

**TIL: Cesar Millan's wife (The Dog Whisperer) filed for divorce in March 2010. She ended up receiving a single payment of \$400,000, monthly spousal payment of \$23,000 (that's \$276,000 a year), AND \$120,000 a year in monthly child support. Cesar Millan then attempted suicide.**

January 7, 2014 | 950 upvotes | by [BobSagetTheFaget](#)

---

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cesar\\_Millan#Personal\\_life](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cesar_Millan#Personal_life)

---

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

---

## Comments

---



Memnar • 484 points • 8 January, 2014 12:51 AM

Even the dog Whisperer is getting fucked by a bitch.

Idontlikearmawhores • 24 points • 8 January, 2014 01:13 PM

Oh this was fucking gold

HanSolo7007 • 19 points • 10 January, 2014 06:48 AM

Bill Burr: Epidemic of Gold Digging Whores. Awesome video about women getting outrageous divorce settlements.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x0gaYyNk7QA>

rebuildingMyself • 191 points • 8 January, 2014 12:16 AM

Wow, and he's actually done something useful for the world, unlike her.

gekkozorz • 144 points • 8 January, 2014 03:27 AM

Reminds me of Bill Burr's redpill-as-fuck rant about great men getting divorce raped by gold digging whores. Link here.

So Ahnold gets ripped as fuck, comes to America, learns the language, becomes a trainer, becomes an actor, then becomes a goddamn Governor. You can't top achievements like these.

And what did his ex-wife do? Fucking got cheated on, so she gets half his bank. How the fuck does that make any goddamn sense?

Beaver1279 • 12 points • 8 January, 2014 08:59 PM

It only makes sense in that the contract you sign when you get married states just that. No one is stopping any of these men from having prenuptial agreements. I commend Bill Burr for making this an issue. Most people don't realize what they are doing when they sign the dotted line.

thelordofcheese • 51 points • 8 January, 2014 04:01 AM

no reals only feelz

[deleted] • 7 points • 23 June, 2014 03:08 AM

"I'm afraid to get married. Why wouldn't a man be afraid to get married at this point? You know, look at Kobe; look at the shit he is going through right now. All right, the guy is getting a divorce. His wife is going to get \$70 million bucks, never hit a lay up in her life."

mc0079 • -28 points • 8 January, 2014 04:09 AM

uhhh...Maria Shriver was a Kennedy, she didn't need to Gold Dig, she already had money....Maybe Arnold should not have cheated.

gekkozorz • 52 points • 8 January, 2014 05:25 AM

Let me ask you a question. Do you think that Orlando Bloom is kind of ridiculously handsome?

Well, interestingly enough, not only is he that, but he's also quite wealthy - like \$35 million dollars wealthy, to be exact.

Well, he was married to Miranda Kerr, a Victoria's Secret supermodel who has quite a bit of cash herself.

So Kerr shouldn't have to gold dig, should she? I mean, she's got it made. Mountains of money, a gorgeous husband... it's the American dream.

Well, recently she left Orlando for a guy who looks like fucking this.

Why, you ask, would a gorgeous supermodel who could have any man in the world settle for a turdface like this?

Because he's a billionaire.

That's right, all those tens of millions of dollars weren't enough for her. She needed more, more, more.

If you think that women stop gold digging at any given monetary level, you are sadly mistaken.

Ormild • 22 points • 8 January, 2014 10:04 AM

Fuck me. Even Orlando Bloom got traded? How does any man stand a chance?

boydeer • 12 points • 8 January, 2014 11:48 AM

he is a foppish dandy. just because he's rich and pretty doesn't mean he has any skills whatsoever.

what you do is build yourself and your life until you can hold a stable frame, and find a woman that is comforted by the frame you provide. keep your standards high, and be willing to walk away if she doesn't meet your them. do not compromise your standards simply because the woman likes you, or she is very pretty. accept someone who is less attractive than your ideal but who has good sense and is willing to put you first. when you live your life, always think about providing the best net effect for your surrounding world, of which she will be a part. create an interesting and secure world, and it will be a nice place for a partner to live.

this is a short guide to successful human relationships.

rebuildingMyself • 9 points • 8 January, 2014 08:34 AM

Gold digging is just hypergamy in a bitter but open light

sweetleef • 4 points • 8 January, 2014 09:38 AM

Lesson: don't put faith in a woman that has more outs than you do.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 02:56 PM

On the other side of the coin, I bet that's one happy pool boy.

[deleted] • 26 points • 8 January, 2014 05:16 AM\*

Being born into a fucking name is not an achievement. If you think cheating on someone is cause for having to give up half of your worth, you're a fucking moron.

[deleted] • 9 points • 8 January, 2014 05:26 AM

Just want to point out, some people might say that *you* are a moron for mixing "have" and "half"

Not me though. That shit happens

[deleted] • 7 points • 8 January, 2014 05:27 AM

I most definitely am! It's been a long day :'(

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 05:44 AM

I hear ya. Not sure what made yours long, but there sure are enough reasons it could be.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 07:22 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 07:42 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 07:55 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

otiswild • 14 points • 8 January, 2014 04:45 AM

Well maybe Maria shouldn't have been an insufferable feminist cunt.

Furfire • -12 points • 8 January, 2014 04:54 AM

Or maybe he shouldn't have cheated.

[deleted] • 22 points • 8 January, 2014 05:26 AM

Not sure why that entitles her to half of what he owns.

quintaldo • -1 points • 8 January, 2014 06:55 PM

men cant cheat with their dicks, only with their checkbooks

women cheat with their vaginas, because that's what they bring to the marriage

Captain\_of\_the\_ship • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 08:55 PM

Seriously? What the hell happened to you? You need to get out more and live a little.

Unfortunately life and relationships can't be reduced to such meaningless platitudes.

quintaldo • 1 point • 11 January, 2014 03:23 AM

biological gender differences which happen to contradict social truisms are  
"meaningless platitudes" ?

Whisper • 834 points • 8 January, 2014 12:19 AM

Don't.

Get.

Married.

frankie\_q • 62 points • 8 January, 2014 02:18 AM

Unless there are children involved. Unmarried men have even fewer rights to their kids, and will have to pay child support whatever happens.

Alimony seems to be on its way out, and a prenup might soften the blow of divorce settlements.

If there are no children involved, and the dude's had a vasectomy, then definitely, don't get married.

Whisper • 146 points • 8 January, 2014 02:21 AM

Don't.

Have.

Children.

[deleted] • 26 points • 8 January, 2014 03:56 PM\*

Yes. The only solution to solve men getting screwed over with divorce is to live solemn, empty life with no family and to survive off a flow of young, loose women with issues until you're an old lonely man. Maybe the better solution is to find a spouse/significant other that is stable and trustworthy instead of just marrying the hottest chick that will say yes. Also, if divorce happens, hire the best/seediest lawyer you can find.

elevul • 21 points • 8 January, 2014 02:36 AM

Vasectomy is a man's best friend.

[deleted] • 17 points • 8 January, 2014 12:46 PM

They don't even have to be your children for you to be forced to support them. You just need to be seen as a "father figure"

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 06:41 AM

[permanently deleted]

Whisper • 58 points • 8 January, 2014 07:51 AM

You go ahead.

But be aware that you are not a player in the game of evolution. You are only one of the pieces. So if you want to bust your ass so that a bunch of alleles can "win" a game they're not sentient enough to know they're playing, then knock yourself out. But you aren't going to win anything for it.

[deleted] • 27 points • 8 January, 2014 12:55 PM

This. Ultimate MGTOW. Whisper nailed it.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gene-centered\\_view\\_of\\_evolution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gene-centered_view_of_evolution)

Small excerpt from the article:

Dawkins argues that it is a mistake to assume that an ecosystem or a species as a whole exists for a purpose. He writes that it is incorrect to suppose that individual organisms lead a meaningful life either; in nature, only genes have a utility function – to perpetuate their own existence with indifference to great sufferings inflicted upon the organisms they build, exploit and discard.

Here I'll break it down some more. It's a bit subtle but...

Does this sound familiar?:

If you don't have kids (someday), you are a loser at life

You should "man up" and marry

If you have kids out of wedlock, you are trashy

Those beliefs are on the beta end of the spectrum, maybe not necessarily blue pill though. At least it's a half-step above a white knight circlejerk. You know, a bunch white knight betas circling the pedestal of pussy all bent down on one knee pledging their fiesty to their princess, being at her every beck and call offering their jacket when she is cold or throwing their jacket into the gutter so she doesn't dirty her shoes.

What do the white knights have in common? The view that you should act against your self interest time and again to help out women. That you should go out of your way to look out for them. That their princesses find this self-effacing behavior attractive. I think this is a fair summary of the blue pill.

Once again:

in nature, only genes have a utility function – to perpetuate their own existence with indifference to great sufferings inflicted upon the organisms they build, exploit and discard.

I think Whisper was on to something deep when he said

So if you want to bust your ass so that a bunch of alleles can "win" a game they're not sentient enough to know they're playing, then knock yourself out.

Food for thought: How many people out there are not sentient that their genes will play their minds and emotions like a video game if unchecked? That from your genes' point of view, you are the organism - to be built, exploited, and discarded. It's not just the woman in the red dress you have to be careful to not let manipulate you, it's also the code that makes up every cell in your body. Welcome to the Matrix motherfuckers! haha!

madstatistician • 21 points • 8 January, 2014 04:10 PM

Yes... Good goy... don't pass on your white man genes... don't leave a legacy... all is going according to plan

Sorry I'll see my way back to /pol/

[deleted] • 10 points • 8 January, 2014 04:36 PM

This is the crux of it. For some of us there is a bigger picture than having sex.

madstatistician • 5 points • 8 January, 2014 04:51 PM

It's like these guys don't even read the great books for men.

triceratraps • 4 points • 9 January, 2014 08:10 PM

If you dont pass on your genes what do you leave behind, everything else is transient. What better way to establish your legacy than to have resources and have kids with a good women so your children can use those resources and climb the social ladders of

the world. You are born into the social category you are and the opportunities presented to you because somewhere along your history one of your ancestors either fucked up or succeeded. Isn't sacrifice the most important quality of a leader? Isn't the goal of this subreddit to be a better man?

[deleted] • 7 points • 8 January, 2014 03:37 PM\*

If The Red Pill is about accepting harsh realities, then you simply have to accept #1.

Your purpose as a biological entity is not to sit around, drink beer and blow your load into a rubber. It's to fuck women and have children. Your purpose in life is to see to it that your genetic material is included in that of the next generation.

So yeah, if you never breed, you do lose at life. Because that's the entire purpose of life. There is no getting around that.

Edit: to add, indeed, Numbers 2 and 3 derive their entire authority from the undeniable nature of this fact by positing that only through marriage is the production of children properly achieved. *this* is the lie, and it is on that front that the lie can be destroyed. Because you can have kids easily without marrying a woman or even starting a traditional family.

But you will never defeat the primary instinct of every life-form that has ever graced this planet, and in all likelihood, any other. If you try to argue against #1, all you will do is discredit your arguments against #s 2 and 3. You may as well try to use your voice to tell a computer that its coding is wrong.

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 January, 2014 06:33 PM

So yeah, if you never breed, you do lose at life. Because that's the entire purpose of life. There is no getting around that.

I don't buy that. I still say it depends on how you look at it. I see it as boiling down to a question of: is having a kid in your best self-interest? I wrote a detailed response to /u/redpillschool's comment, and in it I pointed out that the genetic difference between any two people is only about 0.1%. Having a kid for the sake of passing on your genetic material is misplaced vanity the way I look at it.

On the other hand, if you are doing it because you want to be a father and feel ready to provide a stable parental role for a kid (i.e. you are financially secure and the kid was not an accident with a random bar slut) - more power to you.

I'm going to come clean here: I have not had a vasectomy, and am not inclined to get one at this time. There is research being conducted into easily reversible vasectomy operations that work by plugging instead of snipping. I'd strongly consider getting that if it were available.

Why? Because if I am going to have a kid, I'm going to do everything in my power to have it on my terms and with a woman of my choosing. Too many men have knocked up a random slut they hardly know. And then what happens? The woman has 100% the final say in whether to have the baby or not. And often the man years later is unhappily divorced and/or paying child support with hardly any visitation. Fuck that noise, in light of that I'm perfectly content with blowing my load into a rubber, thank you very much!

Alphadestrious • 1 point • 13 January, 2014 08:51 AM

Yes 100% true. From a biological perspective we are on this planet to mate and pass on our genes to the next generation. However, from a career perspective or other perspectives it is otherwise. Also, I feel bad for Cesar but in life we all get shat on in some way to varying degrees. What matters then is how you rise up like a fucking soldier and plow through.

pizzabegetspizza • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 10:49 AM

All other things being equal, I think it's the case that marriage produces stronger children.

DanReggins • 5 points • 8 January, 2014 01:06 PM

Excellent! Plus, what would you rather do?

Teach, build, contribute, leave some sort of production built by (or partially) by you? Or leave a kid who might be retarded or a felon?

PlanB\_pedofile • 10 points • 8 January, 2014 03:11 PM

As a man who's sterile (nature's vasectomy) I've come at peace knowing I won't be passing my genetic lineage on. As such, I made plans to influence the lives of other people and spread my seed in other ways.

My father had lots of kids. But his contribution to those around him was his legacy. He had over 300 people attend his funeral. People came out of state to attend. Politicians, Co workers, volunteer groups, fellow military vets. He made such an impression on them that it resonated.

I've seen blokes who only had 12 people at their funeral and all family only.

Shows that legacy is more than the fruit of your loins, but fruit of your labor.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 03:51 PM

Teach a million students. Build a hundred buildings -- hell, build an empire. You will never have 1/100th the influence on the course of events that Genghis Khan had.

If your child is a felon, so what? Admittedly, the retard thing matters, but who gives a shit if he's a felon? Do you think that there were no rapists or murderers in Albert Einsteins evolutionary line?

Having children isn't only about having children. It's about having your children's children, and their children, and their children, and their children after that. It's about taking the first step on a path that has the potential to influence not only the course of human evolution, but of every species that derives from us and from our descendants.

redpillschool • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 03:24 PM

From a philosophical standpoint, it's interesting to notice these facts.. but from a practical standpoint, what is one to do when your own happiness is contingent on satisfying the urges and needs given to you by your genes?



what is one to do when your own happiness is contingent on satisfying the urges and needs given to you by your genes?

Ah, but is it?

Think of it this way: What do you tell a guy who complains that he can't get women and just keeps getting friend-zoned? You tell him stuff along the lines of he needs to put himself first and not let women walk all over him. His problem is he is stuck in a frame of "If she's not happy, I'm not happy".

Kind of like a husband in a beta frame who says "Happy wife, happy life".

Perhaps, but if that woman loses attraction to her husband, cheats, takes him to divorce court extracting alimony and child support.. well I'll bet that saying rings hollow to him - she's happy and he's miserable.

Here's the thing, the human genome is pretty much exactly the same for everyone. Between any two humans, the amount of genetic variation—biochemical individuality—is about 0.1%. Your code is virtually identical to everyone else's. Yet the percentage of people who are fine with living a life without children is certainly higher than 0.1%.

Do a majority of people feel like it is their biological imperative to have children? Sure. Do a majority of guys (read: betas) feel like they need to reply quickly when a woman sends a text message, or do things like act super-nice to them all the time? I think so too. At least naturally, until the programming is seen for what it is and overcome.

The genetic code exists because it makes copies of itself. That is what it does, the reason it exists. It is not intelligent, and it doesn't substantially change except over *very* long periods of time. It doesn't even have a goal - It exists because it exists, and keeps on existing because some mutations are ever so slightly better adapted to the environment.

Consider the "Actual Advice Mallard" meme. Does AAM care if you follow his advice? No, it's just a silly picture of a duck (information in a computer file). AAM is one of countless memes. Incidentally Dawkins coined the term "meme" in the very same work (*The Selfish Gene* that I referred to in my previous post). The difference between AAM and our genome is that AAM images have more than 0.1% variation between any two. Oh, and Actual Advice Mallard isn't responsible for spawning humans either.

in nature, only genes have a utility function - to perpetuate their own existence with indifference to great sufferings inflicted upon the organisms they build, exploit and discard

The language of this sentence is somewhat loaded but it helps illustrate the point. The key word here is "indifference". "Exploit" implies malice, but it isn't deliberate. "Use" doesn't sound much better, but that's basically what the human genome does - use all of us in order for it to exist. Actual Advice Mallard does a similar thing - if there were no humans, there would be no Actual Advice Mallard.

I'll leave off here with a fun fact: What sets men apart from women genetically

speaking? We have a piece of code that they lack - the Y chromosome. They have two X chromosomes whereas we have one X and one Y chromosome. Perhaps the Adam and Eve story in the Bible is a metaphor - you can make a woman out of a man, but you can't make a man out of a woman. But I digress.

redpillschool • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 05:59 PM

I'll just go ahead and short circuit this one, yes, the urge to reproduce is biologically programmed to make you want to do it (using positive and negative feedback). If it weren't, we wouldn't likely exist.

redditaccountpls • 0 points • 10 January, 2014 02:06 AM

You missed a part.

Cells (our bodies cells) have an incredibly intense symbiotic relationship with our genetic code, so comparing our genome to the AAM is completely, totally wrong. The genome, in simple terms, may only exist to make copies of itself, but that code would be completely useless without the cells that replicate it and more importantly, translate it. You can't discuss such an issue solely using genetics without factoring in it's very important, ever present neighbour: cell biology. If you're going to talk about reproductive sciences, you're not doing yourself any favours by just talking about the genome, because a huge player in reproduction and the biological imperative to reproduce is cell biology. The genome may not have an end goal, but the cells do, and that end goal is to reproduce.

2comment • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 06:44 PM

Sorry, I don't buy this but it's an interesting train of thought. The reason I can't accept it is that it's going into "I'm a special snowflake" territory.

You see, you can try to unsuccessfully try to separate yourself from your alleles/genes, but you are an expression of them. The best way to think of this is that you're a link cursing at the chain. But the chain is not some separate individual on its own trying to manipulate you, simply your line of ancestors leading down to you. The alleles are not in some grand conspiracy to force you to do anything, they're just a survival and breeding instinct within you that without which in your ancestors, you wouldn't be around to complain.

If you had anybody else's genetics, you wouldn't be yourself, from body to mind, leading up to the point where if you had nonhuman genes, you couldn't even process or form these thoughts.

santaincarnate • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 09:51 AM

The evolution game will be won by the Catholics, Quiverfull and rapists, and we can't change it.

semigod\_\_ • 5 points • 8 January, 2014 11:52 AM

the evolution game is being won by africa

after rome, the dark ages came. history is repeating itself.

boydeer • -1 points • 8 January, 2014 11:34 AM

go team rape!

still\_very\_alive • 11 points • 8 January, 2014 03:06 AM

Get some sperm cryogenically frozen first, though. Never hurts to keep options open.

hermit087 • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 07:50 AM

Its only about \$500 a year to keep sperm frozen, so for high income men it should be a no brainer to keep some sperm frozen, then get clipped. Its the best of both worlds.

wiking85 • 5 points • 8 January, 2014 02:40 PM

They're only viable for about a year after freezing, so its not a panacea.

Stopher • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 03:55 PM

I really wouldn't want to get clipped. Don't you gain weight? Become Less masculine?

hermit087 • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 07:43 PM

Nope, it only applies to the actual sperm. Testosterone, sex drive, semen, and pretty much everything else remains the same. You would have to actually cut your balls off to have those kinds of issues.

[deleted] • -1 points • 8 January, 2014 05:08 AM

Or just reverse the vasectomy.

JustThrewUp • 15 points • 8 January, 2014 05:11 AM

Doesnt work always

Hurp4Derp4 • 4 points • 8 January, 2014 11:06 AM

Hopefully that vasigel (or whatever its called) is released soon. Kinda like vasectomy but its only a gel that can be removed with some clensing.

wiking85 • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 02:41 PM

Vasectomy reversal success rates go down every year after you get the vasectomy. Within 5-10 years its pretty much irreversible depending on the person.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 January, 2014 02:44 AM

Good to know. I'm heading for a consultation to get a vasectomy myself, and I'm honestly OK with that fact.

Do you know any other not - on - the - brochure information?

wiking85 • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 03:17 AM

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vasectomy#Vasectomy\\_reversal](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vasectomy#Vasectomy_reversal) Not sure if its not on the brochure, but the wikipedia entry is pretty thorough on the issues around it. Don't do it lightly, its pretty permanent; even if you get it reversed the sperm is damaged by it, so can produce damaged children as a result.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 11:13 AM

I never intended to have it reversed, but I'm 20 and we all change.

Do you have any other tidbits of knowledge on the subject or related subjects?  
Perhaps anything I should be aware of going into a consultation or perhaps any side effects

Thanks for the information thus far.

equeco • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 09:50 PM

I see having children as the only concrete attempt to immortality. Life's a continuum, your genes form a new human, he's part you in a very concrete way, and he may live and reproduce too. It only takes finding a nice, intelligent woman to reproduce with. That shouldn't be so hard for a healthy, accomplished man.

FascistComicBookHero • 10 points • 8 January, 2014 04:42 AM

It's frustrating to see that this is the majority opinion amongst these parts, because not having children is the evolutionary equivalent of rolling over and dying a quiet death in the ditch somewhere. This no-marriage-no-kids thing is a nihilistic abdication of responsibility. It stinks of laziness and cowardice. We should be aiming to out-compete, out fight and out-smart the douchebags - and the disgusting feminist social experiment that created them - by procreating and raising future generations in our image. To do otherwise is the path of surrender and extinction. Is scorched earth really our only policy in relation to Western society?

CurveballSI • 14 points • 8 January, 2014 02:21 PM

It stinks of laziness and cowardice.

No, it stinks of "I don't agree with this statement."

by procreating and raising future generations in our image. To do otherwise is the path of surrender and extinction.

I wonder how long it will take people to finally understand that Red Pill **isn't about beating anyone at anything. It's about being a better person for you, not anyone else.** You want to have kids? Great, go do that. You want to be a rich, powerful CEO? Awesome. Do it. But do it for you, not for a chick, not for your family, not for "future generations." Do it for you.

batfish55 • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 05:13 PM

Thank you. Few people seem to get this. Mostly it's all about Charlie's Sheen's version of *WINNING*, instead of just making you a better you.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 04:55 PM

I wonder how long it will take people to finally understand that all of life is inherently about beating someone at something: breeding.

This isn't some metaphysical question. You are a vehicle for the propagation of genetic material. That is your purpose. I don't give any shits how much you grate against that, that's how the world works. It can't be disagreed with -- I'm not the one saying this.

Nothing you do will ever be for you. Everything you do will be the result of instincts. Are you

honestly so stupid as to think that only women have hamsters? Sure, society enables them to give theirs a much better workout than it does men, but every human brain is a rationalization generator. You have no more idea why you *really* do the things you do than anyone else does. Not one thing you do is done for any other reason than that your instincts are telling you to do it. That's why humans can create a sub simultaneously dedicated to both declaring how having children is fucking stupid... and how to fuck lots of chicks.

CurveballSI • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 07:00 PM

Are you honestly so stupid as to think that only women have hamsters?

No, but keep the insults coming. They really help prove your point.

Not one thing you do is done for any other reason than that your instincts are telling you to do it.

This sounds like a really twisted and convoluted version of fate. If you seriously think the human species acts on instinct and instinct alone, I've got bad news for you.

Instinct: an inborn pattern of activity or tendency to action common to a given biological species.

The species part is the important part. If working out was instinctual, that means that every human would work out/exercise. Not true.

If eating healthy was instinctual, that would mean every human does it. Not true.

I wonder how long it will take people to finally understand that all of life is inherently about beating someone at something: breeding.

Hey, if your ultimate goal in life is to have children, then congratulations. I can't imagine how you set expectations of yourself any lower than that.

Whisper • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 10:06 PM

I wonder how long it will take people to finally understand that all of life is inherently about beating someone at something: breeding.

I wonder how long it will take for *you* to understand that life isn't inherently "about" anything.

No one *planned* life. No one *designed* it. It wasn't put here for a purpose. It's here by accident. Life has no meaning, no purpose, and no goal. Life's tendency to breed and reproduce itself is an emergent property, not goal-oriented behaviour.

Life. Has. No. Purpose.

That means *your* purpose is whatever you decide it is. Same for me.

You wanna breed, fine. But the only thing that gets *you*, personally, is the feeling of knowing that your kids will outlast you, and the experience of being around your kids. After you're dead, and I'm dead, we'll still both be dead, and we won't experience anything.

So feeling gives you satisfaction, whatever. But you're only chasing a feeling. Not some ultimate meaning of life.

Don't confuse evolution's "goals" (which aren't actually goals at all) with yours. They don't

align unless you want them to.

real-boethius • 40 points • 8 January, 2014 07:48 AM

It stinks of laziness and cowardice.

You're right. **We should man up.**

/s

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 04:01 PM

Man up has to do with society. You can rebel against society. You can tell other men to go fuck themselves. I do that all of the time. I would never be so foolish as to think that I could do that to the natural world, because the natural world would fucking kill me.

Natural selection will make you it's bitch one way or the other. Either you'll give in to instinct and have a kid willingly, the instincts that actually matter will take over and you'll have that kid by accident, or you'll fail to breed altogether and be removed from the gene pool.

But like I said, you will be nature's bitch. There is no way around that.

Whisper • 26 points • 8 January, 2014 08:22 AM

It's frustrating to see that this is the majority opinion amongst these parts, because not having children is the evolutionary equivalent of rolling over and dying a quiet death in the ditch somewhere.

You are not a player in the game of evolution. You are a piece.

This no-marriage-no-kids thing is a nihilistic abdication of responsibility.

Can't abdicate a responsibility I never had to begin with.

It stinks of laziness and cowardice.

Go on and keep trying to shame me into being a tool. I do so love a good laugh.

Is scorched earth really our only policy in relation to Western society?

Ay-firmative. Men taking responsibility for society without thought of reward was what got us into this mess.

Trying to sell your point of view, trying to win people's hearts and minds... you can't win that game. You've forgotten The Fundamental Premise.

So you can go on pouring your time, love, care, and tax money into western civilization. And feminist-enlightened women will drink it right up, slurp, gone, like a cup of water poured into the Rub' al Khali. And then they'll say "where's the rest?"

Because when you *give* someone something unearned, they resent you for it. People want to believe they deserve their good fortune. So they make up stories about how it's theirs by right. They will convince themselves that they are entitled to everything you have given them, and demand more.

And everyone will believe their rationalizations about what they are entitled to, because of The Fundamental Premise.

So you can't win by fighting. The way you win is to go on strike.

triceratraps • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 08:04 PM

I dont understand what you mean by you are not a player in the game of evolution you are a piece. Can you please explain?

Whisper • 3 points • 9 January, 2014 08:23 PM

Sure.

Evolution is a game played by genes. The win condition of this game is to make lots of copies of themselves.

The way they play this game is to influence the behaviour of organisms in various ways. Genes try (well, they don't "try" anything, but we all understand *that* metaphor) to make their hosts do things that will make more copies of the gene. Win conditions benefit the gene, not necessarily the host.

Because it is genes who win or lose, and genes who make the moves, genes are the players. Because we are the ones who are moved, and the wins and losses don't always help or harm us (respectively), we are analogous to the pieces.

Just as a pawn can be sacrificed to help one side win, your genes can screw you to make you have more offspring. Or to make you do something that benefits people with genetics like yours (relatives, etc).

The *pawn's* goal is stay on the board and not die by the end of the game. Maybe to reach the end and get promoted. But, like good chessplayers, successful genes will happily sacrifice a pawn, knight, or rook to win the game.

People who think that having more descendents is "winning" are people who fail to recognize that their instincts can diverge from those of their genes. They are in danger of being sacrificed in a gambit to improve their player's position.

triceratraps • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 09:03 PM

What makes you think there is a distinction between your genes and your self? Arent we just products of our genes and our environment?

nicethingyoucanthave • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 02:08 PM

The Fundamental Premise

It's a very compelling idea that differing parental investment is the underlying basis for a lot of our views and customs. I was about to ask you to post a link to that in PPD and see how they respond - but then I remembered that I can predict their responses quite easily. "Humans are not animals! We're *way* more complicated than that!"

Basically, the dismiss uncomfortable truths with a wave of the hand.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 04:24 PM

I would find this argument easier to accept if it wasn't being made by two people very clearly trying to ignore the uncomfortable biological truth as to what the purpose of life actually is.

nicethingyoucanthave • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 05:33 PM

what the purpose of life actually is



To reproduce?

strangestdude • 2 points • 9 January, 2014 12:18 AM

uncomfortable biological truth as to what the purpose of life actually is.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Appeal\\_to\\_nature](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Appeal_to_nature)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Naturalistic\\_fallacy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Naturalistic_fallacy)

Whisper • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 10:08 PM

Life has no purpose. It's here by accident.

*Your* purpose is whatever you decide it is.

nicethingyoucanthave • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 03:15 PM

what the purpose of life actually is.

...so, you're not going to reply anymore?

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 05:19 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 06:40 AM

[permanently deleted]

md619 • 11 points • 8 January, 2014 06:25 AM

Not getting married or having kids has nothing to do with laziness. Read more. And TRP is not a social movement. If you want to save society go somewhere else

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 04:33 PM

Sure, but it is fun to argue with people who who so laughably contradict their own supposed beliefs.

You all claim to accept every uncomfortable truth... but this one you spit back out because you don't like the way it tastes. I don't particularly like it, either, but that doesn't mean that it's not the truth.

I am an atheist, but if God started talking to me right now, I'd be a convert by noon. What I want doesn't mean dick.

Nemester • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 03:54 PM

No, it is a rational decision. It is self-interest over social interest.

Frankly, I know quite well that society will collapse because many men are looking after themselves first now. It gives me a warm fuzzy feeling inside to think of the leftoids being destroyed by their own stupidity.

strangestdude • 2 points • 9 January, 2014 12:14 AM

It's frustrating to see that this is the majority opinion amongst these parts, because not having children is the evolutionary equivalent of rolling over and dying a quiet death in the ditch



somewhere. This no-marriage-no-kids thing is a nihilistic abdication of responsibility.

I don't let the theory of evolution dictate my ethics.

Evolution explains speciation, but I don't use it as a model on which to base my life.

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 January, 2014 07:10 AM

Fight what exactly? Who can run towards the cliff faster? Not having kids doesn't just help you, it helps the world. Humans = wasted resources, pollution, wars, disease, more scumbag humans, more extinct species, less natural habitat and a general degradation of the world in general. Human society is disgusting. Debauchery, murder, theft, corruption and let's not forget that it's all meaningless too, that's a pretty big one.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 04:15 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 05:03 PM

Cause I'm having too much fun.

sweetleef • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 10:34 AM

Yes, the world would be a more enjoyable place if there were no people around to enjoy it.

Hurp4Derp4 • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 11:08 AM

Less\*

boydeer • -1 points • 8 January, 2014 11:38 AM

Humans = wasted resources

what are the resources properly used on?

pollution

like cats cause pollution

wars

like ants fighting

disease

that's called life

more extinct species

more life

less natural habitat

unnatural habitat doesn't exist

general degradation of the world in general

this is an illusion all generations of us experience. we've been on the verge of destruction for thousands of years, which probably has something to do with how our consciousness is

shaped by our single serving life cycle.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 12:51 PM

[permanently deleted]

boydeer • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 01:02 PM\*

So would you call an ant hill unnatural habitat? The only thing you can weigh the cost of existing against is the experience of existing, so calling the byproduct of our existence pollution doesn't make more sense than calling the byproduct of the existence of rats pollution. And if life is pollution, what is the unit of value against which you are evaluating things?

Edit: and I acknowledge that pollution exists relative to us. People can pollute less or more. But the above statements ignore the system by which pollution is defined.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 04:49 PM

'Natural habitat' refers to the habitat a species has adapted to exist in. It is not a comment on the 'naturalness' of the habitat itself.

A city can be a natural habitat if the species in question has become adapted to live there.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 04:45 PM

1. Us, but not all of them right now on the humans currently alive.
2. All living things cause pollution, that doesn't mean that there aren't truly vast differences in the proportions of it.
3. Yes. Ants fight wars for the same reasons people do: resources. See part 1. That war is natural and sometimes necessary doesn't mean that we shouldn't seek to lessen it when possible.
4. You're an idiot. I don't even know what to say to someone who appears to believe that medicine shouldn't exist.
5. Mostly accurate, though when humans cause extinction, we should do so more carefully. We can usually get away with kill anything predatory that represents a danger to us because we are sport-hunters and with the remove of an apex predatory, the largest challenge is usually keeping the population of ungulates down. However, if we were to make, say, deer extinct, we would be royally fucked. Other species can (and have) fucked themselves over by making the species' they depend on extinct, but I don't really care about that.
6. Yes. The only way you can argue against this is to adopt a completely different definition of 'natural habitat' than the overwhelming majority of the human race.
7. While you're not entirely correct (we are not, in any knowable way, on the verge of extinction, nor have we been at any time in the last several thousand years, though humankind has undergone several population bottlenecks indicative of extinction-level events), there is some truth to your last statement.

However, it should be noted that you make that last statement even in the face of an actual disaster, given your previous statements. This is the flaw in the 'boy who called wolf'. Because eventually a wolf will show up, regardless of any other behavior. Humanity will go extinct.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 03:58 PM\*

It's not laziness or cowardice, it's just idiocy.

And it won't really matter. If our instincts actually depended on us wanting the end result, those instincts would be easily defeated by our intellect. But our instincts just nudge us along in subtle ways that never allow us any consideration as to where those nudges will take us.

Watch these men. They will claim not to ~~have~~ Want children. Then they will brag endlessly about the women they screw, as if the two are completely independent of each other. But condoms suck as birth control. Vasectomies at times fail, and many of the men who suggest them will never even get them themselves.

But if fear was actually enough to prevent breeding, the cub would never challenge the aging pack leader. The old buck wouldn't have to fight for breeding rights with young bucks. The few who are so instinctually flawed as to allow fear to get in the way... well, they were never meant to breed in the first place. That's just natural selection taking it's course.

Alma\_Negra • -7 points • 8 January, 2014 08:21 AM

In risk of getting downvoted. This is the most redpill statement I've read in this sub.

REDDITCanSuckMyCOCK1 points 8 January, 2014 03:19 PM\* **[recovered]**

Sure is bluepill being afraid of downvotes

Alma\_Negra • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 04:07 PM

Not afraid. But I know it will happen.

ADH-Kydex • 5 points • 8 January, 2014 03:15 AM

Kids are awesome. I just taught my little guy how to shop vac and got to watch him clean off a work bench. Then I let him drill a few holes on the drill press, that's always fun. He's a great kid and its really fun watching him grow up, no matter what happens in the future I do not regret having kids.

So, being married is fine. Having kids is pretty cool.

Don't

Get

Divorced

FloranHunter • 40 points • 8 January, 2014 04:04 AM

It's a good thing both parties have to agree to divorce.

OH WAIT

Nemester • 8 points • 8 January, 2014 03:46 PM

You don't get a choice. I bet you end up like my brother. Together 10 years, he "did everything right" (this isn't too far from the truth from my perspective). That didn't stop her from cheating on

him and filing.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 03:45 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 04:12 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

Mengs87 • 12 points • 8 January, 2014 05:08 AM

It's a fair point. There are 50/50 chances of divorce though, and few marriages are really happy.

[deleted] • -9 points • 8 January, 2014 05:51 AM

That's not a correct statistic.

[deleted] • 7 points • 8 January, 2014 12:56 PM

Thanks for linking a source to counter his statement.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 05:03 PM

I'd think the burden of proof is on a person making a numerical claim...

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 05:13 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 01:11 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 05:00 PM

Eh, I do know some people who've made it for a relatively long haul (none are dead yet, so you can't really say they crossed the finish line).

But so what? Marriage *can* go well. A lot of shit *can* happen. I just play the odds, and the odds say that marriage is a shitty bet. It isn't just divorce, but deadbedrooms, and the woman's ability to hold the threat of divorce of false domestic violence accusations against you.

I am simply unwilling to put myself in a relationship with such a drastic imbalance of power. Or, to put it more honestly, such a drastic imbalance of power that isn't in my favor.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 05:06 AM

Cheers.

[deleted] • -2 points • 8 January, 2014 05:51 AM

Thanks for this post. I don't see what the point of *any* of this is, if I don't have a wonderful loving partner and kids. That's the entire point of male and female humans. I want to find a great partner (I found one), marry her, and have children. if women are all horrible, women only want to take from you and divorce you, and kids are awful, what is the

FUCKING point?! Why do we talk about women at all? Is it just about fucking? Is TRP life only about fucking any women you find attractive, and never sharing emotions with her or ever wanting to raise your own child? If so, I have completely misunderstood the whole purpose.

You sound like you have a wonderful life. There are many incredible women and amazing marriages, where both the man and women are in love and raise their children. There are marriages where men abuse and hit, and rape, women. There are marriages where women scheme to steal money from a divorce. But there are ones that work out great.

IllimitableMan • 8 points • 8 January, 2014 12:03 PM

Oh dear lord. Someones still in Disneyland.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 05:08 PM

Well, I'm very happy and love my life, family, and partner. I'm sorry you don't think it's possible.

IllimitableMan • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 06:23 PM

Well, I'm very happy and love my life, family, and partner.

If everyone was in your situation this place wouldn't exist because it wouldn't need to. Society is broken and you ignore that because "you have it made" you should read about relationship game to maintain what you have, but being deluded about the nature of things because "you're ok" is ignorant. Your life is not representative of society. Divorce rates 70% etc.

I'm sorry you don't think it's possible.

I didn't say it isn't possible. It's possible but not likely. This is a philosophy of pragmatism, not romantic idealism.

sweetleef • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 09:07 PM

A large portion of posters here seem to be frustrated immature types going through their existentialist nihilism phases, adopting a seige defense mentality against manufactured enemies as a means of defending against their confusion.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 01:21 AM

Absolutely. Reminds me of the Ron Paul internet 17-22 year old libertarians of the early 2000s. You said it perfectly. Manufactured enemies. They are quick to point out correct biological impulses, but don't see why that relates to marriage and children. Those are the reasons we want sex, and provides fulfillment in life. Otherwise we should all become asexual or gay.

I also hate this unicorn mentality. Everyone here ostensibly loves male competitom in sports to careers and wealth, but 'great' women are so rare we never talk about them and berate anyone who is happily on a relationship. Well fuck that. I worked hard to find a wonderful female partner who is my equal in many ways, but ultimately fulfills many female roles such as cooking and cleaning and soon child rearing; at the same time she has a beautiful moral compass and makes more money than me (a lot). Any man who has had a legitimately wonderful women

knows they don't conspire to divorce or use you. That's sensationalist bordering on obsessive fears

Cyralea • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 04:16 PM

if women are all horrible, women only want to take from you and divorce you, and kids are awful, what is the FUCKING point?!

Welcome to the real world princess. This is how it is. Now decide for yourself what the point of it all is. Pretending that the reality of the situation isn't shitty doesn't make it less so.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 05:05 PM

Doesn't match up to my experiences or life, so I'm not too worried.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 05:04 PM

I wish this were true, but nature simply doesn't care if mommy and daddy stay together, or even love each other. **We** should care, because that gives our children the best possible chance to be successful human beings, but nature doesn't, because being a successful human being isn't the same thing as being a successful breeder.

Nature doesn't give a shit if you got sperm-jacked. Nature doesn't give a shit if a guy kidnaps some chick and chains her to his bed for nine months. Nature wants you to breed. The only judgement it makes on the tactics used is the level of their success.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 05:13 PM

Sure. Nature doesn't care if you enjoy Bach either, nor does it care if you study and learn physics and math. We are in many ways slaves to nature, but there is also a complexity in humanity that is absent in other animals.

And nature actually does care about that, as human children are unable to survive without immense care for a large part of their life, so they have required a male/female to team together to raise them. The most success in successfully having a child comes from parents who raise the child together to protect/teach/feed that kid. Single mothers weren't capable of raising a child on their own in the past. And these kids would be less likely to mate against as a result.

boydeer • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 11:40 AM

i think he's saying it would be worth it for him anyway.

[deleted] • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 05:42 AM

Lead well

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 04:46 AM

[permanently deleted]

YouDislikeMyOpinion • 12 points • 8 January, 2014 06:14 AM

Judges can throw prenups out. It's not like it used to be anymore.

YouDislikeMyOpinion • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 06:10 AM

You don't have to be married to have kids.

[deleted] • 10 points • 8 January, 2014 07:08 AM

1) Having children with a women is nearly as financially committing as getting married is. If you break up, there will be child support payments, and they are not based on what the child needs, they're based on your income. You're effectively married in terms of financial risk.

2) Children are best raised in a two-parent household. The idea of running around "spinning plates" while trying to raise 2-3 kids is ridiculous and is just a plain bad family environment.

3) Many places have common law marriage. In Canada, if you have children with a woman and live together, you're now under the same financial burdens of actually being married.

Reality is, if you want to have kids and give them a good home, you're going to have to face the same financial risk as getting married. It sucks, but if you want kids, that's our legal climate.

YouDislikeMyOpinion • 7 points • 8 January, 2014 07:27 AM

1) Having children with a women is nearly as financially committing as getting married is. If you break up, there will be child support payments, and they are not based on what the child needs, they're based on your income. You're effectively married in terms of financial risk.

This furthers my point. Adding marriage does nothing to help this situation.

2) Children are best raised in a two-parent household. The idea of running around "spinning plates" while trying to raise 2-3 kids is ridiculous and is just a plain bad family environment.

You can still have a life long relationship / commitment with a partner without signing a legal document.

3) Many places have common law marriage. In Canada, if you have children with a woman and live together, you're now under the same financial burdens of actually being married.

This is true. I wish more people would understand this.

Reality is, if you want to have kids and give them a good home, you're going to have to face the same financial risk as getting married. It sucks, but if you want kids, that's our legal climate.

Wrong. It's not the same financial risk as getting married. Yes the child support risk is the same, but the spousal support risk is less. Much much less.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 07:40 AM

This is true. I wish more people would understand this.

Basic reality from where I'm from, if you want to have kids and live with the mother of your kids (good family environment) you are going to be married whether you want to or not. There is no "opt out" of that.



Worse is that you cannot live with a woman here for 2/3 years without becoming married by default. It's absurd at this point.

I think that women are going to be the ones that pull this system apart before MRAs do, largely because as they start to out-earn men (at the median level) they'll start to be on the losing end of these "divorces" and since they have nearly all the power when it comes to creating, financing and supporting lawmakers and these laws they'll easily pull them apart and we'll see a whole bunch of TRP/libertarian talking points coming out of their mouths about "unfairness" and "why should I have to pay for you?"

In the end, as long as men don't have an equal voice in the creation of these types of laws (and make no mistake, just because a male legislator is voting for the law does NOT mean men have a voice here) they'll always favor women. When women make less, no fault divorce + common law marriage. When women make more, re-formed divorce laws + end of common law marriage.

Nemester • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 03:50 PM

Or move to a country friendlier to men.

Or be willing to drop everything and just disappear if she tries to divorce rape you.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 05:16 PM

It is hilarious how many people clearly disagree with you, but can't quite, because they know how blue-pill it sounds when they do.

A man who leaves half-dozen pregnant woman behind him is more likely to be evolutionarily successful than a man who stays with one woman he impregnates a half-dozen times. The genetic variance secured through this action is simply more effective at spreading his genes than the resources he would invest in a marriage.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 05:46 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 January, 2014 06:03 AM

Oh shit...

vozkhan • -1 points • 8 January, 2014 05:40 AM

Adopt a kid?

niceguy\_gone\_cad • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 06:54 AM

Use a surrogate mother if you want one.

[deleted] • -1 points • 8 January, 2014 10:11 AM

Um. No. Children have the potential to make you more awesome.

redpillschool • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 03:21 PM

Getting married doesn't change your legal status as father.

[deleted] • 91 points • 8 January, 2014 12:20 AM



Everyone on reddit needs to up vote this. People should join reddit just to up vote it.

Manuel\_S • 44 points • 8 January, 2014 12:42 AM

Done. Because true is true.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 02:15 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

Atleticomadrid • 22 points • 8 January, 2014 02:47 AM

You won't find this opinion very popular here.

sibre2001 • 31 points • 8 January, 2014 03:21 AM

I imagine when I get married

So much advice, so little experience.

[deleted] • 13 points • 8 January, 2014 02:42 AM

personal issues afoot.

You mean like more money to spend on personal time?

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 04:36 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 January, 2014 04:47 AM

I was going to get on my soap box and rail on how the downfall of America is destroying stable marriages, not the other way but fuck it. I'd love for you to explain to me a universally understood definition of a marriage without offending someone but that's equally as pointless.

[deleted] • 13 points • 8 January, 2014 05:23 AM

Dude. You think every fucking guy that ever got divorced is an idiot? Like they went into it thinking it wasn't "the right thing"? "Well fuck it, may as well try"?

They all thought they had the right one. They got fucked. Learn from them.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 05:25 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 9 points • 8 January, 2014 03:54 AM

You're in the wrong subreddit mate

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 03:15 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 04:51 AM

[permanently deleted]

FloranHunter • 12 points • 8 January, 2014 04:02 AM

If you're been together for 5 years then why would you marry?

Look at marriage the way a wise person would: a contract. A contract where the man gains a few fringe benefits, a tiny bit more rights to their child, and incredible burden. The woman gains those fringe benefits, loses a bit of control over their child\*, and gains a huge incentive to divorce.

Your relationship has ups and downs. In the downs, things may get rough. Do you really want to add a massive incentive to break up on top?

\* I don't say rights because men gain some control over seeing their child while women merely lose the ability to as easily deny men that control. The skew is enough that there's a qualitative difference.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 04:42 AM

[permanently deleted]

FloranHunter • 8 points • 8 January, 2014 05:05 AM

You aren't being concrete. Why is marriage better than a LTR? Why is the ultimate in manhood to be a father and husband? What do you actually mean by "the right way" and why do you think modern marriage fulfills that?

Because it *is* an issue of modern and ancestral marriage. Modern marriage is the zombie of traditional marriage: marriage died but its corpse seems alive enough to evoke our emotions.

Spore2012 • -8 points • 8 January, 2014 05:20 AM

Marriage is whatever it means to you. Fuck whatever the media says about it or whoever. The point of marriage is to bond a family together. Obviously it takes some moral/value to see why just a LTR doesn't work for this. Would you want to start a family and not be married? If you did would you want your kids to think their parents weren't secure enough with themselves to be married. You have to man up.

And ofc there is the purpose built in to give credits to those who are willing to man/woman up to create that stability and perpetuate the proper formation of family systems and values to increase productivity of that nation and reduce it's burden (from fractured family systems).

I mean do you really just think marriage is some archaic fairy tale shit to fuck people over or give people power? That is absurd.

FloranHunter • 8 points • 8 January, 2014 05:38 AM

Again, everything you say about marriage is true but your advice is worse than useless. Divorce will continue to dominate until women no longer have incentive to divorce. No matter what you or anyone else says about "manning up" and the value of marriage to society, wise men will not marry. The benefits to children are minute compared to the penalties to men. Children would be much, much better benefited if you spent your efforts pushing family court reform.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 03:46 AM

[permanently deleted]

still\_very\_alive • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 06:15 PM

Looks like they did- I've never seen a comment on this sub with so many upvotes.

[deleted] • 2 points • 21 March, 2014 07:55 PM

I did and I realize that I made a huge mistake. I feel like my finger is constantly on the suicide trigger because so many things can go wrong.

Good2Go5280 • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 07:04 AM

Just make sure your wife makes more money than you.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 January, 2014 09:15 AM

<http://www.reddit.com/r/engaged/>

ItsMrQ • -12 points • 8 January, 2014 03:47 AM

Marry.

The.

Right.

Person.

[deleted] • 27 points • 8 January, 2014 04:37 AM

You.

can't.

marry.

yourself.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 04:55 AM

[permanently deleted]

niceguy\_gone\_cad • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 06:53 AM

Yes, you can in some places.

[deleted] • 11 points • 8 January, 2014 05:24 AM

Who ever got married thinking it wasn't? Your sure thing isn't sure. EVER.

YouDislikeMyOpinion • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 07:41 AM

Load some bullets into the cylinder, spin it, close the cylinder. Put the barrel of the gun against your temple, and pull the trigger.

Pull the trigger on an empty chamber.

Nemester • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 03:33 PM

Get out of our subreddit asshat.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 06:19 PM

[permanently deleted]

we need more marriages in the Western world

Who's this "we"?

I don't need to get married. I don't need other people to get married. I don't need you to get married.

Do you need me to get married? Does someone else?

If so, then the need for me to get married is that person's problem, not mine, and it will remain not my problem until whoever it is figures out how to incentivize marriage for me.

And telling me "you'll save Western civilization!" cuts no ice.

Because Western civilization hasn't shown me that it's worth saving, or that it's worth it to me to save it, or even that it wants to be saved. The West is a sinking ship, whose captains have shown all too willing to throw me and my fellow members of the penis owners' club over the side if it means they get to ride a little higher in the water for a while. And now you want me to bail until I go down with the ship?

No, thanks. It's the lifeboats for me, and if I can't get one, then it's party time on the topmost deck until the inevitable end.

Because you can't save civilization by working harder and sacrificing more. That's how we got into this mess in the first place... with men doing what was good for everyone, and women doing what was good for themselves. Women's ability to take, consume, devour, and use up finally outstripped men's ability to produce, build, fix, and invent, because women, no longer satisfied with consuming the product of men's roles, began to covet the roles themselves.

They wanted into our companies so they could play career. And, like a child who was no longer content to play race car driver with her little red wagon, they demanded daddy's car to play with. And we, insanely, gave it to them. Now daddy can't drive to work, the little girl can't get a job and replace his earnings because she's just a little girl and doesn't even *want* to drive to work for real, and no one eats.

You think you're gonna save civilization by working harder and raising more hard workers? Nah. Feminist-enlightened women and their leftoid ideological colleagues are just gonna take everything you build, and everything your children build and make it vanish with a giant slurping sound.

And then they're gonna say "Where's the rest?"

These people are incapable of moderating themselves. They do not understand scarcity, and they are not going to sit still for you to explain it to them. They do not realize or care that government money isn't free mana from heaven, and they don't know that the economy is an engine, not a cornucopia, and they don't care about the people down in the bilges doing the bailing.

You can never produce as fast as they can consume, because they demand not only what you produce, but the means of production. They don't just want the house you built for free. They want you to give them your saw and hammer and nails so they can play carpenter. And once you give them your saw and hammer and nails, they want another house.

The only way to get rid of these people is to starve them out. To give them nothing until they either perish or learn to produce. You have to give them as little as you can of what you produce, and keep as much as you can for yourself.

[deleted] 9 January, 2014 05:48 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

Whisper • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 07:22 PM

Man what a wall of text, you obviously took that very personally... be cordial son, I am not your enemy.

Bro, you can shit test me if you want, but I'll just agree and amplify. Besides, you'd look kinda silly in a skirt. So let's skip the talking about each other's feeeelings and skip right to the facts part, eh?

I'm not quite sure you fully understand me. Or the sidebar.

You see, you ask:

What's the point of TRP if not to help change this absurd feminazi/liberal brainwashing being DONE to the West?

Welcome to TRP. We are a subreddit about personal survival and sexual strategy in a culture increasingly lacking a positive identity for men.

A friend of mine recently pointed out that crusades consist of crusaders, while civilizations consist of civilians. YOu cannot save civilization by persuading everyone to join a crusade.

You denounce Western CULT-ure

I do not. Western *culture* contains some of the greatest things humanity has come up with, and it is just plain superior to others. Western *society*, however, the inheritor of that culture, is a different thing.

The ship may be the best design ever, and soundly built, but the tiller has been given to madmen, and they are steering us towards the rocks. Why would I keep rowing? That will just make things worse faster.

[deleted] • -2 points • 8 January, 2014 06:38 AM

That or major pre-nup, with multiple fucking lawyers present!

Abiogeneralization • 99 points • 8 January, 2014 12:45 AM

I was so sad when I heard that. I'm a big fan of The Dog Whisperer. It's like TRP of dog training. Humans and dogs are different. If you try to treat a dog in the way you'd like to be treated you'll get nowhere. The blue pillers in this case are people who still try and deal with their dogs as they would with unruly children... Someone's going to read this and think I think women are like dogs...

Anyway, I hated hearing about how his whole "pack" broke up at once. His wife divorced him, destroying his family AND his favorite dog died. Men like him just need a pack to belong to; they can be loyal if you let them.

It's unfortunately common for divorced men to attempt suicide. Fortunately, Caesar tried to kill himself by eating a bunch of chocolate.

DanReggins • 42 points • 8 January, 2014 01:23 AM

Actually, I found his teachings about dogs to be really helpful in leading group expeditions/tours.

Publicly not acknowledging someone's aggressive, dominant behavior, followed by not acknowledging them, is REALLY effective.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 03:14 AM

[permanently deleted]

DanReggins • 31 points • 8 January, 2014 03:21 AM

Especially little fat ones named Eric Cartman!

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 04:14 AM

[permanently deleted]

DanReggins • 17 points • 8 January, 2014 06:21 AM

Certainly. You can laugh, but I first learned it when watching Cesar Milan's character on South Park, when he was brought in to discipline and fix Eric Cartman after nannies had failed.

video

If you can, check out the full episode.. one of my favorites!

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 03:24 AM

Out of curiosity, what job did you have/do you have where you lead group expeditions/tours and also have to deal with aggressive behavior?

DanReggins • 5 points • 8 January, 2014 05:54 AM

PM'ed. I'd rather not mention too much here.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 06:13 AM

Sounds good

Crackertron • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 07:03 PM

Probably camping trips with troubled inner city teens.

rebuildingMyself • 4 points • 8 January, 2014 08:38 AM

Concepts like establishing dominance and not reinforcing negative behavior are universal. We're all animals underneath it all

MysterManager • 26 points • 8 January, 2014 05:08 AM

How the fuck does a judge award shit like this with a straight face.

ar10308 • 20 points • 8 January, 2014 06:06 AM

Probably a woman.

rebuildingMyself • 17 points • 8 January, 2014 08:43 AM

A male judge that's run through the feminist brainwashing requirements are just as bad

mydoucheaccount • 20 points • 8 January, 2014 08:58 AM

"If you try to treat a dog in the way you'd like to be treated you'll get nowhere"...also if you treat a woman the way you'd like to be treated you'll get nowhere

Abiogeneralization • 4 points • 8 January, 2014 08:09 PM

if you treat a woman the way you'd like to be treated you'll get nowhere.

Especially since you can't get anywhere at all if you never leave the bedroom.

BoyMeetsHarem • 21 points • 8 January, 2014 03:51 AM

It's unfortunately common for divorced men to attempt suicide. Fortunately, Caesar tried to kill himself by eating a bunch of chocolate.

LMFAO

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 01:00 AM

good analogy about how people interact with dogs.

Sergnb • 1 point • 12 April, 2014 06:39 AM

Wasn't it proven that Millan's methods were baloney and were actually harmful in the dog's behaviour, and only were effective for the instant "wow" moment of seeing the instant change in behaviour, but utterly pointless in long time terms?

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 03:24 PM

It's like TRP of dog training

Actually, I think Milan's tactics are unnecessary. Does it work? Yes, it works. Is there a better way? Absofuckinglutely!

It's too draconian.

I've so far trained 2 dogs for obedience competitions, and not once have I and to be cruel to them.

There was a post here on TRP about how you're supposed to use more of a reward system with women instead of punishment. It's exactly what I do with dogs.

Abiogeneneralization • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 04:29 PM

I don't think his tactics are draconian, even as a human. But the point is that humans try to deal with dogs as they would humans. They get down on their level and use their words to communicate their wishes. What they need to do is to speak dog, which is being dominant (not aggressive or violent) and giving a light bite on the scruff of the neck. Humans would prefer not to be treated that way but for dogs anything else is abnormal and confusing.

*The Golden Rule* has limited value in dog training and in heterosexual relationships.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 06:14 PM

What they need to do is to speak dog, which is being dominant (not aggressive or violent)

Exactly. But I don't think Milan is speaking dog, I think he's speaking wolf or lion.

Dogs we've domesticated for thousands of years.

My favorite trainer is Zak George, and he differs from Milan in every possible way.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O-ziOPzsBhk>

This is what he does.

Abiogeneneralization • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 06:28 PM

Very true. But humans have been domesticated for longer. We haven't changed as much as people would like to believe. That's why this sub exists.

But I won't pretend to be an expert on dog training. I'm sure you've got more experience.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 08:43 PM\*

Very true. But humans have been domesticated for longer. We haven't changed as much as people would like to believe. That's why this sub exists.

Absolutely. However, in humans we haven't done artificial selective breeding. There was an Austrian guy in the 1940s that tried it, and the whole world went to war over it (yes, Hitler was from Austria, not Germany).

With dogs we've selected for the traits we want, and killed off the breed lines we didn't want. Humans haven't changed much because we keep fucking each other across races and different geographical locations. It's the Genetic Drift principle. New genetic traits only emerge when the species is forced to do so. We've been living comfortably since we invented farming.

Abiogeneralization • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 09:17 PM

in humans we haven't done artificial selective breeding

Oh we so have. I won't claim to be a dog training expert, but I am a biologist. The word "artificial" here only means that the breeding is controlled by humans. And humans have the weirdest breeding preferences. Whether or not we're actively aware of it, we've been selectively breeding ourselves for as long as we've been breeding.

We're not even just homo sapiens anymore; we're homo sapiens bred in captivity by humans. We have all the weird features of a domesticated species.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 10:58 PM

I think we did when we enslaved all the black people.

Now they dominate track and field at every olympics. I don't recall the last time I saw a white guy win a sprint race final.

Abiogeneralization • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 11:55 PM

Well I guess... By then we sort of knew what we were doing and were total assholes about it.

I'm talking about the transition from the life of the nomadic ape to that of the human villager (the kind of people who first kept dogs). What is "nature" selecting for here? Ability to use tools, living in huts, cooking food, hyper-intelligence...

These are not "normal" traits. If village-life traits are selected for in *any other species* we certainly call that "artificial selection." Why not humans? In reality there's hardly a distinction between artificial and natural selection; humans are a part of the environment other species have to adapt to. Now we know about genetics and such so the manipulation seems obvious. But those ancient humans were being selected for pretty "artificial" traits without doing it on purpose.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 07:03 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 08:33 PM

Dogs aren't wolves.



We've domesticated dogs for thousands of years. They're not even close.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 08:45 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 08:50 PM

Show me.

Show me a wolf as tame as this. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pM2pD9Kwv4c>

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 09:14 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 11:01 PM

We haven't domesticated wolves for the same reason we chose to domesticate horses instead of zebras.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 09:18 PM

[permanently deleted]

autowikibot • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 09:18 PM

*Excerpt from linked Wikipedia article about **Dog behavior** :*

---

**Dog behavior** refers to the collection of behaviors by the domestic dog, *Canis lupus familiaris*, and is believed to be influenced by genetic, social, situational and environmental causes. The domestic dog is a subspecies of the grey wolf, and shares many of its behavioral characteristics.

---

**Picture - Dogs roughhousing.**

image source | about me | /u/lecrasedutch can reply with 'delete' if this comment is irrelevant. I will also delete if points fall below -1.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 10:57 PM

I've read it.

Show me. If it exists, there's a video on the internet.

Bro, there's a reason we chose dogs over wolves as companions.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 11:02 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • -1 points • 8 January, 2014 11:11 PM

Nope, they're different species. Dogs being subspecies of wolves.

permaculture • -4 points • 8 January, 2014 09:27 AM

?

--TakeThePill • 122 points • 8 January, 2014 12:27 AM [\[recovered\]](#)

You'd think someone like Cesar Millan would be able to implement his tactics on her.

So many great men have been screwed by marriage..

[deleted] • 34 points • 8 January, 2014 02:14 AM

I remember hearing him talk about his marriage with his wife (pre-divorce), and it was clear he was overly sensitive to her wants and perceptions. He kept going on about how she straightened him out and such.

InternetFree • 36 points • 8 January, 2014 03:08 AM

Many men want marriage because they can finally have someone to tell them what to do. A person they can be vulnerable to. Men sometimes want to be and feel vulnerable and show that side of them. They can't do it with anyone but if someone swears her loyalty to you, you should be able to take their word on it, right?

Wrong.

However, you would assume a person whose fucking job it is to be super dominant every single day at sometime also wants to be vulnerable and have at least one person that can dominate him. It was what cost him all this.

rebuildingMyself • 13 points • 8 January, 2014 08:44 AM

A lot of men don't know any other relationship other than mom and son. He expects warmth, protection, etc and thus acts vulnerable and weak in front of her.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 January, 2014 05:58 PM

This reminds me of a conversation my wife was having with me about our 14 yro son today, she said he was defiant to her, but not really in a rebellious way. I explained to her that it was ok because he was just expressing the fact that he didn't want mom telling him what to do.

My awesome RPW wife understood, though she was sad to see her "baby" growing up. Mom's can be the worst for sons. We dads really need to be there and show them how to stand on their own.

My son knows from my telling him, and his experiencing how, harsh and cruel the world truly is. He will learn to be strong, and I'm not going to correct him for respectfully expressing his desires to his mother.

DaedalusFinch • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 03:31 PM

Thank you for posting this.

indieshometownhifi • 51 points • 8 January, 2014 12:42 AM

Unfortunately people aren't logical like dogs. I think this is why dog people exist.

jaketesnake76 • 6 points • 8 January, 2014 01:30 AM

i have learned alot from Cesar about dogs and how to read them , i thought surely he could also read women and lead them too.Boy the western world sure has things backwards with women and men and it will not go

well for us in the future..

[deleted] • 71 points • 8 January, 2014 02:44 AM

TIL Cesar Millan is straight.

[deleted] • 19 points • 8 January, 2014 07:55 AM

He might try men after that episode

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 06:02 AM

[permanently deleted]

rebuildingMyself • 25 points • 8 January, 2014 08:49 AM

It's just a wink wink nudge nudge bonus for the woman.

hermit087 • 14 points • 8 January, 2014 04:02 PM

There needs to be a hard limit. I don't care if the father is Bill Gates, \$15k a year is enough to cover the actual costs of raising the child.

LuciusExitus • 5 points • 8 January, 2014 08:09 PM

Yeah why give the kids to someone that needs extra money instead of the person that can afford it?

Wouldn't it be easier to give the custody to the father instead of transferring assets?

drdewm • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 08:02 PM\*

The state Child Support Agency agency gets a federal kick back for the money they collect in child support so they take every bit that is legally enforceable. Imagine asking the IRS to take a little less than they are legally allowed to, won't happen. They take because they can.

[deleted] • 23 points • 8 January, 2014 07:20 AM

Damn man. I liked this guy a lot. Some of his show was hammed up nonsense as is the requirement to be on TV, but most of it was actually very true. I'm a big dog person, and a few years ago I got a quarter wolf-dog and Millan's ideas worked really well, and helped me avoid a lot of the problems people report having with half wolves or quarter wolves.

Basically, everywhere a guy is out there contributing something to humanity, there's someone receiving half of what he earns for doing jack shit. Well, three people. The government, the courts earning a % of the amount of alimony / CS paid, and the ex-wife who deserves to "maintain her standard of living". It's a great 'fuck you for helping the world'.

Stop supporting this bullshit societal institution. Marriage has one function - to help the state and women profit from the accomplishments of men. It helps the economy by giving women (spenders) access to men (savers) bank accounts. Yes this is a generalization that women are spenders and men are savers, but ask any top level marketing guy (5-10+ years in the industry). Women make anywhere from 70-85% of purchasing decisions. Marriage exists to give women access to the money they need to keep crappy corporations alive.

Marriage has nothing to do with love - it is merely another form of taxation. It's the largest wealth transference agent in the world. It's even worse than government taxation, and I say this as a pretty libertarian guy. Taxation reams men a lot harder than it does women, and it puts the majority of those tax dollars to bullshit meant to appease and court female voters. Yet it at least pretends to put that money towards the good of its citizens, thus enabling taxpayers to reap benefits in the end. Marriage just straight up rapes men for 60% by the time all the

proceedings are done. That money, unlike the 30% of income you might pay to taxes, does not go towards society. It just goes to your ex. Which means, it goes to buying whatever companies market to her - a pink prius, some cutco knives, clothes, jewelry, an apartment way above her own means, etc. You have no way of making it even go to your kids.

Marriage is a tax on men. Luckily, it's easily avoidable. While we are lucky enough to live in a society where the "marriage tax" is easily avoidable, I recommend that all men avoid it like the plague. Pre-nups do not always help. Hiding money often does not work.

For married guys, read up on WTF to do if things go bad. You wouldn't go sailing without knowing what to do if bad weather hits. There's a lot of great resources on how to "win" (which in this case means get fucked hard, but not torn apart with a spiked dildo in courts). RP game can help a lot, but beyond that, if you're married, have a detailed escape plan. Learn the tricks of the top players in the game - wealthy women. No matter how happy your marriage is, don't be ignorant, get your knowledge up.

trplurker123 • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 08:15 AM

Marriage is a legal contract between two parties to join themselves together in a legal union. It was originally constructed as joining of two families. Now there's tons of legally privileges including: immigration, tax, end of life, health insurance, estate benefits that have been tacked onto that.

However, for most men (and now more women) if you get divorced and if you have kids, welcome back to your early bachelor(ette) lifestyle because that's what you'll be able to afford. You know without being young and having all the responsibilities of age tacked on top of the bachelor lifestyle.

antihostile • 33 points • 8 January, 2014 01:02 AM

What a bitch.

averageredditor123 • 36 points • 8 January, 2014 01:18 AM

Too bad the guy couldn't discipline his wife as well as he could the dogs.

roamingjerk • 21 points • 8 January, 2014 03:56 AM

If he couldn't pull it off, what are the odds for the rest of us?

Nemester • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 03:20 PM

It is hard to discipline a wife when the state destroys all of your power, and makes sure she knows it.

niceguy\_gone\_cad • 10 points • 8 January, 2014 06:36 AM

He should transfer his assets to a foreign bank and leave the country. He can afford to do that, unlike the average Joe.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 02:32 PM

[permanently deleted]

Di-eEier\_von\_Satan • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 05:21 PM

I don't know that banning women is the right strategy, but rather I think a panel of Judges, like the supreme court, should decide every case. Having more than one judge automatically puts in a system of checks and balances.

niceguy\_gone\_cad • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 04:44 PM

*IMO there shouldn't be any female judge, or any woman in power over logical decisions.*

That would improve the justice system A LOT.

Mightyskunk • 50 points • 8 January, 2014 04:03 AM

The judge who presided over this should be shot. All it takes are a few examples to change a system.

Beardsman2 • 59 points • 8 January, 2014 04:15 AM

If it happened to me then instead of committing suicide I would do my best to kill the judge, lawyer and wife. Dignity and honour is worth killing and dying for.

hermit087 • 10 points • 8 January, 2014 04:09 PM

It happens once in a while. Divorce lawyers have been killed before, and wives too obviously.

One in 2011

Mightyskunk • 30 points • 8 January, 2014 05:01 AM

Thank you. When I saw the orange envelope by my karma, I thought it was gonna be someone saying, "Enjoy getting raped by a big black guy in jail!" or "People like you make me sick" or some other Reddit herd response.

I appreciate you.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 06:22 AM

[permanently deleted]

Mightyskunk • 13 points • 8 January, 2014 06:28 AM

It's not a random stranger. It's someone who shook the right hands to be elected to his or her post. Beyond that, it's someone handing out a cruel and unusual punishment, knowing what it will amount to, in terms of the man possibly taking his own life. Isn't that tantamount to murder? That's not just doing your job. That's sticking it to someone for no good reason.

Should the judge be charged with attempted murder, based on the fact that logically, a man will not work his ass off for nothing and will generally just off themselves instead?

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 06:37 AM

[permanently deleted]

Mightyskunk • 6 points • 8 January, 2014 06:40 AM

Are you trolling? If I took everything away from you, and guaranteed that by law, you would never ever have anything, but you would still have to work as hard as you've been working...you wouldn't kill yourself?

I'm actually curious about you.

Beardsman2 • 8 points • 8 January, 2014 07:07 AM

My reply to him: The "justice system" is dead.

Justice these days requires whoever is fucked over taking matters into their own hands. Others can do what they want, this is just my opinion and what I would do.

And just doing your job doesn't stop you from being/doing evil, it doesn't exempt you from retribution.

Mightyskunk • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 07:09 AM

He deleted his replies. Or, did the mods?

[deleted] • -1 points • 8 January, 2014 07:07 AM

Don't speak too soo...

Nemester • 6 points • 8 January, 2014 03:19 PM

I bet it would only take 1 publicized high profile case where a dude went nuts to prompt a whole bunch of copycats. Those judges and lawyers would be shitting their pants.

Nokusaki • -2 points • 8 January, 2014 09:05 AM [recovered]

Don't kill the lawyer, he was only doing his job.

REDDITCanSuckMyCOCK • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 03:23 PM [recovered]

Every lawyer has the right to say no. The ex-wife's lawyer is just as guilty as the rest of the scum.

Nokusaki • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 08:13 PM [recovered]

Unlike the judge, the job of the lawyer is not to judge who is right and who is wrong. Its just to present the best case they can for whoever is paying them.

jpflathead • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 03:41 PM

I won't get involved in whether anyone should be killed, but I have certainly experienced lawyers who knew better saying things in court, advocating for punishments and rewards that were completely unfounded by the facts.

It's one thing to say that everyone in criminal court deserves a vigorous defense but the daily courtroom antics in family law go way beyond a vigorous defense to advocacy of known lies, misrepresentations and uncalled for unjustifiable punishments. And downright extortion.

[deleted] • 8 points • 8 January, 2014 02:27 AM

Was the Judge that granted this Satan?! Fuck me. Does she fit the definition of royal cunt?

evergonitenitenigga • 13 points • 8 January, 2014 02:07 AM

can somebody eli5 me how this is possible/legal?

Mengs87 • 17 points • 8 January, 2014 05:12 AM\*

In the worst possible case, the man can end up like Dave Foley:

<http://www.popeater.com/2011/03/09/dave-foley-finances-child-support-tabatha-southey/>

Poor guy - he can never go home again.

redpilldude • 24 points • 8 January, 2014 02:32 AM

In divorce, division of assets and alimony is based on what is *equitable* for both spouses. Also, both spouses are entitled to enjoy the same quality of life after the divorce. So, it is very common for the primary wage earner to have to pay a lot of money.

FloranHunter • 32 points • 8 January, 2014 04:11 AM

Also, both spouses are entitled to enjoy the same quality of life after the divorce

This is virtually impossible unless they were living well within their means since shared costs are massive savings. So in practice the woman's quality of life is maintained while the man lives in a tiny apartment, possibly with a roommate.

Mightyskunk • 10 points • 8 January, 2014 07:10 AM

But I was fucking her once a week *before* the divorce...

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 January, 2014 09:43 AM

Of course extra compensation will be given unspoken to the woman, due to how our society portrays them. You wouldn't punish the poor innocent WOMAN would you?

worms\_to\_mooch\_sex • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 02:48 AM

So what if you can prove their quality of life was only at x\$? I.e. if you kept your assets separate? Then would huge splitting up of things like this be potentially avoided?

redpilldude • 8 points • 8 January, 2014 03:06 AM

In almost all states, assets acquired by either partner during the marriage are considered "community property." So, keeping assets separate wouldn't work. Pre-nuptial agreements can help somewhat, but those only cover assets that were acquired before the marriage begin.

rebuildingMyself • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 08:48 AM

If I had a business it would be in my parents' name. Would that be safe?

dale0607 • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 01:49 PM

Worth talking to a lawyer about this. Setting up trusts or LLC's might be an option as well to protect your assets.

redpilldude • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 05:17 PM

I don't know. If you're seriously considering getting married, it would be a good idea to talk with a lawyer about this question.

pelaglus • 13 points • 8 January, 2014 02:58 AM

This really makes me want to never get married. Holy fuck.

[deleted] • 7 points • 8 January, 2014 07:25 AM

Perhaps this should be known as . . . "macrorape," or "omnirape," cause that's what he got right there. 120K a month for child support? WTF! Of course it has to be because the system gets to take a percentage.

[deleted] • 10 points • 8 January, 2014 03:10 AM

The one bitch he couldn't tame.

rebuildingMyself • 7 points • 8 January, 2014 08:52 AM

He had no leverage over her. How could he effectively punish a person that can walk away at any time with half your shit plus bitch-support?

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 12:37 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

Clauderoughly • 53 points • 8 January, 2014 12:54 AM\*

Always get a prenuptial agreement...

Pre nups always get tossed when it benefits the man

Pre nups always get enforced when it benefits the woman.

cobalt1728 • 13 points • 8 January, 2014 01:12 AM [recovered]

true that, just don't tie the stupid ass knot! Why!? What advantage is there? lol

Clauderoughly • 17 points • 8 January, 2014 01:15 AM

Some of us found a unicorn, and were smart enough not to get married in California.

Every nightmare, famous divorce, you hear about are in Cali and their marriage laws are fucking retarded.

There are many tax and immigration reasons to get married.

Not for everyone though.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 01:21 AM

[permanently deleted]

Clauderoughly • 9 points • 8 January, 2014 01:24 AM

New York is one of the best.

VikaWiklet • 5 points • 8 January, 2014 01:29 AM

I recommend the Dominican Republic.

darklogic420 • 11 points • 8 January, 2014 01:45 AM

I recommend a luxury cruise. Marriages on a cruise aren't enforceable once you disembark.

still\_very\_alive • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 03:33 AM

Seriously? That would be hilarious.

trplurker123 • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 08:08 AM

It's not where you get married, it's where you get divorced. You can get married with the "best" laws in regards to divorce, but if he/she gets that divorce in California and California has jurisdiction on you, good luck.

Maybe, if you're lucky you can get a pre-nup that requires that a divorce occur where you want it to be.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 03:17 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 05:51 AM\*



[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 07:12 AM

I've got my brothers and friends for that. I am not specifically hating on marriage, but I wanted to comment that not getting married does not equal being alone.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 07:41 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 08:10 AM

thats definitely true, but still, like I said, you don't have to actually marry your lady...she may want to I suppose, so that one may be tough. However, there are plenty of unmarried people in the long run to give you company even if your friends do get hitched, find new ones...You see, without a wife (and kids), your free time is your own, with those two things, say good bye to friends and family. Or at least be prepared to see them a hell of a lot less. You better have picked the right woman then right? Also something difficult to do...

Point I am making is that life is not so black and white in this regard. Getting married  $\neq$  no loneliness and not getting married  $\neq$  loneliness

Laughing\_Jelly\_Bean • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 06:58 AM

Oh? You found your Unicorn, did you?

Clauderoughly • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 04:01 PM

Yes I did.

Laughing\_Jelly\_Bean • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 05:28 PM

Well, I'm happy for you then, but I don't think the average redpiller would consider your marriage situation to be ideal, or even desirable.

Clauderoughly • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 06:12 PM

Everyone wants something different out of life.

Laughing\_Jelly\_Bean • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 07:14 PM

That's true, including MGTOW's. Yet you do not seem to be accepting of that.

Aerobus • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 03:15 AM

their marriage laws are fucking retarded.

Can you please explain how its worse? Former CA resident here who may move back.

Edited

beepbeepwow • 1 point • 27 January, 2014 06:53 PM

What about Las Vegas?

[deleted] • -2 points • 8 January, 2014 02:43 AM\*

Some of us found a unicorn

I would love to see someone who thinks that get divorced so that I could laugh at his hubris.

Prefecture2 points 8 January, 2014 05:01 AM [recovered]

Yes, live in your bitter solitude.

May everything concur & reinforce your beliefs. I hope those reasons are worth living for.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 02:41 PM

I'd like him to have a long happy life so I know its actually possible and unicorns are real.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 05:14 AM

Yes, getting to enjoy your life *and* not have to worry about being robbed and turned into a financial slave is "bitter". With your attitude and hatred towards those who choose a different life, I'd say it sounds like you're bitter that you're stuck with a life you don't want and can't afford to change.

Prefecture2 points 8 January, 2014 05:40 AM [recovered]

I'm not taking sick pleasure in seeing those that choose solitude out of blatant ignorance—a direct contrast to your topic of laughter.

And I am not bitter or angry about anything. I am in direct control of my life and choices.

However, I'll stop here. This is not meant for my own self reflection. I am not the one with the complications.

Good luck. I hope you can solve yourself and become a better person.

[deleted] • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 07:53 AM

Excellent attitude

[deleted] • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 12:34 PM

I did become a better person by escaping the endless pursuit of pussy and the misery of men in relationships who are controlled by pussy.

Sounds more like you're the one who needs to solve something.

[deleted] • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 07:13 AM

copied from above

I've got my brothers and friends for that. I am not specifically hating on marriage, but I wanted to comment that not getting married does not equal being alone.

Also, you could have a girlfriend and choose not to get married, problem double-solved!

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 January, 2014 01:58 AM

This isn't true.

Prenups aren't something you want to fuck around with- both parties along with *legal council* need to be involved in the process, and even still it can't basically be used to sign away your financial security. More often than not Prenups get thrown out because they were poorly written because they were written by bad

(hint: cheap legal fees can mean you're getting a bad lawyer!) lawyers and / or done improperly. Both parties need to consent to it having been given *legal council* by their own lawyer.

.....and don't get married in California. Don't live in California. Don't think of California.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 02:28 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 8 points • 8 January, 2014 03:00 AM

I live in Oregon.

I really wish the Californians would go home.

KnightsOfArgonia • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 09:27 AM

But Portland is awesome :(

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 04:46 PM

Shoo. All that tells me is that you don't want to fix your own state.

KnightsOfArgonia • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 01:29 AM

I meant to visit, but yeah, its hard to change anything in this state when complacency runs rampant. Decades of poor decisions will be hard to undo by myself lol

[deleted] • 0 points • 9 January, 2014 01:39 AM

Not our problem. You need Oregon more than Oregon needs you.

KnightsOfArgonia • 2 points • 9 January, 2014 01:55 AM

Never said it was, and can't help but get a xenophobic vibe from you.

McMurphyCrazy • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 01:04 PM

So dumb we have to involve all of these assholes and pay them a ton of money to make up paperwork in a language only they understand. How about we just have one sheet of paper that says "hey if things don't work out, you don't get to take everything I own" with a judge as a witness. Both parties sign the paper with a video camera on them for proof, boom, done.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 04:51 PM

Because English is a versatile language where words can have multiple meanings, and one sentence can have a *wild* number of intents.

People might hate lawyers but we need that kind of beaurocracy or else either the state or the individual would walk all over us.

I mean, can you imagine what, "hey, if things don't work out, you don't get to take everything I own?" would mean? They can't take 100% of your net worth. Ergo, they could take 99% of it.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 02:18 AM

Yeah, these guys exaggerate. There was an AmA with a divorce lawyer a while back, and he said that in most cases it takes either poor execution or evidence of coercion by one party on the other to get it thrown out. He said the latter can usually be avoided by getting the prenup taken care of well in advance of the wedding. In any case, he said it was very rare.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/05/us-money-divorce-prenup-idUSBRE8940Y920121005>

BoyMeetsHarem • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 03:55 AM

counsel

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 03:11 AM

Thats not really true at all.

rebuildingMyself • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 08:50 AM

What if you transfer assets to your parents (before marriage)?

rebuildingMyself • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 08:50 AM

What if you transfer assets to your parents (before marriage)?

XCowboyLowkesx • -1 points • 8 January, 2014 01:13 AM

Pre nups always get tossed when it benefits the man.

Pre nups always get enforced when it benefits the woman.

FTFY

Clauderoughly • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 01:16 AM

ta

fixed

Nemester • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 03:15 PM

I am not sure, but can a pre-nup cover a man's earnings after he is married? I am pretty sure you can't exempt post marriage earnings from her greedy hands.

30303030303030 • 14 points • 8 January, 2014 04:38 AM

She earned that money, didn't she?

Jesus Christ, that poor man. It's disgusting.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 03:22 AM

Misleading title. Cesar Millan is the dog whisperer, not his wife.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 07:38 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 08:08 PM

Haha, I just pointed it out because I thought it might be confusing to those who don't know the show. The story is pretty fucking awful though. I can't imagine being taken to such a low point in my life by a selfish cunt, especially as such a successful guy.

hardwoodman • 8 points • 8 January, 2014 02:01 AM

Holy shit, \$276,000 a year. That happening to me would drive me to suicide....

Swifthand27 points • 8 January, 2014 02:34 AM [recovered]

Fuck suicide. Flee to a different country, change your name and live on.

[deleted] • 15 points • 8 January, 2014 03:13 AM

Or do what that one guy did and turn your million dollar savings to gold. The claim that you "threw it away".

Swifthand12 points • 8 January, 2014 03:38 AM [recovered]

The cool kids would use Bitcoins for that task nowadays

[deleted] • 12 points • 8 January, 2014 03:40 AM

Oooo good idea. Then just claim you were hacked and they are all gone.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 08:22 AM

Is this actually a feasible solution? How would one go about doing this?

elevul • 8 points • 8 January, 2014 02:41 AM

Considering my current economical situation, I'd just laugh. What are they gonna do, throw me in prison? Yay, free accomodation and food!

[deleted] • 23 points • 8 January, 2014 02:41 AM

Fuck that, *murder* suicide would be a better solution. If you're going to be dead anyways, might as well make sure the cunt gets what she deserves too.

sushisection • -5 points • 8 January, 2014 02:55 AM

Might as well put your child out of his misery too while you are at it

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 02:55 AM

What child? Get a vasectomy as soon as legally possible and avoid that nightmare.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 05:14 AM

[permanently deleted]

Exactly\_what\_I\_think • 18 points • 8 January, 2014 05:59 AM

Money is noting when you have it and everything when you don't.

Nemester • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 03:17 PM

Though totenglocke has an interesting idea, I think fleeing the country and changing identities would be the best solution.

kamal416 • 11 points • 8 January, 2014 02:12 AM

"Bitch, you wasn't with me shooting in the gym"

[deleted] • 10 points • 8 January, 2014 12:08 AM

Can't blame him.

thelordofcheese • 16 points • 8 January, 2014 04:01 AM

Women are so oppressed, and all they want is to be treated equally.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 January, 2014 10:25 AM

I think the problem is not that he got married, but the unfair divorce laws. I am pretty sure in other countries women can't do that what they are allowed to do in USA. So the real solution would be to change the laws to be based on reality instead of feminist propaganda.

Netwinn • 3 points • 25 March, 2014 03:00 PM

What a cunt. Seriously.

[deleted] • 3 points • 2 April, 2014 08:58 AM

If you read his books, he talks about dropping his alpha male attitude towards and treating her like thw beautiful woman she is. This was before any of this happened.

TRP perfect example.

plopliar • 7 points • 8 January, 2014 03:11 AM

Looks like he didn't assert his dominance.

funnyfaceking • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 11:21 AM

He attempted suicide in May. She was awarded all that stuff in June.

iseeyou1312 • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 04:19 PM

For someone who knows a lot about dogs, they know nothing about bitches.

philosarapter • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 04:51 PM

Monthly spousal support of \$23,000?! Holy shit. I bet that's after taxes too. What kind of scam are they running in these court systems? Nobody deserves a quarter million dollars annually for child support. What child could possibly need that much money to survive?!

lawonga • 2 points • 18 February, 2014 12:07 PM

Given that he obviously doesn't give a shit about his life anymore, I'm surprised he didn't consider a hitman yet

tissueroll • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 02:51 PM

...then got a dog and fought depression? Way to go Dog Whisperer!

Stopher • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 03:51 PM

1.7 million a year because this relationship didn't work out. Jesus Christ!

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 06:48 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 09:49 PM

Known as a pre-nuptial agreement. The contract may be invalidated for any number of reasons, variable by state, so is possibly unreliable.

A pre-nup is usually for protecting pre-marital assets. A grey area exists in off-shoring assets acquired during

the marriage. It's an expensive and probably risky option. Research: community property laws.

jquest23 • 1 point • 8 January, 2014 07:59 PM

Her name was Ilusión ... that was the first sign

gnovos • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 02:17 AM

What a dolt. Why not just relocate to Nicaragua and live like a god king for the rest of his life?

Rollo-Tomassi • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 05:16 PM

Relevant: <http://therationalmale.com/2014/01/08/possession/>

strangestdude • 1 point • 9 January, 2014 12:07 AM

In May 2010, after his dog Daddy died in February and his wife filed for divorce in March, Millan attempted suicide.

My heart broke for the guy.

I was in a similar situation...

Lost my job July 2012, August 2012 wife asked for divorce.

Don't get married guys, you can have a LTR without having a legally binding contract!

renotime • 0 points • 8 January, 2014 12:15 PM

Wait, that dude is straight?

otisofo • -1 points • 8 January, 2014 05:27 PM

My friend told me he plans to get engaged at the end of the year after I told him about the disadvantages of marriage.

He told me he trusts that the girl won't take him for all he's got and he trusts her.

I don't believe they'll even last through the engagement.

Don't

Get

Married.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 03:58 PM

[permanently deleted]

DingDongSeven • 2 points • 8 January, 2014 04:50 PM

Methinks the suicide attempt

Methinks you should not speak of that topic anymore.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 11:24 AM

[permanently deleted]

theredpull • 5 points • 8 January, 2014 12:50 PM

Please don't tell me your serious? If you've ever watched any of his shows you'd know that he'd be the last



person to ever be intentionally malicious on any dog, those clips are completely out of context and this dude has saved more dogs from being put down than literally anyone on this planet.

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 01:53 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 January, 2014 01:56 AM

[permanently deleted]