

The Parable of Mark and Lauren

June 19, 2013 | 92 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

<http://laidnyc.wordpress.com/2013/06/05/the-parable-of-mark-and-lauren/>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

blackhawksoccer • 34 points • 19 June, 2013 09:34 PM

"Nice guys" are emotional sluts.

[deleted] 20 June, 2013 01:35 AM

[permanently deleted]

redpillarofdoom • 8 points • 20 June, 2013 01:50 AM

Girls being used for sex with the possibility of a relationship dangled like a carrot are in the female equivalent of "friendzone"

What makes you think that there are lots of girls that want relationships and are using sex to try to get them?

The dynamic is this: women are the gatekeepers to sex, and men are the gatekeepers to commitment. That doesn't mean that women are having sex to get commitment. They aren't having sex with dozens of alphas hoping to get a commitment from them. They often just want to get laid, and have him go away. Of course, that might lower the number of men willing to commit to them as time goes on.

they can hardly hide the contempt for "nice guys" they use as an emotional tampon.

I would barely be able to hide my contempt for a "nice guy" that allowed himself to be used as an emotional tampon either.

MrStinky • 1 point • 20 June, 2013 01:51 AM

The only difference is that they are trying to force us to "love" sluts with the anti-slut shaming campaigns while at the same time they can hardly hide the contempt for "nice guys" they use as an emotional tampon

Women are actually **OPEN** and **DIRECT** about their distaste for *Nice Guys*. The media is always critical of them as well. Which is ironic considering the media also portrays *Nice Guys* as the perfect example of what a man should be

Nutz76 • 1 point • 20 June, 2013 04:27 PM

Agreed. For those who need it spelled out, men who give validation and attention to women with little or nothing in return are equivalent to women who do the same with physical intimacy.

AlwaysLateToThreads • 10 points • 19 June, 2013 08:52 PM

I see what he did here.

yourlogicisflawed • 15 points • 19 June, 2013 08:44 PM

This should be required reading, perfect analogy demonstrating the dichotomy between what men and women want out of relationships. Somewhat reminds me of the scene in *Clerks* when the guy learns how many men his girl has blown.

[deleted] • 7 points • 20 June, 2013 12:39 AM

37?!?

rebuildingMyself • 4 points • 20 June, 2013 05:08 AM

In a row?

[deleted] • 7 points • 20 June, 2013 05:46 AM

Don't suck any dicks on the way to the parking lot!!!!

rebuildingMyself • 2 points • 20 June, 2013 05:51 AM

Hey, you! Get back here!

[deleted] 20 June, 2013 02:05 AM

[permanently deleted]

MockingDead • 4 points • 20 June, 2013 02:39 AM

All advertising is good advertising.

rebuildingMyself • 5 points • 20 June, 2013 12:02 PM

True, but that sub is dedicated to passive-aggressively bitching about our existence.

legendofpasta • 13 points • 19 June, 2013 09:28 PM

Women I have dated have actually said this to me. "you don't just say I love you to everyone right?" and also: "yeah I slept with all those guys, but I didn't love them so it's different, it didn't mean anything"

I remember in high school and university a little "but I love you" was the key to last minute resistance. It wouldn't work now I'm sure, but back then itu was a panty dropper

redpillarofdoom • 4 points • 20 June, 2013 07:10 AM

Of course I love you and will respect you in the morning!

rebuildingMyself • 3 points • 20 June, 2013 12:03 PM

Just the tip...

[deleted] 20 June, 2013 11:51 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 20 June, 2013 12:38 PM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 18 points • 19 June, 2013 09:27 PM*

This is the best material I've ever read in this subreddit.

At the moment, it's trendy to oppose "slut-shaming". I think it's useful to view the people who buy into this mentality into three distinct groups:

1. People who want to bully and shame men for having sexual standards
2. People who join in with bullies to feel powerful, rather than risk being bullied themselves and feeling weak

3. People who haven't given the topic much thought or energy, but hear "slut-shaming" and think that it *just sounds so mean*

This logic in this piece has a stellar chance of rescuing people in the third group. They could be made to see that the phrase "slut-shaming" is absurd; wanting a mate with fewer sexual partners just another preference, and it's a very reasonable one when viewed with an open mind. Obviously, standards don't have to be reasonable, but that's another issue.

I suspect the only way to rescue the second group is by standing up to the bullies—by showing everyone that standing up for yourself is what's *truly* empowering.

The first group is lost, unfortunately.

Edit: Grammar. *Fuck*, my grammar was atrocious.

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:41 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 20 June, 2013 01:21 AM*

[permanently deleted]

maybestomorrow • 8 points • 19 June, 2013 11:47 PM

Why should she be the one who has to pay by putting her valuable eggs at risk by taking his sperm in order to get the love and attention that the other girls got so easily.

I'm not sure how anyone can take the story seriously after reading that line in particular...

As for the actual story - both characters were manipulating each other. She 'gave' him sex in order to get love. He used 'love' to get sex. That's not a relationship, that's immature/emotionally damaged people messing around.

And yes I get it, showing sluts why men disagree with whoring about. Only problem is that in a decent relationship sex and love aren't commodities.

[deleted] • 12 points • 19 June, 2013 07:15 PM

This is fucking genius.

I doubt women who read it will be able to make the connection, but it's still brilliant.

[deleted] • 9 points • 19 June, 2013 11:23 PM

I would argue that women are better at making such connections than men.

After all, who's swallowing the blue pill?

If you think that women are as clueless as betas, you have much to learn. The hamster absolves them of guilt, but that doesn't mean they don't know themselves.

[deleted] • -3 points • 20 June, 2013 12:20 AM

I meant more that their hamsters won't allow them to see the beauty that the OP intended.

I never said women are as clueless as betas. Plenty of women know exactly what they're doing, they might not know why but they know what.

[deleted] • 0 points • 20 June, 2013 12:23 AM

Ok, fair enough.

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 09:41 PM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 10:53 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 10:22 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 10:16 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:02 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:31 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 10:37 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 20 June, 2013 12:10 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 10:50 PM*

[permanently deleted]

halfbloodprinceton • 1 point • 23 June, 2013 09:00 AM

I survived.

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 10:56 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:25 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:44 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:30 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:47 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:55 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:58 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:59 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:38 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 June, 2013 11:49 PM

[permanently deleted]

betaprime • 3 points • 20 June, 2013 06:35 AM

Whoa long deleted comment thread, what was it

[deleted] • 13 points • 20 June, 2013 07:22 AM

Hissy fit by someone from TBP

betaprime • 2 points • 22 June, 2013 06:09 AM

nothing of value was lost then

Stayinghereforreal • 7 points • 19 June, 2013 07:38 PM

Holy mother of Jupiter that is brilliant.

James_Cook • 6 points • 19 June, 2013 07:52 PM

I am going to make this required reading for my sons.

pitlord713 • 1 point • 19 June, 2013 08:47 PM

The eternal fight

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 June, 2013 03:55 AM

Ok I am going to come out and just admit that I am slow. I am still trying to get this TRP wrapped around my brain. I still don't get how to read this. I get that it is a gender flip and a love/sex flip, but I see this as a put down on TRP men. Can someone help me out? Thanks.

iseeyou1312 • 8 points • 20 June, 2013 06:22 AM

Mockingdead's comment pretty much explains it.

Lauren in the novel is symbolic of a man whose girlfriend makes him wait months for sex when she has given it away for free many times when she was younger, hotter and tighter. Now the emasculated beta has to wait months to stick his dick in something that sags a lot more, because he is merely there so that she can extract his resources, she is not really attracted to him in the slightest, but he is a "stable, nice guy".

How it relates to TRP? Don't be that guy.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 June, 2013 01:19 PM

OK, that makes sense. Thank you for directly answering my question. I don't care my question isn't popular. Since I am newer here, and since I have been taking in too much of this TRP stuff too fast like a fire hose (probably not the best strategy- need to let it sink in more), I was over-analyzing this to death trying to figure out which angle I needed to see this in.

iseeyou1312 • 1 point • 22 June, 2013 04:38 AM

Isn't popular? It isn't unpopular either, it was just a question lol. Men generally tend to gain sexual currency up until their early 30s so that aspect of my reply isn't a valid comparison between men and women. It just so happens that for women it's all a downhill curve, which makes them using betas that much worse. Anyway, I'm glad I helped you understand it, it is a very good post.

betaprime • 2 points • 20 June, 2013 06:14 AM

If your opinion on the essay is inconsistent with your opinion if the genders were switched around, u should think about why that is. That is all.

trpnewbie • 2 points • 20 June, 2013 12:26 PM

Ok see that's where my confusion comes in.

Like, I get what the analogy is supposed to be, and yet not once reading that did I think, "wow that Mark is a loser." Like to me I'm thinking, who the hell cares if he loved 100 girls before, how does that at all detract from or lessen his feelings for Lauren?

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 June, 2013 01:29 PM

As a General principle, there's a certain symmetry to what men and women bring to the table. Women are the gatekeepers of sex, men are the gatekeepers of commitment.

The use of "love" in the parable is not actually about *love*, because in this context "I love you" isn't about feelings or being haaaaaaapy. It's about *commitment*. "I love you" implies "I am committed to you".

How valuable would commitment be from someone who gives it away to anyone who asks?

Secondly, if you're not a woman, you're probably not feeling the visceral repulsion that occurs when considering such a low-value man. I don't know if you can still feel the innate repulsion to the idea of committing to a slut that most men have, but it's the mirror of that feeling.

betaprime • 1 point • 22 June, 2013 06:10 AM

then at least you are consistent, so even if we disagree (and we do), I can respect you for it.

ReggieReddit • 2 points • 19 June, 2013 09:23 PM

Sidebar, NOW!

Mandeponium • 1 point • 19 June, 2013 10:42 PM

Can someone explain this to me? As a man, what am I supposed to take away from this? What should Mark have done differently?

MockingDead • 17 points • 19 June, 2013 10:51 PM

It's a gender flip of women who have a lot of sex with Alpha's but refuse to have sex with their beta provider.

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 June, 2013 07:44 PM

Both genders tend to be generally aware of the value of sex in a relationship (hence why it's not given away so easily).

Sadly, many men (especially beta orbiters) are not aware of how valuable their emotional commitment is to women and how unattractive unconditional love and attention is if it is deemed to have been unearned.

If you get these main points the rest will follow.