

# Wife's husband makes millions, he asks for a post-nup to protect his assets, but she's "confused" and doesn't feel the need for a post-nup because she would never hurt him.

719 upvotes | 26 December, 2017 | by [deleted]

---

Edit: Exabiell. If you find this, send me a message you old bastard.

Found in a relationship sub. You should be able to copy and paste a snippet of the post into google to find it. Don't want any b0ts to remove it by providing a link.

From the title: Wife is 31, husband is 36.

"My husband "Daniel" and I have been together for 6 years, married for 3. When we met, he was an engineer here in the Bay Area (Silicon Valley) while I was a teacher. I was making around \$60K a year which is nothing in the Bay Area so I was still living at my parents house, and he was making around \$110K which is just enough to get a one-bedroom apartment in a decent area. After about a year of dating we moved in together and married a bit after that. He's always paid the majority of the bills, I'll admit that.

Daniel worked full time as an engineer when we met but had a side project that he & a friend were really passionate about. Just a few months after we married, the side project really took off and they had buyers interested. They ended up selling up the side project and my husband & his friend pocketed a couple million each. They teamed up again for another project and that one did well too. Two successes opened up a lot of doors for them -- investors, capital, resources, all of that. My husband quit his old job in order to work on innovating more products with the capital & investors that are now available to them(I know I'm being vague, don't want this to be identifiable). Anyways, he's not Elon Musk or anything but he's doing really well.

Just last year we bought a nice house in the Bay Area which I always thought was unobtainable. New house + 2 new cars + we eat out/go out more + vacations + no financial stress. Our lives have improved a LOT with this money. I definitely would not be living a life so comfortable if it weren't for my husband's success.

So I was a teacher up until about 6 months ago -- I've always HATED my job. I worked at an awful school with zero administrative support and poor funding, it was beyond stressful. Dreaded going to work each morning. My husband has known about this for ages and he sat me down this past summer and said "I finally make enough to support us both and I can't enjoy my life if you're not happy. Quit your job and pursue something else. If you wanna go to school, go to school. If you want to focus on raising our future kids, do that. I just want you to be happy". Music to my ears. I could write a book about how great this man is. We're planning on starting a family in 2018/2019. Things are really good right now.

Okay so that's all background here's the problem -- Daniel sat me down a few days ago and said that he wants to sign a post-nup agreement to "protect himself and his work" just in case something happens. He said that the circumstances when we got married vs. now are very different and, again, he wants to "protect himself". He basically wants something where if our relationship ends, he doesn't lose too much money. He gave me time to think about it.

I don't know how to feel about this. I talked with my best friend about it and both of us are just confused. I was with my husband when we were just two normal middle-class people and now all of a sudden I feel like he doesn't trust me because he has money. I've never asked him for anything now that I wouldn't have asked before. I didn't ask him to buy me a new car or to support me if I quit my job. I've never gone on

shopping sprees with his card or anything like that. It just hurts me and honestly I can't help but to think about how now that he's rich he could leave me tomorrow and hook up with some gorgeous 22 year old. It's just a really sad feeling. He told me this a few days ago and it ruined my Xmas because I just can't get it out of my head. I would never, never, never hurt my husband even if our relationship ended so I don't feel the need for a postnup at all, but really I'm just sad.

tl;dr: Married a middle-class guy. He ended up becoming rich and now he wants to sign a post-nup."

It's interesting to note how she's very adamant on how great the relationship is, how her quality of life has improved, is planning on having kids, yet she "never asked for any of it" (the nice house, cars, vacations, etc), and how her husband could leave her for someone younger. She's already giving herself reasons NOT to sign the post-nu, but reiterates she didn't ask for the benefits of a millionaire lifestyle, as if that were her excuse.

Complete hamster.

I'm 26. I will never get a marriage license. I've seen mountains of cheating, financial rape, and other negative experiences that result from legal marriage. If a future fiancé wants a wedding, no problem. But no paperwork. And be aware of marriage laws (living together for a certain period of time considers you a married couple). I have followed the advice of wiser and older men, and things have gone well for me thus far.

This guy's future is already looking bleak. The top rated comment from a lawyer told her she doesn't have to sign it. If things end between them, he'll lose millions from his hard work. And all for what?

A woman.

---

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

---

## Comments

---

Derek1382 • 559 points • 26 December, 2017 06:39 PM\*

I would never, never, never hurt my husband even if our relationship ended so I don't feel the need for a postnup at all

Right now she might even believe it, however notice how the operating word is "feel". She "feels" that right now she'd never hurt him, so a postnup doesn't make sense. If and when the divorce comes, her feelings will "evolve" and she'll suddenly realize "how much she sacrificed to enable his career", so she'll "feel" entitled to a big chunk of the money "they" made. Her relatives, friends and lawyer will make sure to "help her" consider "what she's entitled to".

Daniel is smart and I hope he pushes this through one way or another.

GroundhogLiberator • 303 points • 26 December, 2017 07:31 PM

"how much she sacrificed to enable his career"

What a martyr, quitting a job that she hated at his encouragement.

Drumcode-Equals-Life • 124 points • 26 December, 2017 07:59 PM

Sitting around only working 8 or 9 months a year max, letting him pay all the bills even when he was just a lowly engineer

Im\_a\_Mime • 31 points • 26 December, 2017 08:42 PM

"Lowly" engineer? It's a pretty prestigious job, people could do a lot worse.

Drumcode-Equals-Life • 79 points • 26 December, 2017 09:03 PM

In comparison to being a millionaire\*

I'm an engineer too

[deleted] • 11 points • 26 December, 2017 10:39 PM

Myself as well. Not a millionaire- just an engineer.

ATPSynthase12 • 53 points • 26 December, 2017 09:55 PM

It's sarcasm like saying lowly doctor or impoverished CEO.

SelfTaughtPiano • 1 point • 8 January, 2018 12:14 AM

In the USA maybe.

In major parts of the world, "I'm just a poor engineer" is a common saying.

garlicextract • 1 point • 21 January, 2018 02:40 AM

No it's not, because in those countries the engineers are still more well off than most

vlada\_ • 4 points • 27 December, 2017 01:33 PM

i guess sarcasm on reddit doesn't work without that horrible '/s'

LuvBeer • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 11:29 AM

He could be a software engineer/coder.

juliusstreicher • 1 point • 29 December, 2017 03:50 AM

I believe that there was irony there that you haven't quite picked up on.

kjvly • 13 points • 27 December, 2017 12:50 AM\*

you mean the job that allowed her to only be able to afford living with her parents?

Psychocist • 122 points • 26 December, 2017 08:41 PM\*

I don't think she believes it - I think she's wondering whether she should use the opportunity to cash out now or later. Fact is, if she doesn't cash out now, she might lose a lot of his money in the future when this agreement comes into place. Wisest thing they can both do is split.

"This is so important and exactly what I was thinking! Hell, who's to say he would have been so successful with his projects if he didn't have emotional and physical support (helping with chores more so he can focus on his side project after work, etc.) from his wife at home before she ever quit her job"

I feel sick. That's enough of that sub for today.

garbagejooce • 60 points • 26 December, 2017 09:43 PM

Puuuuuke. Or he could've hired a live-in maid since he was paying for everything. Still would've been cheaper and less work.

[deleted] • 24 points • 27 December, 2017 03:07 AM

Her lawyers will argue that her job was a key reason that he was able to leave his engineering job to pursue his side project. She provided the health insurance. She provided a small "fall-back" salary in case things didn't work out. And he never would have been able to focus on his side project full time without her.

No side project, no windfall. No windfall, no live-in maid.

This guy just didn't think ahead and made some careless mistakes. It will only cost him at least half of his assets and spousal support.

Dubalicious • 8 points • 27 December, 2017 03:09 PM

This guy just didn't think ahead and made some careless mistakes

Kinda sounds like the only mistake he made was getting married because now he can't just leave his wife for the new hot young thing he found.

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 December, 2017 03:25 PM

Of course he can leave his wife. He just has to give her half the marital assets and probably pay spousal support.

Dubalicious • 6 points • 27 December, 2017 03:35 PM

so he can't **JUST** leave his wife, he has to pay her or give up something. If he wasn't married, he could just leave.

[deleted] • 7 points • 27 December, 2017 03:56 PM

Well that was something to think about before he married her. Without a pre-nup. That ship has sailed.

He did marry her. And he did quit his job to work on a side project while she was still working and making an economic contribution to the household. And he did then piss off his wife with a post-nup that she has zero incentive to sign. And he did do all of this in a community property state. And no one was holding a gun to his head. He did this all willingly.

Now he can man up, own his mistake, write some checks and move on. Or he can whine about how he's the victim of something other than his own poor planning.

Moneyley • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 04:39 PM

I dont see any of this matters. He should just yield total power of the company over to his friend (who may or may not back stab him) but either way he would return to his previous situation. Everything would go back to normal. She wouldnt last a year in their previous "simple" life and would seek to leave.

2 years later she'll look him up on facebook or some other social media platfrom and his tagline will say "millionaire...owner of major real estate portfolio"

[deleted] • 4 points • 27 December, 2017 05:38 PM

He can't yield control of the company to his partner without her agreement unless he was smart enough to set up a corporation for his venture prior to the marriage or he kept the firm's assets within the corporation without ever commingling the corporation's assets with personal assets. Not a single penny.

Given his obvious lack of ability for the most basic financial planning, and her comments about them buying a house in the Bay Area, I think neither applies. Further, because she was working when he quit his job to focus on his side project, she has a claim to a portion of that business. He can't give away control of her portion to his partner.

IVlaskerade • 40 points • 26 December, 2017 11:57 PM

I don't think she believes it

She does... or she did, at least.

When they were happily married, while his star was in the ascendant, and while he lavished her with gifts (including being the one to suggest she use his money to do something she enjoys rather than stay in the job she hated), she loved him and could never imagine leaving him or hurting him.

As soon as she wants a divorce, all she will care about is screwing him over and taking as much of his money as she can.

These are not contradictions. These are just a side effect of women's truths being informed by their current emotional state.

Dystopian\_ • 15 points • 27 December, 2017 12:27 AM

It's far too poetic that the name of that account is "RabidHamster87".

Going by that name, I'm hoping it's a troll account, but sadly it's probably not.

Psychocist • 5 points • 27 December, 2017 12:30 AM

Ha! Didn't even notice that.

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 December, 2017 03:03 AM

The agreement is only enforceable if she signs it. And she has zero incentive to do.

She's already entitled to at least half the post-marital assets, and she has a strong argument for more than half. And if she can prove that he was supportive of her quitting her job, she will get plenty of spousal support as well.

The only thing she could really lose is a portion of his future earning (which may or may not be significant) and a relationship that MAY be emotionally meaningful to her.

Derek1382 • 7 points • 26 December, 2017 08:59 PM

I don't think she believes it - I think she's wondering whether she should use the opportunity to cash out now or later.

The two things are far from mutually exclusive.

Psychocist • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 09:11 PM

Didn't mean to imply they were. Oops.

Drumcode-Equals-Life • 84 points • 26 December, 2017 07:59 PM\*

If she "feels" like she would never hurt him (aka leave him), then logically speaking she would have nothing to fear signing a post-nup right?

Especially if she never asked for nor wanted any of the great things that come with being rich as she claims... Of course, we all know women are naturally self-centered and aren't logical, so she will never sign it because at the end of the day she retains the power to ditch him at a moment's notice and take half his net worth.

Psychocist • 36 points • 26 December, 2017 08:36 PM\*

Worryingly, surely her best play now is to divorce him under these grounds and take what she can and run? If I was in his position, I think I'd pay her off and go find a younger woman to bear my children.

Drumcode-Equals-Life • 20 points • 26 December, 2017 08:41 PM

Honestly I would probably cut and run with a cool million or two if I were her, but I'm a selfish asshole who would only marry if the woman had a higher net worth than I did.

Chaddeus\_Rex • 1 point • 31 December, 2017 10:14 PM

would only marry if the woman had a higher net worth than I did.

not gonna happen because women date up

askmrcia • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 02:04 PM

If she "feels" like she would never hurt him (aka leave him), then logically speaking she would have nothing to fear signing a post-nup right?

Yea, but her thought process is him asking for that post-nub is him telling her he would eventually leave her and she can't get anything out of it.

Now the problem with her thinking is she basically told everyone in that post that she is not entitled to anything from Daniel. she said she was making \$60k a year living with her parents and didn;t ask for anything that Daniel gave her.

So if she didn't ask, then that means she should not be entitled to anything that Daniel gives her.

But where her hamster comes into play is that she feels the guy will leave her for someone better looking so because of that, NOW she is entitled to everything.

Hopefully the post nub would work out because if he leaves now, she will get half his shit. Then again it was the guy's fault for getting married anyways. He was already making 110K a year and would most likely increase his salary over time anyways. A teacher's salary does not increase and if it does it takes years.

So why the fuck would this guy marry a chick who barely brings anything to the table anyways? He basically married a prostitute because she isn't paying for anything and judging by the post, she isn't taking care of the kids no more then he is. He literally just paid for sex.

RushingPrecision • 51 points • 27 December, 2017 03:57 AM

yea, no this is one situation TRP analysis has gotten pretty wrong. Daniel fuct up by showing intent, "i might not leave you, but if I do leave you, I wanna protect my ass now". His cards are known and he's signalling risk aversion by hedging his risk. Rather than over years, slowly building up offshore, swiss, or *gasp* bitcoin accounts, Daniel, like a dumbass, has shared his insecurities with a woman. Oh what's a woman gonna do at the slightest bit of insecurity...FUCKING OVERREACT. Where there was no doubt before, there is now. Now she is gonna question everything he does, and lurk thru his shit to see if he's cheating or wtf he's up to that would be the catalyst for a post-nup. DAMN DANIEL.....you fucking played yourself

Arnoux • 5 points • 27 December, 2017 08:46 AM

How can I find a guide on how to secure my money if I will marry in one day? :D

[deleted] • 18 points • 27 December, 2017 02:56 AM

They are in California. It doesn't matter what she feels. What was earned during the marriage is joint property.

Bedtimeshine • 6 points • 27 December, 2017 08:47 AM

Yeh it's cali. The divorce laws are written in stone. Pre and post nuns don't matter. If the marriage makes it past 10 years it's even worse for him.

DatingCoach111 • 12 points • 27 December, 2017 02:11 PM\*

Women don't lie nearly as much as men think. Women truly believe their own words...in the moment.

adolfsbff • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 04:23 PM

If you believe what you're saying then it's true. I've never told a lie in my entire fucking life.

[deleted] • 5 points • 27 December, 2017 05:52 AM

Hell no he isnt smart. What he is is desperate to cover his prior fuck up.

Moneyley • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 04:30 PM

I've read many books where many of the worlds most successful men all come to the same agreement. Once



you make it; you know how to make it again. If I was him; Id start yielding my share entirely to my friend. Practically give it away or cede power to somebody else. Then tell the wife "Ive signed off/given away all the earnings...we will return back to our normal life" See how fast she asks for a divorce then. After that, go back with your buddy and get back to where you were.

P1000123 • 18 points • 27 December, 2017 04:30 AM

I don't know. I kind of side with the women here. They are in so deep already, it's like asking for a DNA test from your 18 year old kid. Sure you want to know, but it's too late, that's your kid. I don't agree the woman should have half of his money, but she should be taken care of to some degree don't you think? She should be kicked to the curb and continue her 60k a job like nothing happened? What about if she never worked and had three kids? Let's just throw her out on the street? Where's the fine line here? There should be some sort of severance pay, just not as burdensome as the courts have made it.

RedPillFusion • 9 points • 27 December, 2017 05:58 AM

it's too late, that's your kid.

He didn't create a human organism that will live its own life. He created a legal contract.

she should be taken care of to some degree don't you think?

this depends on how her future circumstances have been unalterably impacted by her relationship with him - essentially, whether they had a kid or not that she'll need to raise. Otherwise, she chose her line of work and her locale. She can always go back to the line of work *she selected* as an educator. She can always go back and live with her parents. And even if not, why should he be responsible for financing her post-parent-basement life he elevated her from?

Again, if they had kids together, this could change the conversation. I can't link to her original post here, so I'm going off OP's paraphrasing.

cashmoney\_x • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 06:09 PM

You should be "taken care of" by someone who paid your way for years because they decided to stop paying your way?

Really?

P1000123 • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 09:52 PM

There's a difference between a friendship and a relationship. If you paid for your buddy to live scot free and decided to end it, he would get nothing out of it. But when you commit to someone as a responsibility to each other, that's a whole nother story. Backed by the law. Do you honestly think it's ok for a woman to be a stay at home mother with 3 kids and for her to get absolutely nothing because the husband is tired of fucking her? I mean, have some sense here bud.

Chaddeus\_Rex • 1 point • 31 December, 2017 10:17 PM

There's a difference between a friendship and a relationship

no, actually there isn't. the difference is in your head.

P1000123 • 1 point • 31 December, 2017 10:21 PM

Hey if you and your buddy want to suck each other off that's fine, but I don't do that with my buddies pal.



Chaddeus\_Rex • 1 point • 6 January, 2018 06:45 PM

every friendship is a form of relationships. go read about the three types of 'love' as defined by the greeks.

juliusstreicher • 0 points • 29 December, 2017 03:58 AM

Your niggling about the difference between a friendship and a relationship is pretty weaksauce. And, of course, we all know it's backed by law, that's the whole fucking point.

P1000123 • 2 points • 29 December, 2017 04:45 AM

I don't know. You are a man. Part of the deal is getting your resources. You do realize that this is how it's worked for millions of years right? It ain't going to change overnight.

Chaddeus\_Rex • 1 point • 31 December, 2017 10:18 PM

Part of the deal is getting your resources. You do realize that this is how it's worked for millions of years right?

and millions of years ago, a man could refuse to give resources and walk away with no repercussions.

juliusstreicher • 0 points • 29 December, 2017 05:27 AM

And, trying to change the subject is bottom drawer. Grow up.

P1000123 • 1 point • 29 December, 2017 11:50 AM

Bottom drawer? What kind of references are you using here bud. The topic is male resources being taken unfairly by women. I'm perfectly on topic.

Chaddeus\_Rex • 1 point • 31 December, 2017 10:16 PM

but she should be taken care of to some degree don't you think?

why? was she a partner in the business or did she contribute work (as an employee) to the business? if not, she should be entitled to nothing. Once again, 'justice' (through the law) fails us.

P1000123 • 1 point • 31 December, 2017 10:23 PM

She's a woman. Men have been providers from the dawn of time. Why are we so confused by this?

Chaddeus\_Rex • 1 point • 6 January, 2018 06:44 PM

that would be true if men and women were not 'equal' in the eyes of the law. but they are. so if we are equal, that means that men no longer need to 'provide' for women, she's a big girl and go earn her own shit.

P1000123 • 1 point • 6 January, 2018 09:29 PM

Yep, they have to shovel the snow and we do the dishes. Can't wait!

Chaddeus\_Rex • 1 point • 6 January, 2018 10:03 PM

sounds good to me! you'd be alpha as fuck if you could pull that off and the girl would worship ur cock bahahaha

P1000123 • 1 point • 6 January, 2018 10:13 PM

Bro they are shoveling or bowing down to my logic. Either way I win!

Shadoscuro • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 03:05 AM

So how would you avoid that common law type situation? I figured movie around or having a second house on file are options in theory but not in practice.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 12:46 PM

That would not work. You can't just jurisdiction shop when getting divorced.

ozaku7 • -18 points • 26 December, 2017 08:55 PM

What would you do if you were her and the laws are enabling you to rip many thousands from someone you hate his guts?

It's obnoxious how many men on TRP hate women for what they do, but would do exactly the same if they were in the position of a woman. It's nothing but bitterness that men are pulling on the short end when it comes to divorces, that's all. Or just move the fuck away from the states, I don't hear this happening in Europe. US is wacko and I would rather prefer a 2nd world country to live in.

Derek1382 • 20 points • 26 December, 2017 08:59 PM

It's obnoxious how many men on TRP hate women for what they do

Feel free to quote where I've expressed hatred for her or any woman.

It's nothing but bitterness that men are pulling on the short end when it comes to divorces

Uuuh yeah we're bitter that we're getting legally and culturally shafted in this matter, why exactly wouldn't we be?

ozaku7 • -14 points • 26 December, 2017 09:25 PM

It's not women, it's the system that allows them to fuck you so hard. It's the system you should be hating, not women. If roles would be reversed and you would be in the position of the woman, wouldn't you pull a couple of millions from the dude of whom you hate his guts? You would be fucking retarded not to.

Derek1382 • 11 points • 26 December, 2017 09:32 PM

It's the system you should be hating, not women.

Did you miss the part where I asked you to quote my alleged hatred for women?

ozaku7 • -13 points • 26 December, 2017 09:40 PM

Do I specifically accuse you of hating women? No. I was speaking in general after asking a direct question to you.

It's obnoxious how many men on TRP hate women for what they do

Wafflecopta • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 10:15 PM **[recovered]**

It's not women, it's the system that allows them to fuck you so hard.

Hahahaha so you're saying women aren't to blame for leveraging said system with malice?

Oh but if the roles were reversed men would do it to.

Gee what a mental backflip that is, so what, because hypothetically, if men were in women's situation, they would be "fucking retarded not to", that makes it ok?

You know it's ok to admit that maybe there's a little injustice here, it's ok to admit that women aren't perfect on all fronts. Or hell, if you think men aren't getting the full picture, then convince us without fucking saying dumb shit like "you would do it too".

ozaku7 • 0 points • 26 December, 2017 10:23 PM\*

Hahahaha so you're saying women aren't to blame for leveraging said system with malice?

What malice? LOL. "You are divorcing someone of whom you hate his guts, do you want to get half his assets? It's legal". You now really can have your

You call it dumb shit, but you know full well that it's the truth. It's called grabbing the opportunity by the horns. Women are not at fault here, but the dated legal system.

BluepillProfessor • 4 points • 27 December, 2017 06:53 PM

would do exactly the same if they were in the position of a woman.

This lie is tiresome. Men rarely trade in the wife for a better model. Women frequently fuck around and make the husbands home life an absolute living Hell.

ozaku7 • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 06:14 PM

That's because chumps like you don't have any other chance besides their wives. Women treat men in abundance while men treat women as scarcity.

SlavesOfNewYork • 1 points • 27 December, 2017 06:54 PM **[recovered]**

Where do you get that idea from?

BluepillProfessor • 2 points • 28 December, 2017 01:45 AM

Life. Men cheat just like women but men don't leave their wives for a younger hottie. Usually. The divorces are 85% filed by women and 15% filed by men who were emotionally tormented over an extended period into filing.

IVIaskerade • 3 points • 26 December, 2017 11:59 PM

It's obnoxious how many men on TRP hate women for what they do, but would do exactly the same if they were in the position of a woman.

Tell me you don't actually still believe in the "golden rule". It's bullshit. You treat others in such a way as to ensure they can't treat you in the same way.

It's nothing but bitterness that men are pulling on the short end

No shit. Of course I'm unhappy when I'm put in a disadvantageous position because of something I can't change.

I don't hear this happening in Europe.

Then you aren't looking.

ozaku7 • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 06:26 PM

Tell me you don't actually still believe in the "golden rule". It's bullshit. You treat others in such a way as to ensure they can't treat you in the same way.

Well, you treat them right and they will still treat you wrong if it benefits them. Especially when it comes to women who deal with men who are in abundance.

NSFWIssue • 107 points • 26 December, 2017 10:23 PM

"We" bought a nice house.

Our lives have improved with "this" money.

She already knows exactly what she wants, at least at some level of consciousness. What happens over the next weeks/months/years is the slow usurpation of her human forebrain by the monkey instincts deep below. All the human's job now is to save face/protect the ego consciousness. The slow calculations begin.

Shmagtaff • 1 points • 27 December, 2017 05:13 PM **[recovered]**

Anyways, he's not Elon Musk or anything but he's doing really well.

Hypergamous Freudian Slip. The monkey instincts were already there all along.

Pharan • 8 points • 28 December, 2017 03:04 AM

Yep. Good point. Guys gotta read inbetween the lines.

rpman69 • 6 points • 29 December, 2017 06:19 PM

Lol. She already knows how to play him. Just like elon musk got played by his wife.

P.S: sorry elon. I admire you, but you are one dumb fuck to go after the same girl again.

WaT30 • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 01:14 PM

Yeah lol, it's not like his talent and aspiration made him all those millions...

You know how they say for women, her money is her money, husbands money is their money. It's really funny how with a simple phrasing like that you can deduce what the person is actually thinking/talking about.

blackoutedfast • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 03:19 PM

for all intents and purposes it is her money, at least half of it. under California law, all the assets (income, house, etc) acquired by either spouse after the marriage is automatically considered community property and will be divided in half if they divorce.

you can agree to divide things in a different way, which is what the husband was trying to do here with the post-nup, but cali courts are very opposed to them and regularly throw out post-nups that seem one-sided or unfair to either party. so even if the wife was 100% in agreement with the husband here and signed away all her rights to get any of his money in the event of a divorce, if in a few years they get a divorce, the court would almost certainly throw out the prenup anyway and give her half.

Chaddeus\_Rex • 1 point • 31 December, 2017 10:23 PM

unfair

how is it unfair for him to keep the money HE earned? doesn't make sense. whoever made these laws was delusional

WaT30 • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 03:38 PM

How the fuck is that fair? Who even made up that law?

BluepillProfessor • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 06:55 PM

Women and manginas i.e. the vast majority of the voting public.

HopelessDistraction • 2 points • 28 December, 2017 09:50 PM

It's California, what do you expect?...

garbagejooce • 46 points • 27 December, 2017 05:20 AM

One of my favorite comments by the succubus:

This is great advice, thank you. The thing is - I'm perfectly willing to sign a post up that would give me 45% of everything in case of a divorce (rather than 50% I would be entitled to now) if it meant protecting his businesses and giving him peace of mind. But I'm not gonna just sign everything away so I'm discarded as the starter wife. I stand to gain nothing by signing even a generous post up because I'll get more without it, but I want to fight and keep my marriage.

Oh wow! You're willing to only take 45%!!! How amazingly generous of you. Seeing as it's totally half yours (in the moral, ethical sense).

bumbuff • 15 points • 27 December, 2017 09:29 AM

Except this is a case of men's rights issues in family court more the it is RP. It's a shit post. Guy got married and got rich post wedding. Then plays his hand too early to show he wants out.

I can't fault the woman here.

primu5d • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 04:50 PM

When would be the right time to offer the postnup?

bumbuff • 5 points • 28 December, 2017 03:29 AM

Same time the guy did, don't call it a post nup. He fucked up. She has a legitimate argument as the money was made post-wedding. It's not BP to at least admit that.

It would be BP to say HE shouldn't try to save himself. But he shot a hole in his boat and he hasn't even departed yet.

Chaddeus\_Rex • 1 point • 31 December, 2017 10:25 PM

o I'm discarded as the starter wife

this is such projection from the woman. a man might cheat but he'd wouldn't leave his wife for the younger model. a woman would upgrade AND leave her husband.

AstuteBlackMan • 78 points • 26 December, 2017 08:14 PM

I saw this post. It's crazy how the money changes things. I'm pretty sure the husband or the husbands associates know this and understands it's better to protect yourself in these cases.

The woman is acting kinda dumb. If she knows the relationship is fine why is she worried about signing it?

Psychocist • 84 points • 26 December, 2017 08:41 PM

She's probably wondering whether to cash out now or later.

chuckch • 13 points • 27 December, 2017 12:26 PM

She's just trying to maximize the profits

askmrcia • 7 points • 27 December, 2017 02:11 PM

The woman is acting kinda dumb. If she knows the relationship is fine why is she worried about signing it?

Because she feels that she is entitled to some of his money. She was there when he made it big, she supported him, and she helped raised the kids.

She feels that she is entitled to a piece of the pie.

So if Daniel ups and leaves her, she feels that she deserves something out of the marriage.

In my opinion she deserves nothing because in the post she clearly states that she didn't ask for anything and she seemed content with her \$60k job and living with her parents.

garlicextract • 1 point • 21 January, 2018 02:43 AM

Because she feels that she is entitled to some of his money.

legally, she is. It's his fault for signing into a legal agreement in which he agrees she is entitled to half of his money, no?

boogalooshrimp1103 • 123 points • 26 December, 2017 07:53 PM

He's fucked either way. Id say best case scenario is he should split now before she gets pregnant and take whatever financial hit he's gonna take while he's still young enough to recover from it

Rollo\_Mayhem3 • 50 points • 26 December, 2017 08:01 PM

Yep. Sometimes you got to cut your losses.

Your\_Coke\_Dealer • 15 points • 27 December, 2017 12:47 AM

Stash as cash and prepare to dash

Koryphae\_ • 6 points • 27 December, 2017 08:38 AM

She is provably already pregnant as we speak...

boogalooshrimp1103 • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 10:41 AM

In that case, via con dios,

juliusstreicher • 1 point • 29 December, 2017 04:00 AM

She could be pregnant with Chad's baby, and he's wanting to protect himself without tipping her off.

Of course, he fucked it up already.

One thing is, we don't know why he asked her to do this. Was it because she was giving evidences of hypergamy/whoring, or because he wants some new pussy? Or, just wised up?

guavaberries3 • 8 points • 27 December, 2017 12:23 AM

well if he actually likes her and the vacations + nice treatment won't just a distraction to make her feel safe signing it, then why take the losses now rather than if things break in the future?

by leaving now and losing 50%, you realize the worst case scenario. if he really does like her more than the 22 yo gorgeous sluts and wants a child and family with her, then he could continue with a non-0 probability of rape-divorce-less happiness.

typos.

Drumcode-Equals-Life • 114 points • 26 December, 2017 07:51 PM

He's always paid the majority of the bills, I'll admit that

Yet the hamster will still rationalize she's entitled to half his net worth...

Psychocist • 104 points • 26 December, 2017 08:52 PM

..yep, and they're already doing it for her:

"This is so important and exactly what I was thinking! Hell, who's to say he would have been so successful with his projects if he didn't have emotional and physical support (helping with chores more so he can focus on his side project after work, etc.) from his wife at home before she ever quit her job"

Sickening.

IVlaskerade • 72 points • 27 December, 2017 12:09 AM

The truth is that he would have lived in wretched conditions if it meant being able to devote time to his projects.

It's nice to have your anime t-shirts and cargo shorts ironed and hung in your wardrobe once they're done in the wash. But being hung to dry and then quickly folded into a pile will do.

It's nice to have a tasty bolognaise with hand-made noodles, followed by a fruit salad with plenty of exotic ingredients, for dinner. But a microwaved chicken and broccoli portion and an apple will do.

It's nice to have the windowsills swept and cobwebs removed (assuming you don't use some of your 110k income to hire a minimum wage cleaner) - but letting spider bros deal with flies for you and having dusty windowsills will do.

It's nice to come home to a warm, lit, house, with food waiting and the bed made, but walking in, flipping on the lights, and crawling under your crumpled duvet for another few hours of shut-eye will do.

All of these things wouldn't happen without a woman in the house - but without a woman in the house, they wouldn't *need* to happen either. This woman entered his space, decided it needed a bunch of nonessential work doing to it, and then patted herself on the back for doing it.

You know who deserves a cut of his cash for emotional support? The guys in the project who kept him company during the long nights, convinced him to keep going when he was getting tired of work, brought him coffees and played pranks on him. The ones who he sat, half-slumped from fatigue, with in a coffee shop booth, nursing another cup before you all get up, stretch the aches out, and go back to your passion project.

His bros.

Psychocist • 24 points • 27 December, 2017 12:15 AM

Too right!



The *only* reason I can see to keep a woman around is to raise children. Beyond that, I really fail to see the value they bring that I can't easily deliver for myself.

You know who deserves a cut of his cash for emotional support? The guys in the project who kept him company during the long nights, convinced him to keep going when he was getting tired of work, brought him coffees and played pranks on him. The ones who he sat, half-slumped from fatigue, with in a coffee shop booth, nursing another cup before you all get up, stretch the aches out, and go back to your passion project.

Yup.

IVlaskerade • 12 points • 27 December, 2017 12:17 AM

The only reason I can see to keep a woman around is to raise children

They look good naked. And it's always nice to have someone pretty to fan you and pour your wine.

Psychocist • 6 points • 27 December, 2017 12:26 AM

I said to keep them around :P I can think of many reasons to have them in my presence.

throwaway-aa2 • 19 points • 27 December, 2017 07:58 AM\*

The truth is that he would have lived in wretched conditions if it meant being able to devote time to his projects.

Fuck all that. Let's get STRAIGHT to the fucking heart of the issue.

Let's say there's a McDonalds outside my house. Let's say I binge eat there for a week, while I'm studying for a project to pass my last test, which will make or break my acceptance into college or some shit. Let's say I pass the test. Does McDonalds now get to claim a right on future money I make because I used their food as fuel for the test? Absolutely fucking not. It's asinine.

A millionaire drinks from water fountain. Water fountain guy goes "hey you made a decision that made billions yesterday. You wouldn't have done that without my water. I want half your shit".

There's a couple of problems with the argument:

Who the fuck says he couldn't have done it with another water? Water is important, sure, but there isn't a shortage of water, so it's not WORTH anything, the same way air is important but not WORTH anything. And unless the feminists accept women being rated differently based on what they bring to the table (do they know how to cook, suck dick properly, not be a starfish in bed, etc), then they're ALL "special" meaning they're all equal. So if I have 1000 girls I can pick from, and every one of those girls can make an argument that she provided something integral to get half of my money, then it's the same as water fountain guy claiming he's entitled to half just because I took a sip of water. And just for reference, being a millionaire and giving a woman a place to stay, means I'm giving her more out of this deal than she's giving to me. And given how many women would love to be taken care of by a millionaire, while no guy dreams of getting emotional support for a women, how is it that this bitch is entitled to ANYTHING, let alone being able to get by without paying ME for something? If you were going to make that argument about taking half of my shit because I drank from your water, why did you wait until after I drank the water to spring these terms & conditions on me? Aren't you supposed to be given the terms on conditions BEFORE you render services? You realize if you had an advertisement on the fountain stating "please be advised, once you drink water from this

fountain, we're entitled to half" that the millionaire would have never tasted your water to begin with. So the entire point's foundation is based on deception. Why not, instead of the inference that a woman gets half... that she argue what she's worth right there and then, when they get married? It should be on the WOMAN to establish a contract if they have expectations of what they're worth. But again, this isn't practical because men wouldn't go for 100% transparency in terms of womens capacity to benefit off of a divorce, so it needs to be handled in this purposefully ambiguous and destitute way. To summarize: I can get emotional support from a therapist, and I could easily pay like just thousands of dollars for transparent emotional support from a perfect 10 of a women, whilst not having to put up with any of her shit. So explain to me again why YOU think you're worth a portion of my earnings? Also, another interesting question: the women who give destitute men support... how much are they worth? Why aren't millionaires swooping down to pick these women up? Is it because they're not worth a million... they're only worth whoever she's with, which means it's just a price gouge? We can go a multitude of ways, whichever way you fucking want really.

Arnoux • 5 points • 27 December, 2017 09:01 AM

Very good explanation, I even saved it.

The guy made a mistake to marry a girl without starting a family. I may be fine with the woman getting money from the man after giving birth to like 5 children. But they have zero children. I don't understand how is it logical that the man owes anything to a childless woman in case of divorce.

askmrcia • 5 points • 27 December, 2017 02:33 PM

If you were going to make that argument about taking half of my shit because I drank from your water, why did you wait until after I drank the water to spring these terms & conditions on me?

Beautiful comment. I could not agree more. This part stuck out, but the rest of your comment was on point as well.

My takeaway is the guy was an idiot to marry her in the first place. He basically married a prostitute. Why? Because even though he was making \$100k in the bay area, there was no doubt that his salary would only increase over time.

The woman was making \$60k as a teacher. Teacher's salaries do not increase or they rarely do. And she mentioned her school district was poor funded, meaning there wasn't a chance in hell they would be increasing teacher salaries anytime soon.

So even if he wasn't going to become a millionaire, he was going to be earning good money as time past by.

Now why I say he married a prostitute. Because the woman admitted herself that she didn't pay the bills and they don't even have kids. He pretty much married her for sex (his mistake).

cashmoney\_x • -1 points • 27 December, 2017 06:15 PM

We agree with one another but your analogies actually don't hold up.

ConanTheSpenglerian • 2 points • 28 December, 2017 01:02 PM

Somewhat agreed, but actually single living is better than that. If you get Mizzen&Main shirts, you just machine wash them and you look professional without any time wasted on ironing. You can listen to podcasts to learn more while cooking... rather than listening to a woman nag you to tell her

about how awesome her mediocre cooking tastes. If you cook omelets, steaks, use a crockpot, and eat raw veggies and fruits, and do intermittent fasting, the time and monetary costs of food is extremely low and it's healthy and tasty too. Cleaning takes no time if you have hardwood floors and you don't make a bunch of useless purchases. The woman gives you companionship, sexual gratification, and children. That's it. If you practice stoicism, there's no need for emotional support from anyone.

IVIaskerade • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 01:21 PM

If you practice stoicism, there's no need for emotional support from anyone.

Don't worry, you'll grow out of it.

cashmoney\_x • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 06:12 PM

You know who deserves a cut of his cash for emotional support? The guys in the project who kept him company during the long nights, convinced him to keep going when he was getting tired of work, brought him coffees and played pranks on him. The ones who he sat, half-slumped from fatigue, with in a coffee shop booth, nursing another cup before you all get up, stretch the aches out, and go back to your passion project. His bros.

GodDAMN. Talk about flipping widely accepted wisdom right on its head. Most blue pillers would laugh at this but you're dead on.

leftajar • 16 points • 27 December, 2017 06:56 AM

Feminists always devalue maintaining a good home. "Is that all we are you to?!? You should share the burden!!" Trying to wiggle out of chores.

...except when it comes time for a divorce shakedown. That's it's all, "he couldn't have done it without my support!"

juliusstreicher • 2 points • 29 December, 2017 04:08 AM

Feminists always devalue maintaining a good home. "Is that all we are you to?!? You should share the burden!!" Trying to wiggle out of chores.

...except when it comes time for a divorce shakedown. That's it's all, "he couldn't have done it without my support!"

I know! It's funny when they give a litany of all that housewives do, they include 'paying the bills'! As if keeping a pile of bills then either writing a check or paying online, with HIS money, is some incredible feat, equalled only by designing an SR-71!

Future96 • 20 points • 26 December, 2017 10:06 PM

That's the comment that shocked me the most. I had to close the thread after reading that.

IDisagreeHere • 8 points • 27 December, 2017 02:59 AM

Lowkey, I used to kind of enjoy reading this shit that pissed me off so much. Now I read a couple comments, know where it's all headed, and just turn back. Trying to cut this stuff out in 2018.

cashmoney\_x • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 06:16 PM

Good plan. Get in, learn the lessons, internalize them, get out.

ConanTheSpenglerian • 2 points • 28 December, 2017 12:54 PM

emotional and physical support

This is why I plan on remaining single until I'm very rich. I've never met a woman who wasn't an emotional and physical drain or roller coaster. By myself, I can get by with a stoic lifestyle, minimal possessions, minimal chores, and just stash up the gold. It's way easier now to work on a ton of side projects than it ever was when I was in a relationship.

yeah-yeah-red • 2 points • 29 December, 2017 07:12 AM

or just eurojaunt

heuehuehue

[deleted] • 11 points • 27 December, 2017 03:12 AM

Because she is entitled to half his net worth.

He earned that money during their marriage, in a communal property state, and without a prenuptial agreement. There is no hamstering. The law is pretty clear. She is entitled to half. Possibly more. He did nothing to protect himself.

And if she can prove that he encouraged or supported her leaving her job, she will do very well with regard to spousal support.

Again, people complain that women won't accept accountability for their actions but when a man fucks up, he's a victim? Bullshit. This guy did this to himself.

throwaway-aa2 • 4 points • 27 December, 2017 08:05 AM

I get what you're trying to do, but you're referring to the acceptance phase way of looking at things. Try to look at this in the eyes of someone coming to terms with acceptance.

1. Guys get richer than woman. The gap has shrunk but it's still there.
2. The law is made to benefit women. If women ever catch up salary wise, the laws will start to change. But this is IMPORTANT for guys new to this, to understand why this shit is in place like it is.
3. This guy was probably in love, saw no reason to get a prenup, simple as that. I don't know about you, but there are a couple of people in my lives that I absolutely trust. My mom is out there mentally like most women, but she'd commit suicide before doing me wrong. I don't need to keep a defense up against trusted parties. The problem is, this man was like "well we love each other, we get married, we're like.... ONE, you know?" and then the nature of women bit him in the ass.

So we get it. Laws are important. But you'd think that loyalty and love are stronger than people taking full advantage of the law against someone they were supposed to love and be loyal to. But that isn't the case. And that's what a lot of us are here to learn. All this shit about the guy fucking up, he probably had no idea.

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 12:35 PM

Oh, well. If he was a man and he fucked up no reason to hold him accountable. Because he "probably had no idea".

But this woman who has (to the best of our knowledge), never shown herself to be anything but love and loyalty should be ridiculed as being selfish and self serving because she refuses to sign a post-nup from a man who she has (to the best of our knowledge) never wronged.

He gets a pass on lousy financial planning because he was in love. She is in love and is called a selfish bitch for not signing a post-nup.

He potentially made a mess of his finances, and she's called out for it. Clearly there are different standards.

juliusstreicher • 1 point • 29 December, 2017 04:14 AM

Nobody here has called her a selfish bitch for not signing a post nup. You are too invested in your self-validation to read the posts.

Nobody is calling her anything because of his fuckup.

Stop being a dick.

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 December, 2017 12:54 PM

Reread the comments. Especially the ones the comments about how she feels entitled to his money. As though it is, or ever was, his money.

DuckFromAndromeda • 4 points • 27 December, 2017 05:15 AM

I read up to the point in your comment that said 'entitled to half' then you said possibly more. More? Wtf How? Why?

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 December, 2017 05:36 AM

She continued to work when he quit his job to work on his side projects. She probably provided health insurance and others benefits. She provided a (small) safety net with her salary. In other words, she enabled him to build the business that was ultimately a success.

A decent lawyer could argue that she was entitled to a portion of all future proceeds from that project and any future endeavors that leverage that success. If they got divorced, he could have to buy out her interest out of his half of the marital assets.

But note that I said "possibly". It's a decent legal argument. But far from a slam dunk.

juliusstreicher • 1 point • 29 December, 2017 04:12 AM

We aren't dissecting it to give him money; we're doing it for US.

Saying that it is the law gives us NO benefit. We all know that. We're looking at her hamstering and computing his assets, not what the law states. HER BEHAVIOR. This is for a sexual strategy, not to be lectured that what we all know to be the law is, in fact, the law.

[deleted] • 2 points • 29 December, 2017 12:50 PM

She isn't hamstering. She isn't rationalizing that she is entitled to half of his assets. She really and truly is entitled to half of THEIR assets.

If you are doing this for your own benefit, why are you focusing on her and not on the dozens of mistakes this guy made in failing to do literally anything to protect himself?

You want hamstering? Some guy let his wife work at a paid position with benefits while he quit his job and pursued a side project and now wants to rationalize that the money he earned is all his. THAT is hamstering.

Let him run on the wheel for as long as he likes. But he will be doing it alone. There is nothing for her to try to rationalize. She never had to get on the wheel.

You want to do something for men? Remind them of the importance of the most basic financial planning and then hold them accountable when they fuck up their finances.

godlesspinko • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 09:04 AM

She is entitled to half of his net worth, legally and literally.

juliusstreicher • 1 point • 29 December, 2017 04:03 AM

Def. "I'll admit it, but, I've put up with a lot of his shit..."

WISE\_TURD • 256 points • 26 December, 2017 07:44 PM

Well played by the woman. She's a machiavellian. Let's all learn from this dude's mistake.

Her playing dumb is the correct response from her standpoint. She already bought low, why would she sell at the price she bought at when the asset value increased so much???

The dude's probably getting pussy thrown at him (due to his sudden increase in smv) and is planning an exit strategy. She's either too stupid to realize or she's a crafty little bitch. Not even sure what's worse, as I find both to be insufferable.

I'm thinking this dude's a nerd that will be tempted by pussy (which never used to happen), cheat on his wife, and she'll take him to the cleaners. 50/50 chance whether he wifes up the hot slut shortly thereafter. BB attracts succubus bitches.

He only has himself to blame for not understanding that men age like wine and women age like milk.

She played the game right, he played it wrong. Poor bastard.

AstuteBlackMan • 60 points • 26 December, 2017 08:15 PM

Money increases SMV a shit ton

a\_strategos • 66 points • 26 December, 2017 08:52 PM

He could also be trying to logically guarantee that she won't fuck him now that she has no job towards the bills. Total engineer logic, does not understand the emotions, only the logic

AstuteBlackMan • 22 points • 26 December, 2017 09:04 PM

I have the same mindset. I think of everything logically step by step. I'm also an engineering major. Red Pill, my father, and some various situations taught me to understand emotions. Interesting situation.

the99percent1 • 16 points • 26 December, 2017 11:00 PM

If you use money as your game, you will attract the wrong kind of traits.

She will see you as a beta buck, able to support her lifestyle. She will make you wait for sex, she will be less animalistic in bed, she will show good girl side of herself.

You will never get the proper chad experience if you flash your money.

AstuteBlackMan • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 11:01 PM

If you use money as your game, you will attract the wrong kind of traits.

Not always. If you're just trying to fuck too it's perfect.

She will see you as a beta buck, able to support her lifestyle. She will make you wait for sex, she

will be less animalistic in bed, she will show good girl side of herself.

Cool. Fuck her then kick her to the curb.

You will never get the proper chad experience if you flash your money.

That Dan Blizeran guy would disagree. But ok.

samenrofringslikeLBJ • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 11:23 PM [recovered]

And every rapper on the planet. There was a girl from my hometown who sent vids of herself farting and the right to impregnate her + abortion to a Dubai monied man. Money is king.

the99percent1 • 0 points • 26 December, 2017 11:34 PM\*

Lol.. i like how you are comparing Dan to your average IT/engineer pasty suburban white male who made it rich.

Get the fuck out of here. As much as you'd like to dream of becoming Dan, 99% of the time, your interest would be better served NOT flashing your cash.

AstuteBlackMan • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 12:29 AM

Never said you should become Dan dumbass. In saying your money gets you more hoes to fuck. If you know the game and understand it you can use it to your advantage.

You have to have your shit together as a man. That makes you more attractive. It's simple logic.

the99percent1 • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 05:15 AM\*

Dude.. get fucked.

i'm referring to your average silicon valley nerd on 110k/year who suddenly stumbled into riches because he sold his side project.. Woop-dee-doo, they aren't going to become Dan the Man overnight. You are not going to be snorting cocaine and taking private jet planes to exotic beaches and banging hot 10s every day. Hell no.

Heck, for that kind of lifestyle, you are going to need at least a few hundred million, not the 2-3million most silicon valley nerds have.. If you live like Dan, you are going to burn through your cash reserves in no time.

Get real dude.. at most, you can pay for a high class escort for two nights a month. The rest of the time, you will be driving your beemer and picking up at the bar. Which is where most gold digging women in california can be found. Period.

Money is NOT a substitute for Game. Solely relying on money = beta bucks strategy. Do you want to be a beta bucks? and stop changing your fucking position, now you are saying you need to have your shit together and be attractive as a whole?

Like i've mentioned.. Flashing your money around you will only lead you to trouble. As a blackman, you should know better.

AstuteBlackMan • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 05:32 AM

Dude.. get fucked.

You already sound dumb.

i'm referring to your average silicon valley nerd on 110k/year who suddenly



stumbled into riches because he sold his side project.. Woop-dee-doo, they aren't going to become Dan the Man overnight. You are not going to be snorting cocaine and taking private jet planes to exotic beaches and banging hot 10s every day. Hell no.

Where did I say they should become Dan? Where did I say they'd become Dan overnight? You know how to read?

Heck, for that kind of lifestyle, you are going to need at least a few hundred million, not the 2-3million most silicon valley nerds have.. If you live like Dan, you are going to burn through your cash reserves in no time.

Yes. Because my point was that all men need to live that exact same lifestyle. Great reading comprehension.

Get real dude.. at most, you can pay for a high class escort for two nights a month. The rest of the time, you will be driving your beemer and picking up at the bar. Which is where most gold digging women in california can be found. Period.

Where did I advocate paying for escorts? Lmao. Gold digging women aren't a problem if you use their nature to your advantage. If you're an idiot and fall in love you're dumb. This is what men who don't even know about red pill will do if they are aware of marriage laws and how bitches are. This is why money increases the amount of sex you'll get. It won't make them love you or any shit like that. But if they want to fuck it works.

Money is NOT a substitute for Game. Solely relying on money = beta bucks strategy. Do you want to be a beta bucks?

Nigga money is the game for some dudes who don't know red pill shit. Tf? You not a beta buck unless you paying hoes loads of cash for shit. If you take a bitch on a date. Fuck a couple times at the house then ignore her how tf that make you a beta buck?

Where the fuck did I say money is a substitute for the fucking game? You gotta develop yourself as a man and learn this shit. But again. Like you said. Are most IT nerds who are rich and grew up sheltered gonna find out about this? Probably not. So they're gonna do this.

the99percent1 • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 05:50 AM

If you take a bitch on a date. Fuck a couple times at the house then ignore her how tf that make you a beta buck?

haha.. take her on a date, nice one. Make her pussy shrink even further. No anal foreplay for you either.

Do you think Chad takes a woman he has yet to fuck on a date?

There are alot of cheaper & less resistant ways to take if your end goal is just to fuck.. period.

I dont even care if you have the money to burn. It is a stupid strategy and will only lead you to become a beta buck.

AstuteBlackMan • -1 points • 27 December, 2017 05:53 AM

haha.. take her on a date, nice one. Make her pussy shrink even further. No anal foreplay either for you.

Right

Do you think Chad takes a woman he has yet to fuck on a date?

Nigga you are obsessed with Chad

There are alot of cheaper & less resistant ways to take if your end goal is just to fuck.. period.

Bro. These nerds don't know the game at all. They're not gonna even understand the game. They're gonna use it to their advantage.

More money=more pussy

I dont even care if you have the money to burn. It is a stupid strategy and will only lead you to become a beta buck.

Sounds like you were a beta buck before. Cool. Believe what you want. No one is advocating spending 1000 dollars on a hoe. Or even spending money on her. You spend money on yourself and show you have wealth. Then you know she wants a check. You fuck then leave her.

If that makes you a beta buck then you're lost.

HumanSockPuppet • 12 points • 26 December, 2017 10:33 PM

Money increases RMV, not SMV.

Remember, there are **two markets** that exist, because men and women both want partners for sex and partners for emotional presence and support.

AstuteBlackMan • -1 points • 26 December, 2017 10:45 PM

RMV is part of SMV. Your chances of getting laid increases with money.

HumanSockPuppet • 6 points • 27 December, 2017 07:17 AM

Your chances of getting laid increases with money.

No, they do not.

Women will occasionally throw a piece of "fuck bait" at a rich chump in an attempt to get him to commit. The more experience a girl has with manipulating men, the less likely that fuck bait will be an *actual* fuck.

Only tingles result in sex, and only frame produces tingles.

AstuteBlackMan • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 07:23 AM

A Broke buff guy. Or a rich buff guy.

Tell me who gets more pussy. All things equal.

Women will occasionally throw a piece of "fuck bait" at a rich chump in an attempt to get him to commit. The more experience a girl has with manipulating men, the less likely that fuck bait will be an *actual* fuck.

Money isn't a substitute. You need other things as well. You need to have your actual shit together to really dominate. But pussy will come with money.

Only tingles result in sex, and only frame produces tingles.

L

wracky272 • 5 points • 27 December, 2017 01:19 AM

Women fuck rich men that they are completely unattracted to. Chance of getting laid does not equal SMV, as strange as that sounds. Money will get you laid, but it won't wet panties-- that's the difference.

AstuteBlackMan • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 01:20 AM

I hear you and we should all strive to be our own Chad and obtain pussy without using money but you can be a boss and alpha and use the money to fuck without even spending much.

Plus most men aren't trying to get their panties wet. They just want you pussy.

wracky272 • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 04:12 AM

I'm not saying don't bother with money. Money will make your life, and getting laid, easier. But pretending that money makes you a sex god or irresistible to women is naive.

sadomasochrist • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 02:01 PM

It's probably more accurate to say without status just RMV and an increased number of suitors looking for a mark.

I think it's way more common here to align smv strictly under attraction mechanics.

redd\_reality • 9 points • 27 December, 2017 01:42 AM

And his overt assertion of a post-nup layed the foundation of his destruction.

P1000123 • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 04:33 AM

How should he have played it, picking up to the moment right before he asks her for a post up.

WISE\_TURD • 5 points • 27 December, 2017 05:23 AM

He lost the game long before asking for her to forfeit.

Swelfie • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 07:10 AM

Exactly. What benefit to her would there be in signing such a thing? There would have to be ample consideration in the contract just to be legal.

the99percent1 • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 10:54 PM

Yup. He already made the error of getting married to her.

Like what the fuck was going on in his mind? You know you are building something of high value. You know, eventually, you will become rich of it.

But hey, lets wife up this high school teacher, who hates her low paying job and forces you to pay for her lifestyle.

Like if he shotgunned, got her pregnant, id somewhat understand his decision to get married. But seriously,

you couldnt fuck up your life any better than he has.

Turkerthelurker • 9 points • 27 December, 2017 02:34 AM

Perhaps if he hadn't married her, he wouldn't have had the drive or time to develop his businesses. Maybe he'd be distracted chasing girls instead.

Also, she is now 31. She has a lot invested in him. Her measely salary helped pay rent. Her salary gives him the financial stability (or at least the illusion of it) to pursue his side-business to begin with.

I'm not saying she deserves to take all of his shit, but of fucking course she has a right not to sign a post-nup

[deleted] • 7 points • 27 December, 2017 03:10 AM

Nailed it.

This money is hers. The only question now is how much of his future earnings could she claim in the event of a divorce.

Talk about closing the barn door after the horses escaped.

garbagejooce • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 09:47 PM

Most objective respond here.

Reanimated1 • 86 points • 26 December, 2017 08:06 PM

I hope the guy finds her Reddit post. Valuable evidence in the future divorce.

guavaberries3 • 21 points • 27 December, 2017 12:24 AM

hes a nerd, it's possible if this story gets popular and shows up in finance communities.

Your\_Coke\_Dealer • 37 points • 27 December, 2017 12:50 AM

Kick this over to WallStreetBets, and they'll not only have odds on the divorce happening within five years, but also an over-under on what percent of his assets she gets

guavaberries3 • 8 points • 27 December, 2017 03:53 AM

is that the tldr of WallStreetBets? just bets on shit?

sounds pretty interesting actually. does the sub provide insightful learning oppportunities?

Your\_Coke\_Dealer • 13 points • 27 December, 2017 04:07 AM

Nah, WSB is stockbrokers and other finance guys shitposting, but it's good entertainment if you're into investing

thomascoopers • 8 points • 27 December, 2017 12:54 AM

It had 3k up votes, but she removed it. I wonder why.... I just *knew* someone would post it here. Very thankful cos all I could see was the husband getting ripped to shreds in the comments. The story doesn't paint the husband as that bad of a guy, really, and it came across like OP *felt* like the hubby cared mostly about the money.

omega\_dawg93 • 40 points • 26 December, 2017 10:16 PM

she may not want to hurt him but her lawyer wants to ruthlessly ass rape his current and future earning potential.

i hope he fucked her a lot bc he's abt to find out just how much pussy actually costs.

[deleted] • 73 points • 26 December, 2017 07:21 PM

In five years, she'll have half of his millions and she'll be out on the town pretending "she's still got it" while competing with the 22 year old gorgeous girls she envies.

IVlaskerade • 11 points • 27 December, 2017 12:13 AM

While competing with the same 22 year old her husband left her for, because he sure as hell isn't going to repeat his mistake with the next hot piece of ass who crawls into his bed.

AFuckYou • 38 points • 26 December, 2017 10:24 PM

I like how she says he "came into" a lot of money. Like whoops, he got rich. It was his work with his friend that made the money.

LordThunderbolt • 33 points • 27 December, 2017 01:09 AM\*

**"Anyways, he's not Elon Musk or anything but he's doing really well.**

**Just last year we bought a nice house in the Bay Area which I always thought was unobtainable. "**

Gotta love this. She didn't pay a dime on the new house, but it's "WE" who bought it lol. Women.

P1000123 • -7 points • 27 December, 2017 04:51 AM

They are married. They share everything. Legally. "We" is appropriate.

Trpogre • 13 points • 27 December, 2017 07:50 AM

So if the man says "I ate a steak".... and by your logic you are together, then you can say "WE ate a steak"???

What kind of fucking language hamstering is this.

P1000123 • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 01:48 PM

It's not hamstering. There are certain possessions you would claim a "We" too. "Our" dog is ok with you even if one person bought it? She's not saying "Our" business. That's different. But a home? Yes, that is theirs. They both live there and they are viewed as equals so that's that.

Rainliberty • 57 points • 26 December, 2017 09:31 PM

This guy fucked himself by bringing it up in the first place. If you have the type of mindset that you would ask for something like this. You do it before you get married. The basis for any relationship, married or not is trust. He just let her know he doesn't trust her. This probably won't end well.

[deleted] • 31 points • 26 December, 2017 11:07 PM

Seems like he just potentially set himself up for the fate he wanted to avoid.

guavaberries3 • 19 points • 27 December, 2017 12:25 AM

my thoughts exactly. cringe. and now even if things are fine, she'll always remember this which will result in a bit of constant doubt and lack of guilt should she financially rape him

NakedAndBehindYou • 1 points • 29 December, 2017 07:00 AM [recovered]

If he were smart he would have given her some legal mumbo jumbo about how his partner was demanding that he get a post nup to protect the integrity of their business projects in the future. Even go so far as to offer her a guaranteed cash sum in the case of divorce in order to avoid her getting any business equity. Seeing as how they are already married, that's about the best he could hope for.

ArmaniDiamonds • 1 point • 1 January, 2018 01:36 AM

This is very smart actually. I should consider this since I have investments

WaT30 • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 01:26 PM

But tell me then, what was he supposed to do? He really had 3 choices. 1. Stay with your wife, no post-nup or anything like that, worry about will she or will she not divorce him later. 2. Stay with your wife, post-nup so she doesn't divorce rape him. 3. Divorce the wife, which in itself he WOULD have to pay her something.

Me personally, in his situation I would do the same. In my situation, whether or not I was poor or rich, I would make her sign a pre-nup (bruh, but your not supposed to get married, first rule of TRP - yes but I can't raise kids in a normal way without a mother figure, and that would be their mother in marriage, for all it's worth, marriage is the only way to raise healthy kids in a normal environment).

The\_Lear\_Bluce\_Ree • 17 points • 27 December, 2017 12:17 AM

Yup the relationship is poisoned now. He's fucked.

DONT\_reply\_with\_THIS • 1 point • 29 December, 2017 07:43 PM

Better now than in the future. This guy is obviously bright so his future projects will earn him tens of millions which is what he wants to protect, not the couple of million he has now. Better to get the divorce now and move on

LordThunderbolt • 12 points • 27 December, 2017 01:18 AM

He was most likely one of those "I don't see the need for it, I trust my wife. Besides, I dont have much anyway" guys. Now that he's rich af he sees the potential unlubricated financial rape coming his way, so now he's tightening and peppering his angus.

B\_Campbell • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 02:57 PM

Yeah. That train left the station. What's she really supposed to think if he comes to her with this? I really don't blame her in this case. If you're gonna get married you got to get that done at the beginning.

uebermacht • 31 points • 26 December, 2017 07:54 PM

Said post: <http://archive.is/99vzk>

Ganaria\_Gente • 13 points • 27 December, 2017 03:21 AM

Damn.... That sub is sick and evil.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 10:29 AM

Smart lawyers in the comments.

They see a huge commission incoming.

taxandstuff • 13 points • 27 December, 2017 07:57 AM

you don't know a woman until you've met her in court

momomotorboat • 23 points • 27 December, 2017 01:35 AM\*

Something that gets totally overlooked but I think helps swallow the pill:

Have you ever looked at a marriage license?

You know what word NEVER shows up on one? LOVE. Not even once.

A *legal* marriage is a contract under the supervision of the state. It has nothing to do with your emotions. Those are entirely immaterial to the state. The instant you sign that, what you've effectively done is reported to the state that you are responsible for this other person. Does the state ask if you love them? Fuck. No.

What we've done is equate this act with love, and conflate the two things as if they necessarily go hand in hand. They don't.

Marriage binds you legally. What it does not guarantee is that she won't change her mind. And if she does, then you're at the mercy of a judge. Good luck with that.

See legal marriage for what it is. A contract. Nothing more, nothing less. That's when the lenses get a richer shade of red.

EDIT: a word EDIT 2: Brothers, if there are marriage contracts where the word 'love' or similar sentiments involved, please share! I'm dying to see what municipalities do when the contract has that in the language.

SohithKumar • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 05:08 AM

Awesome perspective. I am going to use this when my girl asks me to marry her.

Bkblul • 10 points • 27 December, 2017 04:27 AM

I don't think this is a bad move on his end.

If she's legitimate she'll sign it and the relationship will carry on.

If she doesn't sign it he'll get his answer and get out before he makes some bank/she has kids. I mean he's even giving her a taste of what she could have if she signed (no need to work etc).

Magnum256 • 10 points • 27 December, 2017 08:37 AM

I can understand WHY she'd feel "hurt" or whatever, but it's purely a selfish, emotional response to the situation, not a logical one.

Plus we're missing many details. She frames it as the guy claiming he wants to "protect himself", but given his alleged success, he might have a company now with many people employed, and if she were to divorce him, and he faced a multi-million dollar loss, could ruin his existing business and result in many people losing jobs as well. He might not necessarily just be "protecting himself" (although that is completely valid), he might be protecting much more than that.

Also this part is laughable:

I would never, never, never hurt my husband even if our relationship ended

I'm sure that won't hold true if she suddenly starts "feeling" neglected, if the husband isn't home enough for her liking, or she finds him flirting with one of his secretaries at the Christmas party or whatever.

Sucks for the husband but he's basically fucked. This is the world we live in.

trplurker • 8 points • 27 December, 2017 01:49 PM



She's definitely bullshitting a bit, though I'd bet dollars to donuts the dude had someone else sit his ass down and give him the hard truth. "Hey Dan, welcome to the club, what have you done to protect your success and assets from your soon-to-be-ex-wife". Complete with a few real examples of successful men they know who have had their shit taken to the cleaners by California's male rape laws. Light bulb went off in his head and now he's looking for ways to protect himself.

One of the aspects of being an engineer (all the flavors) is always plan for contingencies and emergencies. We build redundancies and fail-safes into things to protect them from the rare catastrophic failures that can happen and he's now finally looking at his life like he would any other system and realizing there was a critical vulnerability (the wife) with no fail safe or contingency.

[deleted] • 69 points • 26 December, 2017 07:16 PM

Never marry or cohabit with a woman in the United States or other anglosphere countries if you have any ambitions of achieving financial success. There's a high chance if something goes wrong, you're fucked.

ShinyRedKetoPill • 56 points • 26 December, 2017 08:46 PM

This. Friends dont let friends marry [period] but I am making concessions for those who have grandiose dreams of parenthood bliss and will say Friends don't let friends marry without a prenup.

Past 8 years I saw a handful of Bros get married. And I lectured all of them to be smart about this. Guess how many went and got a prenup? Zero!!

Excuses ranged from "I'm at the lowest rung of middle class, I got nothing to lose that justifies the lawyer fee" to "I want to have a child with her so if we were to break up down the track I want to step up and do the right thing anyway" to the truly beta "I am afraid to bring it up. It's awkward and not romantic."

I don't get invited to many weddings these days LOL.

And most of my friend's LTRs try to keep me away from them because I am "bad influence".

One thing I learned though is that it's not worth my time to try and save the pussywhipped.

I spend my weekends between gym and parties - they spend theirs choosing childcare centers and hanging out at IKEA with their wives who immediately gained 20 pounds, cut their hair off and closed their legs.

I ask the fallen brother "are you content with life?"

"Best thing that ever happened to me" he counters.

It's a write off. Every time. Not up to me to decide for them, I suppose. It just drives me crazy seeing these things unfold.

[deleted] • 22 points • 26 December, 2017 09:12 PM

Let their ex-wives red pill them the hard way I guess. No sense in white knighting for bluepillers who don't accept your help. The best you can do is lead a horse to water, but you can't make it drink.

electricspresident • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 10:48 PM

How do u go to parties while all ur friends are married/LTRs - someone in that situation

ShinyRedKetoPill • 9 points • 26 December, 2017 10:53 PM\*

Easy!

Go out Friday nights alone and see what you come back with. There is opportunity everywhere!

Alpha needs no wingman. Entourage can be useful but is not a must-have. I improvise and some of my improvised nights have been my most fruitful!

RedPilledGodEmperor • 2 points • 28 December, 2017 05:55 AM

Going out alone can actually be pretty freaking fun if there is music and dancing. It's a way to let loose and have fun, without worrying about how you look around people who know you. I'm doing a solo trip for the first time this weekend and I'm actually pretty excited.

IVlaskerade • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 12:00 AM

How do u go to parties while all ur friends are married/LTRs

Offer to let them be your +1, and when their wives decline for them, take one of your bros or plates instead.

askmrcia • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 02:42 PM

Good question; I simply got a new set of friends. Basically it was through guys who I played flag football and basketball with during the week So they would have parties and stuff.

But yea, all my married friends or guys in serious LTRs are a lost cause. The best part is I even tried to invite them out, they always say "Well I was planning on staying at home to watch netflix with my SoSo because we haven't hung out in a while."

Yup my cousin is like that. I stopped inviting him out two years ago after he dropped that shit on me.

AstuteBlackMan • 4 points • 26 December, 2017 08:16 PM

Yep. It's better to get a woman not from the west.

Bediv3re • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 08:37 PM **[recovered]**

How about not marry a woman at all? If she truly loved you, why would she need to marry you?

Psychocist • 12 points • 26 December, 2017 08:51 PM

Truth. As said elsewhere on this page, there is nothing wrong with a ceremony, but I am not signing away my potential to a fucking soul, and especially not to a woman.

AstuteBlackMan • 8 points • 26 December, 2017 08:41 PM

Yep. Marriage back in the day was simply the woman you were sleeping with. There were also no legally binding contracts.

askmrcia • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 02:46 PM

How about not marry a woman at all? If she truly loved you, why would she need to marry you?

Yea we can think this, but ask this to a woman and they will tell you tell its all the status that comes with it.

Just take it from an outside perspective. If you are in a LTR with a girl 5 years and over in yours late 20s-early 40s people will think you're weird as fuck or you're cheating on her.

They will all ask you why you've been together so long and have't married her yet. And this is worse for the woman as we all know.

We can all sit up here and talk all big and bad about how we are just going to stay in a LTR for years and never get officially married, but I'm telling you, it won't work. Everyone around you will judge you and it will eventually get to the woman.

Hell even telling someone "she's my GF for 15 years" sounds weird as fuck.

Me personally, I plan to casual date for the rest of my life. If a chick ever does bring up marriage, then she can walk out the door because I'm not signing shit.

[deleted] • 11 points • 26 December, 2017 10:41 PM

I live about 25 clicks outside of Moscow and I'm telling you if you come into Russia looking for a woman you're gonna get a snake

AstuteBlackMan • 0 points • 26 December, 2017 10:42 PM

Never said all women were perfect there. I'm saying its better in other countries. With strong cultures. I don't know your country.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 10:55 PM

If you get outside of the Metropolitan areas of my country you'll find farm girls who could kick the shit out of the average western "man" but they're honestly the only hope of having a somewhat stable mother of the children I want just finishing school

tieltiel • -1 points • 27 December, 2017 12:26 AM

They have no recourse for cohabitation in the vast majority of states. This myth about common law marriage really needs to end. It is an extremely rare oddity in the United States.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 07:56 AM

They can also have the legal system rape you even without common law marriage. Look up palimony, asset division in cohabitation etc. It may not get as bad as in common law marriage states but it can get ugly and expensive. Plus you know, the false domestic violence accusations and such as a cherry on top. The legal system is built by manginas to serve women.

BobbyPeru • 48 points • 26 December, 2017 07:14 PM

I stopped reading as soon as her hamster went into overdrive

abolishpmo • 20 points • 27 December, 2017 01:09 AM

Wife: Not when I shift my hamstering into **MAXIMUM OVERDRIVE**

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 12:00 AM

First paragraph is a tell all.

Future96 • 46 points • 26 December, 2017 08:29 PM

Just look at the comments. They're all saying the money belongs to both of them, even though she contributed nothing to it.

[deleted] • -3 points • 27 December, 2017 05:51 AM

It was earned during the marriage in a communal property state, with no pre-nup.

The money does belong to both of them.

cjmessier • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 09:12 PM **[recovered]**

It does not rightfully belong to both of them. Just legally. That's what matters in court.

The legality doesn't matter until the end. There are certain measures he can take to lessen the chance of a divorce without being too accommodating. She seems to be offended at the lack of trust rather than the prospect of limiting her potential for financial gain. She don't give a fuck about the money, she's pissed that her husband is now deciding to be a dickhead.

[deleted] • 21 points • 26 December, 2017 10:41 PM

dickhead?

Protecting one's assets does not a dickhead make.

[deleted] • 22 points • 26 December, 2017 10:09 PM\*

Going to go against the grain. We know that women are emotional creatures - ignore what they say and watch what they do - so there's really no point in getting analytical about what she wrote in a panicked reddit post. Her ramblings aren't going to tell us much one way or the other.

If the roles we're reversed, we'd say she's already cheating and for him to take his cut and bounce. That could be the situation here and the dude is covering his ass - smart move. The engineer fucked up by getting married without a pre-nup. Him offering a postnup is basically saying "sign or we're done" so he can cut his losses. I'd be impressed if she signs.

rraadduurr • 6 points • 26 December, 2017 11:23 PM

Spot on! There is no need to start women hating without reason.

However the community in on a slippery slope, majority doesn't hold to trp values.

Frdl • 5 points • 27 December, 2017 12:11 AM

I didn't take much from this post at all. All I see is a guy laying on thick dread game by asking for a post-nup and woman getting terrified that he's looking for a younger girl.

P1000123 • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 04:43 AM

I wouldn't. That's a dumb woman.

ArmaniDiamonds • 1 point • 1 January, 2018 01:40 AM

Honestly I think he should just cut his loss either way. Either through divorce or she signing. There isn't any reason for him to prolong the future since that's clearly what she has in mind. She made the post to try and find validation to her knowing she is going to fuck him in the future. Its that simple.

[deleted] • 1 point • 1 January, 2018 04:38 PM

Yeah if she doesn't sign then I'd say they're done. The more I thought on this, the more it bothered me that more details weren't given. If the post-nup was heavily favored for her but carved out his business shares as untouchable, then it would be no big deal at all. She is taken care of in the exact way she would be, and his business is free to grow without threat of takeover from the divorce.

Her post is premature.

ozaku7 • 37 points • 26 December, 2017 08:53 PM

You are completely misinterpreting what she is writing.

I've never asked him for anything now that I wouldn't have asked before. I didn't ask him to buy me a new car or to support me if I quit my job. I've never gone on shopping sprees with his card or anything like that.

It just hurts me and honestly I can't help but to think about how now that he's rich he could leave me tomorrow and hook up with some gorgeous 22 year old.

It's not that she didn't ask for him to become rich, it's that she has never asked things that would require his wealth to get. That is exactly what she is writing. She didn't explicitly ask for that car, or a credit card to go on a shopping spree.

Now you have to consider that this woman might actually really love the man for the feels he is giving her and that he has now broken her trust regarding his commitment, which in the end will bite him in the ass. If he was really clever, he would go to a lawyer and learn that pre or postnups are basically invalid and no sane woman would say "sure, it seems that you believe I will leave you, or you might be planning on leaving me, but yeah I will sign that paper that excludes me fucking you over, because why wouldn't I if I have the legal right and I hate your guts anyway at that point?"

He fucked himself that he didn't get a prenup, he fucked himself again because of actually trying a postnup.

Psychocist • 20 points • 26 December, 2017 09:10 PM

which in the end will bite him in the ass

Marriage is a lose-lose situation for a guy. Regardless of what he does, it will ALWAYS bite him in the ass. Accept the reality of the shitty situation and stop hamstering.

sketchyuser • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 09:28 PM [recovered]

Too many of you are wounded dogs who have an awfully skewed view on marriage and reality. Maybe your parents divorced or you had a bad break up or divorce yourselves.

But maybe keep your cynicism and hermit values to yourself?

Many people on here are red pill'd and want to get married. My last ex was unbelievably loyal to me and had a good family, i know for a fact she would never leave me if i married her. I broke up with her for my own selfish reasons, but i know I can find another one who will be loyal.

Could also be you date shitty women.

Psychocist • 20 points • 26 December, 2017 09:33 PM

Maybe your parents divorced or you had a bad break up or divorce yourselves.

Better yet, my friend, my parents never married and raised me well. That's the only proof I need that marriage is unnecessary. What exactly do I, as a man, gain from marriage? Because I can't see a single benefit, and especially no benefit that outweighs the huge risk. If I was a woman, or a man under the spell of the feminine matrix, I can see plenty of benefits!

sketchyuser • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 09:59 PM [recovered]

In the US there are many benefits legal and financial...?

Psychocist • 10 points • 26 December, 2017 10:11 PM\*

You're seriously trying to tell me there are many legal benefits to marriage for a guy? Is that why this guy is asking for a post-nup, because of all those legal benefits he has? Please.. just stop. Go find your crowd. We are not it.

TheOriginalWasBetter • 10 points • 26 December, 2017 11:25 PM

There used benefits to be when marriage was a legal contract. Marriage is supposed to be

a contact where a man and a woman agree to start a family together, which usually includes kids, house, land, perhaps a business. Each person is guaranteed the cooperation of the other because the person who breaks the contract gets nothing. An enforceable marriage contract would mean men can't cheat or be lazy or neglectful, but it would also mean women can't either, or they get kicked to the curb with nothing.

Now that divorce is no fault and women are always assumed the victims, women can just divorce a guy pretty much whenever she wants and take half his stuff. And on top of that she'll get free money from the government if she has kids and kicks him out.

So yes, as of right now marriage is rendered useless because the contract is not enforced. The same thing would happen if business contracts could be exited with "no fault", having a business partner would be something only stupid and gullible people would do.

The root of the problem isn't women or marriage, it's liberal judges and liberal policies that give women a free pass out of marriage any time they want. That's how big government liberals like it. Destroy families and make people dependent on government. When parents aren't influencing their kids that allows more room for the government to influence kids.

sketchyuser • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 08:29 PM

Get a pre nup and get married it's easy also marry a rich woman.

gELSK • 4 points • 26 December, 2017 11:32 PM

// , What legal benefits?

You actually have LESS rights to your children, and many judges are quoted verbatim saying that married men are expected to raise their wives children of another man, as their duty, *after the marriage*.

Marriage Hurts Men

If you do not marry, but, in stead, cohabitate, you are more likely to have an improved sex life, better mutual commitment, more likelihood of keeping your children, a thinner significant other, and lower risk of social isolation.

Kelly Musick, Larry Bumpass. Reexamining the Case for Marriage: Union Formation and Changes in Well-being. Journal of Marriage and Family, 2012; 74 (1): 1 DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00873.x (Cornell University's College of Human Ecology, chose 2,737 single men and women from the National Survey of Families and Households to follow for six years.)

Paternity fraud, even when proven, has little to no effect on child support cases or alimony. Judges polled considered it "a man's duty."

People who point out positive examples of marriage as a counter to this are engaging in the Base Rate Neglect fallacy<sup>1</sup>.

ON AVERAGE Sex decreases after marriage, regardless of children. ON AVERAGE live-in girlfriends even stay thinner on average than wives, again, regardless of children.<sup>1</sup> This more recent research contradicts previous, highly cited research.

Werewolf35b • 16 points • 27 December, 2017 12:30 AM

You don't know anything about your ex's (lol, ex's) future behavior. What supreme arrogance to think

your the one guy in the world that knows, for sure, his lifelong marriage would succeed over decades for a lifetime. You must be really young. It's a dumb thing to say. 50% of marriages end in divorce. Cynicism? It's something to be cynical about. "Hermit values?" Your the one planning to be shackled up at home with the same lady (whose mind you can read apparently) for the rest of your life, while red pill guys are out on the town and social. Who is really the "hermit" here?

You think people here date shitty women, but you can pick the diamonds out of the rough? All women have the capacity to be shitty, if you are a trp guy you'd know that awalt. You think you can find a loyal one? That doesn't really exist. They are driven to keep looking thier whole lives, and it's not even conscious.

The girl you mentioned that was so great, (you have oneitis also, if you view her this way, mr. trp) is the same way. She can't help but look for a better man. Its nature. She'll get wet in his presence, regardless of how much, you and her both, believed her promises to you. She was a "shitty woman" too. You just didn't stick around long enough for it to happen to you, so you still have googley eyes for her. Enjoy your oneitis, if you want, but it's telling that you gotta slander everyone else's chick as "shitty" to maintain your delusion.

SohithKumar • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 05:00 AM

Man, you said it right. Perfect. ☐

[deleted] • 4 points • 27 December, 2017 06:54 AM

Perhaps you know everything and should marry a nonshitty woman and come back and tell us how our wounds are blocking us from true happiness.

NYCSPARKLE • 9 points • 26 December, 2017 10:14 PM

Many people on here are red pilld and want to get married.

Contradictory statement. A true red pilld person doesn't want to get married just "cause romance, man."

i know I can find another one who will be loyal.

*Preemptive Oneitis and a lack of comprehension of AWALT.*

You have oneitis for your ex-GF and you're going to get it again. I don't think you've had it hard enough yet (congrats), so you haven't really gone full TRP. I'm guessing you're a high functioning beta. Hey man, stay plugged in for all I care.

sketchyuser • 0 points • 27 December, 2017 08:29 PM

it's not because of "romance Man" it's because it is part of the culture and tradition I grew up in. The family unit is the most successful method of building a good society, having well adjusted kids, have a sense of stability to come home to, have people in your life who care about you. If you find someone who grew up in this way and shares these same values they won't leave you so easily. If you're a catch they will never leave you.

ozaku7 • -1 points • 26 December, 2017 09:15 PM

Marriage is bullshit to begin with, animals don't need to get married to get offspring. Neither do we. The main shitty situation he brought upon himself is being born on US soil because it seems that this crap only happens on that northern continent of the globe.



Psychocist • 3 points • 26 December, 2017 09:20 PM

Agreed. I'm in Asia at the minute, but I still wouldn't consider marriage here. Ironically, marriage just incentivises separation.

ozaku7 • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 09:33 PM

I will never get married because I don't want to be caged. I hate it. I will stay exactly there where I am, I can stay a full week at home without a problem, but I would go apeshit if that door would be locked for only an hour.

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 10:35 AM

Yea, but his lawyer sees a 10year court fight with lots of \$\$\$.

[deleted] • 13 points • 27 December, 2017 12:23 AM

TL;DR: "I don't feel like I would ever, ever, ever hurt him, but let's not get rid of the option."

gELSK • 4 points • 26 December, 2017 11:22 PM

// , The truth of her intentions is in her pronouns.

Rudeyyyy • 5 points • 27 December, 2017 04:06 AM

So she does absolutely nothing to support him yet she's still going to get half? LOL how pathetic. He's protecting his assets and business because a divorce would only hurt it. Of course if his dumbass didn't get married in the first place then there would be no need for any of this. I can see the hamster spinning already trying to rationalize how she should get half. It's pathetic. I hope this guy opens his eyes.

troezz • 5 points • 27 December, 2017 05:16 AM

After some lawyer gave her some advice, this is OP's reply. OP's husband is about to get screwed.

This is great advice, thank you. The thing is - I'm perfectly willing to sign a post up that would give me 45% of everything in case of a divorce (rather than 50% I would be entitled to now) if it meant protecting his businesses and giving him peace of mind. But I'm not gonna just sign everything away so I'm discarded as the starter wife. I stand to gain nothing by signing even a generous post up because I'll get more without it, but I want to fight and keep my marriage.

Just look at this number **45%**. Scary.

Edit: format

RedPilledGodEmperor • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 03:23 PM

Seriously. What the fuck? She doesn't deserve 45%. She wasn't actually out there earning that money. She can easily get a job.

I hate this whole we need to give her half of the assets because "she's accustomed to the lifestyle." If I'm fired or laid off from a job that's paying \$100K/year, I can't just go to the next company and demand that same amount because I'm "accustomed to the \$100K/year lifestyle."

Banincoming • 6 points • 27 December, 2017 05:29 AM

First response: "Now that BOTH of you are rich..."

This guy needs to exercise a lot more discretion with what he tells her. Embedded in his purpose is a self-protection against her, so there's no reason he should expect her to respond any other way.

What I'd do in this situation is play off the post-nup on his business partners - tell her they don't want to get into bed with someone without protection from the risk of her potentially owning half of his portion of the business. He could even tell his wife that all of the business partners signed a contract doing the same. In doing this, he's given her a much more digestible foundation for making the decision, and hasn't created the new risk of a self-fulfilling prophecy with such a candid curveball.

trplurker • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 01:55 PM

I agree that he bungled this part completely. I'm thinking he just recently discovered how exposed his ass is, probably from an older successful man who shared a bit of mature wisdom about bored rich housewives and their propensity to cheat and divorce for cash and prizes. He overreacted and instead of going about this with a Machiavellian purpose he went directly for the solution without thinking how she would take it.

It would of been far better for him to sell it as a business requirement that would bring in million of USD for them.

just\_a\_thought4U • 42 points • 26 December, 2017 06:55 PM

California law says that half his income belongs to her. He has pretty well killed the marriage by asking for this and should just man up and get a divorce.

vast\_rightwing • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 07:15 PM [recovered]

Not a lawyer but if you're referencing the fact that California is community property, it affects assets, not income.

Alimony is a separate beast but he's always going to fare better by doing it earlier in the marriage, before she quits her job, and before they have kids.

just\_a\_thought4U • 9 points • 26 December, 2017 07:57 PM

As soon as your income hits the bank it becomes an asset. If he made bank whilst married, then she gets half that bank...in California. California is a bad place to get divorced.

vast\_rightwing • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 08:55 PM [recovered]

And as soon as you spend it (which people do with most of their income), it stops being an asset.

just\_a\_thought4U • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 08:59 PM

What is your point? California divorce law is pretty settled. You can easily research it. BTW, as soon as you spend it, then it is gone and you don't have it any more...unless you buy a tangible item. Then that becomes the asset.

Psychocist • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 09:06 PM [recovered]

What about if you 'give' it to someone else? And they 'give' it back to you after divorce? My God I think like a 5 year old haha

just\_a\_thought4U • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 09:10 PM

Hiding assets in divorce proceedings can backfire.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/jefflanders/2012/11/14/what-are-the-consequences-of-hiding-assets-during-divorce/#3898ef1a190c>

Psychocist • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 09:14 PM

Figured. Well, shit. I deserve to be divorce raped if I ever get married knowing what I know.

just\_a\_thought4U • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 09:21 PM

Don't get married or insist on a pre-nup. Pretty simple.

Psychocist • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 09:25 PM

But can a pre-nup provide as much protection as not getting married in the first place?

OhhDatDogOMine • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 02:41 PM

Stop this purple pill bullshit. Either take the red pill or I will shove it up your ass.

Pre-nups are overthrown every day, don't get married. That's it.

Low\_Cost\_Chimp\_Meat • -1 points • 27 December, 2017 12:19 AM

Do not hide assets during a divorce! In fact, put it all, ALL out there on day one....otherwise, it will get drug out and THAT is when all legal fee\$, civil case and ass-raping commence. When people describe a typical \$300k divorce.....it is almost always because of this.

Psychocist • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 12:25 AM

Don't worry, I won't ever be getting divorced because I won't ever be getting married. Was just wondering how others might avoid some of the financial raping. Seems like you can't really avoid it, and by trying to (at least by hiding it) you make it much worse.

KakarotSSJ4 • 0 points • 26 December, 2017 07:56 PM

Yeah he should run for the hills while he has the chance. She has quit her job because he can at least get out before the kids and hopefully walk away with the house

GroundhogLiberator • 26 points • 26 December, 2017 07:30 PM

Just man up and concede to the woman and give her half your shit undeservedly, am I right?

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 05:54 AM

Or he could remain married, recognizing that she has zero incentive to sign a post-nuptial agreement, and one of four things happens:

- 1) They divorce and she walks away with at least half the assets
- 2) She outlives him and gets everything
- 3) He outlives her and he keeps everything for himself
- 4) They lose their money, which seems like it would bother him much more than it would bother her.

Low\_Cost\_Chimp\_Meat • 4 points • 27 December, 2017 12:29 AM

Unfortunately, that is the absolute best thing you can do. Take the hit right away....DO NOT drag it out in any anyway!

The judges and lawyers lick their chops when they can create a contentious divorce.....they'll happily drag it out for 5 years \$\$\$\$. They want you to [attempt to] hide cash, punch her in the face, and generally disagree on everything.

just\_a\_thought4U • -4 points • 26 December, 2017 07:54 PM

Yea, man up and follow the law you agreed to when you got married. If he didn't want to do that then he shouldn't have gotten married. Right? Real men keep their agreements.

empatheticapathetic • 29 points • 26 December, 2017 08:08 PM

This is not a time for "real men". It's a time to pull whatever sneaky fucked up shit he needs to pull to protect his future.

just\_a\_thought4U • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 08:13 PM **[recovered]**

What goes around comes around. Real men keep their word. If they don't like the deal then they don't make it. If you don't want to be a "real man" then that is your choice. Accepting the responsibility you commit to is the mark of an honorable man. Who wants to deal with a dishonorable man.

IVlaskerade • 9 points • 27 December, 2017 12:14 AM

Real men keep their word.

Why are you in TRP trying to tell us what a "real man" is.

Werewolf35b • 7 points • 26 December, 2017 11:55 PM

What word? When you agree to marry, you can't be expected to have a lawyer's knowledge of your state's divorce law. And you shouldn't argue it as a moral obligation, as these rules will differ from state to state. Which one is right? Which one is immoral?

The "word" that "real men" keep your referencing is what? To give half his assets away? Funny I don't remember that part of the oath. The one I remember was that you'd stay with her no matter what til you die. 90% of divorces are initiated by women. So maybe your barking up the wrong tree, when women can't even get the overt, openly professed purpose of marriage right, yet suddenly become divorce law experts when they want to bail, and think it's the husband that isn't living up to his word. And worse, that the whole turn of events is moral and right, is supreme arrogance.

Bizarro world mentality. You must be a woman. No man could be a that double minded and self centered.

empatheticapathetic • 15 points • 26 December, 2017 08:18 PM

If he was dealing with a man, yes. He's dealing with a woman; play dirty to win at all costs because that's exactly what she's doing.

just\_a\_thought4U • -13 points • 26 December, 2017 08:23 PM

"because that's exactly what she's doing."

Like you know her mind. Listen to yourself. Is that what your mother did?

Future96 • 11 points • 26 December, 2017 08:33 PM

You don't belong here. You're no red pill man.

just\_a\_thought4U • 3 points • 26 December, 2017 08:39 PM

A real "Red Pilled" man is honorable and up-front. He doesn't have to lie and cheat to get what he wants. A real man lets it be known what he wants and then gets it...with no fear. He stands tall and open...not to slither like a snake in the dark. His yes is a yes and his no is a no.

Werewolf35b • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 12:05 AM\*

Haha using concept of chivalry and a European/White code of conduct is invalid when your in a country whose court systems been subverted by Jews for decades for the purpose of destroying you., Splitting your families wealth in two, that is, after taking their third. The wife's probably a philipino anyway, no, he's a California tech nerd, surely he met the nice but homely Chinese girl at college, when he failed at nabbing the blondes (at least she'll stay skinny, he tells himself!)

He ain't slithering. He's slippery because he's dodging all the hands in his pockets. A noble pursuit in a Zionist country. He isnt in the dark, he's not hiding assets, he came right to her and told her what's up in plain English. He's a nerd but gotta give him credit that he looked the devil in the face and said "I need to protect myself from the- more than likely evil turn- I see you making, cuz you don't love me like you say you do. Sign here, byatch."

His yes was yes at the altar but like I said in a previous post, 90% of divorces are initiated by women. A "real man" learns at about 3, that his stuff is his and you don't touch other people's stuff, why can't adult woman learn this? How much do you think she knows about computer programming and shit like that? It's his money, all your invocations of Western chivalry have to gloss over that. He made it. It's his. What right does she have, since you want to talk morals, what right?

You want him to deliberately be dumb, and act against his own interests, in the name of honor. Your shady, lady.

Psychocist • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 09:04 PM [recovered]

No, a real "red pillled" man understands what he is dealing with when in association with a woman. That is all.

godlesspinko • -3 points • 27 December, 2017 09:35 AM

Thank god. Red pillers are apparently basement dwelling neckbeards who get their knowledge of women from talk radio and porn. Enjoy jerking off by yourself for the rest of your lonely pathetic lives redpill men!

empatheticapathetic • 8 points • 26 December, 2017 08:23 PM

You're on the wrong forum bud.

just\_a\_thought4U • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 08:28 PM [recovered]

No, because there are honorable men here. Men who are up front their relational guidelines to the women they want to get involved with and are honest about it.

empatheticapathetic • 6 points • 26 December, 2017 08:30 PM

You don't even know what point you're trying to make any more.

godlesspinko • -2 points • 27 December, 2017 09:30 AM

Get off the internet Mr. President.

Your\_Coke\_Dealer • 8 points • 27 December, 2017 12:51 AM

real men

Now fuck right off with your *No True Scotsman* bullshit

just\_a\_thought4U • -3 points • 27 December, 2017 01:38 AM

You want the truth...(seems like) you can't handle the truth.

cjmessier • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 08:34 PM **[recovered]**

I'm taking her side. Sounds like a nice woman who got in early, didn't marry for money, etc.

He's better off sticking with her. If he decides to start banging sluts attracted for his money, he's going to be in for a long, miserable life. He should stick it out with her, make sure she's happy without putting her on a pedestal, and cross the road of divorce if and when it presents itself.

If he is so successful, he should be able to hire a good attorney anyway. No need to fuck up loyal LTR because he pocketed a few mil.

Your\_Coke\_Dealer • 16 points • 27 December, 2017 01:02 AM

He'd have been a smarter man to not reveal his hand with a post-nup. That's a can of worms that overtly tells a woman "I don't trust you". He doesn't have to trust her, he may have been even smarter not to marry in the first place, but what he should have done was stashed his assets **without her knowledge**. Sure, she wouldn't be locked out of everything he made, but he could easily make himself an insurance policy in the form of a holding corporation and some cleverly disguised business assets that a woman wouldn't touch with a ten foot pole during a divorce. A lawyer and an accountant consulted in advance are a lot smarter than "I want a pre/post-nup"

Turkerthelurker • 12 points • 27 December, 2017 02:49 AM

what he should have done was stashed his assets without her knowledge.

Cryptocurrencies. The guy is in the tech industry too...

Sounds like he complicated their relationship for fuck all.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 06:01 AM

You are assuming that her attorney wouldn't engage a halfway decent forensic accountant.

My BIL owned thousands of vending machines. He literally earned his money a quarter at a time. My ex-SIL managed to track down 10 years worth of his earnings, and then found where he stashed it overseas.

She got half the assets, he got to pay the taxes and penalties out of his half.

He was an idiot.

Turkerthelurker • 1 points • 27 December, 2017 02:43 AM **[recovered]**

Christ, thank you. Looking at her situation through a RP lens:

She is now 31. She has a lot invested in him. Her measly salary helped pay rent. Her salary gives him the financial stability (or at least the illusion of it) to pursue his side-business to begin with.

Perhaps if he hadn't married her, he wouldn't have had the drive or time to develop his businesses. Maybe he'd be distracted chasing girls instead.

I'm not saying she deserves to take all of his shit, but of fucking course she has a right not to sign a post-nup. Frankly the guy sounds like a moron.

askmrcia • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 03:10 PM

Her measly salary helped pay rent

You didn't read the post did you? She clearly stated that the guy was the one paying for everything before they even moved into the bigger house (that he paid for completely).

Read the post again, she clearly outlined that she virtually bought nothing to the table other than her emotional/physical support.

Turkerthelurker • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 05:14 PM\*

You just can't tell based off the description. She has said:

He's always paid the majority of the bills, I'll admit that.

That's basically the extent to which she talks about her financial contributions. Given that he makes twice than her (and is the man in what seems to be a traditional relationship) he pays the majority of bills. Makes sense.

If you want to focus on raising our future kids, do that. I just want you to be happy". Music to my ears. I could write a book about how great this man is. We're planning on starting a family in 2018/2019. Things are really good right now.

She then goes on to say many things supporting the idea that she wants to have his children, seems sincere, she really does love him *right now*.

Of course that could change, we're talking about women afterall. I don't see how someone can read this description and think that she is at fault here, though.

This guy is a MORON or he wants to end the relationship now. Only a dipshit would think he could casually bring up a post-nup, and not have that lead to a future of fights and mutual distrust.

If he wanted to protect his assets, he should've started to hide some. But this conversation was only going to lead to problems.

sneakyMak • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 04:48 PM

whos to say that emotional/physical support doesnt mean alot?

IVlaskerade • 4 points • 27 December, 2017 12:18 AM

Sounds like a nice woman who got in early, didn't marry for money, etc.

She does sound like that was who she was.

But that was 6 years ago.



Psychocist • 12 points • 26 December, 2017 09:08 PM\*

Loyal? I don't think her loyalty has been put to the test. How long have they been together?

cjmessier • 17 points • 26 December, 2017 09:17 PM\*

6 years. Either she's a decent partner (read: loyal) or he's incapable of upgrading. From the success indicated previously, the latter is unlikely.

MusicSports • -3 points • 26 December, 2017 09:55 PM

6 years is nothing when it comes to relationships. And on top of that, if she is so loyal and a good wife then what's her reasoning for not signing it? If she's so good she would sign it and continue being the great wife that she is so he has no reason to leave. She knows he wants out and she has probably been talking about his money like it's both of theirs. Women will never give the full story. They say whatever makes them look good and deny anything they can't flip into making them look good

Hughtub • 14 points • 26 December, 2017 10:55 PM

yeah fully 33% of one's reproductive life is "nothing". Jeez. Yes, 6 years is a HELL of a long relationship. She indicates that she's the one feeling threatened by the chance that he'll leave her.

[deleted] • 8 points • 26 December, 2017 11:20 PM

I would absolutely bang hundreds of sluts who are attracted to me for my money (if I had millions of dollars). I cannot fathom how that would make for a long miserable life.

dokaebeex • 1 points • 26 December, 2017 11:41 PM **[recovered]**

If he decides to start banging sluts attracted for his money, he's going to be in for a long, miserable life? Says who?

darksoldierk • -2 points • 26 December, 2017 11:09 PM

Cross the road of divorce if and when it presents itself? Really? He should have dealt with this before getting married. You don't wait until a financial crises happens to "deal with it", you anticipate it, and prepare for it. Which is what he is trying to do.

If the relationship gets fucked up, it's really her fault. Like he said, he just wants to protect himself, it's his earnings not hers, and he has that right to seek protection. If she signs the post-nup and he cheats, well that's life. She can still get her 60k a year job and live a normal life.

cjmessier • 1 point • 31 December, 2017 08:53 PM

To each his own. Be good to those good to you. Don't twist it

ImYourMajesty • 5 points • 27 December, 2017 08:45 AM

Yo i read that yesterday and I was shocked. The only thing that was on my mind was the picture of her taking most of the husbands money after a few years. Like Jesus this guy gave you the life of a queen and you can't even sign some paper for his comfort. And these lawyers at the top comment (there were a few) all recommending her not to sign, wtf is up with those guys. Imagine them in the same situation probably begging for their wives to sign. This is some major blue pillness on their side. The only thing I can say is AWALT.

Dmva100 • 8 points • 26 December, 2017 08:42 PM

This is like a beta going to a model and telling her he wants to impregnate her so no other guys can't have her and she'll be his forevaaaarrrrrr.

And then she says no she doesn't want to.

Must go post in relationship subreddit and bemoan her lack of love for meeeee

UndergroundCEO • 14 points • 26 December, 2017 09:02 PM\*

I'm going down the same path as him myself right now and tbh, I would never get married without a prenup in place in the first place. I hope my future wife doesn't take it as a sign of distrust, it's solely for peace of mind. That same peace of mind he gave you by making you both financially stable is the same piece of mind that he wants to ensure no one has the capability of making him financially unstable. He is doing the right thing. All financially successful people go to great lengths to protect their assets, and if they don't, they're probably not financially successful. Don't think of it as "I wouldn't hurt him, so he shouldn't need one". Think of it more as "I know I wouldn't hurt him, so it doesn't really make a difference to me if he gets one or not". Unless you are a snake in the tall grass then you shouldn't have any problem signing it. Again it's not a distrust thing it's an more of an insurance thing. People get fucked over by the ones they least expected all the time, and safety procedures only work if you follow them with everyone, everytime.

Trpogre • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 07:48 AM

Why are you talking yourself into legal marriage?

Most of my plates would have my children in a heartbeat and would love to live with me. Completely open about No Legal Marriage.

Fix your frame... the right woman will not distrust you for talking about only ever living together (no legal marriage)... quite the opposite that she will feel very special to be with such a careful and discerning man.

aDrunkenWhaler • 7 points • 26 December, 2017 10:29 PM

Prenups can get overthrown in court. They can be useless.

UndergroundCEO • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 10:57 PM

Usually in cases where it wasn't solely one parties fault for the split up and when it is hard to determine who exactly at fault. If one parties malicious acts are solely responsible for the split up then the prenup will usually be enforced, so most shouldn't have a problem to worry about.

aDrunkenWhaler • 10 points • 26 December, 2017 11:22 PM

She will lie, the court will believe her, the prenup will be thrown out. The end. Hoping it will not happen to you is a fool's errand. Like getting married in the first place.

gELSK • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 11:34 PM

// , I looked it up. The legal standard for overthrowing a pre-nup is "onconscionability", and guess what the ruling history looks like for it?

NOT GOOD

<https://nationalparentsorganization.org/blog/22457-studies-show-judicial-bias-against-dads>

MattyAnon • 26 points • 26 December, 2017 09:01 PM

"and now all of a sudden I feel like he doesn't trust me because he has money."

Ah... the old "trust me" smokescreen, always conveniently used to get something rather than to give something.

I didn't ask him to buy me a new car or to support me if I quit my job. I've never gone on shopping sprees with his card or anything like that.

But still - she had all bills paid and didn't have to contribute much.

And now hubbie wants a post-nup before raising a family.

Damned good plan, but it is unlikely to hold up in court. You can't even get a prenup to hold up if it's signed just before the wedding. Has to be shortly after proposing, otherwise it's seen as "springing this on her at the last second and she's forced to comply". I can't see a postnup working, especially if they then have kids.

A smarter option is "I want to be with you, but we're getting a divorce to protect my assets". If she's ok with that she's not a gold digger. If she objects (and they always do), it's because they see the fortune as half hers already.

It just hurts me and honestly I can't help but to think about how now that he's rich he could leave me tomorrow and hook up with some gorgeous 22 year old.

hahaha well, she's right there.

It's just a really sad feeling. He told me this a few days ago and it ruined my Xmas because I just can't get it out of my head. I would never, never, never hurt my husband even if our relationship ended so I don't feel the need for a postnup at all, but really I'm just sad.

Would never never hurt husband..... but won't put it in writing.

If things end between them, he'll lose millions from his hard work. And all for what? A woman.

The crazy thing is that he paid for her.... and what he gets from that is the obligation to continue paying for her.

Marriage has no upsides for men.

Turkerthelurker • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 03:06 AM\*

Marriage has no upsides for men.

Devil's advocate:

The guy is a San Fran engineer, so probably not chad we're talking about here.

For six years, she helped pay rent, presumably kept him sexually satisfied, invested prime(ish) years of her life to him. She's not staying with this guy if they aren't married, because this guy probably isn't redpill at all.

If they aren't married, maybe he wastes his time chasing pussy. Maybe her paying rent, or doing things around the house, or cooking, or continually fucking him frees up that time for him to develop the side-businesses?

Marriage has no upsides for men.

I would argue in this case it does. Sounds like they're doing pretty fucking well financially. Even if he loses half.

Most women worth having aren't going to stick around without a proposal for that long -- especially for billy beta the tech engineer. It's not like he was making that much. 110k salary in the bay is like 40k in Utah.

If the guy was smart he would just start hiding assets. Asking for a post nup was never going to turn out well -- all a woman would think is that the guy is looking for the door / doesn't trust her.

MattyAnon • 9 points • 27 December, 2017 06:48 AM

For six years, she helped pay rent,

According to her - he always earned more than her and paid most of the bills.

. She's not staying with this guy if they aren't married, because this guy probably isn't redpill at all.

This is true. She's trying to cash in.

If they aren't married, maybe he wastes his time chasing pussy. Maybe her paying rent, or doing things around the house, or cooking, or continually fucking him frees up that time for him to develop the side-businesses?

You've not lived with a woman have you?

They are MORE work than living alone, not less.

Marriage has no upsides for men.

I would argue in this case it does

No, you're missing my point. Cohabiting with a woman can have advantages. Dating has advantages. Being with a woman can have advantages. This arrangement with this woman clearly suited him.

But that's not my point. My point is that *marriage* confers no benefit on the male. Her presence may have advantages. The legal construct of marriage is 100% one-sided.

Most women worth having aren't going to stick around without a proposal for that long

For beta males - yes.

What you are saying is that men have to marry women to get them to stick around.

That may be the case.... but I would argue if they pull this shit, it's time to get a new one.

all a woman would think is that the guy is looking for the door / doesn't trust her.

We shouldn't HAVE to trust women.

He should just get the divorce. I can't see a postnup working out well for him. She'll resent him, and the courts probably won't uphold it. It's lose/lose.

Turkerthelurker • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 05:41 PM\*

You've not lived with a woman have you? They are MORE work than living alone, not less.

Eh. I sort of agree. More work as far as stress, staying on top of your game, or planning/doing anything goes. If (and this is a big if these days) she is helping keep a clean house, cooking, doing laundry, fucking him -- even some of the time -- its saving him work.

No, you're missing my point. Cohabiting with a woman can have advantages. Dating has advantages. Being with a woman can have advantages. This arrangement with this woman clearly suited him.

But that's not my point. My point is that marriage confers no benefit on the male. Her presence may have advantages. The legal construct of marriage is 100% one-sided.

Completely agree with you here. Marriage is a loaded contract, allowing her whims to be enforced by the government.

But this is a contract he has already entered. Without this contract, they would likely not still be together. Had they not been together, they might not be as well off financially.

Should a rp guy get married? Probably not. The only time I would make a case for it is if you want to raise a family. Even then, that man should be recognizing the risk of marriage, the power she wields over you, and act accordingly.

That may be the case.... but I would argue if they pull this shit, it's time to get a new one.

Come on. This is a beta we're talking about here. Men push for sex, women for commitment. If she isn't pushing for marriage (btw, she's 25 when they started dating. Tick tock biological clock) she is playing some piss-poor woman game.

He should just get the divorce. I can't see a postnup working out well for him. She'll resent him, and the courts probably won't uphold it. It's lose/lose.

Yeah, this isn't going to turn out well. My only point is that the marriage has already happened, and she is totally justified in her concerns of him wanting a post-nup.

As another user put it: He's trying to close the barn door after the horses have escaped.

---

We might be arguing past each other. I agree that marriage in its current state is a poor arrangement for men. I'm asserting that this case is not a good example for why marriage is a poor arrangement.

MattyAnon • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 08:28 PM

But this is a contract he has already entered. Without this contract, they would likely not still be together. Had they not been together, they might not be as well off financially.

This comes down to the details of the story. She's clear that he pays most of the bills. But this is a woman talking, so you can guarantee that he pays ALL the bills, except she chipped in \$5 that one time.

He's been paying for her. It's extremely unlikely he'd be worse off without her.

As far as "wouldn't be together if they weren't married": likely yes. Women demand marriage as a downpayment on spending more time with a beta. It's criminal that men don't understand or recognise this dynamic. As such it's a shit test. It's a "are you beta, can I play you?" test. Further reason why it's a terrible idea, and you're better off without her than marrying her.

Should a rp guy get married? Probably not.

Probably!?

The only time I would make a case for it is if you want to raise a family. Even then, that man should be recognizing the risk of marriage, the power she wields over you, and act accordingly.

STRONGLY disagree.

If you want to raise a family with a woman, then do not provide a financial incentive to her to destroy the family. She's more likely to stick around if there is a benefit to doing so. More likely to leave if that is where the benefit is.

Marriage is no longer "paying her to stick around". It is defined in law as "paying her to leave". Everyone pretends otherwise, but the cold hard facts amount to "if the woman leaves, the man

pays her half his shit and then alimony". It's simply paying her to leave.

I wouldn't offer the mother of my children money to break up my family, and that's all that marriage is.

The ONLY reason to do it... is because the woman demands it. "Marry me if you want children with me". If being blackmailed like this is acceptable to you, then go ahead. Otherwise just don't do it. There's better ways to structure things so that she is rewarded for staying rather than rewarded for leaving.

Come on. This is a beta we're talking about here. Men push for sex, women for commitment. If she isn't pushing for marriage (btw, she's 25 when they started dating. Tick tock biological clock) she is playing some piss-poor woman game.

Sure, I accept that this is what she's trying to do. But for the man, it's still a terrible idea. Marriage is clearly highly beneficial for women, I can see why they're still so keen on it.

Commitment itself is onesided, even without marriage. Women don't commit anything, other than a commitment to stop going to the gym, slow down on her career, and eat more pies. It's the man that's paying, and it's the man that's backsliding on his game.

My only point is that the marriage has already happened, and she is totally justified in her concerns of him wanting a post-nup.

She isn't justified at all - she isn't entitled to the fruits of his hard work. Obviously she WANTS access to that money. Doesn't make it morally right though.

I'm asserting that this case is not a good example for why marriage is a poor arrangement.

This case is the PERFECT reason why it's a poor arrangement. Pay for a woman, and then when you make it big give her half of that too. Where the hell is the upside for him here?

P1000123 • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 04:49 AM

Yep, most men don't calculate how much more creative you can be with a full belly and your balls drained.

Trpogre • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 07:45 AM

My plates cook for me and regularly draining my balls.

I'm not seeing how another agreement with the state helps in these regards.

I'm negotiating with one of my plates so we can be a family of 3: me and her and another sexy creature.

She agreed to no legal marriage. She agreed to pay for half of everything. She agreed to find a 3rd woman that will live with us.

Help me understand how all those things in life necessitates an agreement with the state?

Jonlife • 8 points • 26 December, 2017 11:02 PM

Oh she won't sign it. Her hypergamous nature commands it. Every western woman today is an indoctrinated feminist whether they know it or not. And that she thinks she's entitled to half that money for simply opening her legs is hilarious.

Why he even sat her down in the first place means that she's probably been acting different. Women love to give

their side of the story and have mob rule over their partner without anyone hearing his side.

Either way, he's an idiot for ever getting married in the first place. Most people cause their own misery (especially women). This guy is about to learn a hard lesson

bumbuff • -1 points • 27 December, 2017 09:38 AM

RP theory doesn't work here. It can explain her thought process a bit but she's got legitimate reasons. The guys fucked not because of his wife but because of men's rights in divorce court.

Jonlife • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 10:03 AM

That you think her reasons are "legitimate" is the first of many blue pill mishaps you're manifesting. To even think rp theory won't work in certain situations is even more hilarious. You're part of problem, and the reason why women think they can (and do) get away with bullshit like thinking they're entitled to half of everything their husband does/makes.

Let me reiterate again for the slow and retarded. Her reasons are not legitimate. We don't even know his side of the story, which is just the way women like this want it. Women only like unilateral agreements when it benefits them but not the other way around. This is why egalitarianism is utter garbage and does more harm than good.

This is why men are avoiding marriage. He's fucked because he got married, period. Waiting for the courts to be equal to men is like waiting for world peace by continuing to get married, thinking that everything will eventually work itself out. It won't. Avoid marriage at all cost. Learn from this guy's dumb mistake.

His wife going online for advice from total strangers to feel sorry for her only shows her hypocrisy. How about she act like an adult and talk to her husband about this instead of try and plot behind his back. Oh, wait. That would mean she has to be held accountable for her own actions. Can't have that now, can we

bumbuff • 0 points • 28 December, 2017 03:26 AM

You make valid points. But only does the RP theory show in this situation if you look at the points under a microscope. Unfortunately, he fucked himself by showing his hand too early. I'd do the same thing he did, except I wouldn't ask for it as a post-nup. I'd proposition it as a business contract. I can't invest if we're both beneficiaries, type of thing.

Marriage is a contract, as a man your word is all you have. He fucked himself in his handling of the situation. There's nothing BP about admitting she's allowed to everything that's been earned post-wedding. It would BP to think that the man shouldn't try and lock it away, but it's not BP to at least agree she's got contract leverage.

This doesn't need to be an anti-woman circle jerk just for the sake of it. She's out for some money, but this was money earned post-wedding. This is a shit post with a sprinkle of RP.

Jonlife • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 03:55 AM

True. She probably feels deceived, but all women always think that their husbands are going to leave them for someone younger.

There's no circle jerk here. He's fucked because he got married. Period. And yes, the ways he went about wanting a post nup is making him look even worse. He should have just filed for divorce. That he's even asking for one means she's not telling us something. Of course, just hearing her side of the story, women are always going to try and come off as the victim.

I'd love to know the real story, but def not gonna lose sleep over another simp falling victim to



## Gynocentrism

hodltaco • 7 points • 27 December, 2017 01:35 AM

Attempting to get a post-nup? You're fucked. Think about it-would you sign one?

This should serve as a cautionary tale: ALWAYS get a pre-nup. 25, broke, and getting married? Get a FUCKING pre-nup. You have no idea where your life is headed so it's as important as condoms.

Oh and if you're getting married...rethink that shit and just don't.

Archterus • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 03:28 AM

Agree. This guy has discharged both barrels into his own foot. First getting hitched, second this. It wont fly. Best bet is bail IF he is has his doubts before kids, and wrap it ASAP.

DONT\_reply\_with\_THIS • 1 point • 29 December, 2017 07:48 PM

If you're broke and don't have any assets a prenuptial isn't going to do shit

hodltaco • 2 points • 30 December, 2017 01:55 AM

Yes it will. In the pre-nup you are contractually eliminating spousal support and inheritance and a host of other things your attorney finds reasonable to fight for in front of a judge.

You can't predict what the future will bring.

Meterus • 7 points • 26 December, 2017 10:03 PM

I don't know how to feel about this. I talked with my best friend about it and both of us are just confused.

I wonder if the friend is male or female.

xXMaGaMaNXx • 7 points • 27 December, 2017 02:04 AM

If she feels she would never hurt him she should have no problem agreeing to a post nup. She comes off like she wants to be able rob him clean in the event of a divorce

SaveTheRhinos • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 08:07 AM

So if she signs then he leaves the next day you're fine with it?

MagnumBurrito • 7 points • 26 December, 2017 09:43 PM

Ha! He married her. She's entitled to half of everything. It's his own fault.

I will say.. well played now with the post-nup. Whatever happens.. she's going to give him some good ass loving until they separate.

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 December, 2017 10:09 PM

It's worse if she has kids. Smart guy to address this sooner than later.

Frdl • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 12:12 AM

Asking for a post-nup is definitely not well played. She's not going to give it to him and just stirred up all kinds of shit. He should have just hidden his money!!

TimeBombCanarie • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 03:25 AM

And of course, as per that shitty sub, the comments are all guiding her through the steps to take his money should he file for divorce.

Having the right to spend YOUR money how YOU see it without having to share with someone who did comparatively little to earn it is this man's right. In no way should he be legally obligated to share his wealth with anyone outside of his business partners. But alas, that sub puts "feels" before practical realities every time.

SaveTheRhinos • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 08:05 AM

Did she not sacrifice anything?

AshyBoneVR4 • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 06:48 AM

**and pursue something else.** If you wanna go to school, go to school. If you want to focus on raising our future kids, do that.

This man said to go to school, and get a job doing something else so you can support yourself.

We're planning on starting a family in 2018/2019

What a surprise, bitch chose to have kids and be taken care of rather than being able to put her self in a position where she can happily support herself and kids if she needs to. It's sad that most women would rather chose to be taken care of than to better themselves. Yet they turn around and bitch and moan about money but as soon as you ask them about school or education they say that's not for me, or some shit like that.

SaveTheRhinos • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 08:00 AM

Or maybe she just plays her position.

BluepillProfessor • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 06:44 PM

right now I feel like...I would never, never hurt my husband.

[deleted] • 11 points • 26 December, 2017 08:40 PM

This was also posted to Hacker News (which is not a website about hacking, mostly programming topics). The white knight beta cucks and entitled feminists are out in full force representing tech adequately. *rolls eyes*

Psychocist • 17 points • 26 December, 2017 09:09 PM\*

It's sad to see my programming brethren fall for it. Oh well. Save yourself. That's all you can hope for.

El\_Serpiente\_Roja • 1 points • 27 December, 2017 01:57 AM **[recovered]**

Oh man programming is fuckkkked

htbf • 8 points • 26 December, 2017 07:25 PM

Jesus man, just give an archive link. It's a pita to find the topic from mobile and I like reading the comments.

boogalooshrimp1103 • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 07:57 PM

It was the very top post when I looked just now

PhantomNishobrah • 6 points • 27 December, 2017 03:40 AM

Honestly he's fucking stupid and deserves what's coming to him. If he was planning on splitting as soon as he made it big, he shouldn't have gotten married in the first place.

And honestly it's a complete slap in the face to the wife. I really hope she doesn't sign a damn thing.

SaveTheRhinos • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 08:04 AM

You and I may be the only practical ones here.

destraht • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 02:43 AM

I'll admit that.

I've only read this far yet but its obvious that a huge hamster justification is coming for how she is going to bleed him.

bumbuff • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 09:35 AM

She worked while he quit his job. She's got an argument that she supported him while his ventures took off. Everything is shared post wedding. There's no hamstering here. Just a regular Joe that made it big after getting married trying to reduce the hurt in divorce court.

majorketone • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 04:49 AM

I legitimately wanted to throw up reading that shit. This mix of anger and depression phases is making the pill digestion difficult

bumbuff • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 09:32 AM

This isn't a RP piece to discuss. It's more about men's rights in family court.

He got rich post wedding. There's nothing RP about the situation. He's just tired of being married while rich.

The woman is acting reasonable given the circumstances . Even if she's going to take half their money.

Everything post wedding is shared.

The only thing about this that's RP is highlighting why not to get married. Even if your salary is average it might change later.

cjmessier • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 04:59 AM

HE earned the money. She may have facilitated his doing so but that's purely speculative.

I am saying if this guy is deciding to protect himself only so that he can move on and act however he wants (I.e cheat on a girl who's worth it) it is not a stand-up move.

Asset protection for its own sake is noble and wise. Doing so to cover your ass only to proceed to leave her in the dust is not something I'd be proud of on my deathbed, personally.

Chmmrgat • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 10:26 AM

Perhaps he could throw a large sum of money into an off shore account or 'invest' the money into something easily liquidatable.

ExposeTheFAUX • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 11:19 AM

**Just because society pays it less than someone in a technology field does not mean you are any less of a valued and important member of this society. If anything I would argue that what you choose to do is more important.**

An entire family of hamsters was needed for this post.

trrptrp • 7 points • 26 December, 2017 09:31 PM

So she had her fun when 15-25. Now she leeches off a working man who provides for her for free. But ofc thats not enough. She also wants the right to half of his success. Sickening.

CoronaTRP • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 12:49 AM

So she had her fun when 15-25.

She married him when he used to be unsuccessful. So she did the opposite of that.

I do agree with you that it would be morally wrong that she is legally entitled to half of assest. But it is not sickening of her to retain this right. She would be incredibly stupid if she gave away this right (just like he was incredibly stupid giving her this right).

The law has to be changed here (and the stupid man), but not her actions.

trrptrp • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 01:05 AM\*

*She married him when he used to be unsuccessful. So she did the opposite of that.*

So did he.

You have would have case if she married him as 20yrs hotty, then It can be said that she gave him exclusive right to her youth which might entitle her to some compensation (still not millions).

*But it is not sickening of her to retain this right. The law has to be changed here (and the stupid man), but not her actions.*

The whole situation is sickening. State and her both are to be blamed here. State for creating and enforcing the law. Her for being reluctant to say no to she does not deserve.

She has a choice. She can choose not to (male version) rape him.

And "the stupid man" ? Wow asking 100% fruits of your labour is stupid. ok.

CoronaTRP • -1 points • 27 December, 2017 01:15 AM

I see your point. I have nothing to add to the blame question, but I want to add something here:

You have would have case if she married him as 20yrs hotty, then It can be said that she gave him exclusive right to her youth which might entitle her to some compensation (still not millions).

In my opinion, a womans youth is the most valuable thing a women possesses. It is as important to her as his time should be to a man. If I were a women I would want to maximize my gain I have with my only (but powerful) bargaining chip.

trrptrp • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 01:25 AM

*If I were a women I would want to maximize my gain I have with my only (but powerful) bargaining chip.*

And you should. If she gets husband to sign contract explicit stating compensation, the husband has to pay up irregardless of amount (assuming he is that rich). No argument here.

But if the contract is implicit like marriage licence where state/court changes terms of contract as it go, then there must be a limit.

Hughtub • 0 points • 26 December, 2017 10:56 PM

She didn't say anything implying that. She fears that he's getting ready to leave her by asking for a pre-nup. They've been together 6 years, which is LONG.

trrptrp • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 11:47 PM

She didn't say anything implying that.

By not signing postnup she is retaining the *right* to divorce rape.

She fears that he's getting ready to leave her by asking for a pre-nup. They've been together 6 years, which is LONG.

If he wants to break up the marriage, in sane world he should be able to do without giving up 50%+ of his success to which she contributed nothing.

godlesspinko • -2 points • 27 December, 2017 09:18 AM

You've never been in a ltr have you? When they married they became partners, and they share all assets in common. She is absolutely entitled to half when dumbass divorces her to look for new pussy. Hope she takes him to the cleaners for undermining their relationship.

chopyhop • 6 points • 27 December, 2017 12:01 AM

This guy's future is already looking bleak. The top rated comment from a lawyer told her she doesn't have to sign it. If things end between them, he'll lose millions from his hard work. And all for what?

Marriage might as well be a business partnership. The idea of post nup in this situation is stupid; if you were in a business partnership which suddenly exploded, you wouldn't sign away your half for nothing.

He is acting like a total cunt even offering it to her.

godlesspinko • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 09:20 AM

Amen. These guys are a bunch of cavemen for thinking otherwise.

DONT\_reply\_with\_THIS • 1 point • 29 December, 2017 07:49 PM

Better now than when he's worth hundreds of millions.

francisco\_DANKonia • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 10:04 PM

A post-nup is not a very smart plan. Asking for something for nothing will not go well with anyone. I'm sure there are much better ways to protect your assets.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 08:44 PM

This is the plot of the original "Christmas carol" if anyone noticed

OhhDatDogOMine • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 10:26 AM

Let this be a lesson to all the morons here who supposedly "swallow the pill" yet still end up getting married. It used to be rule 1 on TRP, repeated every day.

DON'T GET MARRIED YOU RETARDS

trplurker • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 01:41 PM

No, Rule #1 on TRP was "make yourself happy first". For the vast majority of men that means no marriage.

WolfeC93 • 4 points • 26 December, 2017 09:00 PM

He should be falsifying expenditures, hire on his brother or mother someone he trusts no nub for a easy job with unheard of pay. House Cleaner: 200k a year, Car Washer 200k a year, Personal shopper 500k a year, under contract 2 years paid upfront. The tax implication are hefty but it gets the assets out of his name and into another with a paper trail, she can try and fault him for X reason but she can't take what HE doesn't have.

NYCSPARKLE • 4 points • 26 December, 2017 10:07 PM

This would never hold up, and would put you at risk for fraud / hiding assets.

The only way to hide assets before a divorce is small ATM withdrawals over a year or two that you put in a safe deposit box at a small community bank in another city or state. And that would maybe get you, like, \$20k.

The best way to protect your assets is not get married.

the99percent1 • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 11:17 PM

There already exist a top post on here on how to hide your money written by an accountant.

The solution is to own multiple bank accounts across many countries and just move money in and out until it confuses the shit out of the accountant.

You want to introduce as much doubt on your true networth as you possibly can.

yeah-yeah-red • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 01:55 PM

Can you link the post brah? I've looked through the top threads all-time and can't find it.

gELSK • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 11:36 PM

// , You have not been blessed with ex-IRS agents as your tax counsel, have you.

Step up your game if you want to win, bro. You're from NYC. You should know how this works.

WolfeC93 • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 11:13 PM

Who's it defrauding? Fraud is a criminal accusation not very divorce oriented not to mention the need to prove intent.

Hiding assets maybe but again prove his intent was anything other then benevolence, trying to help a family member.

I'm not saying it would save all of his money but it will save more then 20k, also hiding 20k in assets your way is very criminal with tax implication that automatically show hiding assets and when you get caught doing it that way good luck trying to explain benevolence in hidden box full of money. Hell in 2 years with a only minimal effort he could hide 28k in tax free gifts to a family member, or 56k if his wife is good with applying her annual exclusion. It's not what the person knows it what can be proven in court and proving criminal intent on a benevolent action is wicked hawrd. Services rendered is services rendered.

There's more ways to lose a million dollars then there is to make a million that I can assure, personally I'd rather go to Vegas and go for broke then let some broad take a bath in money gained through windfalls of my own victories. Hell I'd rather spend a few years in a minimum security prison with a broke ex wife then live a free man in misery knowing some woman is living off my victories. I'm full of spite with alot of resolve.

Werewolf35b • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 12:43 AM\*

What he needs is a "gambling addiction" or a "drug problem" wink wink, and his brother to set up a Bitcoin wallet or otherwise get his wealth moved.

The court will hear her shit on him for having an addiction, because she can't help it but to drag his name through the mud because remember, she's a "victim" of his "abuse" now.

Never realising that she just explained the missing money for him. She bolsters his alibi because it was too irresistible to establish her victim status.

WolfeC93 • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 01:01 AM

Brilliant there, I was thinking a way to involve a illegal activity that is viewed as a disability, seeing as they live in California...

Get bruised up bad from people "collecting a debt" hell I have given my brother a black eye as an excuse for coming in late with his girlfriend "We got into a fight at the bar... no charges were pressed" when it's really 'I was screwing around on you haha', refuse to testify because the people that made him pay 500k in "illegal gambling" debt would kill his family make himself the victim and the hero AND have a nice tidy sum stashed away.

Pull a few hundred thousand dollars out and buy a couple hundred dollars worth of baby powder "Honey they said it was cocaine, I didn't know until I got home and it wouldn't crack back... I just wanted to become a drug lord and pay for my addiction in profits :'("

SparkyMcGhee • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 10:35 PM

Post-nup? This is the first time I have ever heard of it. *Honey, I am thinking of dumping you, however, I don't want it to be too expensive. It looks like I am going to make a boatload next year and I am a little concerned about you raping me in divorce court. Here, sign this*

gELSK • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 12:14 AM

// , Better he lose half his millions now than lose half his 10 millions later.

I think he's taking the right approach.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 10:37 PM

Seems like the guy can put all of his assets in a trust or "business" with multiple partners which she is not a part of, if she will not sign.. or something like that (I'm not a CPA).

Every state's law varies on this sort of thing, but my understanding is that there are ways to protect ones self. You just need to be clever.

etherealembryo • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 10:41 PM

If hes been paying the bills where does her money go? Saved up? 60k a year? 1000 dollar checks into savings all at once? Damn living the dream!!

gELSK • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 12:15 AM

// , Read the comments if you want to get a sense for it:

<http://archive.is/99vxx>

Redditology101 • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 01:09 AM

Is the takeaway message here to always do prenup?



jefecaminador1 • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 04:21 AM

This is one of the dumber posts I've seen on this sub. Guy was just a regular dude, got married and then struck it rich. If he had won the lotto instead and wanted a post-nup, nobody would even hesitate to call him an idiot.

Koryphae\_ • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 09:03 AM

Honestly, guys, we are dissecting a post which a woman WROTE and taking into account stuff she says.. Some people are even drawing conclusions that the guy is most likely a beta nerd. Where the fuck do you get this stuff? All we have is a post a woman wrote on the internet. Why the fuck do you even bother? And why the fuck is this post kept up for blue pills to hamster off of?

Get fucking real..

Phixer7 • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 12:25 AM

Can't he just leave her, and stop paying to support her and never divorce ?

KJH77 • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 07:56 AM

Unless, of course, she divorces him.

dingman58 • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 05:20 AM

Supposing she never goes for the post nup, what's the guys best move? Spend all the money?

KJH77 • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 07:53 AM

"Lose" the money. The business tanks. But really he sells out, moves the money in an untraceable way (something like buying crypto and then shifting that to a Swiss bank account, then selling - or physically takes cash to Bermuda or the Bahamas) and then she gets another job, he gets a job schlubbing for a year or so on less money than her. Get a divorce. The lifestyle she's accustomed to is now being the breadwinner. Let's see how keen she is for 45% then.

tim99uk • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 07:20 AM

If everything is perfect and she would never hurt him then what's the harm.. Unless of course she has Neen a typical wife who wants tge moon on a stick and only now considers that her husband may feel unfulfilled..

bumbuff • 0 points • 27 December, 2017 09:27 AM

Chances are he's already out the door

tim99uk • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 08:26 PM

Lucky sod! I have kids and love half my stuff too much to leave!

taxandstuff • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 07:53 AM

for him to allow her to be a housewife is a windfall itself.

justtheretohelp00 • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 01:05 AM

If I were him, I'd buy crypto if she refused to sign it.

Good luck getting any of that, it'll be hidden so well I'd look like I went broke lol.

kasper138 • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 04:18 AM

Of course she would never hurt him.... until "something something feelings" and she cuts his dick off.

mubee94 • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 07:43 AM

Can someone message me link?

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 10:32 AM

He deserves to lose everything for

1. Getting married.
2. Not getting a prenuptial
3. Thinking such contracts won't be tossed out in family court.

Fucking moron. I don't have shit. But if you think I will risk my future like that then you're crazy. Women don't care. They'll get your ass for alimony even if you're living in a car in a trailer park.

S-Blaze • 1 point • 29 December, 2017 03:46 PM\*

What a bad move if he genuinely love her tho, told her their relation isn't "special" afterall of course she'll want revenge.

Best thing he could do now put some money aside, tell her "fuck the post-nup babe", fuck her good and remind her how their bond is special.

blue\_27 • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 11:05 PM

*Prenups* aren't ironclad either. He fucked himself by marrying her. ... The only winning move, is not to play.

bumbuff • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 09:22 AM

He's already out the door in his head and heart.

You think it's hamstering by her but regardless of your TRP opinions, everything that happens post wedding is both of yours. To think otherwise is to deny the reasons why we say no to marriage.

This is a shit post. He made his bed. If he wants out he should go now before he makes more.

Robocompany • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 08:27 PM

Can you give me a link to the post? I'm interested in the comments.

DatingCoach111 • 3 points • 26 December, 2017 08:44 PM

Courtesy of another user.

<http://archive.is/99vxx>

gELSK • 2 points • 26 December, 2017 11:37 PM

// , The comments on there make me notice the hair on the back of my neck.

Werewolf35b • 1 point • 26 December, 2017 11:36 PM

She would never hurt him. She would just take all she can on the way out as a matter of course.

And it's not that now hes rich and doesn't trust her, he never trusted her, he just has something worth protecting now.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 02:53 AM

Even if she does sign the post nuptial agreement, it would only apply to those assets he earned after she signed. Whatever he earned between the marriage and the effective date on the post-nup is legally joint property. So that was his first mistake.

His second mistake was quitting his job to work on the side projects that were ultimately successful while she was still working as a teacher. She has a decent argument that he was only able to leave his job in the first place because her job provided health insurance, other benefits, and a small safety net in the form of her income.

She has no incentive to sign the post-nup. And he has no leverage because she can walk now with half of their assets.

He made a mistake. He has to own his mistake and decide if he wants to remain married or not.

WestyWorld • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 07:26 AM

No woman with a brain is gonna sign a post-nup. Like others have said, as soon as she signs it he could be gone tomorrow with a hot new 20 something and keep all his \$. But of course from his standpoint, she could be gone tomorrow with half his \$ and get engaged to the pool boy.

The game is already over and she won it - his SMV now probably greatly surpasses hers.

There really should be a limit to how much a spouse can get. Like if you become a multi-millionaire and she divorces just because she doesn't love you anymore, you really should only have to pay out a livable wage like maybe \$50,000 per year - why does she get to enjoy a lavish lifestyle that was 100% thanks to you.

RedPilledGodEmperor • 1 point • 28 December, 2017 03:44 PM

Because "she's accustomed to the lavish lifestyle."

Yes, that's actually the reason for alimony. Makes no sense. If someone gets fired/laid off from a cushy \$120K/year job, they can't just demand that salary from other companies they are interviewing at, "because they are accustomed to it"

KJH77 • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 07:48 AM

The guy is an idiot. End of story. What a stupid and corrosive move for his marriage. What an autist.

He's afraid she may screw him over if the marriage ends. There's either a reason for that, or there isn't.

So, if he's on to something and she's given him some reasons to think she's going to leave and divorce rape him, the move there is to make her think he has nothing. And he has to actually make sure he has nothing. He needs to sell out of his company and put the money in a foreign bank account. Literally sail to the Bahamas with a briefcase full of 100s, if necessary. Then transfer it to Switzerland. He'll lose a chunk, but not 75%.

Then get divorced. Then start a new company.

It sounds like his heart isn't in it anyway, and she doesn't deserve shit just because he had good ideas.

Siskiyou • 0 points • 26 December, 2017 10:25 PM

Why would anyone sign such a thing? Would he be willing to sign something saying she did not have to take care of him if he got ill? Getting married means you have to take care of each other through the good times and the bad...

VincentPrice • 5 points • 26 December, 2017 10:44 PM

He's obviously thinking about leaving so he can fuck 22-year-olds and that was a really bad move on his part. Probably a Hail Mary play, but now he divorces her she'll feel vindictive and entitled to go after as much money as she can when she probably would've been down for an equitable and reasonable settlement

if he never made that move, and just said, sorry I'm not happy.

joner888 • -1 points • 26 December, 2017 10:42 PM

1. Study to become a electrician 2.Work in Russia
2. Find traditional wife 4? ?? 5.Happiness,big family and wealth.

Summum • -1 points • 27 December, 2017 07:40 AM\*

I don't agree with the people here.

He told her to quit his job and be reliant on him. Then he wants to take away the safety net. That's what marriage was for. Seems somewhat resonable to me in the case where he asks her to become financially dependent and is already married without a pre-nup.

P.S. I still agree, don't get married without a pre-nup. This case might be an exception.

bumbuff • 2 points • 27 December, 2017 09:27 AM

His company and millions came post wedding if the story is correct. This is a shit post that has nothing to do with TRP other than it seems like the guy found it the natural way. He owes her half. If he wants out do it mutually and be on his way.

SaveTheRhinos • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 07:59 AM

Why all of a sudden does he care now? If she was there when he was normal she'll be there when he's a winner. I usually side with the men on this kind of thing but sounds to me like he's the one that changed.

SaveTheRhinos • -1 points • 27 December, 2017 08:10 AM

The amount of beta fucks here thinking this woman is crazy and the problem is astounding. It's very obvious that he's the one wanting to bounce and live that bay area silicon valley lifestyle. Some of you guys need to learn what the red pill is really about and grow the fuck up.

godlesspinko • -2 points • 27 December, 2017 08:55 AM

Hell no, she should NOT sign a post-nup, and that guy is a cretin for asking for one. Before his business partnership, he had a romantic one. One that he wanted (wants?) to raise children with. She supported him emotionally and perhaps in other ways, and now he wants her to sign away their marriage contract because he got more money? He is def. thinking of shopping around for new pussy. Both he and op apparently view women as less important than money. He just introduced that materialism to their relationship and fucked it up. Thoughtless, uncaring and reckless.

BlackVale • 0 points • 26 December, 2017 08:50 PM

What advice did you get from older men?

hyugafan • 0 points • 27 December, 2017 03:34 AM

The guy is making the best of a bad decision: getting married. The mantra of Never Marry is unfortunately hard to uphold for a lot of men. However, I am a firm believer in « If you do something wrong, do it the right way. ». The rest is typical hamstering, inability to see long-term risks/consequence, etc. There's a reason he's the industrialist and she's the trophy wife.

ummwtfiswrongwithyou • -2 points • 27 December, 2017 02:43 PM

That's. Not. How. Marriage. Works. "For better or worse. For richer or poorer. In sickness and health."

HUGE red flag indicating he's about to start fucking around big time. If my husband asked for a post nup he would get divorce papers, and I would expect the same if I were to ask him for one.

DatingCoach111 • 3 points • 27 December, 2017 03:17 PM\*

Get ready to get roasted by all the angry guys on here.

Relationships end. Marriages end. 60% of marriages end in divorce here in the US. Nothing lasts forever, and everything is impermanent. He doesn't want to screw around. He just doesn't want to lose too much money if the marriage ends.

As for the "Sickness and in health" speech, you have no idea how many stories we've read on here, experienced, and seen first hand how women stick with their men while they're strong, then proceed to abandon them in times of sickness or poor circumstance. Maybe you're one of the good ones, but we've all believed in "good ones" before, only to have a hot knife slowly pushed into our backs.

Your point of view isn't invalid, but neither is ours.

ummwtfiswrongwithyou • 1 point • 27 December, 2017 05:23 PM

I have been with my husband since 1989. I am 45. He is 47. We have only been "married" for four years. We have been through major sickness...he had CKD for most of his life - in and out of hospital constantly, stent surgeries starting at annual and eventually occurring every 3 months...had his transplant, finally, in 2013. Not everyone deserves the anger and cynicism. Not everyone is a succubus.

It makes me sad that so many are so jaded, I can't imagine what they must have gone through to get to this point.

They can roast away, I'm not flammable.

DatingCoach111 • 4 points • 27 December, 2017 05:28 PM

It's pretty traumatic. Many of us were once sweet, gentle souls. Now we're just men with guarded hearts.