

Swedens Liberal Youth Party suggests men should be able to denounce fatherhood for as long as women can have an abortion

March 4, 2016 | 1423 upvotes | by [taracus](#)

Link to article: <http://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/article22380686.ab>

(I think the newspaper is protecting its article against search-engines so google refuses to translate it for me, translate it manually if you're really interested)

Summary: So youth-part of the Liberals suggests men should have the same option to opt out of a pregnancy as a woman

Body: The idea is that men should be able to reject parenthood up until the 18th week (for as long as women can have an abortion without special circumstances).

Note that this is most likely mostly to get attention as the same party suggested that necrophilia and incest should be legalized a few weeks back. Still the motion put the "equality" principle to a test and shines some light on the fact that men have next to no power when it comes to deciding if they want to become a parent or not (wrap it up boys and dont let anyone close to your condoms).

He also points out that this would obviously be an irreversible decision, so you wouldnt be able to change your mind once your kid is successful.

To me this is a very sound and logical idea and the fact that it plays into the "gender-equality" ideal makes it even harder for feminist to try to denounce it. Im obviously not naive enough to believe they wont try.

So what's your opinion, do you believe it could work?

Would less women go through with their unexpected pregnancies if they knew they couldnt use their babies as pay-checks?

Inb4 "cuck-old sweden", "Sweden is getting raped by muslims" etc.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

MattyAnon • 268 points • 4 March, 2016 02:21 PM

Women also have the right to give their child up for adoption *at any time* and thereby exonerate themselves from their only real responsibility in life.

Men do not have this option - child support cannot be exempted.

wanderer779 • 100 points • 4 March, 2016 02:31 PM

yeah this is the thing that makes me laugh when feminists talk about a patriarchy.

[deleted] • 19 points • 5 March, 2016 04:09 AM

The whole thing relies on the premise that men are stronger than women and are responsible for taking care of them.

Feminists should go all the way through and make it illegal for a man to provide for a woman without her permission, and make it impossible for a woman to demand a man to provide for her without his consent.

LyricBaritone • 9 points • 5 March, 2016 04:13 PM

That would make sense is Feminism was interested in equality. They want women to have more privileges and less responsibilities.

[deleted] • 62 points • 4 March, 2016 04:01 PM

I have a friend whose former SO had their child in secret, then gave said child up for adoption. The two meet up about 10 months later. She gets drunk and tells him. He lawyered up and went and got his son... Full custody. Men do have some judicial recourse, just not in the other direction.

GroundhogLiberator • 14 points • 4 March, 2016 11:14 PM

Had his child Been adopted? That must have been heartbreaking for the adoptive parents.

danielcc07 • 14 points • 4 March, 2016 11:19 PM

That would majorly suck... imagine fighting for a kid and then having it snatched away. Especially in such ugly circumstances.

[deleted] • 2 points • 6 March, 2016 07:33 AM

The child had been adopted. Adoptive parents were heartbroken.

[deleted] • 5 points • 5 March, 2016 12:53 AM

Huh what?

Was she fat as all hell? How did he not notice she was pregnant?

Dath14 • 13 points • 5 March, 2016 01:21 AM

The key word in their statement was "former." I assume they broke up sometime at the beginning of the pregnancy, then met again later after she had gone through the entire pregnancy.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 07:34 AM

She disappeared for about 10 months. They broke up and he didn't see her until afterwards.

SolarPoweredSauna • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 02:46 PM

Where is this that women can give up their child for adoption at any time?

When my wife and I adopted, we had to track down ALL of the potential fathers and get them to consent to paternity tests and/or grant us permission to adopt their child (or at least prove that we had made very reasonable to locate them). The two potential fathers who were incarcerated gave us the most difficulty....and they were in no position to support their child financially, emotionally, or otherwise.

MattyAnon • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 03:29 PM

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Safe-haven_law

When my wife and I adopted, we had to track down ALL of the potential fathers and get them to consent to paternity tests and/or grant us permission to adopt their child

Potential fathers? Why not just the real one?

Yes, when a woman gives up her baby for adoption, the father could get primary carer status. However the father does not have the right to absolve himself of care responsibility like the mother does.

SolarPoweredSauna • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 08:28 PM

The mother did not know which man was the father. She provided us with a list of the men she could identify as possible fathers. But she didn't even have a name for everyone.

In my case, the mother could not have given up the child for adoption without the father's permission. Refusing to grant permission would have prevented the adoption and left the mother with fewer options.

taracus[S] • 4 points • 4 March, 2016 03:16 PM

If a woman gives her child up for adoption, can she or the father later be ordered to pay child-support in anyway?

MattyAnon • 23 points • 4 March, 2016 05:26 PM

can she or the father later be ordered to pay child-support in anyway?

She: no, of course not. Don't be silly.

He: not sure. Probably not, but I don't know for sure.

FFXIV_Machinist • 21 points • 4 March, 2016 07:56 PM

i wouldnt be surprised if he did. we live in a country where a statutory rapist is receiving legally enforced child support checks from their victim (meaning the courts are forcing him to pay under penalty of incarceration). she raped him at 12, had a baby, and he has to pay child support now that hes 18. he also owes the back support from when he was a minor.

MattyAnon • 23 points • 4 March, 2016 08:01 PM

Yup.

Underage rape victim? You gotta pay, son

She kept your sperm in her mouth and inseminated herself? You gotta pay, son

Coming soon: she combines your hair follicle with her egg and creates a baby. Guess who's gotta pay?

FFXIV_Machinist • 9 points • 4 March, 2016 08:13 PM

which is funny because we just recently thought of a way to turn skin into sperm.

Entropy-7 • 14 points • 4 March, 2016 08:51 PM

There are multiple legal cases in the USA where a woman raped a boy and then claimed child support against him and won. That is so messed up in so many ways and yet that is the law of the land.

SecularNotLiberal • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 09:40 PM

Nope, she can't be forced to pay CS in the adoption case. Not too sure about the guy but I'm going to bet "probably not".

Women can do another thing though: legal baby abandonment. The vast majority of states have laws in place to allow this. A woman can legally go up to any designated place, usually a hospital, police dept, even fire dept, and abandon their infants. No questions asked, no identification taken, nothing. Europe even has nice little baby boxes for dumping the baby, and anyone can do it! Man or woman. No one would know.

[deleted] • -1 points • 5 March, 2016 04:58 AM

Nice, their only real responsibility huh? Guess you forgot women have brains attached too

MattyAnon • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 03:14 PM

Guess you forgot women have brains attached too

And for the most part those brains are used to find ever more ingenious ways to absolve themselves of responsibility.

[deleted] • -1 points • 5 March, 2016 05:06 PM

For a lot of women sure, but of course you know not all right? Surely you know better than that? But if you don't then please continue on with your cynical and counter productive view of women. If you're tired of meeting women who don't account for their actions maybe you should stop seeking out women to have one night stands with you, because there are plenty of women seeking to better themselves and their lives but you can't give credit where credit is due?

MattyAnon • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 05:43 PM

Yeah, because not all women are like that. There is a special snowflake for everyone. Women are wonderful. Yeah yeah, we've all heard those lies before.

And when women are not wonderful... *no matter how often*.... then it's "not all women are like that!" again.

If you're tired of meeting women who don't account for their actions

I've met and dated the best that women have to offer, and I'm unimpressed. I've known a lot of women, in many fields of life. And every time it's the same story of justifications, hamstering and under achieving. Oh, and it's always a man's fault.

because there are plenty of women seeking to better themselves and their lives but you can't give credit where credit is due?

And what credit do you deserve exactly young lady? You achieve less than men, you get more support, and oh god do you fucking *complain* about it. Everything is twisted around until it's men's fault, and that's what your post is about of course. Trying... as always... to dissuade men from the truth by attacking and shaming.

Here is a list of how you are *identical* to all the other women out there:

Attempts to shame me ("sure you know better..." and "guess you forgot women have brains")

"Not all women are like that!" claims

Accusations of mysogony ("cynical and counter productive")

Blaming *me* for female actions ("you should stop seeking out women who...")

It's all there in the sidebar, right there under "here to toll?". You'll recognise everything you've said, written out there in black and white.

So tell me again how you're a super special little snowflake.

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 06:29 PM

I'm no special snowflake, I am simply one out of many. You could say I'm more like an amethyst (my birthstone which I love), common and full of flaws! And I'm not saying you're a mysogonist per se, but you are attacking women for simply being and interacting in their natural state. Also it's funny that you should say that I blame men for my own position in life, because I actually don't. I'm fully aware of the actions I have taken before and have analysed and learned from them, and continue to account for my own actions and grow. I have the inspiration of a mother who's "hamstered" herself into a tiny box to keep me going. It may be true that on average men do achieve more than women, and it's no secret to my boyfriend that I do get a little complainy the few days before I begin to menstruate as I am flooded with hormones, and things that were not problems before become something for me to complain about in those short couple monthly days of PMS. This cycle is no secret to me and even though I do complain on a monthly basis (only to my boyfriend) because sometimes it just seems so hard, I also keep a perspective on what I'm doing and how it's really irrelevant, and I chock it up to basically needing to just let out a good cry. If you can't understand something as basic as the menstrual cycle maybe you do possess a twinge of mysogony, though that's none of my business. Besides, nobody likes a bitch anyways and if a woman can't control her actions well then she might be a bitch. But I don't destroy my relationships with people during these times of hormonal imbalance, which is naturally occurring in every woman. But hey, if you can't find a woman you like maybe you should just give up on the search. Or start playing for the other team. Makes no difference to me really, I don't care about other men. I've got all the man I need.

MattyAnon • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 06:46 PM

you are attacking women for simply being and interacting in their natural state.

I'm telling it how it is. Removal of the "women are wonderful" bullshit. Simple facts. You don't like it because you want the myths of female nature being "good" to continue.

This cycle is no secret to me and even though I do complain on a monthly basis (only to my boyfriend)

Haha... yeah, guys just love the special treatment you reserve "just for us" once a month. Thanks for that.

If you can't understand something as basic as the menstrual cycle maybe you do possess a twinge of mysogony,

What... the... fuck? This is just deranged, even beyond the usual hamstering. You're doing a weird projection thing - you've manufactured something based on nothing I said, projected it onto me, and now are trying to condemn me with the consequences of it. All completely fabricated for your own purposes.

haha another crazy woman.... we're done here, don't bother to reply, but thanks for the laughs :)

[deleted] • 0 points • 5 March, 2016 07:01 PM

Well, I would just like to add that I'm not trying to convince anyone of the inherent "goodness" of women. Nothing is good or bad, we're all just life forms glued to a planet and we weren't "created" for any special purpose. And I can see why you would say I projected the menstration thing onto you, and I was aware that I was tying in something that was kind of irrelevant anyway. But is the menstrual cycle really all that irrelevant to the actions of women? I was trying to get you to understand that women are creatures of emotion, and that's neither here nor there. And I don't reserve that special treatment for "guys", I reserve it for my guy and I am incredibly indebted to his ability to listen to me, and even put me in my place at times. But in all seriousness, men harm women and women harm men and men harm men and women harm women. Who cares? You seem to care an awful lot about the women harming men part but you couldn't possibly be a hamster yourself, right? Women are crazy!

[deleted] • 0 points • 5 March, 2016 10:00 PM

Look man, I know it's not wise for me to be commenting here again though I have to say I don't get why you would try to convince a random stranger on the internet that they are crazy and not worth the trouble simply for being a woman. I'm not gonna sit here and tell you I'm offended at the words of a stranger who I've never met, but I hope you learn some wisdom. I had to comment when you said women exist only to have babies, because women don't like that. There are plenty of us who don't care about children and don't want one. Granted, biologically the purpose of a woman's nether regions is to produce offspring but evolution is a real thing and as our species becomes more and more adapted to an easy life with no real threats of extinction, our purpose also evolves. Women are sort of in a transitional phase and while I wouldn't call myself a feminist I can understand their violent lashing out at the norm, though it doesn't appear to be productive anymore at all. Which is why I appreciate this sub and the concept behind it, because I have seen and felt firsthand the beauty of a successful male-female relationship. Aaaaand I mentioned menstruation and the fact that women are ruled by emotions to serve as a potential eye-opener for your naive pigeon-holing ass. Many women, myself included, do not allow their emotions to jade them and are actually able to use reason and perspective to stabilize themselves and their actions. This is why I said you might be mysogonistic for not understanding the menstrual cycle and thus mocking women for simply being. Yeah yeah maybe you were hurt by a woman or, excuse me, "unimpressed". But I say to YOU to get over it and stop

hating women. It is incredibly counter productive. Every argument you have made against women has missed the mark in some way or another pertaining to me, because a one size fits all description actually doesn't even fit most perfectly. But possibly the two most hilarious parts of your argument to me are 1. When you say "And what credit do you deserve exactly young lady?" then go on to make broad and generalized statements about women. And then the other part where you said all women's problems basically boil down to blaming something on a man. I actually had to laugh out loud at that one because I don't blame any man for my problems, of which I am on top of like any normal person. I guess you want me to say I blame my father or something? I don't know. Or perhaps an ex who damaged me or a stranger or uncle who raped me. Truth is, I don't blame anyone for anything, and I don't even have the impulse to. When you said all women blame men, I literally sat here racking my brain trying to see if there was a man I blamed for some aspect of myself and guess what? I was drawing blanks. Nope, doesn't even occur to me to blame other people for my own problems lol. But I guess AWALT mafacka. And as for your question, I do have a lot to be proud of though I wouldn't say I deserve credit because I don't just expect people to acknowledge my accomplishments, and actually I don't care if they do. But I am proud of my humble journey so far, and you are right I am quite young, 20 to be exact. And you make another assumption about me as a female considering your rash judgements prior, but my boyfriend actually doesn't make a ton of money and is in fact currently an unemployed student who is studying art. That is his life and there is nothing for him but to paint, and I love every bit of him. I am also a student and I am a biology major who will go on to study neuroscience, and I am not half assing it either, I qualified for honors classes and will be seizing the opportunity next semester. And I did this all on my own, I applied to the college and signed up for federal student aid and through careful consideration and introspection decided what I wanted to study and found something that fits my passions to a t, all without the help or encouragement of either parent. And guess what? I'm happy and burden free, if you can believe such a thing. Well, not free of financial burdens of course but yes I am free of emotional burden. I know what I want (shocking, I'm aware) and I will take it because I've never been handed anything in my life and it's ridiculous to assume the world owes me anything anyway, so I don't. I actually live life and yes I do get a bit emotional at times, but that doesn't tear down any of my progress nor does it discourage me one bit. It's just a hormonal wave I gotta briefly surf and yes I do recognize the seemingly useless hurdle that creates that men don't have, and I would consider a hysterectomy if I didn't just love being a woman so damn much. Sue me.

MattyAnon • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 12:08 AM

Seriously... please recognise that you have a problem here. Probably with men. You insist on making accusations, misquoting, making assumptions, being consistently sexist, and assuming I am identical to other men (here's a clue: I'm much, much worse than other men).

Allow me to be concrete for a second:

you said women exist only to have babies

Never said this.

Many women, myself included, do not allow their emotions to jade them .. able to use reason and perspective to stabilize themselves and their actions

Except you're not. You're emotionally raging and babbling incoherently. But I'll come back to this.

And then the other part where you said all women's problems basically boil down to blaming something on a man.

Nope, didn't say this either. I said women always blame men for their problems. You're imagining things again.

And you make another assumption about me as a female considering your rash judgements prior, but my boyfriend actually doesn't make a ton of money

Err... where did money come from? I never mentioned money and your boyfriend.

Look... you have a problem, and I've seen this before with women. You make something up that I've said, and then attack me for it. You do this because you *imagine* a problem, *project* it onto me, and then *fight back* yourself against this imagined attack.

And it makes you look insane, because now you're stating things as facts that are provably false, that never happened, that only exist in your mind. Read back. See that I never said the things you've made up. You can't still claim you are reasonable and rational after doing this. In the space of a few short posts you have degenerated into literally making things up like a child, misremembering, and believing that you're 100% right.

But hey... don't take my word for it. Read back and check for yourself. You're reasonable and logical right? See my objections above, read back, observe how the comments you made are manufactured, and then come back here and apologise for making all this stuff up. Hahaha I'm joking of course, no way you've got that level of responsibility. It's not how you are.

Accept your nature as I have... stop trying to persuade other people you're rational and reasonable and logical... be female, accept that you're basically emotional and a bit crazy... try if you can to stop actually manufacturing "facts"... and live your life as you are. You're not a man, you'll never be a man, responsibility and logic are just not going to come naturally to you.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 12:50 AM

Firstly thanks for taking the time to actually reply with careful thought, I do realise I rambled quite a bit but I don't assume you are like other men because I don't assume all men are like something. I did still assume some things about you though to be fair you did the same of me. I initially wanted to prove to you that I am not the enemy, as it seemed to me that you considered women to be a pretty big problem. But I think the old adage "Can't live with em, can't live without em" applies here. As for some of my paraphrasing of the women's problems boiling down to blaming men, I may have phrased that poorly and unintentionally conveyed a different meaning than what you intended. What I meant was what you said, that women always blame men for their problems.

Which may be generally true, I'll give you that. But YOU projected that onto ME and yeah obviously I didn't like it. Pertaining to the boyfriend/money thing I did jump to a conclusion there considering you're redpill and I assumed you also thought I was hypergamous in nature which I am not. But you cannot say that you didn't make a plethora of assumptions about me as well. But I don't believe I'm 100% right, or even mostly right. I don't see things as black and white like that. Admittedly I first became upset when you said you've met and dated the best that women have to offer and are still unimpressed. Like I said before I'm not trying to convince anyone of the inherent goodness of women because I don't believe they possess it, or anyone for that matter. And I loathe the correlation between motherhood and sainthood that this and many cultures make, that mommy can do no wrong and would never do anything to hurt her children. Mothers are simply women that got laid. So yeah, I get that. I do accept my nature as I've already told you, but it doesn't mean I'm not capable of reason. It means I'm passionate and capable of going off on a tangent for something I believe. Not implying that's a positive thing, just that it is a thing. Also I'm not sure of this truth you seem to think I'm dissuading men from. I'm a loner and I've not really experienced a whole lot of camaraderie with women and in fact preferred the company of myself to large groups of girls from a young age. Not saying I haven't had excellent female friends because I have. But because of my family and my single mother who raised me, I have been acutely aware of the problems which plague women from a young age and have actively tried to distance myself from it, to only some success. Obviously I still have work to do, but raising babies is not a woman's only real responsibility!

jokerscon123 • -2 points • 5 March, 2016 09:09 AM

Child support is for the child. To make sure the child is clean and warm and in clothes that fit. I never understand why men think child support is so bad! Yes women can choose to abort a baby and then there is no baby to take care of and no money needs to be spent. But if there is a baby, then both parents should support it financial and emotionally support them. It's not fair to leave the financial responsibility to one parent when it took two parents to make the baby. It should be about what's best for the child, not what's best for mummies and daddies

capt_quackers • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 10:25 AM

It is not the child support that is bad, forcing men to pay child support for an unwanted kid, considering they have no option to abort the pregnancy, is wrong. It is not fair to put the burden of having a baby on one parent, but neither is sentencing someone to take on the responsibility for a child in case of an accident, as contraception might always fail. Not to even mention "accidents" orchestrated by women.

AudioRebellion • 3 points • 5 March, 2016 11:08 AM

I think the real problem with men paying child support is with girls using the money to buy whatever shit they want and NOT using the money to buy the needed things for the child

MattyAnon • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 03:13 PM

Child support is for the child.

And yet it is not audited not checked. Women make on the deal, enough to support her as well as the child. If she decides to spent however much of that on a nicer house /car/ whatever instead of the child, that's totally legally allowed.

Child support is bad because it *motivates* women to trap men with pregnancy and break up families to get that unconditional paycheck. Women would be a lot better behaved if they were financially responsible for keeping their marriage promises, rather than getting a free pass at every turn.

But if there is a baby, then both parents should support it financial and emotionally support them.

Noone is making women financiallly responsible for their children. Women have the right to child support, state support, and the right to give the child up for adoption.

Men are legally obliged to provide all financial support.

It should be about what's best for the child, not what's best for mummies and daddies

Ah but the long term view is the EFFECT of the laws you create. Child support and alimony financially motivates women to break up families.

The best interest of the child is that the mother doesn't alienate the father for financial gain. Yet that's exactly the motivation provided by out laws.

adam-l • 2 points • 6 March, 2016 09:21 AM

Besides legal obligations, there is an ideological and emotional pressure on the man to keep providing for his children, no matter what (crazy ex, children turned against him, etc).

The answer to this is that men have a *moral* right to *abandon* their children - as much hurtful as abandonment can be for a child.

In some cases, the most a man can do is protect what little is left of himself, even if it means completely cutting off ties with his child.

There is much to be said from an evopsych perspective about it (fatherhood is more of a social relationship than motherhood, which is more biological), but the main point I want to make is about the morally ingrained social expectations (keep providing), which account for extreme stress - or a relative relieve for men.

Whisper • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 06:39 PM

It should be about what's best for the child, not what's best for mummies and daddies

So how long should a woman's prison sentence be if she has an abortion?

jokerscon123 • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 10:41 PM

.... That doesn't make sense. If a woman has an abortion there's no financial or emotional responsibility for either adult

Whisper • 2 points • 6 March, 2016 01:13 AM

So the rights of the child trump the rights of the parent, but if the mother decides to kill it, it's no longer a child, so it doesn't have any rights.

Your mental gymnastics are truly a wondrous thing to behold.

jokerscon123 • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 06:16 AM

A bunch of cells have no rights. A breathing, talking and walking little child does. It's not hard to understand. A bunch of cells that may develop into a baby has no more rights than my lungs or anyother human tissue inside of me until it's outside the mothers body and becomes an independent human being all of its own. Bunch of cells needs no child support, real life baby needs child support.

That's the reason you don't pay child support to your pregnant girlfriend, because there is no baby until it's outside her body

It's not a challenging subject

Fuck_shadow_bans • -7 points • 4 March, 2016 03:18 PM

There's no age ceiling on adoption? I can give my 16 year old teenager up for adoption?

Da fuq?

Are you sure about that?

MattyAnon • 14 points • 4 March, 2016 05:25 PM

I can give my 16 year old teenager up for adoption?

Of course you can't, you're a *man*.

Only women can do that. Because they're the responsible ones. Err wait..

99639 • 7 points • 4 March, 2016 07:31 PM

In the US women can, men can't.

Screenp2 • 9 points • 4 March, 2016 04:35 PM

not without a little legal paperwork but basicly if you want to give up parental rights you can. Parents find themselves in jobless situations and the best interest of the child would be to place them in foster care while the parents get back on their feet.. sometimes those feet keep walking

baykahnsewduh • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 08:55 PM

Reminds me of the kid from Angels In the Outfield

[deleted] • 4 points • 4 March, 2016 09:14 PM

Yo fuck that kids dad though

Entropy-7 • 119 points • 4 March, 2016 11:49 AM

This idea has been floating about for a few decades. Back in the late '90s when I was on the university debating team I ran a case called "BYOB: bankroll your own baby". Same basic idea: a guy can opt out of fatherhood. So no parental rights, but no child support obligations either. Then it's up to the woman to decide if she will follow through with the pregnancy.

A few guys have tried to make a legal case out of it but the courts would not indulge them. I'd have to do a bit of digging but I recall one case in Quebec and another in America but they crashed and burned.

It is a curiosity as to whether women would get an abortion if the guy got himself a "financial abortion".

The reality is that once a baby is on the scene, the government will flail about to tag some guy to foot the bill

rather than use taxpayer money from general revenues. As much as you will hear women go on about how horrible an idea this is, it really has nothing to do with "taking responsibility" (which is a complete joke coming from a woman).

The standard argument that women have is "keep it in your pants if you don't want a kid", but it is totally lost on them that women have no obligation to keep it out of their pants, and they can always dodge the bullet by heading out to Planned Parenthood regardless of what the putative father thinks about it.

There have also been cases where a woman will get pregnant and then extort the father's family: "Pay me cash or I will get an abortion".

The logic is sound and the thrust of this sort of policy would be fair, but feminism has never been about logic nor fairness. It's just about women seeking resources from men while offering nothing in return.

The courts and the politicians - as well as about 80% of the guys in the general population - are so cucked that this policy would never fly. Even if you could sneak it past 50%+1 vote in any legislature, the SJWs would come out in force and say it is unconstitutional, and the courts would be all too happy to strike it down.

u-r-silly • 38 points • 4 March, 2016 05:11 PM

Women fought for their right to abortion and contraception. The "keep it in your pants" argument and "take responsibility" make absolutely no sense.

whatsazipper • 12 points • 4 March, 2016 11:52 PM

It makes sense when you realize they're arguing in favour of anything that benefits themselves, even if it logically contradicts previous successes.

TRPmmm • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 05:45 AM

Since when has any large demographic ever argued in favour of another though? The problem is that most men are too spineless and concerned about being politically correct to stand for themselves. Most men see a sacrifice of their own rights for those of a woman as a noble cause.

whatsazipper • 4 points • 5 March, 2016 12:17 PM*

Since when has any large demographic ever argued in favour of another though?
Most men see a sacrifice of their own rights for those of a woman as a noble cause.

You said it yourself.

Yesterday, some betas at work were arguing for schemes that would redistribute money to women (topics were children, families, maternity leave). They were horrified that I argue on my own behalf instead of caving into self-sacrifice. They always love pulling the "greater good" line, too. If I'm less of a liability and produce more value, then no, you shouldn't tax me, you should pay me more.

[deleted] • 9 points • 4 March, 2016 07:44 PM

There is a third option from child support or tax money. That is leave the woman without any assistance and it's the only right thing to do. Otherwise you kill your society.

Entropy-7 • 9 points • 4 March, 2016 08:03 PM

The angle is always that the assistance is for the child, not for the woman. "THINK OF THE CHILDREN!"

fiercealmond • 14 points • 4 March, 2016 08:09 PM

This girl I have been dating has a millionaire father she has no contact with, her mother takes 2000 plus dollars a month in child support and uses it all for rent and food for herself. She's in college now and still wearing clothes from middle school to college some days. Child support is the fucking worst. I've told her she has leverage on the situation, but since her mother (who has a masters in occupational therapy) hasn't worked in years, she only makes money from child support, thinks it would ruin her mom's life or something.

PapaFedorasSnowden • 8 points • 4 March, 2016 09:58 PM

On the other hand you have people like me. My mother works ~70hours a week because my (rich) father won't even talk to us. My only criticism for the RP view on child support is that the man IS the provider, and the child is as much his responsibility as it is hers. No one should have the right to renounce to their children. This is why I believe the father should have to co-sign the abortion. In the case of rape (more often than not it is legit, but we hear about the exceptions), a court order can override either parent's wish. Obviously it's not going to happen, but that's how I'd structure it.

fiercealmond • 5 points • 5 March, 2016 12:29 AM

I'm of course not claiming that all mothers do that. I think that father's should have the choice to take custody if the mother wants an abortion, but on the flipside father's shouldn't be forced into paying child support. Both parents should be equally responsible in an ideal world, but in reality its the mothers decision to keep the baby so it should be her responsibility to find a decent father or else raise the baby. But you know, I might be a little biased, my 3 year-old's mother took off to live with her coworker and left her with me, so I don't really have any sympathy for "moms who got stuck" or something like that. I have had 0 choice in the matter and get 0 money from her or her family. I'll always love and support my daughter and don't need to garnish her mother's wages for two decades, even if she is a piece of shit.

PapaFedorasSnowden • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 01:55 AM

I fully understand your point, given your situation, but I grew up without a father and barely had a mother because of that very point. After the child is born and the parent is registered, the law must interfere when one does not want parenthood anymore; that is not how it works, you don't pick and choose when the child is yours or not. The impact of not having a mum is very big. As much as you love her, you can never be a mother and a father. I'd be inclined to think that you would have sympathy for mums who got stuck, since you "got stuck" with your daughter, but it is all a matter of perspective. My experience as an abandoned kid says that if the parent is not going to be present, they should at least pay so the other can be there more often and try to substitute the other.

I have had 0 choice in the matter and get 0 money from her or her family. I'll always love and support my daughter and don't need to garnish her mother's wages for two decades, even if she is a piece of shit.

Of course you don't, neither does my mum, but if your daughter's mum, and my father both paid, we (your daughter and I) could actually spend more time with the parent that *does* care about us. The only thing is that a requirement for child support which states that all child support money must be used *for* the child, either at the moment or to be put into a fund, should be set.

fiercealmond • 3 points • 5 March, 2016 04:01 AM*

First off, I don't see myself as getting stuck with my daughter at all, most fathers don't get the chance to spend time with their kids like I get to!

So, I see the distinction you are making. Yeah, both parents should have a limited time to opt out consequence-free (legally at least). The law is just lopsided. If you have money for a good lawyer, you can end up not paying your fair share. If a mother has nefarious intentions, the law can give far too much power to her. It should be a flexible, pragmatic system, allowing parents to find alternative ways to contribute, instead of wage garnishment or imprisonment. Wage garnishment is just not a power I think the state should have, and we all know how great jail makes dads. Especially when they get out at baby mama is chomping at the bit for that court ordered back-pay.

PS. It's nice to see someone in trp who doesn't see all women as diagnosed psychos. Mad respect for your mom coming from a single dad!

PapaFedorasSnowden • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 12:53 PM

Sorry, I wasn't clear. I didn't mean you didn't want to be with your daughter, I just said stuck in the sense that you "never expected to raise her by yourself."

All the best for you and your daughter.

FunAndFreedom • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 03:58 PM

Not to go after you personally, but I can see things from a fathers point of view.

Once the marriage has been shattered and the children become a liability, the best way to maintain happiness is to have a clean break. The father may need to work a little extra to offset the cost of child support/alimony, but emotionally he can have freedom. He can recover and have a new life without a connection to the failed family.

It's also the ultimate Nuclear option fathers have. In most cases the divorcing mother wants the father to stay "a father", while getting those checks every month to subsidize her life. If the father agrees to pay the monthly costs, but severs contact from the family, the mother is in a much worse position. All her power plays go out the window and she is left with a few grand each month, which given women's money management skills isn't a lot.

If I were married with kids and my wife did me dirty in a divorce, I'd pay whatever checks I had to pay but then focus my energy entirely on myself.

[deleted] • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 09:23 PM

She's in college now and still wearing clothes from middle school to college some days.

You have quality girl if she still fits in clothes that are 4-8 years old.

fiercealmond • 3 points • 5 March, 2016 12:22 AM

Yeah, she's tiny and cute, but I don't really like being out with her when she got rhinestone ass jeans.

[deleted] • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 08:13 AM*

Take the money you would use to go out.. and buy her some new jeans.

Netflix and jeans.

fiercealmond • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 05:31 PM

Oh, I have, but it's a bit of a process

hhamama66 • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 04:47 PM

The thing that people don't realize is that a child cares more about growing up with both parents than they care about having those "kick ass new Nike's" or whatever.

I lived in a foreign country for a good period of time away from my parents and was jealous of all the kids my age who lived with their biological parents, while I lived with relatives. I felt like an ugly duckling lol. Anyways, after months of kicking and screaming I finally get brought back to the US. Meanwhile, my mom is working nonstop and my dad is pursuing other things and can't be bothered to give a fuck. I've gotten into numerous arguments with both my parents about how a child needs the guidance of both their parents and not just their money since it does them nothing. But as usual, they were stubborn as mules and didn't want to give up their view points. Finally, it hit me that if I wanted to become a real man, I'd have to drown out all the stupid shit they had to say as none of it is logical. I'm still trying to find myself to this day, but luckily I was smart enough to avoid doing anything that would land me on jail or ruin my record for the rest of my life

fiercealmond • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 05:35 PM

Well she's adopted and doesn't really want time with her parents, but I have had the same experience as you with my parents (divorced). My dad's the type of guy who tries to throw money at emotional people because he doesn't have the attention span. I spent my teenage years trying to explain to him I just wanted to go back to watching a movie with him or playing quake. Don't need a bigger tv, don't need a new gameboy... I need attention from my dad. Didn't get through to him, and he is worse with my little brother because he doesn't try and fight it.

hhamama66 • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 05:41 PM

After a while, I realized that even if I did manage to convince them I was right (which is impossible with this world parents who think that their age magically makes them more intelligent and wise), I would gain nothing of value from them. So I decided to just give up on them. Best decision I've ever made. The only thing I can say is, if you plan on having kids (if you don't, I won't judge, I don't want them either), don't make the same mistakes your parents made. Or better yet, don't have children you're not ready or are unwilling to take care of.

[deleted] • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 08:23 PM

Which in an ideal world is a valid reason. Children are in fact the future of our society, and as such we should be raising them right. To do so you need to be able to feed your child a basic meal and clothe them, and if the family cannot do that it's up to the public to do it because the only way to get winners in your society is to raise winners in your society.

Overkillengine • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 12:32 AM*

Then the funds should be handled by a (randomly rotated) case worker, not the mother.

The best interest of the child is to have their assistance handled by someone without a conflict of

interest.

Which is how pretty much all social welfare programs should be handled to be honest- just handing someone money and expecting them to use it for its intended purpose without some sort of oversight is naive and stupid.

Edit: Especially to someone that has already demonstrated poor decision making in that they got knocked up without having a personal plan for providing for the child on their own and didn't pick a man that would stuck around either.

Entropy-7 • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 03:17 PM

Won't happen: courts have far too much faith in the good judgment of mothers.

CuilRunnings • 4 points • 4 March, 2016 08:04 PM

"Oh, but what of the poor children!" screamed liberals, women, and the feeble-hearted all in unison!
"Who would leave them to starve on the streets?!?!"

heldericht • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 09:55 PM

Well...? What's the answer?

I'm all for equal rights for men, but I don't see a valid solution to the problem. It's much easier for the man to walk away than for a woman to go get an abortion.

Overkillengine • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 12:34 AM

Then the funds should be handled by a (randomly rotated) case worker, not the mother.

The best interest of the child is to have their assistance handled by someone without a conflict of interest.

Which is how pretty much all social welfare programs should be handled to be honest- just handing someone money and expecting them to use it for its intended purpose without some sort of oversight is naive and stupid.

Edit: Especially to someone that has already demonstrated poor decision making in that they got knocked up without having a personal plan for providing for the child on their own and didn't pick a man that would stuck around either.

heldericht • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 01:15 AM

Fair enough. That can be an alternative, although the same people will rail against unnecessary government interference in their lives. But a 3rd party being involved would be the fairest way to go about it, it would seem.

Overkillengine • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 02:49 AM

I would posit that they were free to conduct themselves in a way that would have kept them free from government involvement, but chose not to do so.

Additionally, I would posit that government involvement *should* be inconvenient so as to encourage independent and responsible citizens.

Unfortunately I am not Glorious Dictator for Life.

break_main • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 10:05 PM

Yeah call those people assholes, then forget to explain why they are wrong.

CuilRunnings • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 10:10 PM

I can't, without making myself look like a bigger asshole. To be honest, I don't give a fuck if someone who has completely different views on delayed gratification and diligence than me, has a 5th kid they can't feed. I say fuck it, let them starve on the streets. You'd probably end up with the same amount of people starving now, after people adjusted their behavior, but the transition would not be pretty. People are nothing but dumb animals who like to pretend they're better than the forces of nature.

break_main • -3 points • 4 March, 2016 10:12 PM

You still look like a bigger asshole, and now an imbecile to boot

CuilRunnings • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 10:16 PM

I can't, without making myself look like a bigger asshole.

Ok, good thing I already got that out the way myself...

break_main • -3 points • 4 March, 2016 10:02 PM

Ahh, the Medieval option. A woman who gets pregnant becomes a whore, the kid becomes a criminal, and you don't get ANY ass until marriage because most women don't take any chances, so you go to whorehouse and get chlamydia. Women who do get pregnant dump their babies in the forest and join a nunnery

[deleted] • 6 points • 4 March, 2016 10:28 PM

What would you call a woman who deliberately (it's 2016, the pill exists) gets pregnant by a stranger?

A single woman can support a child without government assistance or child support. Food and clothes are cheaper than ever before.

And in medieval times, people had much larger families than today, so your point is worthless.

break_main • -1 points • 5 March, 2016 01:54 AM

She might be called woman without access to contraception, or who fears ostracism from her family/community, or who fears complications related to abortion.

I agree a lot of women take advantage of child support laws. But hearing you guys talk about this, it sounds like you guys all have this perverse view of women, that they are the enemy, and yet you want to fuck them without consequence. I don't want to live in a society where guys like you fuck girls without a condom on and then force them to either undergo abortion or raise the child in a single parent home.

Sorry if I don't take your word for it that being a single mom is easy. Most research shows that it is bad for the kid, even with support. The census bureau report for 2013 says that 28% of single parent homes live below the poverty line, and about 3/4 of these come get most of their money from child support. And many of the women that would let themselves get knocked up by dumbasses like you are probably too stupid to get a good job.

I don't see what your statement about ppl having bigger families in medieval times has to do with this argument.

But I stand by my argument that some form of support for single moms is necessary, because the kids will have worse outcomes if there is no help for them.

The idea that unmarried women will make smarter choices if you take away all support for mothers is ridiculous. First, most ppl on TRP seem to be of the opinion that women are stupid or irrational, so it sounds weird to hear a red piller say that women will make the smart choice. And furthermore, many women become mothers at a very young age, before they are responsible adults. Finally, no matter what consequences, women and men will have sex and get pregnant and desire to raise the kid because that is what 2 million years of human evolution has programmed them to do.

I have seen this theory of history floating around here before that feminism, single moms, etc are the cause of societal collapse, and it makes me laugh every time. It cracks me up to see how you try to apply your reactionary ideas to everything you see. The idea that TRP explains societal collapse is absurdly reductionist. Too bad no one told Edward Gibbon, he could have reduced his classic *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* from six volumes to a single thread on reddit

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 01:04 PM

You attribute a lot of ideas to me that you've heard from somebody else or maybe imagined. Maybe you have a hard time finding somebody with enough patience to discuss with you. There are many flaws in your reasoning above, but I won't go over them, because at one point it comes to you either get it or you don't. I don't have the patience to discuss with somebody who doesn't want to understand.

Keep on cuckin'

break_main • 3 points • 6 March, 2016 10:48 PM

This is a great reply, and useful in every situation:

Someone disagrees with you, makes a few points.

Reply: You are wrong, and you are too stupid to understand why youre wrong, so i am not going to reply. Also your wife cheats on you.

Hope you dont mind if i try it out a little

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 04:53 AM

a woman without access to contraception

I have a dare for you: call up your local drugstore. Ask them the price of a prescription for three months of generic orthodox-tri-cyclen, cash.

There's no such thing as a woman without access to contraception, unless she also is without access to Starbucks.

strps • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 08:30 PM

The courts and the politicians - as well as about 80% of the guys in the general population - are so cucked that this policy would never fly. Even if you could sneak it past 50%+1 vote in any legislature, the SJWs would come out in force and say it is unconstitutional, and the courts would be all too happy to strike it down.

I'm not sure I believe you here. It took a lot of work and campaigning to make abortion legal, work that lasted a long time. It certainly won't happen in the next five years, but this is very likely what will happen in the long run, for both economic and social reasons. It will happen faster if enough people stand up and shout for it.

Entropy-7 • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 08:49 PM

But not enough guys will stand up and shout for it, and women certainly won't because it is against their economic interests.

break_main • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 10:08 PM

Many of the guys you think this would serve were raised by single moms getting child support.

Future guys might be pissed that their mom couldnt feed them cause dad took off and didnt pay for his kid

Entropy-7 • 2 points • 6 March, 2016 02:22 AM

I think we agree on several points. This will never happen because women have the vote and it is against their interest, and most men are completely brainwashed, if not cucked, by the existing system.

break_main • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 10:43 PM

"Cucked" - this word has been appropriated and overloaded by TRP types (and more recently Trump supporters and young conservatives) to an absurd degree. It seems to be used to refer to anything that you think is unmanly.

I wouldnt want to unknowingly raise a child that isnt my own, just like any other man. But i hear it used to refer to men in liberal countries, just to mean that women there have more rights than TRPers like. Ive seen it used in this thread to refer to any man who thinks men should pay child support. I have seen it used to refer to men who raise adopted kids.

I think it is a pretty crude way to insult men who dont ascribe to TRPs narrow definition of manliness. It also seems to imply that the most important part of being a man is to pass on his Y chromosome, and that men are in a constant struggle against one another for genetic success.

I would not want my gf or wife to cheat on me, but it isnt the biggest fear in my life. And many studies have found that women cheat a lot, which makes it likely that this happens more than even you guys might suspect. Hell, a surprising number of us here in this thread are likely to be children of cheating women. Its not the end of the world, and considering how often men think about and engage in infidelity, it seems sad that you would make it sound like the worst possible fate to raise another mans kids. Hell, imagine if you banged another dudes gf or wife (whether or not you knew she was with another guy), and she had a kid. Would you want the other guy to divorce her, and leave your kid worse off?

And, another angle to this is that infidelity plays a pretty important part in genetic diversity and the health of the population. We have married ourselves, as a society, to the crazy system of monogamy, for the sake of stable social life. If each man was only allowed to mate with one woman, and each woman with one man, as is mostly the case in the Western world, then it drastically reduces the number of combinations that are available for genetic mixing, even though it makes more sense, genetically, to play the odds and have several children with different partners.

(A side note: I think the best mating arrangement would be that taken by some native groups, such as certain new guinean and native american tribes, where men live with their female relatives and support them, while having sex freely with other women. The men protect and care for the children of their sisters or cousins, who are the closest relations that they can be sure carry some of their genes, and then they get to fuck a bunch of different chicks.)

But most of all, i think this use of "cuck" as the ultimate derogatory is an embarrassment to those who use it. It reveals the anxiety and sexual insecurity of men who throw it around as an insult. It also indicates that a mans top concern is patrimony, when there are so many other interesting pursuits in life, like getting rich, having lots of sex, becoming smart or well respected, doing/making cool stuff, and having fun and experiencing interesting things. So please, get over the fear of being a "cuck", and find something more interesting to obsess over than making sure your girl isnt cheating on you. Youre not a fucking bird, so dont act like one

Entropy-7 • 0 points • 7 March, 2016 03:58 AM

Traditionally, "cucked" meant a man who has a wife who fucks other men. More recently it means men who white knight, who give in to the feminine imperative or who otherwise do not stand up for themselves or for other men who want to be men.

I live in China. Maybe you want to be in New Fucking Guinea and live the dream.

I have never been a player; I practice serial monogamy. I am more of a one woman man who doesn't have plates and such.

Once, when I was young, I got cucked and it was fucking humiliating. She was 5'10", blonde and blue eyed, and whip smart. I am 5'10", decent looking, well educated have an IQ in the top 2% or so. But who did she cheat on me with? A bone dead moron Chad with muscles on his muscles, standing 6'2" or so and with a 9 inch cock.

So what are you going to do?

break_main • 1 point • 7 March, 2016 10:44 AM*

Geez, I ... I cant believe she told you how long my dick is. We live happily in papua new fucking guinea now. She fucks all the dudes, tho, i couldnt keep her off the cock ferris wheel

Linrraba • -42 points • 4 March, 2016 01:55 PM

I dont think this has anything to do with being blue pill. I loathe every single absent father out there and would never support such thing. And im also not an abortion enthusiast ,even though I think is much better option than raising a kid poorly.

MattyAnon • 57 points • 4 March, 2016 02:24 PM

I loathe every single absent father out there

I felt this way too, until I started being honest about how women treat men, how men are abused and berated by women, how women alienate and antagonise men based on nothing more than how she feeeeeeeelz in that one second.

Now I am much more sympathetic towards men wanting nothing to do with them.

Linrraba • -32 points • 4 March, 2016 02:34 PM

The mistreatment of men is no justification to me. Turning your back on your child because the mother is cunt is just weakness. Also, whos gonna teach the kid to be better off? To avoid such traps?

poopcasso • 25 points • 4 March, 2016 03:01 PM

But you're talking about raising a kid when the discussion is about why, during the early stages of

pregnancy, women can chose to have a baby and men can't.

Fuck_shadow_bans • 41 points • 4 March, 2016 03:17 PM

Yeah, you are missing a few things.

- 1.) A lot of fathers are "absent" because the bitch of a mother won't let them into their kids lives.
- 2.) A lot of fathers are absent because they are the victims of a corrupt legal system, spending 10 years in jail for shit like possession of marijuana.
- 3.) A lot of "fathers" are absent because it's not their kid and the dumb cunt of a mom doesn't know who the dad is. I'm not working to support someone else's kid no matter how fucking cute or special they are.

break_main • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 10:18 PM

So no child support for any child? You gotta bear in mind that on TRP, youre getting forcedef only the bad examples. None of the dads on here are telling the story of how they were asshole dads, and their kid was kept off welfare only bc court made them pay

Fuck_shadow_bans • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 10:10 AM

That's an exceptionally rare circumstance in the US. Roughly 70% of all divorces are because the woman is "dissatisfied." Not because the husband did anything wrong, mind you. She just wants something different. So you are off the bat only working with 30% of divorces for some other reason, where the mother gets full custody and the dad has a job worth hanging on to. I bet it's less than 1% of all cases.

MattyAnon • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 05:27 PM

So many fathers *try* to be a part of their child's life, despite the mother alienating him from the child. The myth of the deadbeat dad is just that - a myth that's repeated by feminists for their own purposes.

Most fathers at least try to step up, despite the mother.

break_main • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 10:21 PM

True. But lets find a solution that doesnt put the mom and kid on welfare

MattyAnon • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 03:18 PM

True. But lets find a solution that doesnt put the mom and kid on welfare

Welfare pays or father pays. You think there is another option here?

break_main • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 10:07 PM

The father pays is the option that TRP frequently rails against.

MattyAnon • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 11:22 PM

Especially when he's also paying for the mother who cheated and uses the child against him and lies to the police to restrict his visitation rights.

break_main • 1 point • 7 March, 2016 01:22 AM

Oh yeah i forgot this was the only possible case. Never has the dad been an asshole

aspiringbullshitter • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 11:37 PM

But why do the mom and the child have to be on welfare? Why can't the mother work?

break_main • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 11:42 PM

Then who watches the kid? Also, according to the census office, child support is the majority of living income for single moms under poverty level. Keep in mind that a woman that lets this happen is probably not very smart or employable

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 08:58 AM

Keep in mind that a woman that lets this happen is probably not very smart or employable

So lets subsidize incompetence?

break_main • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 12:12 AM

Lets feed the kid, even if their mom is dumb

[deleted] • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 04:33 PM

[permanently deleted]

break_main • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 10:22 PM

You are buying the TRP spin that every single mom is a Jerry Springer guest, which isnt true.

Purecorrupt • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 03:53 PM*

Let's be honest.

Men don't give birth. Men don't have this growing love for something over 9 months like women do. As men we can spit out thousands of sperm into a toilet, napkin, a girls face every single day. One sperm reaches and egg and the woman who is the host of our little parasite let's it grow for 9 months.

Then you are "obliged" to be a father? That's natural if they were together and liked each other. But if you get a phone call from a girl you banged once at a party a year ago? Lol. Men are not the same as women. Men are different.

I've never been fatherless so maybe I would take this current ramble I've said personally if I were. I am also not a father. When things are reality it's not so easy to dismiss a cute baby(assuming it's cute) that looks like you.

....But if it was with a cunt of a woman and you adamantly did not want a child I can see how a man would basically feel "Fuck you".

You're not special and that baby ain't special. That new born is just another future walking talking sperm that no one will care about after it's not "cute" anymore so why should a dude who was just busting a nut care.

break_main • -3 points • 4 March, 2016 10:14 PM

Oh my god you sound like a school shooter before the rampage. What world did you grow up in that you were reviled and mistreated by women. I have met very few women that werent more polite than

men, and approachable. Do you never get dates? Wtf?

[deleted] • 3 points • 5 March, 2016 03:23 AM

Oh my god you sound like a school shooter before the rampage.

A new adaptation of labeling someone a commie or for a more recent label, a terrorist, to associate malice with their argument. Bend over some more, you're doing a great job with persuading intellectually starved retards.

ghebert001 • 10 points • 4 March, 2016 03:12 PM

Not every "absent" father is absent by choice...many women use the courts to keep the father out of the picture and let's not forget single-mothers-by-choice who need to keep a man out of the home in order to get their welfare cheques. So yes, the deadbeat dads exist but the fathers who want to be in their child's life but are barred from doing so are lumped in the same category. The saddest thing is those fathers who want to be involved still have to pay child support or else go to jail, yet haven't been allowed to see their child in years.

jamaljabrone • -2 points • 4 March, 2016 03:21 PM

I don't think that anyone disputes that the saddest cases are the ones where despicable and spiteful women use the long dick of the family court system to keep well-meaning fathers away from their children. OP's saying that fathers who abandon their children are fundamentally weak. He's right...it's 100% a bitch move. Fleeing from your responsibilities is what women do.

stemgang • 13 points • 4 March, 2016 02:58 PM

absent father

Most "absent" fathers don't simply leave; they are **pushed** out by the mothers.

Most single mothers are single by their choice, not due to some stereotypical deadbeat dad abandoning them.

Linrraba • -30 points • 4 March, 2016 03:01 PM

It doesnt matter. Fight for you kid.

Crazy_K9 • 25 points • 4 March, 2016 03:19 PM

You clearly are speaking out of emotion and not logic.

rp_newdawn • 8 points • 4 March, 2016 03:54 PM

Context always matters in every rational discussion

stemgang • 15 points • 4 March, 2016 03:35 PM

You have no idea what you are talking about.

Many absentee fathers did everything they possibly could to stay in their children's lives.

Most parental "kidnappings" are committed by fathers who are desperate to be fathers.

And then of course the police find them and lock them away, return the kids to the mother who was unwilling to let them be fathers, and put the men in jail.

Invalidity • 6 points • 4 March, 2016 04:26 PM

How is a father to fight for his kids if the mother of his child has convinced the courts that he is a negligent and abusive parent/spouse and has a legal restraining order against him?

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 03:25 AM

Treat my username as a response to your request.

Entropy-7 • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 08:06 PM

Actually, I don't support the idea of men being able to cut and run; I don't support abortion either but since it is there and we have it men should have similar options to be as equally irresponsible as women.

NeoreactionSafe • 25 points • 4 March, 2016 03:14 PM

The better way is to just abolish the **Child Support Laws**.

However, this might be a clever trick to achieve that... so if they are successful (unlikely) that could prove to be the start of a whole new way to attack the problem and could spread elsewhere.

Obviously the globalists will not be on board with it because their goal is depopulation and the modern family laws are carefully designed to inflict the maximum damage on the family.

If men could "opt out" then women would be **forced** to be feminine again in order to keep the man involved and that's like going back to nature.

Natural relationships are exactly what the Blue Pill is trying to destroy.

Entropy-7 • 12 points • 4 March, 2016 08:36 PM

My understanding is that old Roman law was rather straight forward on these matters: 1) a child born out of wedlock belongs to the mother and is her financial responsibility 2) a child born in wedlock belongs to the father and is his financial responsibility (and if you get cucked, then too bad for you; paternity is assumed. It's your fault if you can't keep your cunt on a short leash)

NeoreactionSafe • 6 points • 4 March, 2016 10:22 PM

That's actually very good... that's close to Marriage 1.0.

I'd like to see some better research though because that seems too good.

It's possible that the laws were changed after the fall of the Republic.

Entropy-7 • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 02:27 AM

Marriage 1.0 had a certain logic and functionality to it. I live in China and 1.0 is the standard here so I am looking to wife up. If I have to return to Canada then will either go back to playing girls half my age or getting back into the BDSM scene, the latter of which is the closest you can get to 1.0 these days in western countries.

tb87670 • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 07:44 PM

After reading pages of arguments and counter arguments how to go about things I believe this here is the best post, abolition of Child Support Laws is really the only logical way to go. The existing ones are so fucked up

that modifying them to be more fair to men still doesn't do justice for the rest of the clusterfuck, no down right abolition of said laws is the only option that would make long-term sense.

NeoreactionSafe • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 10:31 PM

The courts should simply not intervene.

The kids can go to whichever parent wants them. If the wife is able to take the kids and support them and the kids want to go then that's fine.

The kids might choose the father... or maybe a son goes with dad and a daughter goes with mom.

Entropy-7 • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 02:31 AM

Kids are. . . well, kids: they can't make rational decisions for themselves. Under Canadian law, they get a say once they are teenagers.

Shared custody is fucking work, but I think it is the best outcome for the kids.

(I spent 4 years as a divorce attorney.)

sir_wankalot_here • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 10:50 PM

A lot of the globalists power is "psychological" the consumer actually has a tremendous amount of power. Case in point is China, most middle class Chinese have no desire to vote, but they want the Chinese government to start listening to them. For the most part the Chinese government is.

There are maybe 200 million Chinese middle class. They are now able to afford a motorcycle, a smart phone to access the net, a small apartment and a few luxuries. Not much by American standard but much better then 25 years ago when he was starving to death.

The middle class Chinese now have a huge amount of consumer choices, that means they have a huge amount of influence. Also because of bad past experiences they assume their government is lying. Example of influence is the pollution problem in Beijing. For years the government was in denial. So the average Chinese decides he won't go for a vacation in Beijing. The Chinese government is now forced to admit there is a problem and clean it up.

The American consumer by contrast is stupid. The guys who bitch the most about Chinese goods on America are the ones who shop at Walmart. They then want the government to step in and fix the problem ☺

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 02:38 PM

Is there somewhere I could read more about the globalists' intent to destroy the family? I've heard that a lot

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 02:44 PM

That's so widespread now in the "alternative media" (online) that it's hard to name one without showing a preference.

If you are in the beginning stages of enlightenment I'd suggest you seek to discover on your own for a little while. Gain your own voice in understanding things then ask again when you are more specific.

I'll give just one clue:

<http://www.jfklancer.com/CIA.html>

Losendos100 • 171 points • 4 March, 2016 11:55 AM

It's a fairy tale pipe dream. There is actually ZERO chance of men being given reproductive rights that are comparable to Women's.

Here is the basic flaw in your argument; Women aren't interested in equality. They're into forwarding their own fucked up agenda. At the end of the day they don't want Men to have guilt free sex and not have to pay The Fiddler at the end of it, no matter how logical it may seem.

TBH I've learned not to even humour ideas like this, because change is never going to happen. The feminists are going to keep persecuting masculinity, meanwhile Abdul and Arif carry on beating their wives and pumping out two-dozen kids, guaranteeing the future islamisation of my beloved country.

I cant wait to retire and live in the middle of nowhere away from these people.

taracus[S] • 36 points • 4 March, 2016 12:00 PM

Women aren't interested in equality

According to the article the idea came from a group of "young women in the party"

Maybe you meant to say feminists?

[deleted] • 43 points • 4 March, 2016 03:18 PM

To be fair Swedes are so bent on equality that it may have come full circle. The youngest generation of women might actually be looking for equality at this point rather than *Equality*™. There's no other explanation, if women have the right to choose, logically men should too if you think of it in terms of absolute equality (save for the whole baby inside them argument, choosing is choosing and men don't have that choice).

Older feminists are the main shit stirrers in the media, considering the younger generation haven't gotten there yet. More and more I meet 18-25 year olds who call themselves "humanists" because feminists ignore men. Maybe they just say that to me because I'm outspoken and unapologetic for my views, however I don't think that's it.

Now, I'm not one for labels, in fact I think it's part and parcel to what makes feminism bad (us against them mentality), but I think at least some young women recognize that feminism is failing at actual equality, and this may be what's happening. I'm not suggesting anything major is going to change, but maybe just some minds are opening up and realizing feminism has failed.

Azzmo • 9 points • 4 March, 2016 05:49 PM

I've been noticing this too. For the pessimists, this is a worthy point worth considering. 15-25 year old women are actually somewhat likely to utilize logic in some of their thinking.

fiercealmond • 11 points • 4 March, 2016 08:18 PM

I'm torn on this. I'm 25, I have friends from 18-35. The college campuses are where these neofeminist ideas are growing. You'll find a rare girl here or there that actually picks these things apart and sees them for what they are, but the vast majority of girls claim feminism. Even on community college campuses, which I find very scary, there's no gender studies professors to plant these ideas there, it's all tumblr. A lot of guys on campuses are huge feminist whiners too.

Azzmo • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 01:44 AM

Only 23% of young women consider themselves feminist.

I think you have that impression because the crazies are *fucking crazy* and the rest aren't willing enough to denounce them. We tend to let outliers bias our perception.

fiercealmond • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 03:35 AM

Yeah, makes sense. The friends I make don't tend to be like that. The closest you get to the end of the bell curve the louder you seem in comparison.

[deleted] • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 07:57 PM

Exactly, the older guys here may not see it as much since their peers are older women, generally speaking. I think it has to do with younger women being brought up in what for all intents and purposes is an equal society, despite the recent articles regarding emojis being sexist, the HORROR. They have their male peers next to them to compare themselves to and don't see that great of a difference in what society *allows* them to do (what society *expects* of them is different, men get the shit end of that stick).

Older feminists might remember a time where women in a professional setting was new and maybe even controversial. Young women simply cannot relate, with more college grads today being women than men, the professional landscape has shifted dramatically. Granted people in general love the victim mentality, many young women cling to it for dear life, it's in their own self interest to do so afterall. But there's a subset that actually take in what's around them and care about others. Those are generally the ones you see sympathize with men.

Entropy-7 • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 08:10 PM

I am both curious and frightened at what 4th Wave Feminism will entail.

[deleted] • 6 points • 4 March, 2016 08:25 PM

I hadn't considered more waves. Hopefully there will be a backlash as women try and regain femininity and submissiveness. They see all the single feminists in their 30s with no kids and no men, and the wreckage of their dads and brothers and decide not to be total cunts.

More of the 'I can be a feminist and still be a stay at home wife/mom' stuff. Blue pillers think the men on the Red Pill are angry? Or that Red Pill women are Stepford wives wanna-bees? Just wait until more Red Pill moms get out there. My aunt and mother get hilariously 'sexist' sometimes.

Entropy-7 • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 09:00 PM

The internet is not always the best indication of what is happening in the real world but it seems that the pendulum is swinging back. Maybe there will not be a 4th Wave of Feminism. Maybe men, women and confused people in between will come to their senses and move things towards something more reasonable.

It's hard to say for me since I have been living in China for the last three years; a place where women are women, men are beta but happy because the government does not encourage hypergamy; and you won't see a Pride Parade marching through Tiananmen Square any time soon.

[deleted] • 10 points • 4 March, 2016 08:07 PM

I think you are both a bit too willing to take women at face value. If they grew up actually believing in 'equality' and fairness and logic, then feminism could never have arisen in the first place. Remember, Machiavelianism, for men, is an art form; for women, an instinct. Women are

seeing just how much men despise feminists, and recognise that in order to manipulate them for their own ends better they need to play a different tune. Given how much social standing matters to women, it wouldn't do for them to be shunned by men.

Azzmo • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 01:39 AM

While all of that is true I maintain that there is logic occurring. One example is the polls that show that something like 85% of women under 30 plan to vote for Bernie instead of what might be the first female president ever. I have to think that they're utilizing logic. That alone says to me that they aren't as overtly YouGoGirl as we're sometimes led to believe. Those polls are anonymous so it's not pandering to men.

[deleted] • 3 points • 5 March, 2016 02:26 PM

They are recognising that feminism hurts women. It didn't (much) for a long time, it harmed men and children, but now that men are starting to react against it, they try to distance themselves.

Azzmo • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 02:42 PM

If men lead, women will follow. Demand respect, receive respect. It stands to reason that groups of men taking stands on divorce rape, custody bias, false accusations, false narratives re: wages, and being less willing to be punching bags has led to a young generation viewing men with some respect.

For all the mocking MRAs get, they (we? I stand for all the same principles but don't seek a label) seem to be shaping the thinking of a generation of young people into a more egalitarian mindset.

Calypto- • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 03:43 AM

Women vote socialist and Bernie fits the bill for betabux.

AlexTheIndecisive • 16 points • 4 March, 2016 01:05 PM

Lol'd at Abdul and Arif part

cariboo_j • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 05:40 PM

Well they announced they want bestiality to be legalized last week... so my guess is no one takes these clowns seriously.

Entropy-7 • 8 points • 4 March, 2016 08:12 PM

Given that the average American woman has a BMI of 29, "bestiality" is now mainstream. Or should we say "hambeastiality"?

cariboo_j • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 08:25 PM

hahhaah oh jesus. BMI of 29 is 5'4" and 170lbs for example.

naaasty.

Entropy-7 • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 09:05 PM

Nasty but true, lol. There is all sorts of nonsense talk about the "top 20%" of men but it seems to me that even a modest HB6 is in the top 20% of women, at least in America.

My rule of thumb is 100 pounds at 5 feet tall and then + 3-5 pounds per inch thereafter. So a 5'4" girl SHOULD be 112 to 120 pounds, but look around: how many fit that profile?

cariboo_j • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 01:50 AM

I live in a yuppy health-nut city in Canada... not that many fat people.

But whenever I travel to the States there's at least 2-3x the amount of fatties. I feel for you guys...

BallisticTherapy • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 09:11 AM

"hambestiality"

Sounds like a finishing move from one of the Mortal Kombat games.

Entropy-7 • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 03:15 PM

If you bone one of these chicks then "flawless victory" is ironic at best.

FFXIV_Machinist • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 07:57 PM

meanwhile i'm just waiting patiently for the emergent artifical sentience to happen, and it will either kill us or love us. if it loves us i'm totally gettin me some robo booty.

[deleted] • 3 points • 5 March, 2016 12:11 AM

If this happens in our lifetime all the issues we stress over today will be moot.

Because either humanity will be annihilated or we will ascend to immortality.

FFXIV_Machinist • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 01:49 AM

on one hand weve got robo booty, and the other total annihilation. seems worth the risk to me.

[deleted] • 0 points • 5 March, 2016 03:29 AM

guaranteeing the future islamisation of my beloved country.

Fuck you and your beloved country. The biggest reason shit like this happens is because men enable it through unconditional nationalist sentiments. Women have no agenda, feminists might, but society in general has no agenda, it is simply easy to manipulate due to reactionaries (like feminists). "Muh country"? States have always seen men in the same eye, a utility, you either unsubscribe from the idea completely or you don't, none of this "one foot in base" shit.

fetterbender • 28 points • 4 March, 2016 01:15 PM **[recovered]**

So you just inform the happy father-to-be in the 19th week?

[deleted] • 10 points • 4 March, 2016 04:41 PM **[recovered]**

This could be easily solved. Guys could sign a document saying something like "I renounce the rights to all my children, known and unknown." Could later add exceptions if he did want to have kids. This works out better, parenthood should be an opt-in thing, not an opt-out one.

LA_producer • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 06:04 PM

This could be an interesting counterpoint to all the "affirmative (sexual) consent" shit that's floating around college campuses right now: affirmative parental consent.

Entropy-7 • 7 points • 4 March, 2016 08:25 PM

"Affirmative parental consent": that made me giggle. Women have had that option for a good half century but men are trapped by what the woman wants.

My understanding is that an effective and reversible male contraceptive is coming out of the gate soon; that will change the dynamic.

I have talked to GPs about a vasectomy and they have a weird way of advocating against it.

RichardBelmont • 4 points • 4 March, 2016 04:28 PM

Yeah, to combat this you'd have to show you attempted to notify them in writing or something like that.

Don't get pregnant from someone you don't at least have a way of contacting, or you're out on your own. I kinda like that, but that's even less likely.

Entropy-7 • 0 points • 4 March, 2016 08:18 PM

I have never been a player and my Red Pill insights tend to smack of social conservatism even though I am nothing of the sort. But one piece of advice is that you should never fuck a woman unless you would be willing to fuck her without a condom.

[deleted] • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 09:26 PM

But one piece of advice is that you should never fuck a woman unless you would be willing to fuck her without a condom.

Sober. You have to be willing to do it sober and not pull out. Which I have failed on both accounts in the year since I've separated and gotten divorced.

Entropy-7 • 1 point • 6 March, 2016 02:16 AM

I never drink alcohol around women. You can play it straight and just drink ice water, you can be tricky and drink near beer or grape juice, or you can be downright manipulative and bribe the bartender to soften your drinks.

Several years ago I dated an HB4. She was smart and interesting to talk to but I was not interested in fucking her. She had other plans, and we had dinner and I got liquored up, and then fucked her silly in her car in a public park.

Regret is a rather useless emotion so I came away from that with simply a lesson learned. Don't cloud your judgment with alcohol, and more generally never be a slave to your dick.

Entropy-7 • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 08:13 PM

My uncle got a big surprise. . . 16 years after a ONS!

[deleted] • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 11:45 PM

A better concept I came up with is that he's not a father UNTIL he goes to the hospital/family centre and signs a document saying that he wants to be the father.

[deleted] • 10 points • 4 March, 2016 02:33 PM

"Just don't tell him you're pregnant."

If it passes at all.

JakofClubs • 11 points • 4 March, 2016 03:56 PM

That's a good point you raise. A good law would be mandatory notification of the (suspected) father within 48 hours of a woman discovering that she was pregnant. Sure, it's can be hard to prove when she discovered that she was pregnant, but it sets the correct standard.

yomo86 • 23 points • 4 March, 2016 01:57 PM*

Children are a binary choice. You don't want them or you do. The next question is the time and the girl.

Recently I got notarized copies of my vasectomy. So when some bitch is preggos and wants to cash in on my made ass she get's a nice dinner in the 20th week and handed the papers.

Never rely on the gov to change things for men, they have to cater to white knights, the economy and over 50 % of the voting population.

MattyAnon • 27 points • 4 March, 2016 02:26 PM

Why get notarized copies?

Just "Ok bitch, prove it". The end.

Or better still - get a signed statement from her saying you are the father. Then prosecute her for paternity fraud*

*Obviously I'm joking, noone cares about female crimes.

JakofClubs • 13 points • 4 March, 2016 03:53 PM

Getting the paperwork notarized

All a notary can do in this case is certify that a copy is a true copy of the original or witness a signature. But it makes it look much more official.

Source: former notary public

yomo86 • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 08:50 PM

Right. But it is enough to give the papers to her so no attorney will touch this case if they are not paid up front.

apoostasia • 11 points • 4 March, 2016 04:00 PM

A friend of mine went the "Ok bitch, prove it." way; he's currently paying child support because her "proving it" was a paternity test which he had to pay for, somehow. Was a broke fuck at the time, couldn't afford it, and is now paying child support for another twelve years.

She's a cunt and then some but he stepped the fuck up, made sure if he was going to be paying for this little girls life he was damned well going to be a part of it, and now is the proudest not-dad I've ever met. Yes, not-dad is what she calls him.

Azzmo • 16 points • 4 March, 2016 05:53 PM

A paternity test costs like \$100. You/your friend full of shit?

apoostasia • 7 points • 4 March, 2016 07:39 PM

It's two hundred in Canada, not that it matters when you're a high school student with no job. This was like six or seven years ago. Who the fuck knows, he's probably full of shit, you're right.

Azzmo • 7 points • 5 March, 2016 01:31 AM

I did some math and found that he would have paid roughly 58.16 fuck tons more for child support for 12 years than the initial \$200 would have cost him. Next time you see him you owe him a headlock; he either lied or he's an idiot.

redpillbanana • 4 points • 5 March, 2016 12:09 PM

I agree with your assessment. If I were in the same situation, I would beg, cheat, borrow, or steal the money.

SlimLovin • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 09:02 PM

Your story is:

He said Prove it She proved it. He paid Child Support.

Pretty standard stuff.

apoostasia • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 09:13 PM

My story is, she didn't have to actually prove shit. He couldn't afford a paternity test and couldn't prove it wasn't his, so by default it is. She knew these things, and while I only see either of these people rarely, I think it's pretty fucking shady on her end.

Yeah, standard, but also fucking shitty.

yomo86 • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 08:42 PM

Badly played. You deny having sex with her so the burden of proof is on the accusing party - you got snipped and get the "you are the daddy talk" go to a doc and re-check. Hell if you own a microscope you can do it yourself.

TheRedStoic • 7 points • 4 March, 2016 02:11 PM

Same here. Genetically sterile.

I personally wait until she goes social with the pregnancy scare before sending copies of the papers to family and friends. All while wishing her the best of course.

MazeMouse • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 04:18 PM

The public court. The only one that matters in these situations.

stemgang • 4 points • 4 March, 2016 02:59 PM

That paperwork will do exactly zero for you once a DNA test proves you are the father.

Even vasectomies are not 100%, you know.

yomo86 • 4 points • 4 March, 2016 08:47 PM

Vasectomies are 100% safe.

What you mean are either botched procedures, re-attachment of the vas-deferens or a false negative probe after your procedure. Don't buy into the whore hamster talk of getting pregnant when you have had the operation done.

SlimLovin • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 09:03 PM

Everything you just said contradicts the notion that "Vasectomies are 100% safe."

whatsazipper • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 11:57 PM

If you're concerned you can get the sperm count tested.

stemgang • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 06:26 PM

Vasectomy failure rate is 0.15%, which is great.

I was not talking about safety.

I was taking about the failure rate of paperwork, which is 100% when faced with a DNA-tested baby.

yomo86 • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 09:34 PM

got it. But remember. A positive DNA test is no the end. Their failure rate is 1/1000000 but hell several hundred guys got struck by lightning in the US. If there is reasonable doubt you are entitled to a second test. A recent negative sperm count creates that doubt.

A DNA test tests several markers in your genom it does not compare the complete genoms with each other, so when you are from a small town chances are good for a false positive. Even botched DNA tests happend, and your attorney is allowed to be present when they probe the child.

Entropy-7 • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 08:30 PM

The separation between MRAs and other guys of our sort is that the former want to run to the government to change things. It's not going to happen. On the other hand, even with a hundred and fifty thousand members, TRP is only 0.1% of the male population of America so it is moving at glacial speeds.

YouDislikeMyOpinion • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 10:12 PM

I would love for someone to show me how much it would cost to put such a policy in place. I also don't think that many people understand the role of government.

[deleted] • 9 points • 4 March, 2016 04:35 PM

honestly getting rid of child welfare laws and child support laws would do a lot of good

taracus[S] • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 04:49 PM

How is getting rid of child-welfare laws doing good?

You mean less women would go through with their pregnancies if they knew they werent going to get money from the state?

[deleted] • 11 points • 4 March, 2016 08:02 PM

Women would chose a man who is actually suitable to father a child instead of counting on child support and welfare.

Relationships would be stronger when a woman is dependent on pleasing her man (which is not difficult) instead of having the power to remove him from his children and forcing him to pay with the government backing her.

That's how you create civilization.

[deleted] • 7 points • 4 March, 2016 05:00 PM

yes, they'd also be more careful with mate selection, and would be more feminine

taracus[S] • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 05:17 PM

But this assumes that women follow a logic narrative when "mate-selecting".

It feels like they would change nothing and the children would suffer.

[deleted] • 9 points • 4 March, 2016 05:20 PM

they do not follow logic they follow incentives.

Dr_Killpatient • 5 points • 4 March, 2016 08:02 PM*

Trust me, once her child has died of hunger, because she made an emotional choice to spermjack Chad, who then wanted nothing to do with her snotty-nosed bastard, she will think twice before she does it again.

Besides, it's not your child, so don't concern yourself with single mommy Alpha-bastards who will probably in the future end up robbing you at gunpoint, stealing your car, or breaking into your house when they grow up.

infiniteslinky • 0 points • 5 March, 2016 06:17 AM

Ah yes. Dead children, the height of RP doctrine.

Dr_Killpatient • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 12:45 PM*

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RBqjZ0KZCa0>

What solution do you see? Except taking a needle and a thread and sewing up her snatch.

other_worlds • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 04:27 PM

A baby needs to go from being a paycheck to a liability. Once this is common in society, women's "feels" would match the best scenario for reproduction.

Ride the CC with drummer with long hair that makes \$200 a month, or go make some breakfast for her grad student boyfriend to cement her as wife-worthy in his mind?

When her future baby absolutely needs the resources SHE ALONE can lock down, the choice becomes weighted towards careful mate selection and being a person of high quality.

TheMountainWhoDews • 6 points • 4 March, 2016 06:37 PM

I'm all for gender equality - and a big fan of this. Assume there are 4 possible scenarios when a baby is conceived: Mother willing/father willing - Kid is born, kid has a happy life in theory (Both parents satisfied with outcome) Mother willing/father unwilling - Father pays child support for 18 years for something he didnt want. (Mother is satisfied, father is royally fucked) Mother unwilling/father willing - Child is aborted. (Mother satisfied, father is not) Mother unwilling/father unwilling - Child is aborted. (Both parents satisfied with outcome)

I know that's oversimplified, but if you can't see the obvious weighting in favour of the mother then you're blind.

donttelltthefamily • 7 points • 5 March, 2016 01:04 AM

Day after day we're told to man up and take responsibility for the consequences of our actions. Day after day women are told they have complete freedom and total choice over what they do with their bodies.

If a women gives up a child, either through abortion or adoption, it wasn't the right time for them.

If a man walks away from the same situation he is a coward. No matter his personal circumstances.

NiftyDolphin • 6 points • 4 March, 2016 05:44 PM

Abortion: Reduces the state's long-term expenses. If there is no child, the mother does not request assistance from the State to help in raising it.

Renouncing Paternity: Very probable that it will increase the state's long-term expenses. With less income and one less body available to care for the child, the mother is more likely to approach the State for services.

The fun part is that I could foresee a government passing something like this. It would green-light this law in conjunction with a Bachelor Tax.

Then, over the next several years, it would chip away at the law, eventually repealing it.

But they'd keep the tax.

Edit: It'd keep the tax, not because it was anti-male, but because once a government can take money from you for something, it abhors having to stop doing so.

taracus[S] • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 05:53 PM

The other day I posted an article about how Swedish women can get their artificial insemination paid by the government, one could argue that this should lead to a "bachelorette-tax" (women are willingly putting babies into society that will need tax-money to be provided for them).

And to be honest I don't really buy the whole "raising a baby costs money" argument a lot of people seem to have in discussion, isn't the idea that making babies for your nation is a good investment for the future (almost no matter the cost of bringing them into adulthood)?

[deleted] • -1 points • 4 March, 2016 08:05 PM

Yes, of course it is a good investment. A human being in the 21st century can easily produce 10-100 times what she consumes. The goals of governments aren't economical, their number one goal is population decrease at any cost.

taracus[S] • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 08:12 PM

Why?

I'm not trying to say you're right or wrong I just can't see what the government has to gain from decreasing its population, especially in a country like Sweden where we're not exactly running out of space.

[deleted] • 0 points • 4 March, 2016 08:20 PM

Decreasing population is their number one goal, that's what they have to gain.

MakeEmSayAyy • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 02:40 AM

It should be if the woman approaches the state for services you just take the child. You can't pay for it? Okay, then you're not a fit parent.

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 March, 2016 12:11 AM

Note that this is most likely mostly to get attention as the same party suggested that necrophilia and incest should be legalized a few weeks back.

Let that sink in for a minute, Equality for Fathers is put at the same level as necrophilia and incest for attention seeking stunts.

phrostbyt • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 02:01 PM

great idea i hope it passes (it won't)

Ibex3D • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 06:50 PM

To me this is a very sound and logical idea and the fact that it plays into the "gender-equality" ideal makes it even harder for feminist to try to denounce it. Im obviously not naive enough to believe they wont try.

No it doesn't. "It's about what's best for the kid." Boom, argument over. I've had this argument a million times before. You can't win.

taracus[S] • 4 points • 4 March, 2016 06:56 PM

Single women are allowed to be inseminated on tax-money, how is that "what is best for the kid"?

Ibex3D • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 02:15 PM

I don't know. I'm not the one making the argument.

Tamazin_ • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 07:05 PM

So in your world, best for the kid is having the man paying childcare to the mother for 18 years? Or the child knowing that "this guy here is your birth father; he doesn't like you and won't say a word to you but he IS your father"? Bullshit.

break_main • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 09:54 PM

Best for the kid is having food, clothing, shelter. How you gonna pay for that? If mom works to get the money, then no one is watching the kid. If the state pays, it costs more money, though better than the kid going to an orphanage. Dad pays is the best option.

Tamazin_ • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 10:09 PM

First its the mothers decision to have the children, if she can't afford it she shouldn't get kids. Secondly, in Sweden the government pays for everything even if the mom doesnt work, as well as having generous paternelyleave (sp?) so that isnt a problem either. And good childcare etc. When the kids are somewhat older.

break_main • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 11:40 PM

Yeah, i guess im mostly for it. I worry about men being released from all responsibility, though. How much unprotected sex would you have if you werent worried about the consequences? And it isnt like abortion and birth control are just simple procedures, there are side effects and risks, so to leave contraception totally in the hands of women is pretty shitty

Tamazin_ • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 02:17 PM

But in the end the woman is the only one that have the right to decide if she's going to keep the child or not. So men atleast should have the right to legally abort the child.

Ibex3D • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 02:14 PM

No, I'm just telling you what they will say.

[deleted] • 3 points • 4 March, 2016 07:54 PM

There's a reason they make this proposal right now. Like other youth parties they are controlled by the rulers of

the country.

A weeks ago they got in the spotlight they suggested making necrophilia legal, which of course taints any other idea they put forward. They were asked by the government to put forward first necrophilia, then this idea, to smear the idea of allowing men to denounce fatherhood before anybody else suggests the idea. Swedes are very anti-family, so anything having to do with splitting families will gain popular support, including denouncing fatherhood.

Basically you group sensible proposals with outrageous ones to make the public denounce them.

Denouncing fatherhood is nothing new, the romans would chose whether to call a child theirs or let it be a bastard.

taracus[S] • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 07:59 PM

A weeks ago they got in the spotlight they suggested making necrophilia legal, which of course taints any other idea they put forward.

If you would have read my post you would notice that I pointed this out and that his is more of a media-stunt, but thanks for making it clear you were more concerned about posting something than contributing something

[deleted] • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 08:19 PM

I'm explaining why they put forward the issue in the first place. Do you think they put out an outrageous suggestion like necrophilia for no reason? Media-stunt are made for a reason, these guys don't make money selling records so they have other reasons for wanting to be noticed in the media.

break_main • 0 points • 6 March, 2016 10:51 PM

There are many flaws in your reasoning above, but I won't go over them, because at one point it comes to you either get it or you don't. I don't have the patience to discuss with somebody who doesn't want to understand.

Keep on cuckin'

stawek • 3 points • 5 March, 2016 10:29 AM

No, no, no, no!!

It is Sweden ffs.

The women will get all the money they need from men's taxes anyway. Forget cild support, when you pay 80% taxes every man is fucked by the system.

This is actually benefitting women: now they can ALL have babies with Chads while the betas pay taxes. Normally Chad will make sure not to produce too many babies or he ends up bankrupt, with the new law he'd fuck everything raw and the women would then get all their child support from government.

In a tax-liberal country it's a great idea. In Sweden it's terrible.

indlife • 4 points • 4 March, 2016 03:00 PM **[recovered]**

It won't pass for many reasons:

First, many governments are broke. They function day to day, but the reality is there is no money. I have no idea how much child support is paid in various counties, but say it would be reduced even 15% and it is likely a lot of money the government would have to cover in welfare situations.

Second, while it sounds fair in principle, there is really no way to enforce the loss of all parental rights. Eventually the child gets old enough and actually does have rights, even before the age of majority. So now the child gets a lawyer to sue his/her mom to make the mother stop blacking access to the child's biological father, and this could even include requesting court orders that force the mother to give the father's personal information. Then you have questions that once a relationship is established, and if it at the behest of the minor child, does the father now have to pay?

Lastly, grandparents rights would come into play, and grandparents would either be forced to pay to see the kid. And if they did or didn't pay, there is nothing stopping them for taking the kid on vacation and oh, dear old dad who wants to be in the picture is coming now.

taracus[S] • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 03:05 PM [recovered]

I dont think grand-parents have any legal rights over their grandchildren as long as one of their parents is still their legal guardian do they?

Adurell • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 02:35 PM

That is very uplifting. Even though it won't pass

[deleted] • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 03:26 PM

[permanently deleted]

taracus[S] • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 03:30 PM

Youre right, unfortunately the title cant be changed so you're just going have to live with it

vandaalen • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 11:08 PM

Translation of article:

<https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&sl=sv&tl=en&u=https%3A%2F%2Farchive.is%2FAjoBP>

aazav • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 11:47 PM

Sweden's Liberal Youth Party, son, Sweden's.

taracus[S] • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 01:26 AM

I'm too used to autocorrect doing that for me, but you're right I'll shape up.

Baron_Lipton • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 01:14 AM [recovered]

I'm a little concerned that this approach leaves a potential child at risk of a fatherless home more than it 'evens the playing field' so to speak. There should be a focus on making women as responsible as men and not making men as irresponsible as women if you get me.

The family unit and being a family man is the real alpha male, lads.

MakeEmSayAyy • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 02:29 AM [recovered]

haha women and responsibility is like oil and water, natural aversion to each other

theknowmad • 2 points • 5 March, 2016 01:20 AM

Get yourself the Google Translate Chrome Extension. It will translate the page just fine.

Fuck_shadow_bans • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 03:14 PM

Of course it could work, the problem isn't whether it will work or not. The problem is that it will cost the government a shit ton of money in child support payments. Sweden already has that, and is one of the most feminized countries in the world, so it wouldn't be much of a change tbh.

TheRealMewt • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 04:38 PM

Whats stopping a pregnant woman from waiting until week 19 to break the news to the father? What's stopping the government from drawing out the financial abortion proceedings until it's too late for the man to bail out?

taracus[S] • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 04:49 PM

Well you would have to assume if this was to become reality, it wouldnt be impossible to write this up so that if the mother made no attempt to notify the father that time-frame extends?

Also in Sweden abortions is covered under our universal health-care so Im not sure what you mean by "financial abortion proceedings".

daddymonsterpoodle • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 09:29 PM

It certainly would change the dynamic. My country has an issue with teen single moms. There are too many. It is pretty obvious why. Work hard, get a student loan, and be in debt forever. Choice 2, be lazy, get pregnant, get government handouts and child support until the child is 18, You might even get a house out of it.

This is what makes me angry. A guy can be lied to by the woman he fucks about contraception. He can state categorically that he does not want her to have the child, well before it is a problem, state clearly he does not want to support the child (that might not be his anyway) and still pay 10% of his salary for the next 18 years!!! Just watch words like 'honorable', 'responsible', 'real man' get dragged out against him if he chooses not to support the child.

Explain to me why this isn't fraud "gee, I wasn't on the pill after all." Extortion (supported by the state) "give me money for 18 years or else" or supporting the worst aspects of female nature. All those feminists who fought for the right for women to be able to choose must be crying themselves to sleep as young women choose to be selfish career incubators rather than successful and independent.

No woman in a developed nation is incapable of getting contraception before, during and well after sex. Also implying no agency on the part of women is ridiculous. She was there, she helped get naked, she helped get that penis into her vagina. It is NOT laziness, maternal instincts, stupidity, ignorance or love that let's a girl get pregnant, it is conscious choice. There needs to be realistic consequences for choices. The consequences for 'I chose to believe her when she said she was on the pill' should not be a 18 years of debt. Sorry, rant over.

feo83nix • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 11:19 PM

I came to this as a conversation point with a friend in trying to see a fair way. I really think it could work and rings strongly for equality. Thanks for posting this.

throwawaycomedian95 • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 12:13 AM

These people are ahead of their time. Give it time and the progressive world will likely start to recreate this.

[deleted] • 1 points • 5 March, 2016 09:52 AM

[permanently deleted]

taracus[S] • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 10:26 AM

Well I guess it would mean women would have to take a bit more responsibility over whos kid they trying to give birth to.

Note as well that abortions are tax-funded in Sweden

Lord_shitmeister • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 07:21 PM

YES GOOD FUCKING IDEA I'VE BEEN SAYING IT FOREVER

Drmadanthonywayne • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 08:38 PM

I've always felt this way. Both parties made the choice to have sex, yet should a child be conceived the woman gets to opt out after the fact (abortion), while the man has no say at all.

Choice and responsibility should go hand in hand. Either ban abortion altogether (no opt out for anyone) or give the man a veto on the abortion and/or give him an "opt out" option (renounce the child).

Honestly, I don't think many men would renounce their children, but it would put an end to pregnancy being used as blackmail.

DDOS_Feeler • 1 point • 21 March, 2016 08:34 PM*

Well, that came out kinda racist at the end.

thenemaxofredpill • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 04:27 PM

Give that group a cookie, fast. They deserve it. Sweden should be proud to have a logical group like that as its future.

[deleted] • 1 points • 4 March, 2016 06:32 PM

[permanently deleted]

taracus[S] • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 06:48 PM

Well if you bothered reading my post you would see that I did in fact point out that this is more of a media-stunt and that they also tried to legalize necrophilia and incest.

themanbat • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 07:58 PM

This would be a great and just law. Unfortunately it will likely never fly. Feminist disinterest in true equality aside, the government has a policy of doing whatever it takes to see that children are supported. If there is a known father, then the father has to pay. Why? Because if the father doesn't pay, the state has to pay. And the state doesn't like to pay for anything it doesn't have to.

Apexk9 • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 08:52 PM

Takes 2 people to make a baby but a women to keep one.

[deleted] • 1 points • 5 March, 2016 01:51 AM

[permanently deleted]

Dr_Killpatient • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 12:54 PM

Yet, for women adoption and abortion - murdering an unborn child - is legal, while for men denouncing their fatherhood is not. Go figure.

[deleted] • 1 points • 5 March, 2016 01:06 PM

[permanently deleted]

Dr_Killpatient • 3 points • 5 March, 2016 01:38 PM

But it is the same, when it comes to maintaining one's personal freedom at the expense of the wellbeing of the child by denouncing parenthood. Women abort children and give them up for adoption to free themselves of the responsibilities of motherhood. Men are not allowed to do any of those things to free themselves of fatherhood.

giving the father the same right to abort the child

Never gonna happen.

P.S. No-one here, including me, is equating a woman having an abortion to a man not wanting to be a father - we're simply drawing attention to the fact that women have multiple legal routes to opting out of parenthood, while men have none.

Apexk9 • 0 points • 4 March, 2016 08:56 PM

What is the result of child support payments when declaring bankruptcy?

russiamagda • 0 points • 5 March, 2016 01:42 PM

I'm not a feminist But women also could have been raped and deserve to abort a baby that they didn't even decide to have in the first place. If a man and a woman both have a baby and both planned to do so, then they both take responsibility over the child. They can keep him/her or put him/her up for adoption, therefore a parent has an obligation to take care of what THEY created, with the consent to do so. Therefore, if a man abandons a child, like so, it's morally unjustifiable, and is far different than abortion, because he actually consented to have a child with that woman. Especially because the only person who can truly get a woman pregnant, is a man, so it's under, mostly his control.

russiamagda • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 01:44 PM

BUT, not to say that women also are responsible and have control over getting pregnant, as well.

AdrianWerner • -2 points • 4 March, 2016 02:43 PM

This could work, but only in countries where in absence of father the government would take over with basic child support. Because ultimately the money is for the child, who got no say in being born.

Kanyin • 12 points • 4 March, 2016 02:45 PM **[recovered]**

The money is never for the child. If it was, sports stars wouldn't be paying 15k+ per kid to baby mama. Kids don't need 15k a month to survive.

Fuck_shadow_bans • 2 points • 4 March, 2016 03:19 PM **[recovered]**

That's true, but the vast majority of child support payments are set at the state minimum. Celebrities live in their own world with their own rules. Alimony is almost non-existent outside of that world, but you wouldn't ever guess that from the news.

rrealnigga • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 09:10 AM

I thought alimony applies on everyone?

Fuck_shadow_bans • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 10:21 AM

Nope. Alimony is exceedingly rare, having been essentially replaced by child support. But in cases with no kids, the non-working spouse is pretty much fucked unless the working spouse is

super rich. Otherwise, courts don't generally pass out alimony. Courts still give mothers the benefit of the doubt when they stay home, but no one gives a women with no children and no real reason to stop working the benefit of the doubt when she sponges off her husband anymore. Only about 15% of cases involved alimony at all, and even then, its small amounts and on a temporary basis (usually less than 3 years). Also, alimony IS negotiable in a pre-nup while child support and child custody are not. So, assuming you were halfway smart, you will never pay a cent in alimony ever.

You'll still get raped with child support, but that's a different topic.

rrealnigga • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 10:31 AM

I see, thanks for the reply

whatsazipper • 1 point • 5 March, 2016 03:59 PM

The fact that it isn't a fixed amount that gets allocated to specific needs of the child is a giveaway that the money isn't for the child. At that point you're supporting the lifestyle of the mother.

break_main • 1 point • 4 March, 2016 09:57 PM

Never for the child? What world do you live in? Look for facts outside of TRP and tabloids. Stars are not the typical example. Most of the time it is for a poor mom who cant work and take care of kid at the same time. You got a better solution that doesnt involve welfare, share

[deleted] • 0 points • 4 March, 2016 08:13 PM

There is no way to not afford giving a child what they need if you live in an industrialized nation. Children of single mothers in western nations living in poverty do so by the choice of the mother.