

Marriage 3.0

21 upvotes | 21 May, 2019 | by OsmiumZulu

Marriage 3.0

A Look In The Rear-View Mirror

Over the past century Marriage 1.0, also known as *Traditional Marriage*, the marriage of our ancestors, was replaced by Marriage 2.0.

Marriage 1.0 was strictly patriarchal. Men had massive authority in their families and legal power over their wives. Divorce was extraordinarily rare and universally looked down upon. The legal system largely enforced marriage as an institution and resisted any alterations to the marriage covenant. While imperfect, Marriage 1.0 afforded our ancestors a stable platform on which to build western civilization.

This started to change in dramatic ways as feminism took root in the west and began to challenge the patriarchal power structure. By a variety of mechanisms, but especially through changes in the legal system and cultural media influence, men began to lose power over their home, children, and wives. No Fault Divorce, allowing for marriages to be easily dissolved by either party for any or no reason, is perhaps the clearest point demarcating the shift from Marriage 1.0 to Marriage 2.0 in the west.

Marriage 2.0 replaced Marriage 1.0 slowly, one court ruling and feminist influenced sitcom episode at a time. The shift was gradual enough that it went largely unrecognized by the average man. Thus, most men still got married, not knowing that the deck was increasingly being stacked against their success. As the divorce rate skyrocketed and children of divorced parents were forced to endure the ghastly consequences of divorce, marriage itself began to be taken into question. Marriage rates steadily fell as men began to more carefully examine what they were signing up for at the altar. The prospect of losing your wife, wealth, children, respect, and much more without recourse persuaded many men to avoid marriage altogether. Secular men especially, not fearing God's judgment, have increasingly opted to avoid marriage in favor of non-committed promiscuity. Arguably, this is one of the core tenants of secular Red Pill dogma: marriage is for suckers.

The Church's Response

Most men in the church have not followed their secular peers in rejecting marriage outright. Desiring to obey God they continue to marry, attempting to do Marriage 1.0 despite the legal realities of Marriage 2.0 being in full effect. Christian men are effectively LARPing at Marriage 1.0 and are thus afforded no legal protections at all if their wife acts out in rebellion. Certainly, Christians have proven to be better at maintaining marriage than their secular peers, but this does little to comfort the Christian man raked over the coals when his wife acted on rebellious sinful impulses.

What has the church done to oppose Marriage 2.0? Largely nothing unless you count running the white flag up a pole an act of resistance. The church has all but ceded the public square to secular society. Having lost its legal and cultural authority, the only true remaining "sanction" a church can impose is to excommunicate those that violate their marriage vows. This right to dis-fellowship is typically only exercised in the most conservative of churches in the most heinous of situations; the vast majority of evangelical fellowships refused to exercise this last remaining sanction. For those congregations that do

excommunicate covenant breakers, is it effective? In my experience, no. Given the disunity of the church in the west it is far too easy for the excommunicated member to find a home at the congregation across town. Thus, even the last remaining sanction the church is able to impose is rendered ineffective.

Given this anemic response from the church it is no wonder that secular globalists intent on the destruction of the family have pressed onward with their assault on the family. Emboldened by their largely unopposed victory, the very definition of marriage, a union between a man and woman, was put under siege. Their success in this is evidenced by the now common linguistic concession: Biblical Marriage.

The Ship of Theseus

One of my favorite philosophic and logical problems of all time is that of *The Ship of Theseus*. The question goes like this: Imagine a ship. Over time, as parts wear out, they are replaced. Given enough time, eventually every part will be replaced. Once every original part is replaced, can it still be considered the original ship?

Like the ship, marriage is being replaced part by part until it is no longer as it was originally created. The question is this: is Marriage 2.0 even marriage at all? The church does not seem to want to content with this question. As a result, pastors and elders continue to push their congregants toward state recognized marriages unaware of the significant legal, financial, and spiritual risks involved.

At some point marriage, as it is modified by cultural, political, and legal pressures, ceases to be marriage at all. At what point this transition happens is debatable, but nonetheless there is a "line in the sand" for each of us that presents an irreconcilable redefinition.

Imagine it was federally legislated that once married, a man is legally required to be castrated if the marriage ends in divorce, even if the wife divorces him for no reason at all. Would anyone suggest for a moment that this represents God's design for marriage as found in scripture? No, though far-fetched, this would be a perfectly clear example of marriage being modified into something entirely different and unsupportable.

But is it that far-fetched?

Consider what a man signs up for *today* when he gets married. Each time a man says "I do" he is accepting that if his wife divorces him for any reason at all there is a likelihood of him:

- losing a large portion of his assets
- losing custody of your children
- being forced to provide ongoing financial support for the ex-wife and children he doesn't get to see much anymore
- being stigmatized as a deadbeat loser
- having his foreign travel privileges revoked if he fails to make child support payment

The list goes on. Is this God's design as found in scripture? Not even close. So why does the church continue to insist that men sign up for this wicked and dangerous covenant? The reasons are many, but ultimately they boil down to poor theology of what the church is and how it relates to the state.

Marriage 3.0

At some point, as men continue to wake up to the reality that marriage as a state sanctioned institution has been corrupted, the church is going to have to rethink its approach to marriage entirely.

Simply reverting to Marriage 1.0 is not possible. Marriage 2.0, as a present reality, isn't going away without complete cultural revolution. Instead, it is my belief that Marriage 3.0 will be the only way forward.

So what is Marriage 3.0?

Marriage 3.0 is non-state sanctioned binding covenant arbitrated solely by the church.

What this means is that rather than seeking a marriage certificate honored by the state, a couple seeking to be married make vows witnessed by their congregation, elders, and God. They are then held accountable to these vows by the same community. Breaking these vows in groundless divorce results in the application of the stiffed possible sanctions by the church community and total excommunication.

For this to have any effect whatsoever, the church has to become something costly to be excommunicated from. While not a silver bullet single solution, this is not ineffective. Consider the Mormons or Amish. Their communities are so tightly knit, so beneficial, so cohesive, that being banished from them is a costly thing not to be taken lightly. Evangelicals have much to learn from this.

However, this is not sufficient. There must be a secular legal component involved. Prenuptial agreements have been met with contempt by most contemporary pastors, mine included. He once said something to the effect of, "Prenuptial agreements are planning your future failure before you even start." At the time, before I recognized the reality of Marriage 2.0 and all it entails, it made sense to me.

Now, however, I want to present an alternative perspective:

Prenuptial agreements remove temptation from the women and preemptively defeat the incentive to divorce for monetary gain.

Consider the man has his act together and is successful in his career and is building his wealth. Under Marriage 2.0, as his wealth increases his risk in getting married increases, acting as a disincentive towards marriage. Imagine a woman who marries such a man. Under Marriage 2.0 her incentive to divorce him and walk away with his wealth grows with each passing year. This is an ungodly incentive structure that would be wise to diffuse ahead of time.

That said, it is unfair to a woman to walk away with nothing if a divorce ensues. If a woman stays home to raise kids, there is an opportunity cost of the wages she would have earned if she had stayed with her career. Perhaps the prenup (or partnership contract since they aren't legally married) looks something like this:

- All wealth (in the amount of \$xxx,xxx) belonging to the man at the time of marriage will remain his in the event of a divorce.
- \$xx,xxx per year of marriage will be granted to the wife in the event of a divorce; all remaining wealth is to be retained by the man.

I am no lawyer, and common law marriage among other things may make this exceedingly complex in many regions (paging u/Red-Curious), but arranging legal contracts rather than marriage contracts may be a possible alternative to counteract the unjust and inherent misandry of Marriage 2.0.

A Conversation To Be Had

Marriage, if it is to continue as a recommended and beneficial institution, must undergo significant re-examination by the church. Foremost, we must recognize that men who opt out of marriage are not necessarily non-committal loafers looking to simply co-habitate. It is necessary that the church recognize that opposition to marriage, in its current corrupted form, is grounded in *rational* aversion to needless risk. Further, it is important to recognize that men being inherently possessive in nature are inclined towards commitment and loyalty. If the underlying concerns men who are avoiding marriage are addressed in the form of Marriage 3.0, men will likely return to the institution to the benefit of families and society at large.

I do not pretend to have all, or any, of the answers. My hope is that this post will begin to spark creative thinking and productive conversations. It seems clear to me that cultural deterioration will continue for the foreseeable future and this issue will become increasingly relevant.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

OsmiumZulu[S] • 6 points • 21 May, 2019 08:01 AM

Additionally, I recognize that there are obvious tax, health benefits, and visitation rights issues at hand with this issue. Those are serious considerations, though I wonder how long these benefits will be extended towards married individuals. After all, aren't those "gibs" just propping up a system of systematic oppression by the patriarchal male-dominated social power structure? /s

RedPlanetMan • 6 points • 21 May, 2019 11:05 AM

I decided many years ago that exactly that was going to be my own personal solution to the M2.0 issue. Still, I don't see it become institutionalized anytime soon as a norm because material benefits are concrete and change hands quickly.

Things would either need to change in some manner to encourage M3.0, or alternatively, men wherever possible would need to dedicate themselves to the creating a value which the M2.0 cannot match. That definitely means becoming objectively better men than then the average TRP-secular peter pan type, whether by endless lifting, a dedication to some mission that others eagerly want to join, or some objective personality trait that is of value and not found elsewhere.

Under whichever means men decide to regain some personal accountability to God, I imagine the average woman will not knowingly forego all the M2.0 goodies without a fight. Like you said yourself, I don't know the solution, just some thoughts I've had on this idea.

Edit: Some grammar.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 2 points • 21 May, 2019 06:14 PM

I decided many years ago that exactly that was going to be my own personal solution to the M2.0 issue. Still, I don't see it become institutionalized anytime soon as a norm because material benefits are concrete and change hands quickly.

To clarify, does that mean you plan to forgo state recognized marriage?

Things would either need to change in some manner to encourage M3.0, or alternatively, men wherever possible would need to dedicate themselves to the creating a value which the M2.0 cannot match.

Marriage, while a theological and holy institution by design, is also a product like any other. To sell a product it has to provide some sort of benefit to the marketplace. It all comes down to incentives: why would a reasonable man (and/or woman) make this covenant? Finding a satisfactory answer to that question is the key, in my opinion, of Marriage 3.0.

That definitely means becoming objectively better men than then the average...

This helps to answer the question, "why would a woman want to forego the legal benefits of state recognized marriage?" Only to secure an otherwise inaccessible superior man will a woman make such a concession. Think about it. Why would Susie do Marriage 3.0 with Beta Bux Bob when Marriage 2.0 gives her full legal protection and assurance of positive financial outcome? She would be a fool to take that deal, and odds are Beta Bux Bob will fold and agree to Marriage 2.0 anyway. However, would Susie's attitude change if instead of Beta Bux Bob she could secure Chadwick Von Thunderschlong? If Chadwick was resolute in rejecting

Marriage 2.0 and only agreeable to Marriage 3.0, the fleeting opportunity to secure an apex male may very well compel Susie to forgo the legal protections afforded in Marriage 2.0. Marriage is a negotiation and it's all about market value and trade offs.

Under whichever means men decide to regain some personal accountability to God

This to me is at the heart of why the church must begin to seriously oppose Marriage 2.0. Having been robbed of formal power over the home, men are far less able to steward the responsibility of being a husband as God designed.

RedPlanetMan • 2 points • 21 May, 2019 07:28 PM

To clarify, does that mean you plan to forgo state recognized marriage?

I accept that my views are likely to change as I continue growing in faith, but unless absolutely certain that I found a woman who was absolutely within my frame, wishing to help me directly in my mission, in much the same way I imagine some of the mods here have made it work (?), I won't ever enter M2.0 willingly.

Marriage, while a theological and holy institution by design, is also a product like any other. To sell a product it has to provide some sort of benefit to the marketplace. It all comes down to incentives: why would a reasonable man (and/or woman) make this covenant? Finding a satisfactory answer to that question is the key, in my opinion, of Marriage 3.0.

Agreed. A modern man would enter M2.0 if completely unaware/BP and M3.0 if there is some understanding, M1.0 by the grace of God. Women on the other hand, I feel, would always seek M2.0 because it was designed to cater to them specifically.

Only to secure an otherwise inaccessible superior man will a woman make such a concession. Think about it.

This is exactly what I was thinking. I've been thinking about some of these things for years, and I remember thinking long ago that part of the problem under current circumstances was how many TRP/PUA/etc., men act still willing to engage the M2.0 women for sex, bail and then push them to seek safety/security/comfort in a BP provider who has no other option given the intense biological need to "secure" a relationship. To follow your product analogy, the overindulgence of the top % is forcing an inflation that most men cannot afford, outside M2.0-Mart, all of whom lead to a next generation of largely BP young men, with a few natural AF who rinse and repeat the cycle.

Until men oppose the oppression of the current SMP dynamics for others, for weaker and younger individuals, I see the cycle continuing. Secular TRP is a "me-first" and "me-only" solution that only deals with the symptoms and infirmities of one individual at the expense of the larger structure, further enabling. This happens to some degree on #pill subs and the like. Still, that is far from ideal, and I imagine in the past this was solved by traditionally masculine leadership and mentoring, outside the inevitable observer-effects of a female's gaze. Problem I see is that under the Western Equality movements, all traditionally male-only spaces open to the public are now incapable of forming such institutions (i.e., Boy Scouts of America).

I think that instead of trying to attain a M1.0 situation as a goal, which I thought absolutely vital when younger, and then letting myself being lulled into, "M2.0 can't be all bad with the right girl," I am so glad I ran into the "right girl" often enough to make me realize that the foundation for that dream wasn't present on a societal level anymore. Now, it had to come down to domestic upbringing and structuring, whether the child could be raised in a sufficiently healthy manner in order to achieve full awareness of

his or her surroundings, leading to a healthy and fulfilling, God-filled life. Because even the home has been deconstructed, I believe now that the only source of power that any man in the 21st century can really seek to attain is power and control over one's own body (frame). The temple of Christ is the only source of strength we can count on consistently now that most of the institutions have failed. Strength of frame in our relationship with God, as I imagine was originally the case in a prior time.

Rifleshoot • 3 points • 21 May, 2019 05:11 PM

I wish I knew the solution, but I don't. I think we definitely need to do something, though. I don't think that the shunning approach would work. It may work on a really small scale, but not on a wider scale. I think that we need to consider what each spouse brings to the table, so to speak, in a marriage.

In the old way, the man brings protection and provision, the woman brings sex, companionship, and children. The partnership between the two made perfect sense then. Over time, as houses began to become nicer, thereby requiring upkeep, women began taking on the role of maid to the house as well. Then they entered the workforce and had to start providing. So now, they have to take care of the children, keep the house clean, cook the food, have sex, be a good companion, and have a job on top of all of that. And society is reinforcing all of those roles on them. Yet, how have men's roles evolved? Not very much. We are still considering ourselves protectors and providers. But how much do we really protect our homes? There honestly isn't very much for our wives to fear any longer. We aren't concerned with bears, or opposing nations attacking us any longer. Our providing is made worthless when the woman is also providing. What do men have to bring to a marriage today?

That is the fundamental question that we have to answer. That is why I think the red pill is important, especially for Christians right now. That is what we are trying to figure out. We are starting to realize that we have to step up. We have to look better and stronger to attract our women physically, we need to be strong leaders to set the frame for our marriages and provide direction for our households to go in. I know that we are all pretty anti-feminist here, myself included, because it resulted in the current issues we all face. However, we need to find a way to address those issues, and I don't think we can close Pandora's box now that it is open. We now have to find a new way to make our marriages work, and that means finding something more for men to bring to the table than simply a penis. I still don't know exactly what it is, but I absolutely think that is what red pill ideology should be working towards, at least for Christians.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 2 points • 21 May, 2019 05:56 PM

Thanks for your thoughts. I appreciate you weighing in, this is an issue that will take many voices to resolve.

What do men have to bring to a marriage today? ... We are starting to realize that we have to step up... and that means finding something more for men to bring to the table than simply a penis.

This approach is blue pill in orientation. I understand it because I once shared it. "Men need to step up" preaches well from the pulpit, but ultimately fails to address the *underlying* systemic issues that have driven men away from the marriage.

Simply put, men "stepping up" does not fix the massive imbalance of risk assumed by men who choose to marry. A man who develops himself into an alpha, is strong, loving, protective, and a great provider may *lessen* his risk of being divorced but it does not in any way change the reality that if a divorce does happen she enters into the "negotiation" with presumed innocence and he will not.

Make no mistake, a man who marries is assuming far more risk than a woman who marries. Anecdotes aside, statistically women who enters a marriage is far more likely to walk away from it with wealth she herself did not earn, primary custody of the children, and ongoing financial support. Does it happen the other way at times? Sure, but it is far less common.

Further, the very notion that women are getting a bad deal in marriage because they have entered the workforce is pure fiction. Women are the primary beneficiaries of Marriage 2.0 in that there is little cultural or legal expectation for a woman to contribute *anything whatsoever* and to suggest that she *owes* her man anything is a feminist "1950's is calling and wants their oppression back* dog whistle.

A woman who gets married and doesn't keep the home, doesn't satisfy her man sexually, and doesn't work, is under no pressure legally or culturally to change. Cultural attitudes have shifted to, "whatever she decides to do is right" and if you disagree and believe that women are obligated to do anything you are considered a right-wing misogynistic extremist. This is so pervasive that a married woman can murder her and her husband's child in the womb via abortion with full support from the media, legal system, and academia. "Whatever a woman decides is right", right? Pay no mind to the fact that *his child can be murdered without recourse* because our gynocentric culture has made the whims of women sovereign.

So, do individual men need to step it up to survive Marriage 2.0? Absolutely. Will that do anything to *solve* the problems involved in Marriage 2.0 and bring about Marriage 3.0? No. Marriage 3.0 will need to be a *wise as serpents and innocent as doves* Matthew 10:16 oriented out-of-the-box solution.

Rifleshoot • 1 point • 21 May, 2019 06:12 PM

I'm only talking about marriage as it relates to Christians. As for non-Christian and secular types, what use have they of marriage? It makes more logical sense, ethics aside, to just stay single and never have kids. For a Christian, that is not an option. So, we have to make do with what we have. And we are not going to be able to reliably make any societal/institutional level change to address the problems that face Christian marriage. We can, however, make changes on the individual level to secure our marriages. I think the biggest part of that is to ensure that the women we marry are devout Christians. We need to understand the psychology of men and women, in the red pill context, to understand what it is that women want and need from men to find ways to make the marriage beneficial to both men and women. Right now, marriage itself benefits a man far greater than it does a woman. In fact, it's probably better to a woman to divorce the man and get those assets than it is to stay with him, on a practical level. The only thing keeping a woman in the marriage is her love/attachment to the man or her ethical quandaries with divorce. Compare that to the old marriages, where there were tangible benefits to staying married to man and you see the predicament.

As far as marriage 2.0 goes, I think you are confusing the marriage with the divorce. The actual marriage itself does not benefit the woman, the divorce that results from it does. I think the only way to fix the problem is to either make divorce too costly on the woman to make it worth it (not likely), or to increase the value of the marriage to her. That is the way that all decisions are made.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 2 points • 21 May, 2019 06:41 PM

I'm only talking about marriage as it relates to Christians. As for non-Christian and secular types, what use have they of marriage? It makes more logical sense, ethics aside, to just stay single and never have kids.

If they have no intention of having children then yes, marriage makes little sense to the secular man. That said, for those that desire children having a stable home to raise them in is a major benefit afforded by marriage (just not the 2.0 variety).

For a Christian, that is not an option. So, we have to make do with what we have. And we are not going to be able to reliably make any societal/institutional level change to address the problems that face Christian marriage.

Is that true though? Is there nothing the church can do to

Right now, marriage itself benefits a man far greater than it does a woman. In fact, it's probably better to a woman to divorce the man and get those assets than it is to stay with him, on a practical level.

Tell me, how does this mean that men benefit from marriage more than women? These two sentences are in contradiction.

The only thing keeping a woman in the marriage is her love/attachment to the man or her ethical quandaries with divorce.

...and she gets to stay home and raise her kids in peace and not slave away 40+ hours a week as a meaningless keyboard jockey or barista for 30 years, plus she has someone to set direction for her (woman by and large dislike being at the helm), someone to fix broken things, do hard physical labor, keep up the maintenance on vehicles / home, be the "bad cop" negotiator, general division of labor, etc etc. I think you are dramatically understating the benefits a woman reaps from marriage.

As far as marriage 2.0 goes, I think you are confusing the marriage with the divorce. The actual marriage itself does not benefit the woman, the divorce that results from it does.

See above. I think you are understating what women get out of the exchange. Not all women, as some marry losers, but women wouldn't still be pushing men to "put a ring on it" if that ring didn't come with actual benefits beyond warm fuzzy feelings.

I think the only way to fix the problem is to either make divorce too costly on the woman to make it worth it (not likely), or to increase the value of the marriage to her. That is the way that all decisions are made.

I 100% agree. Men, individually, can work on the second half of that: make the marriage more valuable. The church, however, can work to make divorce much more costly for women. First, by sanctioning an avenue for non-state recognized marriages, the church can provide a licit endorsement without the legal risks that state marriage comes with. This would make separation of little financial benefit to her and would serve to increase the cost (or at least reduce the benefit) of divorce. Second, by developing stronger in-group communities each local congregation can increase the "cost" of separation via excommunication. Sure, it doesn't have the teeth it would have once come with, but if the majority of a woman's social group is within the congregation, she is far less likely to do something to jeopardize her social network for fear of being ostracized. The problem the church has with excommunication right now is that most church communities are so weaksauced that being kicked out of them doesn't mean much. Further, there is such low commitment to the authority of the church that even if someone is excommunicated, many of the members don't follow through with their role in disfellowshipping the ostracized members and thus their social network remains largely intact.

Rifleshoot • 2 points • 21 May, 2019 07:10 PM

I live in the Bible Belt, where churches are everywhere and they rarely have any interaction with one another, even in the same denomination. Even still, evangelical churches' own doctrine would inhibit this shunning effect. By their own doctrine, attending church is not part of our salvation. A woman may lose out on her friend group, but she can always go elsewhere. I don't think the church has the teeth to make a divorce sting. The Catholics may have a little more pull, but ultimately, I think those sort of steps are counterproductive anyways. Do we push people away for their sin, or do we bring them close to try and change them? I think the church is

probably doing the best thing it can do, by teaching that marriage is a bond until death, whether the state gives them the ability to divorce or not. The church already plays a role in maintaining the marriage by helping a Christian woman to value her marriage, even if she is unhappy with it. If the church tries to shun a Christian woman, I believe that would only push women away from the Church, and away from Christ. After all, how can a church teach people if they are shunning them?

The church's perspective has to be that if a man and woman are proper servants of Christ, then they won't want a divorce at all. And if the church took to the practice of shunning for sin, where does that practice end? Maybe they shun you for having too much to drink, or telling a white lie, or maybe just for being lazy and not helping out at the church picnic. The church can not forsake its primary mission to minister to the people simply to stabilize marriages. It has to consider its ministry paramount.

Willow-girl • 1 point • 23 May, 2019 04:37 AM

A woman who gets married and doesn't keep the home, doesn't satisfy her man sexually, and doesn't work, is under no pressure legally or culturally to change.

I would argue that things now are *better* than they used to be! In the old days, divorce wasn't permitted except for reasons like infidelity or abandonment. If you married a dud, but she stuck around and stayed faithful, you probably wouldn't be able to get rid of her, and your ability to attract new partners would be impaired by your married status. Nowadays, you can divorce. It may not be cheap or easy, but it's *possible*.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

Whitified • 1 point • 1 June, 2019 07:10 PM

What i actually see God doing is drawing a massive line on this issue, and basically allowing many women, post wall, into their 30's basically begging God for a husband

Elaborate pls? You believe God is allowing post wall women begging for husbands to do what?

Willow-girl • 0 points • 23 May, 2019 01:13 PM

I think men who complain that their wives won't submit to them are like bosses who say that their employees don't obey their instructions. There is a problem there all right, but it probably isn't what the husband or boss thinks it is ...

Im_not_a_robot-yet • 1 point • 23 May, 2019 08:42 AM

I agree with your analysis, and I'm glad this is being discussed, but I try to address this problem from a different approach. Educating men to know what is and is not marriage material is much neglected subject in nearly all churches. Some even preach; 'man-up-and-marry-a-slut'.

When a man marries a woman that is already de-flowered she is **ostensibly** already married to the guy that deflowered her. I know this is trying to get back to Marriage 1.0, but marrying a deflowered woman these days is just begging for failure. I know because I've been there and done that. It doesn't work.

"Marriage 3.0 is non-state sanctioned binding covenant arbitrated solely by the church."

Getting 'the church' to agree on anything is hard. Getting 'the church' to enforce such agreements would seem impossible. I honestly wish you luck, but I think you will be disappointed.

sywonsmumu • 1 point • 30 May, 2019 12:19 AM

What this means is that rather than seeking a marriage certificate honored by the state, a couple seeking to be married make vows witnessed by their congregation, elders, and God. They are then held accountable to these vows by the same community. Breaking these vows in groundless divorce results in the application of the stiffed possible sanctions by the church community and total excommunication

Would a couple then have to stay in the same community or be a part of it forever? What if they decide to leave the community? Since the community holds them accountable who knows the real reason to honor the vows.

It's a fine idea, but the amount of power the community has on the marriage is a bit much. I'm for holding others accountable, but stuff like this can cause identity issues; like not to act or behave a certain way because the community will excommunicate them seems like it can cause some idolism or lack of character.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 1 point • 30 May, 2019 12:20 AM

Historically speaking such a thing was simply called "church".

sywonsmumu • 1 point • 30 May, 2019 12:32 AM

And idols were in these "churches".

Willow-girl • -4 points • 21 May, 2019 12:06 PM

the incentive to divorce for monetary gain.

There is no monetary gain in divorce. In marriage, both people own all assets jointly; in divorce, the assets are divided, so both parties come away with something less than the total. Everyone loses.

Also, this post seems to assume that women aren't working or contributing anything at all during the marriage, which usually isn't the case nowadays. About a third of women earn more than their husband. Why would they ever consent to an arrangement that would give him all of the money in the event of a divorce?

OsmiumZulu[S] • 4 points • 21 May, 2019 04:18 PM

The example I gave was just one possible agreement. Perhaps a woman entering marriage with a large salary / inheritance is the one protected by the prenup. Either way, the current incentive structure of how finances go in divorce incentivize giving up on the marriage and this ought to change.

perfectedinterests • 1 point • 20 June, 2019 04:15 PM

Actually not all properly is not held jointly in marriage in all states.

See " community property states "