainly an anecdote, but I can't help but feel in my gut the Truth™ of that scenario.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 09:02 PM

wedding and somebody to give them money for complaining

snbdmliss • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 09:54 AM

Marriage is the journey and life built together, and it's sooo much more important and amazing than a single day and a piece of paper could ever be.

DazPatrick • 3 points • 12 August, 2014 02:41 AM

When society crumbles, it can begin again, and the cycle will repeat itself.

Society already had crumbled imao

[deleted] • 5 points • 12 August, 2014 06:24 AM

The fear is that it might be Western civilization that crumbles, and other civilizations that pick up the pieces, resulting in what was once the world's finest being reduced to scraps. I guess some of us think it's a shame to let that happen when it doesn't have to.

sailorJery • 4 points • 11 August, 2014 10:55 PM

assuming humanity survives the collapse of society

[deleted] • 41 points • 11 August, 2014 08:45 PM

This may be the most bitter part of the red pill to swallow. I know it has been for me. Like most men on here I've spent most of my life thinking that would absolutely happen. I dated the preachers daughter at 18 and I clearly remember her dad telling me, "when are you going to put a ring on my daughters hand"....At 18 years old....

Talk about conditioning on a whole new level. Glad I dodged that first bullet

[deleted] • 31 points • 11 August, 2014 11:00 PM

I remember at every family reunion the first question my relatives ALWAYS, FUCKING ALWAYS, brought up was **"why don't you have a girlfriend?" and "why aren't you married yet?"** I'd always ignore them, and back then it sort of pressured me into thinking that I NEED THESE THINGS TO BE SUCCESSFUL.

However, after reading some books, and stumbling here. I now can't be any more clear when I say: **"I WILL NOT BE GETTING MARRIED."**

Not trying to sound condescending, but I love my family, however I love myself more, and will not be getting raped ever.

[deleted] • 10 points • 11 August, 2014 11:11 PM

Same here. Now if they ask me If I have a GF I respond with...yeah I have a few, smile, and then go to wherever I can get a beer and play catch with my little cousins.

sailorJery • 22 points • 11 August, 2014 10:55 PM

so....preacher's daughter...did she touch your penis?

[deleted] • -17 points • 12 August, 2014 07:31 AM

the number of upvotes for this question speaks volumes for TRP (still a devout member doe)

squarehead9375 points 12 August, 2014 02:50 AM\* **[recovered]**

The mods should start banning people who advocate getting married. They clearly don't get it, and we don't need them spreading their stupidity to others who could be hurt by it.

I was with you right till this part. A shame because this was a really good post. I might get downvoted for this, but this bit is some feminist level shit. I thought we prided ourselves on not censoring any dissent from the majority, unlike the feminists, SJWs and SRSters. TRP, like any community, revolves around certain beliefs and shared interests, but there's plenty of room for debate. IMHO the "don't get married" meme here is almost reaching circlejerk pitch. Look, I agree with a lot of it, as do many people here, but it is not the only viewpoint in the room, nor should it be, especially by means of censoring other opinions.

[deleted]15 points 12 August, 2014 07:56 AM **[recovered]**

Exact same here, OP had so much right before he was bashing marriage, what's the point of fucking sluts all the time if your kids are doomed because of your selfishness?

We can fix some stuff today and as improbable as fixing even most of our problems is we can still be the guys organizing the rebuilding of our society after the crash runs its course.

This "Ride out the crash and have fun doing it" mentality fails to consider the loss of resources during and after the crash and that post crash we will see a return to social fundamentalism/conservatism/traditionalism

and if you can't get into power with that crowd because they see you as unclean or as a womanizer they'll probably hang you for being a degenerate if shit really did hit the fan. I'm not saying don't fucks sluts, I'm saying that we shouldn't delude ourselves by turning away from the knife and hoping it doesn't hit something vital, we have to watch it come in and understand how to survive it and in that post SHTF/Crashed America. It's easy to escape charges of degeneracy, you just bug on out, but If your going to fuck sluts and try to hold down the fort your going to be turned upon during the reconstruction as social conservatism sweeps in.

We need to do well on the way down but we also need to be prepared to do well on the other side.

Land will always go up in value if there is somebody that knows what to do with it; get land, find a way to use it, prepare to defend it.

manwhy • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 08:38 PM

You have really good points, but let me play devil's advocate. Imagine we're "post-Crash" and social conservatism has reestablished itself as the dominant institution of the time. Imagine that you're the head of the "Post-Crash Church of Conservativism", henceforth referred to as PCCC. Imagine that you have the sovereignty to evaluate the population and excommunicate those who you deem too sexually liberal. Now ask yourself this question: *How do I know for sure who was and who wasn't a slut/man-whore?*

How do you establish that? Our communities are way too dis-integrated to tell. I can tell you that I don't even know the vast majority of people on my street. If I were in your head-of-the-PCCC shoes, how would I persecute people for crimes they *may* have committed two, five, or ten years ago? That's not even considering that you'd be punishing them for actions that weren't criminal at the time that there were performed.

Simply put, we can't retroactively "fix" this stuff.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 10:35 PM

If it were my position to do it I would construct a sort of segregated system that allowed people to whore but they could only do it overtly and would be known for their actions and could never go back to being high quality marriage material, and I'd probably spend the rest of my career trying to make sure nobody was taking the segregation to far and lynching people or stoning them for being sluts.

But I'm a bit to reasonable to get that sort of Job, no the guy with job will try to hold a sort of inquisition where they ask acquaintances about their behavior and then they'd either mark your face or body, in some places they might kill you, and it would be all based on the testimony of others but those are the extreme circumstances I doubt few places will differ so much of their decision making to the guy in charge of the church, that guy will have power but it will mostly just be influence as post collapse people will cling to founding the founding principles of america and hopefully some ideas on privacy will be a bigger part of it.

Essentially I'm saying you'll be known for your actions and if those actions become associated with the societal collapse that just happened they aren't going to be too happy with you. Why do you think ancient civilizations had such brutal consequences for things like sex and small time theft? It's because these harm the foundations of society and they understood that because it happened so much back then. Civilization was a new experiment and they had just begun to figure out why some civilizations collapsed, they had some other unknowns in the process that they put in the realm of the divine but they knew what was causing problems. just look at Sodom and Gomorrah, do you honestly think that two cities actually in the archaeological record where purged by fire from heaven or do you think they burned in their walls because of riots or a lack of infrastructure?

AFPJ • 4 points • 12 August, 2014 06:19 PM\*

The whole "don't get married" business arises from people lacking a combination of precaution, know-how and legal resources to secure themselves from divorce rape. Steps to making divorce-rape impossible are quite simple:

- 1) Create an autonomous trust in the name of your parents or grandparents
- 2) Set your trust's beneficiary as your other parent in case of death
- 3) Ensure both parents have you as the beneficiary in their will
- 4) START YOUR OWN BUSINESS, file 100% of shares to the trust
- 5) Give yourself an annual salary of no more than 40,000-50,000USD
- 6) All your cars, real estate, boats, planes, etc are property of the trust.
- 7) Trust pays revolving taxes/mortgages/upkeep of assets
- 8) You pay rent to the trust (aka yourself) for usage of all assets

Contrary to the popular belief of *"courts have seen ALL the tricks, you won't evade divorce rape"* even if you get the worst possible alimony / child support rulings, you'll be paying a max of \$20K annually as long as the aforementioned has been properly done and lose half of your non-trust escrowed possessions (\$5-10K).

...That is if you, for some god-awful reason, do decide to marry. If you don't the trust limits the legal maximum of child support you are allowed to be charged and your child support liability over the course of 18 years will be under or right around \$200K. But make sure that whoever the trust is filed to doesn't get married.

**TL;DR high-quality, self respecting women of SMV roughly equivalent to yours won't stay long-term or start a family unless they feel "secure". Aforementioned steps give them the illusion of security and you the ability to crush them and leave them with (relatively) nothing if / when they betray you.**

From experience, the look on a cunt's face when the expensive lawyers she got under the guise of getting a cut from what she thought would be her half of a \$3M house and the Italian luxury cars she was enjoying realize that none of that will be happening and turn on her is worth every penny of child support.

Or it could be a happily ever after, but always better safe than sorry.

manwhy • 3 points • 12 August, 2014 08:47 PM

\$20K is most of their yearly income for much of the population. The vast majority of people don't have \$3M houses. Even to an extraordinarily rich and well-positioned man, \$20K is a nice vacation for a few weeks, or another high-end Ducati to add to the stable, or several high-end escorts. And that's every single year, possibly in perpetuity.

No; when even billionaires fall to the bloody axe of divorce rape, the time to run for cover is nigh.

AFPJ • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 10:04 PM

Breaking News! Economic, legal & social constructs in the U.S. are designed to benefit those with knowledge and above a certain net value at the expense of those without knowledge and below a certain net value.

\$20K is most of their yearly income for much of the population.  
vast majority of people don't have \$3M houses

*Like I said: people lacking a combination of precaution, know-how and legal resources*

Even to an extraordinarily rich and well-positioned man, \$20K is



Top 1% of Taxpayers' AGI was \$389K in 2011 - that's not even rich. 20K is nothing.

even billionaires fall to the bloody axe of divorce rape

*Like I said: people lacking a combination of **precaution**, know-how and legal resources.*

As you can see, this is the know-how for those not lacking precaution or (legal) resources.

manwhy • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 11:21 PM\*

I'm not really qualified to argue for "the other side", as it were. I've never wanted for money, so I can't honestly say that I can truly identify with those that have.

### **\$20K is Nothing**

What I can say is that \$20K is not *nothing*. Not really. Let's throw away the very fundamental difference between income and assets to instead focus on your 1% baseline of \$389K. \$20K is ~5% of \$389K. Is 5% a huge percentage? No, but neither is it insignificant. 5% is 1/20 of everything you own. Why should my effective tax be 5% more than it has to be? Let's up the ante; let's say I have an annual income of five times that. Why should my effective tax be even 1% than it needs to be? 1% may not seem like much, but it compounds over a period of years to be way more than you'd expect. Why should a woman ever get a \$200K+ chunk out of my loaded ass? Even as a billionaire, that would still rustle my jimmies.

### **Legal Resources and Precaution**

Are you aware that for the past couple of decades the marriage contract has been retroactively changed? In other words, for a married couple of 40 years to divorce tomorrow would mean a vastly different "divorce arrangement" than if they had been divorced after 5. No amount of legal resources and precaution can protect a man in that scenario. Besides, marriage was a beneficial arrangement for both parties just a few decades ago. The new knowledge that marriage is *not* the same as it was; the fact that it is now a man scam hasn't percolated out to the public yet.

### **Sticking Everything in Trusts**

Trusts are useful tools as part of your complete financial tool belt, but they are by no means a one-size-fits-all solution. Trusts work by fundamentally restricting your freedoms to do what you want with your assets. By putting things in a trust you are basically surrendering those assets to a third party to manage on your behalf. If you want to pass a house or other assets down to your irresponsible children, such an arrangement can work like a charm. On the other hand, what if you give everything you own to a trust and then suddenly decide you want to sell it all and permanently live on a yacht? I don't know what terms you signed up for, but there's a very real possibility that you may be kept from doing so. The simple fact is that a trust is not a magical solution. Maybe you don't want to put literally everything you own into one. Everything is a trade-off.

AFPJ • 0 points • 12 August, 2014 11:29 PM\*

I stand by the point that 20K is nothing to 1%+ because it's the equivalent of 2K/yr to a 40K salaried fellow.

Will you miss it? Yes. Is it significant? No. If you have \$1B+ and 200K rustles your jimmies, you need to prioritize.

no amount of legal resources and precaution can protect a man in that scenario.

Yes, they can. What's not yours can't be divided in a divorce. If your wealth is astronomical,

you are most likely part of a legacy and have had the knowledge on how to preserve it in your particular country passed down to you.

The simple fact is that a trust is not a magical solution.

This is an excellent point; there are downsides to trusts and they are definitely not a divorce-rape panacea.

However, if one is set up properly and written to your ancestors, you do have a lot of flexibility.

Everything is a trade-off.

This is just an Obama-tier platitude which you can't really argue against. 10/10 props for persuasive writing.

manwhy • 1 point • 13 August, 2014 05:04 PM

Will you miss it? Yes. Is it significant? No. If you have \$1B+ and 200K rustles your jimmies, you need to prioritize.

Losing \$200K wouldn't bother me, but handing it over to a gold digging bitch-of-a-woman would.

Yes, they can. What's not yours can't be divided in a divorce. If your wealth is astronomical, you are most likely part of a legacy and have had the knowledge on how to preserve it in your particular country passed down to you.

And if you accumulate your assets after marriage? It's considered "joint property". You also conveniently skipped right over the part about how the government likes to keep redefining the marriage contract *after* it's been signed by both parties.

This is just an Obama-tier platitude which you can't really argue against. 10/10 props for persuasive writing.

I would take this as an insult if Obama's singular redeeming quality wasn't his incredible oratorical ability.

AFPJ • 1 point • 13 August, 2014 05:18 PM

but handing it over to a gold digging bitch-of-a-woman would.

Poor decisions yield undesirable consequences - that's life.

And if you accumulate your assets after marriage? It's considered "joint property".

YOU don't accumulate shit. The company you work for which is (legally) owned by your ancestors or a trust signed to your parents who in turn have their possessions willed to you accumulates the fruits of your labor.

Need a car? Business expense. Vacation? Business trip. Eating out? Business dinner.

**Having access to / control over but not ownership of** your company's assets is the hidden gem here.

Whisper[S] • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 10:33 PM



So your general solution, for everyone to apply, is "be better at safeguarding assets than people who do this for a living are at getting to them"?

AFPJ • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 10:49 PM

Yes. When stakes are high, being better than your opponent at a game or not playing it (ie., not marrying) isn't a "general solution for everyone" or super saintly sage wisdom of any kind - **it's common fucking sense.**

be better at safeguarding assets than people who do this for a living are at getting to them

Not that difficult. People who do this for a living can't get to assets that aren't legally yours, the end.  
*Ever hear a divorcee's ex get half of his parents' house or retirement fund? Me neither.*

Whisper[S] • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 11:13 PM

Yes. When stakes are high, being better than your opponent at a game or not playing it (ie., not marrying) isn't a "general solution for everyone" or super saintly sage wisdom of any kind - it's common fucking sense.

And you're saying "beat the pros", while I'm saying "don't play".

What's the big prize that I win if I beat a divorce lawyer at his own game? I get *to keep what I already had*. Most of it.

I can get that prize automatically by *not playing*.

AFPJ • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 11:21 PM

You missed the part where I'm not catering to your scenario.

Per my original post as for the "why":

TL;DR high-quality, self respecting women of SMV roughly equivalent to yours won't stay long-term or start a family unless they feel "secure". Aforementioned steps give them the illusion of security and you the ability to crush them and leave them with (relatively) nothing if / when they betray you.

You're welcomed to avoid marriage & neither start nor be a part of a legacy, with your family likely descending back into the lower/middle class chaos and ecosystem of perpetually broken and dysfunctional homes & children.

That's a choice we all have - my post is about how those who DO want or have legacies can preserve them.

neurosurg • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 09:08 PM

I'm really interested in this. Do you have an accounting/business background or work in finance? I really think a lot of members of this community would benefit from a guide like this for protecting themselves, even if they aren't planning on getting married. I'm trying to think about myself long term (I work in medicine - hence my username) and would ideally like to do everything I can to protect my current and future assets.

AFPJ • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 11:15 PM

Do you have an accounting/business background or work in finance?

Negative, AF paramedic and business owner with an ivy background here - civilian life pisses me off so I stay active duty & let my managers handle the rest. Saw a successful friend go through a divorce unscathed, though.

a lot of members of this community would benefit from a guide like this for protecting themselves

Basically, here's the gist of it:

are not considered marital property. Instead, inheritances are treated as separate property belonging to the person who received the inheritance, and therefore may not be divided between the parties in a divorce.

But it's not that simple - if your SO's lawyers are top notch, they can even try reaching for Irrevocable Trusts and have a small chance of getting them; it's happened before. To be 100% safe you must keep all your businesses & assets with your ancestors & come from a good enough lineage to be able to trust them with it. Direct Inheritance can sometimes be touched, but if you've got shit that's owned by your Grandfather, signed to your Grandmother if he dies, who has it signed to your Father if she dies, who has it signed to your Mother if he dies, who has it signed to you if she dies ...you get the picture. Not only would it get laughed out of the court if brought up, 9/10 times the divorce asset discovery process won't even find something as far-fetched and nebulous as this.

Source: lawyer friends. Ask any divorce lawyer about "Trusts" and they will break out in hives.

Goupidan • 1 point • 14 August, 2014 03:00 AM

Can't the court remove the corporate veil and go after the shareholder?

AFPJ • 1 point • 14 August, 2014 04:02 AM

go after the shareholder?

Go after an autonomous trust signed over to the divorcee's **parents**? No, they can't do that - divorcee's parents' assets are 100% off limits unless included in a direct will and can therefore be (very rarely) tapped under the "future inheritance" clause ...and even that is considered individual property not divisible by a divorce without exceptional circumstances.

If your parents will is not public, however, the divorce discovery process has no right to override that privacy veil. Also, if your parents have not written a will, you are still considered an implied heir but the court can not count this as a possible future inheritance.

[deleted] • 8 points • 12 August, 2014 03:26 PM

It's also somewhat hypocritical. I very frequently see the argument made by guys on here that they WANT a serious relationship and traditional family, and that they only spin plates because that's the best they can manage, that there are "no good women" who are worth committing to.

Then in the same breath, they will say to "never ever under any circumstances ever" get married, even though they just claimed that a traditional family is what they want.

They do this in bald neglect of the number of posters here who have happy marriages ( they're not the dominant voice, but they're out there ), and the statistics of divorce (for example, if both partners are college educated and above a certain age, i think 26 or 28, the success rate rises to 80%, and the 20% fail rate is partly inflated by serial divorcers).

I am not defending marriage - I agree with the criticisms and I plan to never get married. What I am defending is being reasonable, logically consistent, and looking at the facts, regardless of your ideology. The mentality of OP, with his suggestion to ban dissenting opinion, is a perfect example of how people can take a good idea which has some reason to it, and go too far into the realm of unwavering ideology.

hashtagpound2point2 • 4 points • 12 August, 2014 07:08 PM

Then in the same breath, they will say to "never ever under any circumstances ever" get married, even though they just claimed that a traditional family is what they want.

Maybe they just don't want to take the gamble? 20% chance of getting divorced still seems like a pretty big risk when there's not really any advantages to getting married as a guy.

MartialWay • 3 points • 13 August, 2014 12:48 AM\*

It's also somewhat hypocritical.

Except it's not. GMF - Grandpa's Marriage Fallacy. Grandpa's Marriage was a good deal. Grandpas marriage isn't remotely on the table anymore, and trying to pretend it is won't get you anything but pain. There is nothing hypocritical about appreciating something that was a good deal and lamenting that it doesn't exist anymore. Great post otherwise.

tl:dr - Traditional marriage is once great institution that we dont have anymore, we just have it's rotting corpse. We can prop it up and sit it at the dinner table, but it isn't going to do anything but spoil dinner.

manwhy • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 08:22 PM

I consider it to be the male version of AF/BB. Every man wants to have his decade of pumping and dumping dozens of unspoilt virgins before he finally marries one and has kids. That's only possible if we live in a traditional society wherein he breaks the traditional rules every other man plays by. Kind of like AF/BB inverted, it's the male version of cheating the system. RVEE (Ruining Virgins for Everyone Else)?

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 05:03 PM

"No marriage" is emblematic of the extreme of /r/TheRedPill. It is not a mainstream view.

squarehead93 • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 08:33 PM

Sure. I'm not certain what percentage of the TRP community holds this view, but they're very vocal. I agree with a lot of what they say, but censorship, which OP is advocating, is wrong on so many levels.

ManOfGrapes • 17 points • 11 August, 2014 08:15 PM

This idea is that the basic unit of a society is not an individual, but a family. A society composed of weak, disconnected, or broken families is a broken society.

Civilization was formed out of the need to survive. Each member within a community played a specific role that was essential to larger society. Marriage, in turn, created accountability for both the man and the woman. However, today's society no longer has that need. We have machines that can take care of all of those responsibilities, and all accountability on a woman's end has been lost. In reality, marriage, and all of the accountability, stability and structure that came with it is no longer necessary. It's a sad state of affairs, because it was a system that was successful for centuries. Like OP said, don't be blinded by the sham. Don't get married.

JP\_Whoregan • 18 points • 12 August, 2014 01:40 AM

Of all of the "don't marry" posts floating in our Red Sea lately, this one is the most thoughtfully put together and logical.

Like I've said before, it is mystifying to me that any man would take the marriage deal in this country anymore. I could understand men falling for this scam pre-internet, but the stats and facts are literally at the fingertips of any man that cares to educate himself.

Ask any man if he'd skydive knowing there's a 50% chance his parachute doesn't open. Or if he'd put half of his wealth on "black" on a single spin of the roulette wheel. Or if he'd buy stock in a company forecasted to lose 50% of it's value this year. Or if he'd bareback a chick knowing there's a 50% chance of getting chlamydia.

The answer in all cases is a resounding NO, but tell the same man "hey, statistics over the last 30 years show there's a 50% chance your marriage will fail and you'll be giving your soon-to-be-ex-wife at *least* 50% of your net worth, probably more if child extort or vaginamony is involved.

And he'll still line up at the altar.

The mods should start banning people who advocate getting married. They clearly don't get it, and we don't need them spreading their stupidity to others who could be hurt by it.

I dunno about banning, but it really is one of the running contradictions that TRP needs to address (which I think you did well here):

**How can we advocate "abundance mentality" while at the same time advocating for/tolerating the notion of marriage, which is the highest order of committed monogomy?** You're not just pinky-swearing a chick to devote your penis to her and only her. You are intertwining literally ever facet of your life, financial, social, professional, intellectual, etc with a creature we KNOW for a fact is capable of rationalizing any sort of despicable/immoral/selfish action.

loin\_fruit • 7 points • 12 August, 2014 02:30 AM

This is fucking good.

I think too many men see the statistic and think "well our relationship is different. She's different. We won't divorce. Were different" ha.

Lakey91 • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 07:55 AM

If you've been on TRP for any length of time and your chance of divorce is still 50% then either TRP is wrong or you're no good at putting it into practice.

Minimising divorce risk is a science and an art, but very simple if you know what you're doing

a\_murderer • 5 points • 12 August, 2014 09:00 AM

Then by all means make a post for us that tells us what we need to know about minimising divorce rape. Not to mention the word *minimising* isn't exactly reassuring me that i'll be protected.

Overkillengine • 12 points • 12 August, 2014 12:13 AM

It's betting half or more of your shit the other person will love you forever if you are a man.

It is giving the other person legal permission to financially gut you the moment they are unhappy or just more interested in someone else.

It's a contract....a shitty one. Never sign a shitty contract.

**So, when the modern couple gets "married", they are agreeing to terms they don't know about, breach of which will not be punished, and the dissolution of which will be handled by a templated process that someone else has decided is fair for everyone.**

This insight is brilliant.

One obvious solution when the problem is laid bare like this, is to convert marriage into a normal contract, enforceable through conventional channels.

It'll never happen, but at least it's workable.

MooMooMooN • 24 points • 11 August, 2014 11:04 PM

Plate of mine: "why are you so opposed to getting married?"

"What benefit does it provide to involve the government into my relationships?"

"...but you'd have me all to yourself"

"I got a gold star in kindergarten for sharing!"

"...you asshole *punches me playfully in the arm*

LifeLibertyProperty • 18 points • 12 August, 2014 02:26 AM

"You mean I don't have you all to myself right now?"

[deleted] • 6 points • 12 August, 2014 04:21 AM

That would be a beautiful moment.

jolly--roger • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 12:37 PM

first thing that came to my mind as well.. oh, I <3 TRP

son\_of\_narcissus • 8 points • 12 August, 2014 04:26 AM

"What benefit does it provide to involve the government into my relationships?"

The answer is absolutely none, but just as the religious right appeal to their dogma for moral authority, an even greater number appeal to the government for validation of their own behaviors.

It's pretty frustrating to see all these armchair activists trying to achieve marriage equality through political action. You see it on every website that has news or user-submitted content. If half the energy that was put into trying to get government to allow gay marriage, was directed towards getting government *out of marriage entirely*, you'd actually be addressing the issue. Asking for permission for some new way to marry every generation (interracial marriage used to be illegal, now we're in the midst of gay marriage's legal ambiguity, and in the next 20 years polygamy will be up to bat) is really beating around the bush. This battle has been fought so many times, and nobody gives a shit that all of their energy goes toward a band-aid of a solution instead of an actual cure.

One should not ask forgiveness from government to marry who you want, and you certainly shouldn't need fucking permission.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 08:23 AM

[http://www.askmen.com/sports/health\\_400/463\\_health-and-marriage-benefits-for-men.html](http://www.askmen.com/sports/health_400/463_health-and-marriage-benefits-for-men.html)

Marsupian • 4 points • 12 August, 2014 12:38 PM

1. Men that live healthy lives are probably more likely to find a relationship partner and in today's society that means they get married more.
2. Men in a relationship probably live healthier because there is constant social control on behavior. Single men tend to live a little more dangerously.

This shitty article itself even states that the benefits count for married OR PARTNERED men which in itself indicates it has little to do with the marriage and more to do with having a partner or not.

Cosmicandy • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 11:13 AM

The problem with these sorts of studies is the old correlation and causation.

It seems much more plausible to me that women, being hypergamous, are just more likely to choose a man who happens to be healthier for marriage. A guy who works out is going to get more attention than a fat guy. Also poor people tend to be unhealthier. I could go on, but this phenomenon seems way more easily explained by hypergamy.

jinkop • 8 points • 12 August, 2014 02:48 AM

Thank you for this. I wrote "Don't Get Married, You Fucking Idiot" (Go to my submissions) and had a great analogy about marriage being a shitty lottery. The amount of people who still defend marriage and claimed to be RedPilled is too damn high.

Getting married is the ultimate form of putting pussy on the pedestal.

-Tyler\_Durden- • 17 points • 11 August, 2014 10:45 PM **[recovered]**

*"The wise man learns from someone else's mistakes, the smart man learns from his own, and the stupid one never learns."*

After seeing half of the male population get financially decimated in the US is it a wonder why any man would knowingly put themselves at such a risk.

For the young men thinking about marriage, just look around at work and count the number of broken 40 year old men who are paying over half their check for child support and alimony. Flip a coin; if you lose, this will be your future. Also, count the number of 40 year old men in unhappy marriages. The odds are not on your side; the only sure bet is to never get married.

bobawet • 4 points • 12 August, 2014 06:11 AM

i'm in that boat, pushing 40, wife takes half of my money, doesn't have to work, has pool parties with her friends, kids involved also. Marriage is a fucking joke. Thank God i'm still good looking and at least always have younger and hotter lined up.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 August, 2014 11:36 PM

Tyler Durden appearance that could be a Tyler Durden response. Nice one

leftajar • 8 points • 12 August, 2014 02:15 AM

terms [of marriage], which can change at any time.

To me, this is the most frightening -- the idea the the government can retroactively change my marriage contract. I was on the fence about marriage, but this tipped it.



TRPsubmitter • 12 points • 12 August, 2014 06:58 AM

Whenever I have said LTRs/Marriage are fools gold in the past, I've been inundated with dumbasses saying how "TRP has no set philosophy! It's just a tool to get what you want. And some guys want to use TRP to get married and have kids eventually!"

Marriage and redpill are incompatible. Marriage for men is them giving up their resource (commitment/unlimited validation & attention), whereas the nature of sex in marriage is NOT comparable.

I don't understand when guys say "but if I get married, the sex is only with me!" as if it will improve. When have you EVER hear of a couple's sex life improving AFTER marriage? No. It always gets worse.

And further: the sheer fact a woman has wrapped up her man's commitment means she is LESS obligated to have sex. Why? Because women use sex to **secure** their mate's commitment, not as a **reward** after they've already obtained it.

RedPillDad • 4 points • 12 August, 2014 12:25 PM

Marriage and redpill are incompatible.

Disagree here. Truth begets leveragable wisdom. And any LTR improves when a man wakes the fuck up from his slumber.

Because women use sex to secure their mate's commitment, not as a reward after they've already obtained it.

True, but only if you subjugate and let her take complete control of pussy access. When you regularly hard-fuck her into a state of blissful submission, she'll keep the pussy gate unlocked for you.

When have you EVER hear of a couple's sex life improving AFTER marriage? No. It always gets worse.

I can't speak for others, but my sex life has improved dramatically this past year. I've found my balls again (masculine frame) and my wife loves it.

nyrp • 5 points • 11 August, 2014 10:47 PM\*

This is very insightful stuff.

Focusing on the definition of marriage, I've been telling people close to me that not only is polygamy coming next, but it's already sanctioned according to the popular and most of the judicial reckoning of marriage, only the mass hasn't realized it yet.

It no longer has no agreed upon meaning in any way. As you say, the participants don't even know what it's about!

Gavlan\_Wheel • 4 points • 12 August, 2014 02:59 AM

Polygamy is on the way, that's for sure. But the problem is that the liberals who would push for it hate the Mormons and so do the majority of the conservative religious right. So it will be framed not to benefit Mormons, but Muslims, for diversity reasons. Plus, if you don't think we should have polygamy you are just an islamophobe bigot.

Polygamy will of course be even more horrible for society and slant that 80/20 split even further.

I also think that incest will become accepted before polygamy, strangely enough. Because children in the black community have such a high rate of not knowing who daddy is, all it will take is one study showing high rates of incest in the black community for incest to be pushed as normal.

I am truly frightened of what the world will look like in 100 years. Thank god I'll be dead.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 10:07 AM

Mormons did away with polygamy a while ago and have no inclination or reason to want to bring it back. The only reason it was ever established in the church/community was because the founder got really horny and wanted to bang everyone else's wife.

sir\_wankalot\_here • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 10:08 AM

Until 1900, polygamy was legal in a part of the world. Monogamy is like rent control, it forces a man to only have one wife at a time, this creates a more stable society. The 80/20 split interestingly enough is similar to the Muslim law that a man is allowed 4 wives. The problem with this is 80% of men will never have a wife, as a result they will become more horny and more violent :-)

WillClickOnAnything • 8 points • 12 August, 2014 12:37 AM

I'm hoping that the gays can gentrify marriage like they do for so many dilapidated neighborhoods.

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 August, 2014 05:03 PM

Terrific post OP. It drives me nuts that my fellow Christians don't get this. My issue now is a spiritual one, I believe that sex should fall under the purview of marriage, but what can I do when marriage has been effectively outlawed? I want to breed a small army of kids so that my family name will survive the collapse. Do I just give up on that? To do what? Bang a bunch of sluts that mean nothing to me anyway? Do I forswear women and live a celibate monk-like existence, practicing kung-fu (no, really) improving my lifting and inventing awesome DIY shit in my garage, Tesla-style?

I do not want to go down that road, but if there are other options, I haven't found them.

BluepillProfessor • 4 points • 12 August, 2014 03:04 AM\*

OP goes a bridge to far. AWALT and all that BUT there are circumstances where marriage is not completely unfavorable to men and marriage IS the best way to raise children. No other method is even close.

I worked in family law as a legal investigator for years before I got married so I knew the terms of the contract as well as anybody. I got married to a (soon to be) wealthy, hard-working, logical woman who is a lawyer, shared my religious faith, adopted my political values, and who ended up supporting me financially all the way through graduate school and beyond. A unicorn you say? Hardly. Deadbed marriage for more than 10 years only saved by TRP in the last year.

But banning people who advocate getting married? Should we ban Dalrock and Rollo as well? Tell the truth. You had a little bit of firewater before this post, right?

Lots of married guys have made huge changes in their marriages using TRP so muzzle yourself, not them.

Maximus\_Sarcasmus • 4 points • 12 August, 2014 06:24 AM

Even Rollo refuses to advocate marriage in its present condition. I agree that marriage in very specific circumstances is a good idea, but those circumstances are vanishingly slim and much like AWALT an uncompromising position on marriage does not invalidate the argument.

Gstreetshit • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 01:40 PM

I've thought about this exact stuff before.

I was also thinking that instead of a marriage contract if men want to get "married" they should come up with another type of contract that protects them. Not a prenup, do away with the marriage contract completely and substitute it for a contract that is curtailed to what that couple wants.

Entrefut • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 03:10 PM

I don't know why other people aren't with you OP. The people who are condoning marriage don't even know what it is that they are condoning, which is idiotic. They are condoning their own concept of marriage, which would be fine if that's how it worked, but their own concept that involves love and fairness doesn't exist. Marriage by law is different than marriage by love IMO. If I agree to a woman that we are getting married, it's more like a promise to stick together no matter how hard it gets, no piece of paper needs to represent that and no piece of paper protects that.

[deleted] • 0 points • 12 August, 2014 08:06 AM

OP had so much right before he was bashing marriage:

The mods should start banning people who advocate getting married. They clearly don't get it, and we don't need them spreading their stupidity to others who could be hurt by it.

Censorship is bad mokay, it worked once we can make it work again it's just going to take some effort.

What's the point of fucking sluts all the time if your kids are doomed because of your selfishness?

We can fix some stuff today and as improbable as fixing even most of our problems is we can still be the guys organizing the rebuilding of our society after the crash runs its course.

This "Ride out the crash and have fun doing it" mentality fails to consider the loss of resources during and after the crash and that post crash we will see a return to social fundamentalism/conservatism/traditionalism and if you can't get into power with that crowd because they see you as unclean or as a womanizer they'll probably hang you for being a degenerate if shit really did hit the fan. I'm not saying don't fuck sluts, I'm saying that we shouldn't delude ourselves by turning away from the knife and hoping it doesn't hit something vital, we have to watch it come in and understand how to survive it and in that post SHTF/Crashed America. It's easy to escape charges of degeneracy, you just bug on out, but if you're going to fuck sluts and try to hold down the fort you're going to be turned upon during the reconstruction as social conservatism sweeps in.

We need to do well on the way down but we also need to be prepared to do well on the other side.

Land will always go up in value if there is somebody that knows what to do with it; get land, find a way to use it, prepare to defend it.

If we can salvage Marriage we might be able to salvage the other things that revolve around the foundational family movement.

First steps to salvaging marriage are two fold:

Only marry Virgins or a girl whose only partner has ever been you. No Substitute.

<http://socialpathology.blogspot.com/2010/09/sexual-partner-divorce-risk.html>

[http://www.focusonthefamily.com/about\\_us/focus-findings/marriage/premarital-sex-and-divorce.aspx](http://www.focusonthefamily.com/about_us/focus-findings/marriage/premarital-sex-and-divorce.aspx)

Find ways to enforce the permanence of marriage and make people realize that it has to be a serious binding contract, and that nobody owes you marriage, so don't make a shitty bet just for status. Legislation, ad campaigns etc. People here deny that TRP is a movement but we are moving public opinion.

That's it, from there we will begin to see a more stable society because the foundational unit is stable and we could start disassembling the parts of the machine that are killing our society from common ground positions.

[deleted] 12 August, 2014 07:57 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 11:48 AM

thats old news matey. war was lost long time ago what we have now is naturalization. some just wont accept it. they brandish their single shooters yelling get of my land, some might even get overlooked and succeed in their noble quest

Tom\_The\_Human • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 11:32 AM

I think Admiral Akbar sums up marriage perfectly

Venividivixii • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 12:26 PM

Excellent analysis. You should add in points about chattel marriage and its dissolution, because I think it is relevant.

[deleted] 12 August, 2014 01:32 AM

[permanently deleted]

defcon212 • 2 points • 12 August, 2014 06:24 AM

There will always be people who are caught up in the emotion and escape from reality of religion. Many utopian books have societys where religions are banned, and that is probably the most likely way for religion to end, but I for one would prefer to live in a society where people could choose to have a religion or not have one.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 10:19 AM

IMO Religion as we know it is definitely on its way out. However, there is a significant possibility we will see a big conservative backlash and a return to the structure and values that religion typically espoused, but they will have to be defended on their own merit and not by fairy tales. There is just too much scientific knowledge and solid anti-religion rhetoric floating around in our age to expect the majority of people to do things out of a fear of God. Even today, most churches are just social clubs, how many people seriously give a fuck about the belief system and apply it consistently to their daily life?

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2014 01:57 PM

Yes, but what will happen when you are 50+ , and single. You have no children, your lineage ends there.

I want a family, with children, and grandchildren.