

# Kaley Cuoco's Husband Files For Alimony - women collectively lose their shit

October 23, 2015 | 772 upvotes | by [RedPillGold](#)

---

[removed]

---

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

---

## Comments

---

Borsao66 • 345 points • 23 October, 2015 04:56 AM\*

LOL

My ex made a good bit more than me, especially after the market crash in 2008. So after she figured I wasn't any good as a BB ride anymore, she filed for divorce. She'd been stashing away her paycheck for several years while I paid the bills, and then refused to mediate a settlement (the savings are communal property in my state). So I asked for alimony and all the sudden she realized she was on the hook and wrote a fat check to end it.

The sword can work both ways.

tio1w • 42 points • 23 October, 2015 02:19 PM

The sword can work both ways.

It can but usually doesn't...

Witness\_My\_Greatness • 15 points • 23 October, 2015 03:41 PM

Think that's bad? Try getting custody over a kid, even when the mom is a fucking piece of shit.

trprich • 8 points • 23 October, 2015 04:40 PM

The DHHS data shows that of children abused by one parent between 2001 and 2006, 70.6% were abused by their mothers, whereas only 29.4% were abused by their fathers. And of children who died at the hands of one parent between 2001 and 2006, 70.8% were killed by their mothers, whereas only 29.2% were killed by their fathers. Furthermore, contrary to media portrayals that leave the viewer with the impression that only girls are ever harmed, boys constituted fully 60% of child fatalities.

Source : <http://www.breakingthescience.org/SimplifiedDataFromDHHS.php>

Witness\_My\_Greatness • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 05:24 PM

Jesus H. that's bad. I shouldn't be surprised though.

tio1w • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 09:08 PM

Society as a whole doesn't care and can't care.

For all they're concerned if they were abused they must have done/be something wrong in order to deserve it, otherwise why would their saintly mothers harm them in any way?

LuckyLuke23 • 11 points • 23 October, 2015 03:45 PM

bro this is like the first man positive story I have heard out of a divorce man. shit..

Borsao66 • 21 points • 23 October, 2015 03:54 PM\*

It gets better. I had a good friend (at the time) who was a divorce paralegal and she wrote all my paperwork for cheap. I was slaughtering them pro-se (self representing) and they couldn't figure out how I was doing it. She'd literally hired the best divorce man-raper in the state (legislative consultant on family law).

Finally the attorney pulled the exe aside in the hall and said "Listen, the judge isn't going to care how good or bad the marriage was. Either you pay him his cut now or you're going to end up paying his cut AND be on the hook for spousal-support (alimony) for two years. Settle this today."

BEST. FEELING. EVER.

[deleted] • 6 points • 23 October, 2015 04:54 PM

As a divorce attorney I've accomplished more than a few. The problem with most men and getting divorced is they marry broke and worthless women (do not marry a woman who makes less than \$35k a year if you're going to get married). Women hate it when I ask for spousal support, demand an equal splitting of the assets (which usually includes their fat 401k), and subsequently get it before a judge. Granted this is when you have a guy who made good money for a long time but the job market has destroyed his career and funny enough the woman still has her six figure plus job and wants a divorce while the guy is trying to transition to a new gig (for richer or poorer? ladies say fuck that).

Problem is too many men just give the women anything they want and walk away calling it divorce rape. I prefer to fight it out than settle at mediation as I almost always get a better deal for my client than what the other side is offering. Last guy I took to a final hearing got \$500 a month for seven years as alimony which isn't shit in the grand scheme but the wife had to split her 401k in half (which had over \$300k in it), and she got to retain the house but was ordered to pay him rent (I asked the judge for an order of rent rather than forcing a sale as those can take forever) till the house was sold. Rent is another \$500 a month. And she has to pay him child support.

Granted this is a woman earning over a \$175k a year while my client is barely getting \$40k a year (so he gets a good chunk in child support for 50/50 time sharing with his two kids). She tried all kinds of mental horseshit at mediation and was shocked when I demanded a caucus and told the mediator to step back when the mediator attempted to insist on letting the harpy have her rant about "people told me you would do this and I said no that wasn't him" schtick that most women try to pull.

I've gone after scum bags and assholes who destroy women and try to abandon their parental responsibilities. This guy wasn't one of those guys. He's a good guy who ran into some bad luck and found out his wife truly didn't love him. I had to be his frigging cheer squad and testicle attacher. Got him angry, got him vengeful, and so far it has worked out for him.

His ex is paying for his rent (not including utilities) till the house gets sold or seven years runs out. He gets a nice fat child support check that he's using to create a college fund for his kids (his choice, I feel bad for him and told him to sock it away for himself but he wouldn't listen). And walked away with his dignity.

Guys getting a divorce, need a lawyer, not despair.

Stormhammer • 4 points • 23 October, 2015 04:17 PM

As much as I hate to say it, when my sister divorced her husband ( they just has differences - no cheating on either part or anything ), she ended up having to pay out to him.

You definitely get left torn, because you're like fuck yeah! Then it's your family... -\_-

Luckyluke23 • 5 points • 23 October, 2015 04:24 PM

yeah man rather have a rich sister than a broke one

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 04:47 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

waynebradysworld • -5 points • 23 October, 2015 04:56 PM

Keep your "advice" to yourself

[deleted] • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 05:01 PM

The fuck are you on this sub for if not to listen to other men's opinions, prick.

waynebradysworld • -3 points • 23 October, 2015 05:05 PM

Im here to learn, reflect, converse, share. Just as much bad info here from users as good info. I'm here to judge other men's opinions and guide them when they are faltering. Look at this man's life, he should be learning and improving, not worrying about helping others at this point.

If you can take advice from a world champion or a rec-league bench Warmer, who do you choose

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 05:14 PM

[permanently deleted]

waynebradysworld • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 05:31 PM

Fair enough.

I think it is irresponsible to advise men they can avoid alimony simply by "not abusing" their soon-to-be-ex wife. It doesn't work like that, I've seen multiple men RAPED financially despite being the sweetest, most caring husbands who their wives lost tangles for and decided to "find themselves" with another man and their past husbands money.

Poster got lucky, in a rate situation that he was so pathetic he had nothing to take. Wife cut her losses, realized "cant squeeze blood from a turnip" so to speak.

Trying to pass this off as normal is a very solipsistic analysis, which I find detrimental

pdtrading • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 02:25 PM

What state is that? I wonder if NY has something like this.

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 03:08 PM

[permanently deleted]

Sdom1 • 6 points • 23 October, 2015 03:19 PM

He seriously needs to chill with the 20 year old Asian bitches though.

Why, does he have a gun to their heads?

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 03:29 PM

[permanently deleted]

pdtrading • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 07:32 PM

Lol I laughed when you said that she was a stone cold bitch in the most complimentary way. I see, so New York seems rather fair. I guess the goal has become to marry up in terms of career woman, but honestly its such a bad spectrum. I thought marrying a chick from another country would be key,

(though I've been losing sight of the concept of marriage); but even those women are becoming ridiculously Feministic. I take it that you moved from New York. I actually work in Manhattan, and went to school with ALOT of these Asian girls that ended up in the big 4.

wordjedi5 points 23 October, 2015 03:48 PM\* [recovered]

Well played sir. Maybe we need to start looking at marriage the way women do, as ~~romantic~~ strictly business arrangements.

Billionairesses only please, if you want a "commitment". I'll get you a ring from Walmart, and when you inevitably get bored with me and want to pull the plug, I cash in. Watch how fast marital property laws would change if men refused to marry without financial gain, as women have for centuries.

[deleted] • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 05:03 PM

Men absolutely have to look at marriage through a business lens given how women want "partners" and not "husbands" nowadays. I handed my wife a lock solid pre-nup over a year before we got married. I made her email me questions about it and I attached the emails as exhibits when it was executed over six months before the wedding. I did create a trust where we are both beneficiaries and I have to put five cents over every post tax dollar I earn where that amount exceeds \$50k a year during the pendency of the marriage, but in exchange she waives all rights to alimony. I also put in an arbitration clause and grounds for appeal of the arbitration that can take the form of a separate divorce trial if the result reached in arbitration is inconsistent with the goal, intent, and agreed upon results of the pre-nup. I also attached all the supporting case law as exhibits to control the interpretation of the matter with a limitation on interpretation of any additional case or later reached legal opinion or stare decisis (I have fifteen pages dedicated to this in the prenup).

My wife's cousin in Massachusetts read the thing and called me and asked me if he could duplicate it for his purposes and I joked with him how he was a Mass. attorney and I'm a Florida attorney and he couldn't practice Florida law. He later figured out the equivalent cases he needed to match it.

Also, the thirty page trust is attached as an exhibit. And breach of the money thing doesn't void the pre-nup, it just creates a nuisance penalty (have a in there to make sure of it).

Child support would get me for a hefty chunk of change but that's why my corp. are owned by trusts and not me.

Avoid broke women, they are no good.

[deleted] • -115 points • 23 October, 2015 01:20 PM

I do not know the facts of the case but in general, I honestly don't think men should do this on a larger scale. You are stooping to the level of women who are either dependent on the government or on men whilst still shamelessly claiming to be a bunch of things.

I am not referring to your case just alimony in general.

Manmore • 50 points • 23 October, 2015 01:34 PM

The ONLY way legal/social injustices will ever be dealt with, is if women are the 'victims' of them.

other\_worlds • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 04:14 PM

Agree with you 100%. The double standard doesn't even register to the commenters, or to society yet.

I'm dating a woman who has never been married and I know she wants to. Unfortunately, I'll never marry unless divorce laws are dramatically reformed. It's just too risky.

This is one avenue towards that change.

Manmore • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 04:41 PM

Yeah, that's what all men should do. I seriously don't understand why people want to be so fucking progressive regarding everything, yet marriage is for some reason (read: their woman want it) something men still think is fine. The problem will be solved by just avoiding marriage altogether.

The government could just introduce new laws to deal with this though, and there's nothing anyone can do about it. It doesn't matter if the wage gap is a myth, if women and Obama says it's real, it's real. Bachelor/male tax to even out the global pay gap? You deserve it ladies.

[deleted] • -20 points • 23 October, 2015 01:55 PM

Look, the women paying alimony are a very small minority.

To get that number up, you will have to somehow have women make more money than the men which means rampant affirmative action and other governmental benefits.

That way more men might get alimony and it will finally be abolished because women will be the victims in a larger number. This is assuming women will begin marrying down in mass. Won't happen, they will get the AF and the 'accidental' babies and live off without the possible BB in this scenario.

You will end one social injustice by indirectly promoting another. Left to their own abilities, men will always make much more money than women. Again, this is assuming women will begin to marry down which is not going to happen.

TLDR; Women will have to be victims in a larger proportion to end alimony. This will happen if they make more money and begin marrying down, the latter will never happen in mass. I would not recommend stooping to their lows to even make a statement. It is a waste and there is no honor in living like a bitch.

Dbthrwaway24 • 4 points • 23 October, 2015 04:15 PM

You mean say a situation where women outnumber men at post secondary institutions?

arkane • 14 points • 23 October, 2015 01:32 PM

He made his point as to the why pretty clearly. He was contributing more monetarily than her in the relationship, not necessarily in making more or less, but paying while she stashed away. Parity is a fine ideal, but it works both ways.

[deleted] • -7 points • 23 October, 2015 01:44 PM

I am not referring to your case just alimony in general.

Alimony in general not his case.

FEMIMARXIST • 9 points • 23 October, 2015 01:59 PM

Taking the high road will get you nowhere. Alimony and other injustices will only end when women start feeling the pain.

occupythekitchen • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 02:06 PM

well had he had children he would have been fucked

Borsao66 • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 02:12 PM

Doubtless, that's something I both regret and celebrate.

[deleted] • -2 points • 23 October, 2015 03:11 PM\*

not sure why you're being downvoted but thats pretty pathetic to be supported by a woman if you're not disabled/temporarily off work or something along those lines. why was he paying all the bills for both of them and being a BB for her? why wasn't he saving money on his own? why are we upvoting someone who's literally a beta bucks (to a woman that already has money) that can't support himself?

scarletspider3 • 157 points • 23 October, 2015 04:51 AM

It's interesting how the only time alimony even makes the news is when a woman has to pay.

Hoodwink • 75 points • 23 October, 2015 05:04 AM

It's like a school shooting or tornado.

It's some tragedy to gawk at.

AdorableAnt • 34 points • 23 October, 2015 01:52 PM

Man bites dog is news, dog bites man not so much...

exit\_sandman • 8 points • 23 October, 2015 10:46 AM

Well, the 1 billion \$ settlement of that one guy made the news as well.

rp\_divorced • 21 points • 23 October, 2015 11:21 AM

That one ended in the best way possible when she deposited the check against her lawyer's advice which constituted acceptance of the agreement she was trying to vacate so she could get more. The stupidity knows no bounds.

[deleted] • 8 points • 23 October, 2015 01:14 PM

Oh no! Now she only has a billion dollars! What ever will she do?

vengefully\_yours • 8 points • 23 October, 2015 11:49 AM

Stupidity or greed coupled with lack of foresight and accountability?

Fuck\_shadow\_bans • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 02:53 PM

Link, please? I haven't heard of this one.

[deleted] • 4 points • 23 October, 2015 03:16 PM

This bitch

trprich • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 04:46 PM

Here are the full details of the Case, if anyone's interested.

[deleted] • 0 points • 23 October, 2015 03:07 PM

<http://imgtfy.com/?q=1+billion+dollar+divorce+settlement>

darkrood • 96 points • 23 October, 2015 05:57 AM\*

Here is wonderful modern Chinese saying shared among women:

"Ni de shi wo de, Wo de Hai shi Wo de." (What's yours is mine. What's mine is still mine.)

Don't be surprised if you ever get cleaned up, you've been warned.

TrueMetal • 20 points • 23 October, 2015 06:48 AM

Hah! I've heard that from my parents as well, who grew up in communist Romania.

[deleted] • 28 points • 23 October, 2015 08:39 AM

A Romanian Ex-GF used to say the same thing all the time too. Her mother was head of the house though, despite a fairly masculine father; I still feel sorry for the guy. It was clear he wanted a son and got two daughters when he showered me with gifts of old army equipment.

[deleted] • 9 points • 23 October, 2015 01:09 PM

funny, as most modern feminists have a lot in common with the communist regimes of the 20th century.

TrueMetal • 8 points • 23 October, 2015 01:14 PM

Hell yes. It's all the same mechanism as you would see in what we'd call Cultural Marxism. The sheer amount of rationalization needed for these people scares me. That hamster must be running at warp speed, the bearings on the wheel should have burned out a long time ago.

[deleted] • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 03:13 PM

Took a political history class, it was all women and the prof had a hard on for marxism so Im not surprised.

IoSonCalaf • 7 points • 23 October, 2015 11:04 AM

"Don't get mad, get *everything*!"--Ivanna Trump

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 04:22 PM

American here, ive heard this saying before as well, years before I found TRP. Just another example of how women's thought processes knows no nationality.

nuesuh • 14 points • 23 October, 2015 11:44 AM

Enjoy your equality feminazis

symko • 13 points • 23 October, 2015 12:30 PM

Good, maybe the feminist hive mind will finally end alimony.....one day. i hope he remembers to include that he is,'accustomed to a certain lifestyle and he needs more money to travel to Europe.'

Pour that red wine in your glass and sip it, Feminazis.

Ransom\_Stoddard13 points 23 October, 2015 12:50 PM **[recovered]**

The only way alimony ends is to force it onto women. We are seeing the death of alimony as we speak, gentlemen, because every day more and more women have to pay it, complain, then legislators trip over themselves to "help" these poor women.



TurduckenII • 7 points • 23 October, 2015 03:12 PM

What will happen when lesbians start getting divorced now that gay marriage has become legal nationwide?

[deleted] • 5 points • 23 October, 2015 03:32 PM

I don't know, but I can't wait to find out.

trprich • 5 points • 23 October, 2015 04:50 PM

A Kansas sperm donor caught in the middle of a child support case says he wanted to help a lesbian couple when he made the donation nearly five years ago.

Instead, he may end up paying for his action.

A judge ruled that William Marotta must pay child support, even though he says he signed documents waiving his parental rights.

<http://edition.cnn.com/2014/01/23/justice/kansas-sperm-donation/>

[deleted] • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 04:27 PM

If there's a kid involved, you can bet child support will come from the sperm donor... As for alimony, I guess the more masculine one will have to pay because masculine=bad.

ElectricFleshlight • 0 points • 24 October, 2015 05:38 AM

A sperm donor has never once in the history of donation *ever* been forced to pay child support if he followed the proper channels and donated through a licensed sperm bank. Quit being hysterical beta bitch.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 October, 2015 09:21 AM

Just because it hasn't happened before doesn't mean it can't happen, but thanks for tearing me down instead of trying to build me up or contribute something to the discussion other than just shooting down what I had to say then calling me a bitch like a child. Way to spread the fraternal spirit, bro.

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 08:05 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

drallcom3 • 77 points • 23 October, 2015 10:02 AM [recovered]

Now he gets alimony and can bang younger women (who don't cut their hair off). I'd like to high-five him.

[deleted] • 17 points • 23 October, 2015 12:53 PM

yeah damn she lost at least 1.5 points after that hair cut.

trprich • 4 points • 23 October, 2015 04:53 PM

She hit the wall.

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 10:58 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

sirmadam • 9 points • 23 October, 2015 01:01 PM

Just so you know, she doesn't have any kids.

Kolbath • 21 points • 23 October, 2015 11:38 AM

They got married after only a few months of dating... I think she might be super impulsive. Her haircut, for example: She was hot with long hair but she pumped out a few kids, walked into a barber and said, "I want to look like a Twinkie."

One of my irritations with the "Fappening" pics of her is she has that fucking hideous haircut. Why, Kaley!? Why couldn't you take your slutty pictures with your long hair?! It's enough to drive a man *not* to masturbate.

vandaalen • 17 points • 23 October, 2015 11:59 AM

I never understood what guys found so exceptionally hot about her. She's a 7 in my book at best. She's got funny body proportions, she's chubby, her face is unsymmetrical and she's got pouches like a bloodhound.

[deleted] • 10 points • 23 October, 2015 02:14 PM

I thought she was pretty cute in the first couple seasons of the big bang theory, with those bangs and the long hair (and she was still ~20). But just like the show, no one really cares anymore that she is 9 years older.

Maybe part of the reason guys found her attractive is that it gave omega males 'hope' that they get a 7+ girl.

zomgimonreddit • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 04:08 PM

She's actually hot in the pilot, then either she gained a bunch of weight or they started showcasing her arm fat. I assume they had to make her more "relatable".

[deleted] • 24 points • 23 October, 2015 10:57 AM

One wonders if they are aware, on any level, of their rampant hypocrisy.

Solitary\_Wolf23 points 23 October, 2015 12:22 PM **[recovered]**

women are solipsistic, so no.

Tman5691 • 5 points • 23 October, 2015 01:36 PM

There are plenty of women who are aware, but don't really care. After all, why put effort into changing a status-quo that favors yourself?

Dishevel • 13 points • 23 October, 2015 12:38 PM

Not just women. It is the mentality of the left as a whole. Women's rights, gay rights, racial equality, the "War on Women", all of these things are simple. A certain segment of society believes wrongly and attempts to make it complicated so that they do not have to face their hypocrisy head on.

Alqahid • 5 points • 23 October, 2015 01:33 PM **[recovered]**

Racial Equality. Oh good. My spine still hurts from the cringe I got after I read 1 tumblr post about Egyptians, Arabs, Romans, Vikings and Chinese being black and that white people are the source of evil and most killing.

It doesn't matter what I say, whether I prove more people died cause of Genghis Khan then any European ruler, or prove that White Ancient Greeks where more advanced then any Ancient Chinese dynasty, it's just hopeless. I don't even understand WHY feminazi's hate white people, while most of the time they are white themselves.

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 01:38 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

iamkarnath • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 03:38 PM

Shame is the *real* mind-killer.

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 05:16 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

iamkarnath • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 06:47 PM

I'm talking about "toxic" shame. The kind religions are built on.

As the caterpillar chooses the fairest leaves to lay her eggs, so the priest lays his curse on the fairest joys. -Blake

[deleted] • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 01:58 PM\*

They've tricked many women into being useful idiots by pandering to them that they're somehow a victim of the 'patriarchy'... but we all know middle-class white women are the biggest benefactors of affirmative action and other forms of government favoritism which far exceeds that of any man regardless of race. Why doesn't anyone bring up this point? Well they have, but it falls on deaf ears because Patriarchy.

If we go full blown Marxist, the white women will be thrown under the bus even faster than they are trying currently with the whole 'white privilege' bullshit. Divide and conquer, one niche group at a time. If the Marxists can convince society to introduce policy based on 'equaling privilege', which I believe is their end goal to enact more communist policy, the white-female Marxists will be decapitated shortly afterwards from all their benefits and authority in one fell swoop, not realizing they were being treated as pawns the entire time.

recon\_johnny • 6 points • 23 October, 2015 02:21 PM

we all know middle-class white women are the biggest benefactors

We do, but they don't. Truly. They rationalize shit beyond a level I thought was possible. I saw this rationalization mechanism in full fucking force again---from my wife---about 15 mins ago. I thought in my head "Do you know what the fuck you're saying?". She doesn't, so I just A&A and Ignored.

Elodrian • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 04:03 PM

How does Genghis' body count stack up to Stallins?

putinbush10 • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 04:53 PM

About 40 mil. Give or take. He killed enough that there was a change in the O2 levels around the world. Thats pretty fucking cool.

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 03:31 PM

The commenters on the article are screeching about how he signed a prenup and he should be happy with that in response to anyone that brings up the hypocrisy. Never mind that they're all conveniently forgetting that if the shoe was on the other foot they'd be calling for the prenup to be struck down and to take the guy to the cleaners.

popthatpill • 22 points • 23 October, 2015 10:17 AM

This shows us that the intuitive understanding women have of spousal support is that it's something that's supposed to flow from men to women, not the other way around.

This is another example of women determining society's moral standards - which, of course, they rig to favour themselves.

Dylan\_Tnga • 8 points • 23 October, 2015 02:00 PM

Wow, hypocrisy is off the scale on this one. Good find.

Another irresponsible guy that wants to live off the hard work of a woman. Seriously Ryan, Get a job and support yourself. You aren't physically challenged.

LOL. Talking about this like it's a common situation when it's the exact opposite. 90% of the time or more the woman is leeching off the mans income, and divorce rapes him the moment a better, more alpha prospect comes into the picture.

Again, this is hypocrisy at it's *finest*

remyseven • 43 points • 23 October, 2015 06:58 AM

And women wonder why chivalry died. It's because you wanted equal rights. You got 'em!

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 11:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

Actuarial • 26 points • 23 October, 2015 12:27 PM

Only shovels can be shovelrous

[deleted] • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 04:23 PM

Chivalry was pretty much just rules for sword combat... So yeah that shits dead.

Ex-AlodianKnight • 7 points • 23 October, 2015 10:37 AM

Wait, Kaley Cuoco divorced? That's fast

Kolbath • 12 points • 23 October, 2015 11:42 AM

Wait, Kaley Cuoco divorced? That's fast

It's fuckin Hollywood. I think they preprint divorce filing documents on the back of the wedding licenses there.

justadavid • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 03:01 PM

Yeah, she's the one with the gawdawful short haircut.

[deleted] • 16 points • 23 October, 2015 05:23 AM

I'm sure they can somehow blame the patriarchy to rationalize this.

hebola4lyfe • 95 points • 23 October, 2015 04:41 AM

Women are shit people. My own mother would react exactly like those women . The hypocrisy in every woman's life is so overwhelming that they themselves can't see it ; it is as if they wake up wearing it like their own skin every morning .

I think women are trolling us and society by communicating telepathically with each other. Are they seriously this oblivious or maybe they are pretending to not see it ?

To think that I use to consider taking them seriously at one point . I honestly thought women were reasonable people . Now I realize how fucked up they are .

sweetleef • 64 points • 23 October, 2015 08:10 AM

The hypocrisy in every woman's life is so overwhelming that they themselves can't see it

In most cases, there are no universal, objective truths or codes from a woman's perspective. Rules and standards do not apply equally to every person, but are applied selectively according to how that rule makes the woman feel in a particular situation.

The idea of a woman getting alimony makes the woman feel good, so it's a good thing. A woman paying alimony makes her feel bad, so it's bad. The fact that the two positions are logically inconsistent and unjust doesn't enter into her thinking.

NiftyDolphin • 7 points • 23 October, 2015 01:22 PM\*

The idea of a woman getting alimony makes the woman feel good, so it's a good thing. A woman paying alimony makes her feel bad, so it's bad. The fact that the two positions are logically inconsistent and unjust doesn't enter into her thinking.

Feelings has nothing to do with it. You're not factoring in solipsism.

Say you have a situation where two parties, a man and a woman, have a conflict and are observed by a third party, a woman (observer).

The observer, if she doesn't have prior motivation toward a particular outcome, and the outcome of the conflict does not personally affect the observer, then the observer will view the conflict as herself being in that conflict in the female's role.

So if she observes a conflict, where no matter what happens, she won't personally benefit, she'll think, "Well, if he tried that with me, then I'd...<reasons>."

If she observes a conflict in which she does personally benefit from the outcome, she's going to place herself in the role of whomever is championing her desired outcome.

So it's not "a woman" it's "me."

"The idea of a ~~woman~~ me getting alimony makes the ~~woman~~ me feel good, so it's a good thing."

"A ~~woman~~ Me paying alimony makes ~~her~~ me feel bad, so it's bad."

Then her positions make **perfect** sense. It's pure self-interest.

[deleted] • 14 points • 23 October, 2015 11:33 AM

"Rules and standards do not apply equally to every person, but are applied selectively according to how that rule makes the woman **feel** in a particular situation.

Men have Logic and Reason; Women have Feelings and Emotions.

sunwukong155 • 5 points • 23 October, 2015 02:07 PM

Oh that's bullshit. Women have reason and men have emotion. Were not robots and they aren't animals. Women are just women, you can hate them or you can love them for what they are.

They draw their identity heavily from their emotions while men form a more intellectual concept of their identity. We usually form it around our goals and ambitions while women form it off their relationships.

[deleted] • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 05:23 PM

You're right and basically said the same thing I said. I'm saying those dominant characteristics override the others. For men L&R usually overrides F&E; for women it's usually the opposite. I'm not saying or implying the non-dominant characteristics aren't present. Most of the time Men's decisions are based on L&R, while most of the time Women's decisions are based on F&E...and that is when they actually make a decision. Usually they get to subtle-hint their way through life and wait to be lead to where they really want to go. Subtle hints allow them to bypass rejection and responsibility for their actions. Brilliant really.

sunwukong155 • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 07:44 PM

Okay I gotcha. Men need to be tough, that's always been true. But trying to act like men don't have emotions is stupid macho shit that I get annoyed with.

Also when I hear people say women don't have *any* logic or reason.. Just comes off as whiney anger phase shit.

Good message for newcomers though. Rely on your reason and logical, be a man. Understand women are gonna be emotional. But don't think both parties lack the others main characteristic.

I honestly pity women. Being emotional they can't function well under the feminist society we have. Men can at least try to adapt and not get fucked. Women are much happier and better off in a traditional society. It's nothing but hard work and extra responsibility in both societies for men however, so fuck it, we'll manage.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 October, 2015 12:05 AM

I don't pity the ones who have their emotional act together. I've known a few who were pretty cool and had a handle on their Emotional Chaos Syndrome, but they are a needle in a haystack. I have no sympathy for those who manipulate with their emotions. It's like Karmic payback when they feel as though their lives are falling apart. So much of the problems we all face are self-created in one way or another. Some events are out of our control while others are not.

"Women are much happier and better off in a traditional society."

Bingo. I totally believe this. Feminism has tricked them into thinking they can have it all, and that includes trying to do everything men do: leading comes to mind. You can see why they hate the beta chumps they end up marrying. They resent having to lead. They would rather take comfort in knowing their man has it under control.

Hopefully the pendulum will stop swinging in this direction and eventually go back to a natural course of relations between men and women. At least we're fortunate to have discovered this sub and grown from it. We're miles ahead of the majority of the

population.

[deleted] • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 01:56 PM

Men have Logic and Reason; Women have Feelings and Emotions.

Isn't that how the force in star wars works lol fucking jedi's have reason and the dark side uses emotion. George Lucas was a red piller. Not a single women jedi.

[deleted] • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 02:45 PM

For some reason, I was reading up on the force yesterday. TL;dr both sides have things about them that do (and don't) line up with red pill ideology.

The dark side's (or sith's, in particular) reliance on emotion is what I'd consider breaking frame at times, but for the most part the rest of their tenets are pretty red pill. Some examples including a strong belief of survival of the fittest, using deep levels of anger to accomplish goals (anger phase, anyone?), and growth through conflict (our version would be called living by the stone) amongst others. The Jedi may have logic, but they also sometimes suffer from pacifistic tendencies and inaction due to overthinking things.

The Sith definitely, in my mind, have more of a red pill philosophy, especially when you consider examples of the ideologies of each side. Even Yoda dragged his feet at times. However, you can see cases of Sith that mastered self control despite supposedly being the more emotional side. Darth Malgus being a great example - killing off his lover because he knew she could be used against him.

I've been considering writing a sort of "philosophy of Star Wars" post for a while now. Lots of red pill lessons throughout the Star Wars universe. If there's some interest, I'll start working on it.

justadavid • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 02:46 PM

Princess Leia is supposed to be strong with the Force ...

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 02:48 PM

Supposedly but you never see her use it

through\_a\_ways • 11 points • 23 October, 2015 10:33 AM

The idea of a woman getting alimony makes the woman feel good, so it's a good thing. A woman paying alimony makes her feel bad, so it's bad. The fact that the two positions are logically inconsistent and unjust doesn't enter into her thinking.

Women aren't unique in this, though.

The difference I'd say is that the vast, vast, majority of women are like this, while only the majority of men are.

sweetleef • 16 points • 23 October, 2015 11:19 AM

Women aren't unique in this, though.

I agree, a majority of men do this to some degree.

A difference, though, might be that men in general are at least capable of recognizing that objective truths, standards, and reasons exist. They choose to ignore them when it's convenient, out of



selfishness, laziness, impulse, greed, etc., but they can at least acknowledge them.

In contrast, women seem to be incapable of recognizing them at all, if they produce a result counter to their feelings.

For example, I know a woman whose boyfriend is a petty criminal. She consistently justifies his crimes for always-changing reasons. After talking to her at length, it's clear that she genuinely cannot grasp that his crimes are wrong, at least in the way her feelings define "wrong". She understands that crime is wrong in general, but HIS crimes aren't the same kind of wrong, because of whatever reason she can invent (parenting, bad luck, malicious bosses, stress in his life, etc., etc.). She really cannot comprehend that liking the criminal doesn't change the character of the crime; it's some kind of cognitive dissonance so powerful that she's truly blind to it.

On the other hand, the boyfriend knows damn well what he's doing is wrong and will openly say so - he just doesn't give a shit.

RedSugarPill • 5 points • 23 October, 2015 12:57 PM

You just clearly explained a lot of very successful men.

kick6 • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 03:26 PM

No, they're not unique, BUT society collectively beats men over the head with the reality stick assuring that the men who are this stupid pay dearly for their delusions. Women? Not so much.

through\_a\_ways • 0 points • 23 October, 2015 03:40 PM

society collectively beats men over the head with the reality stick assuring that the men who are this stupid pay dearly for their delusions. Women? Not so much.

This is only true with regards to male-female conflicts.

kick6 • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 07:41 PM

I disagree. I think men have all of their perceptions constantly re-aligned with reality.

occupythekitchen • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 02:10 PM

Yes there is herd mentality, women biologically strive to fit in the herd so if they hear eating shit is good their whole life 90% will and compliment the taste if the majority is doing it. Now a handful will say hey this is shit I'm not eating this and that's when the flock turns on them. "Oh she's too good to eat shit with us, who does she thinks she is..."

zephyrprime • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 02:59 PM

This explanation is right on. Women's do not believe in logical thinking. Their rationalizations are selfish like those of a child.

[deleted] • 31 points • 23 October, 2015 05:29 AM

but did you see the last part, written by a woman. Some are good, some are bad, blanket statements don't work

[deleted] • 28 points • 23 October, 2015 06:02 AM

We have stereotypes for a reason. There is always an exception that proves the rule.



[deleted] 23 October, 2015 07:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 16 points • 23 October, 2015 07:17 AM

The thing is, stereotypes exist because of the majority. Just because 1 in 5 disagree or don't fit into the stereotype doesn't invalidate it.

ShounenEgo • 7 points • 23 October, 2015 07:42 AM

And I'm still baffled with how people don't understand that when someone says "NOT EVERYONE! I AM DIFFERENT" he claims that he is the exception to a RULE. He confirms that there is a rule but it doesn't work for him. He doesn't prove that the rule is false for the majority.

Somehow people don't get that.

Soarinc • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 10:26 AM

BINGO! They don't exist because of the exception, but because of the majority.

\_orion[ ] • -1 points • 23 October, 2015 07:42 AM

The positive statement was obviously made by a fat girl

[deleted] • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 11:45 AM

Can you say why you thought she was fat? I pictured /u/girlwriteswhat - and she's definitely not fat - moderately attractive, in fact.

[deleted] • -5 points • 23 October, 2015 08:07 AM

Michael Jackson named his son blanket. You got a problem with Michael Jackson?

HumanSockPuppet • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 02:57 PM

Women are not shit people. They're just shit **men**. Stop expecting them to have the principles of men.

Women evolved needing other people to provide for and protect them. Of course they're going to mercilessly seize at every advantage. It's the only strategy their biology knows.

Every social attitude and law in existence declares that women are your inferiors. It's time you started acting that way yourself.

kick6 • 4 points • 23 October, 2015 03:25 PM

They're not trolling us, they're shit testing us, and we're collectively failing as a culture.

Cyralea • 5 points • 23 October, 2015 01:18 PM

It's partly because women are much better at compartmentalizing reality than men. They're perfectly capable of picturing themselves as good, upstanding human beings by separating their good, empathetic behaviour from their psychotic, self-serving behaviour.

Most women will mentally rewrite the facts such that she is a victim entitled to the things she's taking from others. In that way she only sees the good in herself. You could literally ask all 3.5 billion women if they think they're a good person and they'd all say yes.

Were a man to exhibit these qualities most people would rightly think him insane.

occupythekitchen • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 02:14 PM

The guy who shot from the clocktower in Austin had a diary. He knew he was going crazy but couldn't reason himself out. At least he had awareness of something being wrong

runnerrun2 • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 06:20 AM

They've been getting away with it in the current left-wing political climate, that's why they keep doing it. No patriarchy to call them out on it.

foldpak111 • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 11:59 AM

I can't even imagine living as a woman. What a fucked up way to live. They aren't even capable of friendship.

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 08:37 AM

[permanently deleted]

RedSovereign[M] • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 01:20 PM

No concern trolling.

[deleted] • 8 points • 23 October, 2015 10:46 AM\*

We aren't the ones carrying out harassment campaigns against people with different opinions from us or creating entire movements to systematically fuck people over, all with the full support of the majority of both western government and western people. I wouldn't call it hate so much as provocation.

Science\_isthenewcool • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 11:42 AM

Nice concern trolling. Stfu, read the side bar and the top 100 posts of all time before you comment again newfag.

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 01:16 PM

bro I'm not disareeing with you but you calling him a newfag paints you in an even worse light than Shelwyn LOL.

Science\_isthenewcool • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 09:41 PM

Look at how many fucks I give.

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 11:28 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

rporion • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 02:39 PM

Yeah, 80 votes out of 130000...

NOW WE KNOW WHAT'S UP!!!

Downvoted, for stupidity....

plenkton • 11 points • 23 October, 2015 07:06 AM\*

Men and women both speak. One might assume both speak from rational faculty. Wrong. Not bad, just wrong.

Men's speech is formulated by response of logic.

Women's speech is formulated by response to emotion.

Again, not bad that it's different, but the assumption that men/women formulate speech the same is wrong.

Men are our specie's builders, and thus their rational faculty encourages value-creation, which is (currently) best achieved through cooperation. Men use logic to determine how to best serve each other, and therefore themselves.

Women are our specie's lifegivers, and are able to best acquire resources by manipulating/bargaining-with males. Their emotions determine who they pander to, and who they should exclude. Their emotions best enable them to survive, and thus it's their primary tool for dealing with reality.

rowdymark • 8 points • 23 October, 2015 11:05 AM

Obligatory

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 11:03 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

plenkton • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 03:16 PM

Man's cooperation stops when you directly limit his reproductive ability. However short of that, men do cooperate.

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 05:41 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

plenkton • 0 points • 24 October, 2015 08:42 AM

That is primal behaviour, which women take part in more than men.

zephyrprime • 0 points • 23 October, 2015 04:20 PM

His behavior is logical. He is preventing other males from poaching his mate. His actions are no less effective and practical than that of a male lion chasing off other males from his pride of female lions. He does not expect you to mindread and know that it was his girl. You are being solipistic and only seeing things from your own vantage point because you are butthurt. Whether the other male knows or doesn't know the girl is his is irrelevant to him. What's relevant is that another male is hitting on and potentially taking his mate away. Does it matter if a gun is shot accidentally or on purpose when it is aimed at you? It matters to the police but in the moment the only rational action for you is to get out of the way of the bullet as fast as possible.

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 05:39 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

DrXaos • 1 point • 24 October, 2015 01:59 AM

He doesn't expect you to know. He expects you to obey.

foldpak111 • 7 points • 23 October, 2015 11:56 AM

I want to see her get thrown in prison because she can't make montly payments, never gets a chance to see her kids, and driven to the point of suicide. I have absolutely no mercy.

IronMeltsinmyHands • 30 points • 23 October, 2015 04:59 AM

Bitches ain't shit but hoes and tricks.

My good friend Tupac errbody! Nigga dead tho.

wiziwig • 56 points • 23 October, 2015 07:30 AM

Bitches ain't shit but hoes and tricks.

That was dr dre and snoop not tupac.

fortifiedoranges • -9 points • 23 October, 2015 05:16 AM

The CIA assassinated Tupac and Biggie.

[deleted] • 19 points • 23 October, 2015 07:12 AM\*

We're doing crazy conspiracies? Here's one I like: Biggie died from a heart attack due to his morbid obesity, but that's no way for a legend to go, so his friends shot him after his death to make it look like he was murdered.

WesNg • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 09:01 AM

Wouldn't the autopsy reflect that?

[deleted] • 9 points • 23 October, 2015 09:33 AM\*

Probably, hence my crazy conspiracy likely isn't true. But let's double down. Maybe the examiner did a shoddy job and said "bullet in the brain, that's it, let's stop looking."

[deleted] • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 01:38 PM

Heart disease and it's oppression, smh.

slyninja77 • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 07:46 AM

It was also good for recird sales.

TrueMetal • 5 points • 23 October, 2015 06:47 AM

My good friend Tupac errbody! Nigga dead tho.

Nigga lives on in our hearts tho.

maadkekz • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 08:42 AM

Are there any precedents for this?

What are the odds that Kaley's more expensive lawyers will see to it that our man receives little to no money at all from this? Let's not forget the legal system is heavily skewed in favour of women.

onehonesttruth • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 01:35 PM

There is in my family.

My dad had very poor employment throughout his life, and brought nothing to the table when it comes to finances. My mom was the one with a solid career. They divorce, my dad asks for half the value of the home (which he never contributed for). She had to refinance her home to re-purchase her half, even though she had paid for it entirely. Thankfully, her lawyer and his lawyer agreed on the original home purchase price, and not the current market value of the home at the time (which had increased in value by like 20%).

arobotspointofview • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 02:32 PM

I think that's still true to some degree, but not as much as I used to believe. I now believe that divorce is skewed in favor of children and the person who makes less money - which is usually the woman anyways.

Brave\_Horatius • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 04:30 PM

If you look at the actual laws they're often drafted gender neutrally but the presumption is there that it'll be a woman benefiting. A lot has to do with the judge anyway. Criminal law is avowedly gender neutral but women end up on different charges or get lighter sentences

rp\_divorced • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 11:29 AM

I know this is thinking logically and is trying to apply logic to the thoughts of women which in general is a stupid thing to attempt, but there's a possibility the women who are making the comments on that article are not the usual commenters that we see on a daily basis.

These commenters might be the one's who usually keep quiet because they understand that men are still the leaders despite what the feminists say and are expected to "man up" and seeing a man come after a woman's money is enough to get them to speak up. Now, we all know they're just as crazy but I have a suspicion that this is a completely different group of women.

justadavid • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 03:16 PM

... it might be interesting to start a "pile-on" (a.k.a., "brigading") on threads like this. I know, I know, I'm just saying it might be interesting to expose women to "divorce rape", "alimony", and so forth. ... "So you're saying no one should get alimony? Are you willing to write your Congress-critter and advocate that?" ... "So you're saying the only people who should get alimony are women ... after they get the kids, the house, half the assets, and continual alimony and child support from the man? That's divorce-rape and it happens every day."

Might be fun to take the truth and post it. Regimes like feminazis cannot tolerate any truth. --D

gossrbeer • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 02:34 PM

Where are the comments coming from

RedPillGold[S] • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 09:43 PM

different Facebook articles - I searched for kaley Cuoco after I found that article

[deleted] • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 04:31 PM

"What a loser! He must be a crap tennis player and not taught by his parents that real men support themselves and not leech off of anyone else."

Real Men <sup>TM</sup>

Realworld52 • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 04:43 PM

It is ironic and easy to point out the injustice, but as a gender what the hell are we going to do about it? At what point will their be representation for the men in this country?

swank86 • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 02:30 PM

I believe most of the comments belong in MRA with the other whiners. Sure there is poetic justice with a man eligible for alimony, but we shouldn't succumb to the idiotic levels of women.

Bignmybrain • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 02:49 PM

Is it just me or does any one else see an issue with one individual who makes a shit ton on money wanting money from another individual who makes a shit tonier more of money more than the first individual? Regardless of gender, it's shitty to try and take money from someone because you can't live within you means. I don't know the situation and all I have is the title and explanation from this post, but he's either a bitch or trying to prove a point by hitting her where it hurts... Her money... Which is what bitches do. I don't see anything positive coming out of this.

zephyrprime • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 02:54 PM

"shaming him into the ground for being a deadbeat loser".

If he were a deadbeat loser, he would be MORE justified to having her money. The whole reason alimony exists is to support the spouse who has much worse income generating ability. A deadbeat loser has horrible income generating ability. What kind of job will he get? Some poorly paid low skill manual labor or service job. A person who can only make a modest income after divorce is exactly the type of person alimony is supposed to help.

Feminists are showing once again how feminism is about women getting more benefits (monetary but also sexual and social) for women at the expense of men. It is not about equality and hasn't been since first wave feminism.

wetmont • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 03:01 PM

How do you pronounce her last name? Is it like when you say Cuckoo clock? And shouldn't that be Coo Coo clock?

IMakeUpJargon • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 03:31 PM

The first syllable is pronounced "woah" with a "k" sound at the front, so "kwoah". The second syllable is pronounced "koh", so it's kwoah-koh.

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 04:17 PM

To women my/our money is ours. Her money is hers.

Her debt? Also mine.

symko • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 04:19 PM

Regarding alimony I'd like to point out that the minute alimony hurts women en masse is the day that alimony dies.

As a realist, single mothers are the most impoverished minority in America. Single mothers are on section 8, welfare, lower housing income and WIC. These women couldn't even imagine the nightmare of paying alimony. What's amazing is that feminist believe they are winning! When you don't tow the line, you get left behind.

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 04:30 PM

I hope he uses some of that alimony cheese on his new girlfriend too

BlueVegas • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 05:49 PM

So why was this post deleted?

getRedPill • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 08:59 PM

Some user posted in Los Angeles Times this comment

Ryan Sweeting is delusional if he thinks he'll get spousal support after a marriage that only lasted 22 months with no kids. He's an able bodied person with his own career and that prenup is probably airtight as far as spousal support is concerned.

User's nickname is "LaBellaLuna" and is obviously a girl. They aren't able to see this happens daily but genders reversed. They don't even notice.

ElectricFleshlight • 1 point • 24 October, 2015 05:42 AM

Alimony is never awarded for marriages that short. Why don't you talk about reals instead of feels?

TheMGhandi • 0 points • 23 October, 2015 07:06 AM

A woman usually is fine living on her own, and hopes for a man someday. A whore can't stop wanting service or entertainment from a man. Hard to say who is complaining about what, and what kind of woman would even support feminism. Let's call the spade, a spade, shall we?

Oh, and, let's only mention women in this sub? I'm getting tired of all the mentioning about those who aren't women. Are they even worth mentioning? Not a dime if you count change, or even two cents.

[deleted] • 0 points • 23 October, 2015 11:02 AM

This is exactly why I posted my post on consuming media that isn't meant for you.

comments/3pmkej/for\_your\_own\_sake\_dont\_consume\_shit\_thats\_not/

This article should be a waste of your time. rage bait, statrtng a fight over facebook on some shit that isn't even designed for your eyes.

And every BS statement in it will eventually have source amnesia. you'll forget all teh bullshit parts being bullshit, and eventually internalize it as reality.

RedPillGold[S] • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 09:45 PM

I'm don't read these female drama articles normally, this one just caught my eye

LeftShark86 • 0 points • 23 October, 2015 12:15 PM

While the role reversal is a breath of fresh air, I don't think we should be supporting this type of bs behaviour from men or women.

The article doesn't go into much detail, but it looks like they had a prenup in 2013, so the money situation should be clearly defined already.

sirmadam • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 01:33 PM

They can be thrown out, remember.

[deleted] • 0 points • 23 October, 2015 05:36 PM

Pre-nups are usually only thrown out when it benefits the woman.

johnchapel • 0 points • 23 October, 2015 01:36 PM

Females are not always feminists. So you can't exactly accuse hypocrisy here.

Frankly if you ask me, aren't they saying the same shit WE would be saying to him?

Clockshade • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 01:55 PM

It's good if he can get spousal support. So many men are fucked by the system, I'd be happy if he can fuck it

back, even if it is just the tip. Good for him.

johnchapel • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 02:01 PM

Sure. Fair enough. But the concept of alimony is fucking retarded even when you set aside that it historically fucks mostly men.

Suddenly applying it to women doesn't legitimize it. All it is now is a reason to never get married.

TattedGuyser • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 02:38 PM

There's a lot in this life that's 'fucking retarded', doesn't mean you can't use it to your advantage. If you can get a free 1,500\$ a month to put towards your life goals, shit why not? Use it.

johnchapel • 0 points • 24 October, 2015 04:09 PM

Specifically because taking a free lunch off the backs of those who didn't offer it makes one a lazy peice of shit.

tyranus89 • -48 points • 23 October, 2015 05:52 AM

Well, now we know why she divorced this beta.

Seriously, I understand that these women are retarded for complaining about this, but we at TRP know that alimony is bullshit. What a fucking beta thing to do -- you're a professional tennis player and you publicly ask for support from your ex-wife? I'm baffled if he ever gets laid again, *especially* considering that women hold resources in such high regard and he's proven he'll take them from you instead of provide them.

Although hypocritical, the original arguments were at least valid.

RedPillGold[S] • 26 points • 23 October, 2015 06:05 AM

Im baffled if he ever gets laid again

Assuming women know what they actually find attractive in a man. Odds are he'll get laid because he's already worth 2mil.

NakedAndBehindYou • 19 points • 23 October, 2015 06:25 AM **[recovered]**

Taking alimony is more of a dark triad Machiavellian "take everything I can get" attitude rather than a beta attitude.

You're basically engaging in the same "man up and get fucked by the law" attitude as those women.

I'm baffled if he ever gets laid again

He's a famous athlete. Chances are the pussy is already lining up at his doorstep.

nishall • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 09:50 PM

Also he got laid by and even married a Hollywood actress. That's huge social proof.

[deleted] • 11 points • 23 October, 2015 06:53 AM

If it's divorce time, all bets are off. Beta? There's a good chance it has nothing to do with being beta. In fact, he probably just wants to fuckin **win**.

[deleted] • 11 points • 23 October, 2015 06:20 AM

If enough men take a stance against this bullshit system we have in place, maybe someday we can actually



manage to change it for the better. I give major props to this guy for highlighting this issue for the world to see just how fucked up it is.

popthatpill • 2 points • 23 October, 2015 12:26 PM

Exactly. This is a good example of Alinsky's rule #4 - make them live up to their own book of rules.

Antibuddy-10 points 23 October, 2015 07:01 AM [recovered]

This makes no sense. How can you take a stance against a system by becoming a part of it and using it exactly how it was intended?

popthatpill • 7 points • 23 October, 2015 10:14 AM

using it exactly how it was intended?

He's not. Spousal support was never intended to direct money from women to men.

Lord\_Sif • 34 points • 23 October, 2015 05:56 AM

I think someone missed the point.

Why not? Women get alimony? Seems more of a beta thing to say that men (you don't know, no less) should just MAN UP while women can have all the alimony they want.

The only 'beta' here is you.

Antibuddy-14 points 23 October, 2015 06:58 AM [recovered]

Yeah, it's you. This post is an excellent example of the stupidity of some members in this sub. I'm not talking about stupidity as in not knowing some fact, I mean literally not being able to put two different pieces of information together.

Do you support the notion of alimony? Forget if it's a man or woman. Do you or do you not? No? Then you must be against a man getting alimony as well. Period. If the first part is true then so must the second part be, otherwise you just failed basic logic.

He didn't say women can have all the alimony they want. In fact, he said

but we at TRP know that alimony is bullshit

This is the only guy in this entire fucking thread that is consistent with his views. He is objectively looking at an issue and not changing his position based on whether he or a member of his team benefit from it. The rest of you are shams, no better than any of the worst feminists.

[deleted] • 16 points • 23 October, 2015 07:28 AM\*

Do you know how they fix corporate loop holes? When people take advantage of them. Same goes for alimony, except in this case they're expecting only women to benefit. If enough men start benefiting they will be forced to recognize how terrible these laws are and change them to make it a more fair system for everyone.

sweetleef • 8 points • 23 October, 2015 08:21 AM

I agree with your consistency argument.

The issue I have is judging the man's actions as negative because using alimony makes him somehow "weak", rather than because alimony in general is bad.

Saying "alimony is bullshit, and for that reason the man shouldn't use it" would be more consistent.

nishall • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 09:52 PM

As long as or shit system exists, it should benefit members of both sides of it. 96% of the time it benefits women. Let us enjoy the 4% of the time it benefits men.

That being said, it's a shit system but like game, if you don't play you automatically lose. Just because someone may not like how the red pill tastes doesn't mean that's not the way things currently are. Same with the law, it sucks but it is what it is and you'd have to be a retard to not take advantage of your legal rights.

sweetleef • 6 points • 23 October, 2015 08:15 AM

I'm baffled if he ever gets laid again,

If he wins, he'll have more money, and therefore a higher chance of getting laid.

real-boethius • 4 points • 23 October, 2015 09:04 AM

we at TRP know that alimony is bullshit

The world is what it is. Using the system against itself is a standard tactic. Read Saul Alinsky's books for the same thing from the left.

If you want to make men's rights arguments you can easily find the appropriate sub-reddit. Just don't mention its name here.

through\_a\_ways • 3 points • 23 October, 2015 10:40 AM

I'm baffled if he ever gets laid again, especially considering that women hold resources in such high regard and he's proven he'll take them from you instead of provide them.

He's pretty good looking and 6'5". Actually, that could be the main reason he was able to pull this off.

waynebradysworld • 0 points • 23 October, 2015 05:01 PM

Delusion bruv. Hit the side bar

Antibuddy • -11 points • 23 October, 2015 07:12 AM **[recovered]**

You're the voice of reason here and you're getting downvoted because idiots rule the world.

I disagree with you on one point: he will absolutely have no trouble getting laid.

However I agree with you in that if you object to the notion of alimony, then you must reject it in all forms, even when it benefits someone you like. Taking advantage of a corrupt system for your own gain doesn't make a statement against that system. This doesn't help end alimony. It keeps it going.

People here are just like the feminists OP quotes who were probably all for a woman getting alimony, but now suddenly against it when a man does. Here, the guys are suddenly for it when a man gets it. It makes no sense and reveals how logically bankrupt they are.

And while I'm here, let me tell you about something else that makes NO sense about this sub's membership. Alimony in a regular divorce without adultery involved is straight up determined by income and worth.

There are ways to game the system such as selling off assets, hiding money, etc., but purely in conceptual form that's what it's about. Yet, so many members in this sub want a traditional marriage where the woman would be working much less and therefore not being worth as much. They want a happy housewife at home to come home to for dick sucking and dinner, but not a professional. So they are setting themselves up for

divorce rape. At the same time, they are terrified of it. It goes like this:

1. Alimony is determined by differences in income and in/ability to support oneself..
2. Having a traditional marriage leaves your wife unable to support herself.
3. You are scared shitless of divorce rape.
4. You want a traditional marriage????

DOESN'T MAKE ANY FUCKING SENSE

-uflw- • 11 points • 23 October, 2015 08:06 AM

You must be new here. This sub doesn't advocate for traditional marriage. It advocates NO marriage at all. Because marriage is a pile of bullshit in this day and age. Now when a man uses women's weapons to expose this bullshit, we can all have a good laugh about it.

chrisindub • 0 points • 23 October, 2015 10:52 AM

This sub also advocates not having children, which from a biological perspective is..... the end of your DNA and your bloodline. Lol

[deleted] 23 October, 2015 03:45 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

chrisindub • 1 point • 23 October, 2015 04:00 PM

Well, if you believe Red Pill theory and you look at male and female relationships purely from a scientific standpoint...

I.e. This is all a complex biological game, women are sexually attracted to alphas because they want high quality DNA from alpha males.

Then it is interesting that this sub advocates not passing on your DNA and reproducing.

As that is THE MOST core beta characteristic since beta DNA is low value. The game of life is reproducibility, and you fail at that game by opting out of it.

No matter how you hamster yourself into thinking it's a good idea.

You just hamstered yourself into the end of your DNA.