

# On the implications of powertalk and other language categories.

296 upvotes | 6 March, 2014 | by Whisper

---

By now, many of us have read Venkatesh Rao's interesting column, linked ~~here~~ (bot doesn't allow links) by TRPsubmitter, on different kinds of language in the workplace.

Already it is ~~generating some commentary~~ (bot doesn't allow links), mostly focused on the concept of the "PowerTalk" language... because communications in that language are the ones which cause real change.

However, in order to understand the concept of powertalk in general, we have to tease it away from examples that make it specific to "The Office" as a story, and the workplace as a setting, and create some more general definitions.

What are distinguishing characteristics of powertalk?

- It is used to get something for oneself, rather than to convey information.
- It can be truth or lies, according to the needs of the speaker.
- It is plausibly deniable.

The distinguishing feature of sociopaths, or power players, if you will, is that they are fluent in powertalk. This sets them apart from the group Rao calls "Clueless", which we might call naive, or surface communicators, or spergs, in that this group mistakes powertalk for straighttalk.

Now, EVERYONE engages in straighttalk from time to time. How long does that machine bolt need to be? Where is Sausalito? Will you that be for here or to go? What were the results of our wind tunnel study? Straighttalk just means language used to communicate a piece of information.

But the distinguishing characteristic of the sperg is that they engage in straighttalk *all the time*.

The third type, whom Rao calls "Losers", which we might call "awakened" or "cynics", is that they are aware of the existence of powertalk, but are unable or unwilling to accept it as just a morally neutral reality, and to employ it to their advantage. Instead, they observe and often resent it. They are stuck in the question of whether powertalk is "good" or "bad", and unable to consider the "how" of using it.

They engage in straighttalk at times, but not always. They also engage in what Rao calls "GameTalk" which is like powertalk, but with out key difference... it is self-oriented.

In other words:

- It can be truth or lies, according to the needs of the speaker.
- It is plausibly deniable.
- BUT unlike powertalk, is it used to make oneself feel better, or feel a certain way that one wants to feel. Instead of being oriented towards external goals, it pursues internal ones.

So, having taken a slightly different spin here, what does this get us?

Several startling but enlightening conclusions:

- Women are usually far more skilled at powertalk than men. Most of them instinctively understand that you don't say things because they're true, you say things to get what you want. If they're true, that's just a coincidence.
- Women's alternative to powertalk is usually gametalk, men's is usually straighttalk.

- This means that where and when men or women are successful and in power, they are both "power players/sociopaths", but the failure modes are different.
- Where and when women are unsuccessful, their failure mode is often "gametalk". They are in too much emotional turmoil to manipulate effectively, and must spend energy making themselves feel better.
- Where and when men are unsuccessful, their failure mode is mostly "straighttalk". They are unable to see that they are not being given the actual story, and that they must sniff it out for themselves. They waste energy responding to illusions someone else has created for them.
- What we are doing here in TRP is trying to engage in straighttalk ABOUT powertalk. This purpose of this is for people who are used to straighttalk to learn powertalk. This requires straighttalk because the number one rule of powertalk is that you never admit to the existence of powertalk.
- This is why women hate TRP and love the techniques it teaches. A man who can engage in powertalk, and use its rules to make himself attractive, turns them on. But TRP isn't powertalk. It's *straighttalk ABOUT powertalk*. The more they love skilled and fluent powertalk, the more they hate seeing the veil ripped off it (because doing so is bad powertalk).
- Feminism is powertalk. Example: Not only does no not always mean no, "No means no" doesn't mean "no means no". It doesn't mean "All men must ask permission before mating". "No mean no" means "If you can't both discern the difference between no that means no, and no that means yes, AND you can't discern that 'no means no' doesn't apply to everyone, then we want YOU to be in the group of men that asks permission before mating. Because your lack of powertalk skills is unattractive, and we want to make sure that you don't try to sex us without first giving us an escape valve that we can use without looking mean."
- The only way to tell the difference between skilled-enough powertalk, and straighttalk is observe the actions of the speaker.
- Feminists calling TRP neckbearded quasi-rapists is more powertalk. Neckbeard is their powertalk code word for "unattractive", but the real unattractiveness they fear is his lack of mastery of powertalk. They're afraid of the creation of a sort of hybrid, a man who understands powertalk well enough to see through their bullshit, but not well enough to create his own bullshit and actually thus BE attractive. That's why they use the term "rapist"... because such a man is indeed frighteningly like a rapist... he ignores social defenses against unattractive men (because he can READ powertalk), but he can't make the leap to being an attractive man (because he cannot WRITE powertalk).
- For this reason, TRP is and must be, not a public forum for calling women out on their bullshit, but a private lab for teaching each other to play the bullshit game.

---

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

---

## Comments

---

Whisper[S] • 51 points • 6 March, 2014 11:47 PM

Relevant links for those who haven't seen the discussion:

[http://www.reddit.com/r/AlreadyRed/comments/1zmm02/four\\_major\\_languages\\_spoken\\_in\\_organizations/](http://www.reddit.com/r/AlreadyRed/comments/1zmm02/four_major_languages_spoken_in_organizations/)

[http://www.reddit.com/r/AlreadyRed/comments/1zpfw/some\\_people\\_will\\_never\\_get\\_it\\_xpost\\_now\\_30\\_longer/](http://www.reddit.com/r/AlreadyRed/comments/1zpfw/some_people_will_never_get_it_xpost_now_30_longer/)

PaulRivers10 • 14 points • 10 March, 2014 05:20 PM

Thanks for posting this links, original article wasn't very useful without them, with them it's fascinating...

redpillschool • 6 points • 11 March, 2014 02:16 PM

Sorry, the bot can't be programmed to whitelist subs, including our own. They're using google api's regex, which is missing lookarounds. (for anybody who knows that really limits our functions)

Whisper[S] • 4 points • 11 March, 2014 06:24 PM

Not a problem, I understand.

Can the actual regular expression it uses be changed? I'd be willing to have a look at it (I'm a software engineer by profession) if it's at all configurable.

It would be nice if we could figure out a way to allow links to subs like RPW, askTRP, AlreadyRed, etc.

redpillschool • 3 points • 11 March, 2014 06:38 PM

Yes, you can provide it custom expressions, but it's a limited set (excluding lookarounds specifically). They do it to keep random mods from accidentally (or purposefully) crashing the bot.

Here's a list of google's supported syntax:

<https://code.google.com/p/re2/wiki/Syntax>

Here's automod's:

<https://github.com/Deimos/AutoModerator/wiki/Wiki-Configuration>

It's been almost half a year since I configured it, but basically the main problem was that whitelisted domains couldn't work since we'd have to whitelist the entire internet, blacklist couldn't work, since we'd have to blacklist each subreddit of reddit (save a few), and a regex whitelist wouldn't work, because you can't do lookarounds and there were limited if any complex comparison expressions.

More power to you if you figure it out, or if they've made changes recently that I'm not aware of. I spent some time with Deimorz and we came to the conclusion it couldn't be done.

Whisper[S] • 3 points • 11 March, 2014 08:04 PM

I see no reason why one couldn't simply blacklist a regexp that matches all of reddit *except* certain subreddits. This actually isn't too hard, unless there are some hitches I'm not aware of.

It can certainly be done, in any case. For any regular grammar, there is a finite state machine that can produce it, and a regular expression that can parse it. And for any two finite state machines,

$X^1$  and  $X^2$ , which produce grammars  $Y^1$  and  $Y^2$ , there exists a finite state machine  $X'$  which

produces  $Y'$ , where  $Y' = Y^1 \sqcup Y^2$ , and a finite state machine  $X''$  which produces  $Y^1 \cap Y^2$ .

In other words, regular expressions are composable.

If you send me the actual regular expression(s) you are using, I'll have a crack at it.

redpillschool • 3 points • 11 March, 2014 08:09 PM

The hitches are lookarounds, can't use them and you can't do complex and/not if expressions. The regex is very poor for what we're looking to do.

I had a working regex, that I have since thrown out, but automod wouldn't accept it.

Right now I'm just using the domain block \*.reddit.

redpillschool • 2 points • 11 March, 2014 08:18 PM\*

This would match all reddit links that aren't internal, but wouldn't remove other urls...

```
reddit\.com/r/(?!theredpill)
```

but again, it requires lookarounds.

Edit:

```
reddit\.com/r/((?!(theredpill|asktrp|redpillwomen)))
```

RedBigMan • 1 point • 11 May, 2014 02:15 PM

Not to be a douche or anything but the bot completely ignores links using the r notation like below... I've avoided using it personally but it's something we should be looking at whitelisting based on the sub involved or where the link leads to than just the text on the link itself?

```
/r/MensRights/comments/257ff2/no_trial_no_jury_no_witnesses_no_attorney_student/
```

jadedspade • 1 point • 14 May, 2014 09:50 PM

```
http://i.imgur.com/DthM2fJ.jpg
```

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

TRPsubmitter • 24 points • 7 March, 2014 10:15 AM

Take a look at his entire website [www.ribbonfarm.com](http://www.ribbonfarm.com)

The entire website goes balls deep into human interactions and philosophy and human economics.

pontifx • 14 points • 12 March, 2014 08:52 AM

Ribbonfarm, metanoia-films dot org, and the black phillip show form a megazord that is just a giant hand that pimp slaps you into reality.

Derkdigg • 1 point • 13 May, 2014 05:18 AM

This shit is amazing.

da-way • 23 points • 7 March, 2014 06:58 AM\*

Holy fuck! shit just got meta

Fantastic analysis, thank you for this.

Edit: after having read that post three times I can honestly say it is one of the best posts I have read on reddit, period.

leftajar • 10 points • 7 March, 2014 05:19 PM

Agreed. I just suggested it should be sidebarred. This is *brilliant* analysis.

[deleted] • 15 points • 7 March, 2014 01:39 AM

This is basically like the whole secret society thing from RSD Tyler. I know I've had my moments, but I want to make that norm for me in life. I still have a long way to go personally.

[deleted] • 24 points • 11 March, 2014 11:32 AM

Side note - I'm seeing this sub call "powertalk! powertalk!" everytime we see an example of women saying things. The problem with that is fairly obvious - the female type of "powertalk" if we must is very different to the male type - aka 48 Laws of Power. The way high status people talk and navigate the treacherous landscape of politics, business, fame, etc is SIMILAR in a way to how a hot girl may speak, but the key difference is that the male form is oriented around forcing results regardless of the morality of the actions / integrity of the words. The female form is like a unaware form of what Rao calls "gametalk", it is a way of speaking that reinforcing your own internal, subjective perception of yourself. Or in other words, it's just simple fucking hamstering.

SOME women will engage in powertalk with the same goal-oriented, ends over means, conscious awareness of what they are doing. The majority, however, are not doing it for power. Women aren't powertalkers because they aren't after power - Men are after power, women are after security, validation, and positive emotion. When they call a guy creepy it is not to wield power over him, it is because she has learned that the simple act of saying that will gain her agreement, make her feel hot and pursued, and pump her emotional state by a tiny bit.

Also, the fact that TRP is going to read an opinion - a very interesting, bright one that fits with SOME RP theory - and decide to adopt it as the new buzz word is kinda weak.

This being said, this is a fantastic article and some of the truest shit I've read in a long time. There really is a binary, bottom line to power - are you willing to live, breathe, sleep, speak it? If the answer is no, it is not because you are different or you prefer going your own way or opting out of the game due to moral reasons. It's because you are weak. You are smart enough to visualize the universe we all play in, but you're too much of a pussy to do what is needed to conquer the sandbox.

This is such a core masculine concept - this idea that a man values his mission in life 1st and will do whatever he must, including speaking, in a way that facilitates his mission. Everything else is secondary to power, because power is what will allow you to create whatever you want out of life.

You cannot conflate this with the female form of "powertalk", which is saying bullshit things in order to pump her own ego and feel good. By and large women do not have a logical explanation for why they say the things they say - they don't call you a neckbeard because they want to code all people nearby in to the fact that you are low status and they want to hold power over you. They say it because they have subconsciously learned it makes them feel cool and good to do it, for whatever reason.

If women ACTUALLY engaged in the type of lethal powertalk described by Rao, the world would be an infinitely more fucked place. Just like men, the vast majority of women are in the ignorant category when it comes to powertalk - their bullshit "gametalk" is a whole different thing, and generally bad for their own health too.

-drukpa-kunley- • 10 points • 12 May, 2014 04:15 AM

If the answer is no, it is not because you are different or you prefer going your own way or opting out of the game due to moral reasons. It's because you are weak.

On weakness:

There is the story of the Zen temple that was overrun by soldiers. The Captain came up to the Zen Master and was shocked to see the Zen Master unafraid.

The Captain said "Don't you know who I am? I could run you through with my sword and I would think nothing of it!"

And the Zen Master replied: "Don't you know who I am? You could run me through with your sword and I would think nothing of it."

Now the question is, who was the "weak" man?

zephyrprime • 1 point • 18 July, 2014 03:20 PM

It's true that powertalk as it relates to women is very different than powertalk that Rao is talking about. However, the ego stroking talk that women engage in is not powertalk, it is what Rao calls Game talk. Powertalk with women is different and I feel that we need to figure it out because I instinctively feel that it is an crucial missing link in PUA theory.

Powertalk with women isn't about negotiating money or labor like business powertalk is. I'm not even exactly sure what it is. It's about proving social superiority or something. Proving that you are more fun than her. That you have better social connections. Something akin to that stuff. What is at stake is not money, it's SOCIAL RANK.

I've been thinking about it a lot since I found out about this stuff 2 days ago. I've been rehashing successful pickup's I've done in the past in light of this information. However, my precise memory of what I said and what she said is too poor and I have too few successes to analyze. I wish I had some detailed transcripts to analyze but typical field reports are too low quality.

steadymotion • 1 point • 12 March, 2014 06:14 AM\*

Without courage, wisdom bears no fruit.

I agree that men and women have different ways of "powertalking". Men's is more active and external focused, designed to cause someone else to obey. Women's is more reactive and internal focused, designed to bring her back to a comfortable emotional state.

[deleted] • 5 points • 13 March, 2014 08:35 AM

Women powertalk in almost every social situation because they hold the power.

Go to any party, wedding, any flirting, it's the women who powertalk. Look at any facebook picture by a woman and see the likes it gets comparable to anything a man has.

steadymotion • 5 points • 13 March, 2014 06:45 PM

Well maybe that's what tends to happen, but men can powertalk too, and they can be damn good at it. Many men just don't do it because they were brought up to only consider the objective, face-value of words, which is a stupidly limiting thing to do.

Also, if a woman holds power over you then I don't see any advantage in talking to her for the purpose of sex, because they're not going to fuck someone with less power than them (you could pretend you're a celebrity I guess). You'd be better off spending your time investing in yourself to increase your power, then go talk to that woman once you've elevated yourself above her.

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 March, 2014 09:06 PM

You can't underestimate the power of game. It is similar to plastic surgery on a woman.

On the other hand the average fertile women is more powerful than the average men because the fertile women are outnumbered.

steadymotion • 1 point • 14 March, 2014 10:40 PM

Having good game is itself a form of power. Having and displaying good game is like displaying high quality genetics for intelligence and social aptitude, which is attractive, which is power. So like I said, women won't fuck men who have less power than them.

On the other hand the average fertile women is more powerful than the average men because the fertile women are outnumbered.

Agree with you there. The avg woman is definitely more powerful than the avg man (at least in Western culture).

Crusene • 9 points • 7 March, 2014 02:43 AM\*

Hear, hear!

I have come here to LEARN, not bemoan the idiocy in life.

[deleted] • 21 points • 10 March, 2014 05:49 PM

Feminism is powertalk. Example: Not only does no not always mean no, "No means no" doesn't mean "no means no". It doesn't mean "All men must ask permission before mating". "No mean no" means "If you can't both discern the difference between no that means no, and no that means yes, AND you can't discern that 'no means no' doesn't apply to everyone, then we want YOU to be in the group of men that asks permission before mating. Because your lack of powertalk skills is unattractive, and we want to make sure that you don't try to sex us without first giving us an escape valve that we can use without looking mean."

Eureka! This is so true. And what a monstrously convoluted shit test it indeed is.

[deleted] • 7 points • 7 March, 2014 10:19 AM

This was really, really good. I'd almost say sidebar material if it was fleshed out a bit more and has a few more simplifications. I hope it doesn't get buried.

emptyform • 7 points • 7 March, 2014 05:59 AM

This is the tip of the iceberg for TRP career advice. Brilliant post. Makes my office dynamics over the past few years (I'm still very young in my career) make 100% more sense.

johnnight • 20 points • 7 March, 2014 02:57 PM

"The first rule of powertalk is you do not straighttalk about powertalk."

[deleted] • 10 points • 12 May, 2014 02:12 AM

"Real G's move in silence like lasagna."

Lil Wayne

[deleted] • 11 points • 7 March, 2014 12:57 AM

Women use this power talk a lot. Even before the current feminism trend how often did you hear the word

sexist? If you stated a true fact about women you would often hear "That's sexist!" immediately thrown back at you. Little to no effort was taken to actually remedy the situation, just the implication of sexism was their instantaneous attempt to grab the upper hand on the conversation and paint you in a negative frame.

Another one I hear about our poor brothers is that they're 'untrusting'. 'He didn't trust me!' the instant response 'oh what a bad boyfriend he was!'. I hear this one all the time. Then of course it comes out they were sleeping with some guy behind his back, but he didn't trust her so he's in the wrong.

It's very easy to fall for their motivations when you aren't used to dealing with it. Because as men it's true we do tend to speak on correctness, we value truth over spin but the second a woman is about to start losing a debate she'll start to throw all these curve balls at it.

JohnPeel • 10 points • 10 March, 2014 06:36 PM

If you watch politicians communicate they are experts at powertalk, but crucially they are also experts in body language.

Take this as an example:

[http://news.bbcimg.co.uk/media/images/63689000/jpg/\\_63689753\\_obamathumb2getty.jpg](http://news.bbcimg.co.uk/media/images/63689000/jpg/_63689753_obamathumb2getty.jpg)

Obama is driving a point home aggressively but note that he uses his thumb to point, not his index finger. Notice also how he leans in when doing so, but not too much.

It's subtle, but a person not well versed in powertalk trying to make a point aggressively would lean in too close and point at the other person with their index finger. This immediately makes the other person defensive and less receptive and comes across as *too* aggressive to observers as well. If you're going to point like that you better be sure you've got the big stick to back up your talking.

But the index finger point does have place:

<http://conservativehome.blogs.com/.a/6a00d83451b31c69e2017ee5773418970d-pi>

Here Boris Johnson is speaking to a hall of followers and the point is signifying importance, he is addressing THEM directly. But also notice how he is pointing upwards so as to not address one individual (even accidentally) but all of them. Otherwise the impact on the crowd is lost.

This is just a small example of the body language of two individuals who are rated for their public speaking ability, and similarly beat out other candidates who were not so well versed.

Crusene • 6 points • 11 March, 2014 06:50 PM

Speaking of politics, I've been watching House of Cards. Lots of good TRP acting, there.

VelociReactor • 2 points • 12 May, 2014 06:49 AM

Everything In the world is about sex except sex, sex is about power.

leftajar • 6 points • 7 March, 2014 05:19 PM

Spot... frickin'... on, man.

Venkatesh's article should be on the sidebar -- look how much quality discussion it generated.

I also think your response should be there too, because it's a masterful application of the theory to male/female sexual dynamics.

mr\_throwz • 4 points • 3 July, 2014 06:29 PM

Can someone post some examples of "power talk"? I'm finding this entire concept a bit (a lot) abstract. Gracias.



[deleted] • 4 points • 11 March, 2014 08:35 AM

Amazing piece.

Feminism is powertalk. Example: Not only does no not always mean no, "No means no" doesn't mean "no means no". It doesn't mean "All men must ask permission before mating". "No mean no" means "If you can't both discern the difference between no that means no, and no that means yes, AND you can't discern that 'no means no' doesn't apply to everyone, then we want YOU to be in the group of men that asks permission before mating. Because your lack of powertalk skills is unattractive, and we want to make sure that you don't try to sex us without first giving us an escape valve that we can use without looking mean."

And

Feminists calling TRP neckbearded quasi-rapists is more powertalk. Neckbeard is their powertalk code word for "unattractive", but the real unattractiveness they fear is his lack of mastery of powertalk. They're afraid of the creation of a sort of hybrid, a man who understands powertalk well enough to see through their bullshit, but not well enough to create his own bullshit and actually thus BE attractive. That's why they use the term "rapist"... because such a man is indeed frighteningly like a rapist... he ignores social defenses against unattractive men (because he can READ powertalk), but he can't make the leap to being an attractive man (because he cannot WRITE powertalk).

Are both phenomenal theories. One question though, would it be correct to say that Gametalk and Rationalization are very related?

The\_Determinator • 1 point • 12 May, 2014 02:41 AM

I think they are supposed to be the same thing, just different people reaching the same conclusions will find different names for things if they don't know there's already a term.

heist\_of\_saint\_graft • 2 points • 7 March, 2014 07:59 PM

Loving this. The original article stymied me a bit, I suppose I was put off by the "Office" examples because I don't know the show well enough. But from the spate of discussion that's come of it, including this post, I know this will be an important read. Here to learn and listen.

burningtimber • 5 points • 8 March, 2014 04:41 AM

I wish someone would pull out the relevant clips and throw them on youtube. Not going to watch a tv series to figure out what he's talking about.

RedSunBlue • 3 points • 8 March, 2014 05:59 AM

The Negotiation

zirzo • 1 point • 13 May, 2014 09:34 PM

the first few seasons really are worth checking out :)

monsieurhire2 • 4 points • 11 March, 2014 04:54 PM

"The more they love skilled and fluent powertalk, the more they hate seeing the veil ripped off it (because doing so is bad powertalk)."

Very true.

[deleted] • 5 points • 7 March, 2014 03:43 PM

Women are usually far more skilled at powertalk than men.

Women are better manipulators, I'll give you that. But wasn't the definition of power talk basically: power + plausibly deniable talk.

Most of the women I know and that I read about here are just all bark and no bite which is: posture talk.

This shit is going wayyy too meta, as someone said - it needs to be simplified down A LOT to make it applicable to sexual strategy. We don't discuss stock markets rates and popular fashion here, despite them being facets(money, physical look) of attracting women.

Whoever manages to dumb this down into something succinct, I salute you.

LasherDeviance • 12 points • 10 March, 2014 08:12 PM

Whisper did dumb it down.

Powertalk = Manipulation to achieve an end without copping to it.

Straighttalk = Honest speech that conveys regular information without bias.

Gametalk = (Not to be mistaken with Game) Hamstering.

SacreBleuMe • 2 points • 7 March, 2014 08:13 PM\*

So now the question is, how to learn powertalk

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 May, 2014 08:59 PM

practice makes perfect.

cray-cray-cray • 2 points • 7 March, 2014 02:52 AM

That was interesting.

MockingDead • 2 points • 10 March, 2014 04:46 PM

Just read the article, happened to coincide with a meeting at work. Blew my mind. It's as if littel Cs, Ss, and Ls appeared over their heads.

I got an L.

IllimitableMan • 2 points • 12 March, 2014 11:35 PM

Taking me fucking ages to read this shit. What I've read so far is good shit.

luciansolaris • 1 point • 11 March, 2014 06:38 PM\*

[deleted]

[Praise KEK!](43456)

Whisper[S] • 7 points • 23 March, 2014 01:31 AM

[http://www.reddit.com/r/AlreadyRed/comments/1zso5x/spergs\\_cynics\\_and\\_manipulators\\_how\\_powertalk/](http://www.reddit.com/r/AlreadyRed/comments/1zso5x/spergs_cynics_and_manipulators_how_powertalk/)

The healthiest societies are made of spergs, but being a sperg isn't healthiest for the individual.

zephyrprime • 1 point • 16 July, 2014 04:10 PM

Yes and the reason some societies are more successful than others is because some societies have more spergs are fewer sociopaths. The reason why redpill slut shames is because slutting around destroys society because women favor and are attracted to sociopaths/dark triad.

still\_very\_alive • 2 points • 13 March, 2014 11:07 AM

It's something I'm forced to agree with, in principle. The world would be a better, simpler place if we all went economist and just used straight talk all the time. But it ain't happening.

RedPill4LYF • 1 point • 11 May, 2014 12:49 PM

I glanced over this the other day when I was semi-busy, and I knew there was great potential, but god damn this is a good post. This is exactly why I stick around. I want every last man that comes into this sub to see just exactly what we're up against and to be able to fight back against it.

87GNX • 1 point • 10 March, 2014 03:33 PM

Shit's more mind expanding then cid.

ComradeGoby • 2 points • 25 May, 2014 09:25 PM

One acid trip I had really just made all this type of stuff click

LasherDeviance • 1 point • 10 March, 2014 08:07 PM

This is genius.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 March, 2014 08:15 PM

This is all well and good. But how does one move from the loser category to the PowerTalk category?

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 March, 2014 05:15 PM

I read the rest of the articles. He kindof spells it out.

I appreciate you looking out for me, though.

[deleted] • 5 points • 11 March, 2014 12:31 AM

By acquiring some coin in the game.

After all, what attracts you to any given woman?

Exceptional qualities right? (Whatever that means to you)

PowerTalk isn't a way to speak so much as it is an exercise of power. Any social situation you want to rise within you must secure the coin of the realm so to speak. You parlay this currency over time through a series of risk/reward exercises into real social capital which you proceed to spend on stuff you think is worth it.

You will certainly win and lose these contests many times throughout your life. But that's how sausage is actually made...

AdmiralVonJackass • 1 point • 10 March, 2014 08:18 PM

Thank you. This has changed the way I think about women. We all know that they are sneaky and covert, but this analysis puts the spotlight on the details of their bullshit.

skinsblackmetallic • 1 point • 12 May, 2014 07:35 PM

This is some fascinating shit right here.

crescent2612 • 1 point • 13 May, 2014 10:58 PM

Excellent fucking post sir!

johngalt1234 • 0 points • 13 May, 2014 03:24 AM

Jesus combined powertalk and straight talk:

<https://heartiste.wordpress.com/2014/04/17/jesus-had-game/>

Learn from the master and founder of one of the world's biggest religion

RcskaSedd • -1 points • 11 March, 2014 05:08 PM

Saving this thread f

charlesbukowski • 0 points • 12 March, 2014 08:16 AM

This is good stuff, thank you.

mangoflavouredpanda • 0 points • 13 March, 2014 01:21 PM

Right. So much suddenly makes sense now.

suscitare • 0 points • 15 March, 2014 08:37 AM\*

The falseness of an opinion is not for us any objection to it: it is here, perhaps, that our new language sounds most strangely. The question is, how far an opinion is life-furthering, life-preserving, species-preserving, perhaps species-rearing, and we are fundamentally inclined to maintain that the falsest opinions (to which the synthetic judgments a priori belong), are the most indispensable to us, that without a recognition of logical fictions, without a comparison of reality with the purely IMAGINED world of the absolute and immutable, without a constant counterfeiting of the world by means of numbers, man could not live--that the renunciation of false opinions would be a renunciation of life, a negation of life. TO RECOGNISE UNTRUTH AS A CONDITION OF LIFE; that is certainly to impugn the traditional ideas of value in a dangerous manner, and a philosophy which ventures to do so, has thereby alone placed itself beyond good and evil.

Thought it might be worth quoting the genius of Nietzsche from "Beyond Good And Evil".

I think powertalk can be understood in terms of information processing theory. The human brain can be understood as an information processing device with a specific internal and complex state at any one moment in time. When a sociopath uses powertalk on you, regardless of whether or not what she said is true or false, one needs to examine how the powertalk changes your internal emotional state and beliefs and how that new change will influence your subsequent behaviour. Skilled powertalkers can basically use verbal language, body language and frames to manipulate you in a manner consistent with their goals and intentions. So when someone is communicating with you don't just take their words on face value but try to examine where the other person is coming from and the overall context of their communication. Think about what the other wants to gain and how they want you to subsequently act.

FeralStoic • 0 points • 13 May, 2014 12:11 PM

This is an awesome find. I wonder what merit strategic silence would have within the interface of powertalk, timed appropriately.