

25. Communication Fails

Space entities from other worlds have been discovered! They sent signals at intervals so timed, their accuracy far exceeded man-made instruments. With scientists concluding that they are especially advanced, what have follow-up investigations found?

Our extraterrestrials are now known as pulsars: a type of star several times our Sun's mass compressed into the size of beach-balls. By speedily rotating, they beam out radio waves, creating a pulsating effect. Scientists not only misunderstood who they were dealing with, they tried to communicate with non-living matter. Since adults with specialized education made such a huge mistake, how frequently do most people misread others? CONSTANTLY. Living in the information age doesn't mean we understand this prosaic tsunami or interpersonal junkyard. Instead, we are more distant than ever.

Personal or Impersonal

Face to face communication, as practiced for aeons, is preferable. With telephoning you lose important body language, facial expressions, and personal contact, while maintaining voice tone, volume, and dialogue. With letters or e-mails, you also lose voice tone and volume, while monologue replaces dialogue. If someone doesn't know someone else well, they may assume the worst. If something can be considered threatening, lecherous, insulting, or dishonest, it often will.

I primarily wrote letters instead of telephoning. That's partially because people answered my calls with a hurried, annoyed tone and then hung up; someone else would say "they're not home" or I'd get answering machines. Then they'd become irate because I wrote a letter. Writing letters also replaced face-to-face communication because when I'd talk, I'd be steamrolled with blather, and barely allowed to speak. So if someone who lives locally never has time to talk or dominates every conversation, there's no interpersonal relationship with them.

Snap Judgments and Other Evaluations

Snap judgments are often necessary. Most of us encounter many others daily, and don't have time to get to know each one. Yet we must decide how to interact with them, if at all. This helps protect us from victimization and find the right people quickly. However, dealing with people we know should be much different. Outside of relying on direct statements and verifying supposed facts, most methods of communicating with and evaluating others are bad news. I hereafter expose these fallacious techniques.

Computer Communication

With Internet, almost everyone is a stranger. An infamous case involved an unpopular teenage girl who thought she developed a relationship with a boy who liked her. However, some other girls and their mother held a grudge and were playing a dirty trick. The chatroom communication took a shocking turnaround; "the boy" repeatedly hurled intense abuse. Distraught, the girl committed suicide.

Consider scam dating services. They're free to sign up; you'll also know if you've gotten any messages. However, receiving sent messages requires payment. Website owners sometimes type phony e-mails, impersonating someone who's interested, even sending pictures. That baits your payment. After you pay, that person disappears. Others message for awhile; then make you feel sorry for them and send money. Scammers from Nigeria, in the sweetest, nicest way possible, claim to be orphaned, and need help managing their inheritance. This requires sending money and personal information so they can victimize you. Beware of for sale advertisements too; some people, after arriving with their cash, were mugged. Certainly most people wanting cre-

dit card information are vampiric scammers. Entering the name of any person, company, or website you're unsure about plus the word scam is recommended.

As for e-mail relationships, there's no excuse for suddenly cutting someone off with whom you've formed a connection with without telling them what happened. Even if everybody does it, it does not make it right. It's downright hateful and gross judgmental-ism when you boom! slam the judge's gavel down on one who is misunderstood and means no offense. If God judged people the way people judge those with personalities they don't understand, I'm guessing that He'd damn everyone on the planet to Hell.

Here's the thing: Insults in response to imaginary slights is ignorant. Try reading for comprehension instead of attributing malice to genuine inquiries or honest statements. Or if you get an awkward e-mail (or voice-mail, letter, flyer, et cetera) ask the sender to clarify what they mean. Other times, you may say that certain things therein or the mail's tone makes you uncomfortable, so they can correct themselves. If you must take a break from them awhile, do so, but contacting them again is ethically imperative.

Piecemeal Communication and Other Dubious Tactics

Blogs are designated interest websites featuring weekly subtopics. Strangers from everywhere add a paragraph, single sentence, or sentence fragment. That's useful in feeling camaraderie with people who agree with you or venting frustration towards your opponents but communicates little. People constantly misunderstand one another; tempers boil. Blogs chiefly benefit blog owners, who use them for self-promotion. They frequently delete posts they disagree with and encourage posters who agree with them. I'm a blogger, but regularly post my website address; my website clarifies my positions.

Religious tracts, political pamphlets, and picket signs are very ineffective. You may convert someone to your philosophy by befriending them and being a good example, or discussing your beliefs with them for years. Whole books have sometimes changed the world, but piddling scraps of paper rarely change anybody. The one in twenty thousand they reach are probably betwixt two positions; the paper tilts the balance.

Quoting an anonymous tract distributor: "When I distributed tracts, people were either indifferent, became angry, or threw them out. I handed a man a tract entitled 'I'm Interested in You.' He promptly shoved it in my shirt pocket, saying 'I'm not your type.' Another time I left tracts in the apartment complex laundry room. Later, I noticed that someone had an anger fit; the tracts looked like they were attacked by a pit bull. And since an acquaintance's bashed out car window was replaced by a makeshift barrier, I pushed some tracts through. After an overnight thunderstorm the inverted flap allowed rain to flood the car and short circuit electrical components." Regardless, you spend your money buying tracts, spend your time distributing them, and anonymous distributors never receive feedback. Conclusively, religious tracts, political pamphlets, and picket signs are often "litter-ature."

Having a car beats having to walk, but pushing an axel-rod with two tires attached would be worse than simply walking. Likewise, piecemeal communication is often worse than no communication. Music is an exception; songs can be incredibly moving despite their limited lyrics. Professional advertising works because they have pictures, and they're not trying to change your whole outlook on life, they're just trying to get you to buy a product or service.

Numerous books are intelligently written and make splendid persuasive arguments, but immediately blare the author's position. Let's say I hate cacophony music and want to convince my readers; my book is titled: Cacophony Music is Garbage. People who already agree might read it, but cacophony fans might throw it across the room. After I explained a certain position, someone thought I should hear the other side, and recommended a book on it. After finding the book, I spotted comments on the back cover saying that people who believed as I did were stupid idiots. I never opened the book; it went flying. Instead, let's start on common ground, and work from there.

Debating or Quarrelling?

Debating is an excellent way of discovering truth. However, few care to debate; most want to quarrel, causing conflict and resentment. Often, people don't even rise to the level of quarreling; they engage in blurting hostile statements.

In alleged debates, my opponents only wanted to use argumentation to elevate themselves and lower me; they weren't interested in finding truth. For example, someone spoke against my viewpoint. I then commenced debate. After I surprised him with my knowledge on the given topic, the topic was quickly switched to another. By demonstrating knowledge on the subsequent subject, it too vanished, and a third subject was raised, then a fourth, fifth, and so on, repeatedly attempting to pull me into terra incognita. Someone may keep changing the subject until a hundred topics have passed, then revert to the original subject. By then, the important points are forgotten about; the whole argument must be started from scratch.

Two common tactics are ad hominem and straw man attacks. Ad hominem attacks your opponent's character and personal life instead of his argument. A straw man is a misrepresentation of your opponent's position, which you refute. In Internet debates, I've gotten twenty ad hominem and straw man attacks on one thread alone. These fallacies, along with card stacking: ignoring evidence for the other side or only choosing facts that show the best or worst possible cases, infest televisions and newspapers.

People who won't communicate honestly, and only engage in vain desultory babbling are extremely dishonorable. And again, there are three levels of verbal conflict: debates, quarreling, and blurting. As long as quarreling and blurting abound without constructive debates or dialoguing, society will never progress.

As individuals we can promote truth, defy lies, and engender positive change. If anyone doubts their ability to influence others, go to a crowded shopping mall and stare at the ceiling; see how many do likewise. Besides, the world has changed repeatedly; this change always started with anywhere from one to a handful of people who influenced others, causing a mushroom effect which enveloped the world.

Body Language

According to the Apostle John, all habitual unrepentant liars will be eternally damned. Yet lying proliferates to where simply asking someone something is often futile. And if somebody doesn't like you, they usually won't say it, and may even say they like you.

Therefore, a method to help determine someone's feelings or truthfulness is analyzing body language, since some physical gestures are universal. For example, someone with arms crossed tightly and fists clenched saying they're perfectly comfortable is lying. That's because human bodies are designed the same way, so oftentimes awkward or comfortable postures or facial expressions are universally awkward or comfortable. However, body language is often ambivalent; some gestures have multiple meanings.

Many lie with body language too. Undoubtedly the most common false body language is women projecting attraction to men by preening or inexplicably sudden smiles. "There are daggers in men's smiles"—*Shakespeare's Macbeth Act II, Scene III*), but women's smiles are even more phony.⁽¹⁾ They may act consciously as a form of manipulation or subconsciously as habit, but every "indicator" is used. However, negative body language is always true; there's no motivation for fake negative body language. Moreover, the body language of attraction is worthless. Besides the pretension, supposed attraction indicators are usually idiosyncratic mannerisms. Nobody I was ever been attracted to ever had a clue unless I told them directly.

My mannerisms are usually misinterpreted. By looking intently at someone because they looked remarkably like someone I knew, I'd get dirty looks or head shaking. A classmate and I were reprimanded at school for eyeballing each other to make each other laugh. The teacher said that people would think something homosexual was going on. My bad habit of looking down and evading eye contact also got negative responses, as if I was examining someone's crotch. So before considering the subtleties of body language, facial expressions, and voice inflections, we must know exactly how it works before causing more problems than we solve.

Oftentimes neither body language nor asking simple questions allow us to ascertain truth. Sometimes the only effective means to communicate with non-compliant people is to repeatedly ask questions until their replies become contradictory or until the truth dribbles out.

Offenses and Snap Responses

When I was a jogger, people throughout my neighborhood began allowing their dogs to roam the neighborhood; dogs followed me and refused to leave. I had to jog alongside a dog; when I crossed a street the dog recklessly dashed across. Enraged drivers rabidly screamed for me to control “my” dog. After escorting various dogs, I decided to give up jogging.

Being isolated, with parents who sometimes disregarded social convention at home caused problems. My father used to press food to his nose to smell it. When I did likewise at school, people got offended, saying that I was blowing my nose. After receiving Christmas presents in garbage bags, I donated items to a church benevolent pantry in never used garbage bags. Somebody got offended and shunned me; another time the minister reprimanded “whoever did it”.

Once I suspected that my current minister “with advanced education” was purposely avoiding me. My suspicions were confirmed from somebody else telling me that the minister thought I’d been insulting him. Many similar episodes were typical. Yet resolving issues logically requires communication. Having been a dedicated churchgoer for years, it’s obvious that most Christian believers are hypocrites. Whether these cases involved coldness, pride, cowardice, ignorance, or all four, conflicts cannot occur without sin being involved. Therefore, instead of writing people off, let’s mature as a society.

When someone says or does something we don’t like, our fallen nature prefers to view it as a personal attack and shun them. Jesus of Nazareth clearly taught how to deal with trespasses (Matthew 18:15-17). The first step, applicable to everybody, is speaking to them directly about it. After taking that first step, the second step, involving others to settle the dispute, is often unnecessary. We may be aware of this principle, but don’t apply it because the person we’re dealing with supposedly isn’t mature enough to handle it. Besides our character analysis not excusing us, now we’re guilty of a double violation, since we’re being judgmental. We also violate the Golden Rule: treating others how we ourselves want to be treated, if we’d want others to confront us directly about a problem. We’re hypocrites if we don’t correct our own faults first and guilty of pettiness if we take offense at trivial issues. Keep these facts in mind before you condemn.

And when some people feel that someone has asked a dumb question, they reply “What do you think?” or “Obviously”. Being unconcerned about something while another is, they reply “What do you care?” Although these statements may seem trivial, these disrespectful expressions are a nuanced way of saying F you; the statements cannot be anything other than an insult. If that’s the best we can say, let’s say nothing.

Portraying and Detecting Potential Criminals

Perhaps society’s criminal element creates a subconscious foreboding within the human psyche which begs assuaging. Criminals are portrayed as bizarre, like the Joker, Penguin, or Riddler, or unlikely combinations such as black men with bleached blond hair, and Hispanics speaking Russian. Evil-doers are portrayed as either mentally slow; such as “Leather-face” and Friday the 13th’s Jason, or mental giants Hannibal Lecter and Lex Luthor. This perpetuates a stereotype which negates the bottom and top 2% of those on the intellectual scale. Hellions are also portrayed as having been abused children (Jason and Freddy Kreuger) or mentally handicapped people neglecting their medication.

It’s revolting to portray victims who need more love and understanding as victimizers instead. Sometimes almost everyone is portrayed as good, and the bad guys are non-existent space aliens. This comforts people by portraying criminals as readily identifiable and “normal people” as nice. Rather, felons almost al-

ways blend in and are considered respectable like super-criminal John Robinson, a Kansas grandfather and respected community member who deceived, financially victimized, and murdered people for thirty-five years.

Unless somebody makes overt threats or commits violent actions, don't assume they're criminal. Even makers of overt threats usually don't act upon them, while those intent on criminal activity portray themselves as upstanding to mask their activities. Considering someone dangerous without a logical reason is offensive. Since dangerousness equates with badness, that's labeling someone a bad person.

In the Salem Witch Trials, innocent people were assumed harmful because they were different and were tortured to death. Rather, people who get pseudo-scientific vibes about others are dangerous. From a Christian standpoint: "Marvel not, for Satan himself transforms into an angel of light" (II Corinthians 11:14). From a Humanist standpoint, sociopaths (those without conscience or "anti-social personality disorder") are recognized as being exceptionally charming on the surface, making them more likable than most people.(2) So regardless, people are grossly misevaluated constantly.

Sherlock Holmes Syndrome

Sherlock Holmes knew people intimately after knowing them for five minutes, and completely understood any scene just by glancing at it. For a Sherlock Holmes to exist in real life, he would require complete knowledge about every existing subject. Deductive reasoning has some legitimacy if logic is applied, but it's counterproductive if you think you can read every situation. Some of my successes with deductive reasoning startled and amazed others. Yet other attempts at deductive reasoning made a fool of me. Deductive reasoning is often applied by "ESP" readers or mediums "who contact spirits." Their seemingly supernatural knowledge seems credible because their inaccurate statements are simply forgotten while their accurate conclusions are remembered.

As a child, I went with my grandparents to McDonald's. On one occasion a sign said that you could talk to Ronald McDonald personally. I thought "Wow" and picked up a special telephone. The man on the other end confidently prattled on like he knew me. However, he talked about typical interests of my gender and age. What the man was doing was playing the odds, which is usually effective. But even effective assumptions negate people who aren't stereotypical.

The special ability of police officers and detectives to read the street consists of intense observation. Though reading situations is valuable, it's woefully insufficient; therefore, most police work is "jawbone". Some officers specialize in interrogation; talking with people for hours to garner information. If intuition was valid, coercing people to give long, detailed, and explicit information wouldn't be needed. Psychological profiling, despite its media popularity, doesn't work. Besides, it's sometimes harmful, vilifying the innocent and ignoring the guilty. A policeman stated "I have almost no faith in the psychiatric profession's ability to tell me if somebody is safe. Psychiatrists for the defense are either incompetent or are attempting to maintain a façade to collect their check---they're terrible."³

Some police departments also incorporate psychics. But just because foolishness is officially recognized doesn't mean we must accept it. Another policeman said: "There is no Sherlock Holmes, Kojack, or Hunter. Good detectives know all the informants, and some informant will tell them who did it."⁴

Communication Barriers in Counseling

Crisis hotline training manuals identify three specific barriers to communication: avoiding other's concerns, sending unwanted solutions, and judging. They all convey the message: "I don't care about what you're saying." The subcategories of judging; criticizing and name calling, are self-explanatory. The other subcategory, diagnosing, is probing for hidden motives and trying to categorize someone. Even evaluative praising is manipulative when used to provoke behavioral changes according to your guidelines (You're wonderful since you agree with me). Avoiding other's concerns may involve siding with those whom the person you are speaking with has a conflict. Sometimes the discussion is simply diverted to you.

Another form of avoiding other's concerns is second-guessing someone when they state something as factual. Or their statement may be reduced to subjectivity by the ablative addendums "You feel that's the case" or "So you say". Within crisis scenarios, proper communication is especially critical; disrespect must vanish.⁽⁵⁾ Fortunately, crisis hotline workers are trained on proper communication. Making typical communication mistakes could traumatize those in dire emotional states.

Facts Known through Logic verses Unproved Assumptions

Although most people no longer believe in a flat earth, most people embrace intuition, inference, or "vibes." Yet if there are a hundred facts about me, and I only tell you twenty facts, you won't know twenty-one of them. After awhile, you'll probably forget some and only know ten. Analyzing nuances or innuendo is often counterproductive; individual quirks or grammatical errors in speech or writing are often mistaken for important implications. Assumptions often harm relationships, especially with a one-in-a-million personality who is constantly misunderstood. Besides intuition being a failure, even witnessing an event yourself or hearing an honest detailed account sometimes fails. Memory is seriously fallible, unreliable, and easily tweaked by individual beliefs and desires. To demonstrate this, independently ask various people who witnessed the same event about the event's details. Even more unreliable is someone relating an account which gets repeated from person to person; it often becomes garbled into unrelated fiction.

However, logic is essential. Since I write, assume I can read. Having four quarters in my hand, with that hand in my pocket, assume there's a dollar in my pocket. If my favorite shape has three sides, my favorite shape must be a triangle. But by only stating that my favorite shape has four sides, you cannot know whether it is a square, rectangle, rhomboid, or diamond. Facts are known from direct statements or deduction if all other conclusions are impossible or nonsensical. Also beware of false "logic;" over fifty different types of logical fallacies exist. Logical fallacies are errors in reasoning due to a misconception or presumption.

Unfortunately, people often hear false information about someone through others. Even parents have given false information about their children. As for me, people tend to hear about me from everyone else, their impression is formed thereby, and what I say about myself is ignored. Consequently, since I'm often completely different from the person someone thinks I am, relationships cannot form.

So anything beyond hearing direct statements from someone or observing their behavior firsthand to deduce facts about them is often useless and sometimes harmful. Even judging ambivalent or nuanced statements can be counterproductive. Considering body language and tone of voice can help, but this must be followed with direct questions and statements.

Testing "Intuition"

Intuition can be defined as a form of knowledge akin to instinct that gives quick insight into reality. "Women's intuition," after having been mentioned endlessly, is assumed to exist. Yet interestingly, a woman alleged that talk show host David Letterman used code words, gestures, and eye expressions to taunt her with a desire to marry her and train her as his co-host through the television. She alleged that this decade-long cruelty caused sleep deprivation and forced her into bankruptcy. Yet David Letterman never met her.⁽⁶⁾ Concerning me, other women thought I was under eighteen at age thirty-five and under twenty-one at forty-five; some intuition. In my experience, men usually read me somewhat better than women. However, men's evaluations of me are still woefully distorted. Their assumptions about me on the Internet are usually dead wrong.

So I have decided to challenge intuition theory. Specifically, I've constructed a quiz consisting of 50 questions pertaining to significant facts about someone, averaging five possible multiple choice answers. The goal is to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that intuition, instinctive knowledge, or whatever is completely fictitious and nonexistent in any living person.

The median number of questions gotten right by simply checking boxes at random would be 20% correct. And by simply observing someone and using common sense, it would be virtually impossible to say, mistake someone under eighteen for someone over seventy and vice versa. That adds a bit without having anything to do with intuition. So if a hundred people took the test based on strangers; and the average number of correct conclusions was 24% or less, intuition theory would be completely disproved. Averaging 26-30% correct would be significant but inconclusive.

Averaging 34% or better for tests based on strangers, 56% correct for people who casually knew the person whom the test was based on, and 80% correct for people close to whom the test was based on would be remarkable. If that happened, I would expand the test base to weed out unusual happenstances; if I still got high results, I'd concede to intuition theory. But even getting that far escapes people. Having already done some testing, I saw that the answers gotten right pertained to issues which the other person made direct statements about; for things that weren't stated, giant mistakes abounded.

Again, you're already getting 20% for nothing by virtue of random chance, a couple percent for common sense, and several answers right because your friend chose to reveal things about themselves. By adding special intuition there shouldn't be any colossal mistakes. Instead, gross mistakes abound. And since even my own parents cannot get every conclusion right about me, where does that leave everyone else?

Furthermore, in a group psychological exercise we all told two things that are true about ourselves, and one thing that was false. Everyone then said which one they deemed false for everyone else. Even with no "intuition" people should get 33.3% right via random chance. However, after all was revealed, we saw that everybody got zero percent right! Try this with any group of people; see how bad you do.(7) So STOP your assumptions and reliance on "intuition", and interact properly.

Extreme Communication Breakdown

Although my learning disability interferes with my ability to socialize, besides having other unusual personality attributes, this contributes to but doesn't fully explain the constant misunderstanding which results. Here's how people misinterpret me: natural laughing "is making fun of someone;" complimenting someone "is being sarcastic or having an ulterior motive," forgetting to do something "is purposely not doing something," doing something without asking "is being audacious", asking before doing something gets an angry "What do you think?", misunderstanding someone "is being stubborn", saying that I misunderstand someone "is giving me a hard time", pointing out a problem "is being overly critical," not pointing out a problem "is neglecting to responsibly inform someone of a problem" and frankly pointing out a fact "is insulting or untruthful."

Moreover, my viewpoints are vehemently denounced as being wrong before hearing my side, while I'm accused of being intolerant of other viewpoints. Intelligent adults having this much misunderstanding is unbelievable; perhaps the Devil is at work.

In Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, Alice has a verbal conflict with the irrational March Hare. The Mad Hatter and the dormouse side with the Hare, adding more nonsense and confusion. Nonsensical conversation, verbicide, vain babbling, tomfoolery, and intellectual dishonesty erupt again from the hookah-smoking caterpillar, Humpty Dumpty, red and white queens, and everyone else. Finally, while the queen of hearts screams at Alice incessantly, the entire pack of card people persecutes Alice, literally flying upon her. Alice then awakes from her nightmare.⁸

Thinking well of those we know (while being on guard) until proven otherwise should solve ninety percent of communication and social problems. Humanity's fallen nature most commonly manifests in how we communicate: thinking the worst about our fellows, habitually lying, and shooting them down. Worse yet, those that are shot down are often society's best and brightest, while degenerates are lauded. So fight these tendencies of calling good evil and evil good.

Brainwashing

The United States still has the freedoms of speech and press. However, “Those who read nothing at all are better educated than those who read nothing but newspapers”-----Thomas Jefferson.(9) Newspapers, television, movies, radio, magazines, and the publishing industry to a lesser extent are predominantly controlled by one group: irreligious people of Jewish origin (who also run government and financial institutions to a large extent). The Internet is also influenced.

Secular Jewish domination is documented in Neil Gabler’s *An Empire of Their Own*, Ben Stein’s *View From Sunset Boulevard*, and other sources.(10,11) Actually, documentation should not be needed if we simply note the names of those in power; names usually reveal one’s nationality. Jewish domination even exceeds Jewish names since some names have been sneakily changed. Ben Stein contends that most of them are adamantly opposed to Christian values and rural America’s traditional conservatism. Imagine if American media was dominated by Iranian sympathizers or Scientologists. Yet besides no outcry about our present situation, there’s denial.

We may eventually lose our freedoms of speech and press. Without these freedoms to dissent, the situation can escalate into legal domination unless we stand up for ourselves. And we won’t do anything if we are brainwashed. So I recommend canceling all newspaper and magazine subscriptions, throwing your televisions in the dumpster, limiting the movie-going, and primarily relying on a large screen computer for news and information.

Understanding Books

Paraphrasing from Louisa May Alcott’s *Little Women* (1868) chapter 34; Since America read rubbish, Josephine “Jo” March reactively wrote sensationalist stories for the “Weekly Volcano”, with gory details of sin and negativity. Her teacher Mister Bhaer saw her article in the paper, declaring “If respectable people knew what harm they did, they wouldn’t feel that the living was honest. They have no right to poison the sugarplum and let the small ones eat it. No; they should think a little, and sweep mud in the street before doing this thing.” Burning with embarrassment, Jo gathered up her entire three month’s work, incinerated it in the stove and quit.¹²

I’ve tried to take this advice, and present wholesome, matter-of-fact, and uplifting material. Since we’re in the computer age, not the nineteenth century, people often find it impossible to successfully market anything without spicing it up with negative entertainment. However, if there is a day of reckoning coming, fame and fortune will collapse like sinking sand if it’s merely built on bawdiness, self-aggrandizement, and subterfuge. Since literature greatly impacts its readers, let’s be consciously aware of what we plan to read, and how it might affect us.

Ghostwriting is writing for someone else, who gets credit for it. Almost every book “written” by someone famous: whether a professional athlete, actor, actress, fashion model, musician, politician, entrepreneur, or religious leader is ghost-written. However, since famous people already hog the limelight, trumpeting “their book” is offensive to people like me. Most serious writers need at least three thousand hours of practice before becoming halfway decent.

So let’s appreciate the great writers of history, who truly have something to say, and stop idolizing the talking heads, pied pipers, and bozos, whose books promote dubious ideas. The writer’s social charisma shines through; readers therefore accept the ideas as facts. This must stop; rather, non-fiction books promoting various ideas should be backed up by documentation via a bibliography (at least two hundred references; I have over one thousand). Some books do have heavy documentation, thus appearing fully legitimate. Yet a position is slipped in which itself has no documentation; so beware.

A big problem is limited vocabulary, often the result of laziness. According to *Word Power Made Easy* anyone can dramatically increase their vocabulary and thereby communicate more effectively.(13) Most importantly, consider that “Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the

day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned” (Matthew 12:36-37).

Conclusions and Solution

If professional people readers cannot apply righteous judgment based on supposed intuition, vibes, or whatever, untrained people ought to repent of arrogance masquerading as superior brainpower. Again, people can seldom be quickly “read.” We must temporarily rely on their direct statements and unambivalent actions alone. People can be read over the long run, even if they disguise their character. But this requires lots of patience and objectivity, which most people lack.

In Corinthians chapter 13, the greatest quality is that which the King James Bible calls charity and modern translations call love. Both words are inadequate; the original Greek word is pronounced agah’-pay; its characteristics are listed in verses 4-7. Among them is being longsuffering and enduring, which foster the patience required to deal with people in righteous fashion, while not being easily provoked might prevent hasty condemnation.

Agape would cause us to respect nice people who are different and treat them fairly. Without that loving patience or empathy, they will greatly annoy and offend us. As long as our selfish passions smolder, which agape would quash, sociopaths will play us like musical instruments. And one cannot be ruled by agape and selfish passions simultaneously. Though we cannot control other people’s perception and interpretation of us, knowing that we cannot affords us relief, knowing that it’s not our fault. CAN WE communicate properly? Affirmative.

