

Good example of manifesto for clear communication argumentative essay

[Experience](#), [Belief](#)



Importance of communication and current state:

Communication is of supreme importance in us humans. Almost nothing would work if we weren't able to communicate with each other. Each man, then, truly would live like an island, living in solitude and aloof of anyone else's reality. For a concept that is so imperative to our social life, it is hardly ever acknowledged and frequently abused. Before the technology boom, communication was always face to face, where people could get a real time experience of our gestures, body language and expressions. But in today's day and age, most of our communication is either written or distributed through the means of media. We are receiving a plethora of information on critical topics like politics, economy, poverty and illiteracy, etc. by these impersonal means. It is, thus all the more crucial to maintain the quality of this communication. People, the world over are exposed to political speeches, and a lot of other information and they form opinions based on what is communicated.

For this purpose, " how communication is done?" is as paramount as " what is communicated?" As the current state of communication goes, the focus seems to be on sounding and seeming important more than making some sort of a difference to mankind. The meaning behind the dialogue can seldom be understood. Generating noise, forcing one's opinion onto other people and winning a debate seems like more of a motive than making a difference. The focus is on sensationalizing issues and yellow journalism. It can be presumed that some reasons for such low-quality communication are the need to say something as soon as the topic is announced. Everyone wants to come across as well read and knowledgeable. But the poorly

thought out dialogues and unchangeable opinions harm this very motive. With the emergence of various news channels, there is a need for constant material. Raising TRP's and generating revenue is non-negotiable. Quantity has somehow become more sought after than quality. There is a need for instant gratification. The desire for the validation of one's opinion is present. And thus, articulation seems to be suffering. The aspect of a dialogue that suffers even more greatly is the art of listening. Patient listeners truly are a thing of the past. TV debates are a perfect example of this. Whether the issue being discussed is a political one or an ethical one, everyone jumping out of their seats to talk. No one really wants to find a solution. And even if they do, it is impossible to with so much competition. Constructive communication is when all parties listen to each other's opinions respectfully instead of hitting everyone with theirs. The lack of respect for fellow human beings as is seen in society is also visible in these debates. But we forget that the entire purpose of communication is to share and acknowledge everyone's school of thought.

English is the official language of more than 60 countries. It is the language that facilitates dialogue between people of multiple nationalities, descent and races. However, good English is rarely seen or heard these days. It is common knowledge that the quality of the language has fallen to an embarrassingly low level. But no one seems to accept that. Is it really impossible to stop and wonder how this sophisticated language has reached a level where it is constantly misused?

What can be done to facilitate clear writing and dialogue?

As George Orwell mentioned in his work " Politics and the English Language ", it is because of certain bad habits and the unwillingness to correct those habits that modern English has deteriorated. It is also pointed out that this is reversible and if people are willing to devote time to the cause, the quality of English language can significantly be restored.

He mentioned what elements are decreasing the quality of the language. I agree with his opinion that modern English has largely become about adding popular phrases and marketing a meaningless article or speech. We are no longer choosing our words for their meanings and the depth they may convey but rather for their popularity. The result is a product which makes no sense and isn't able to display any meaning, forget making any lasting political or economic impact. The practice of using " ready-made phrases" has made for lazy writers and apathetic readers. The writer/speaker may think he is saving time, but it actually is pushing the quality of his work down.

Orwell advocated simplicity in language. To be able to simplify even a complex idea and present it to the world is beautiful. He criticized the use of dying metaphors, pretentious diction and operators in communication. These three elements make for very complicated and superficial dialogue. Neither the originality of the author nor the depth of the topic comes across this way. I am sure we have all experienced this when phrases like " joie de vivre", " Gracias", etc. are used in everyday conversations. There is absolutely no harm in learning a new language. But using a popular word or phrase does nothing for that purpose either. How many people actually know French

grammar and how complex it is? Additionally, political speech or any other important domain must use pure English.

Furthermore, we are given some thumb rules by Orwell. We are advised to use shorter, fewer words and active speech, to stick to English language as much as if we can and to break these rules if our final product is uncivilized. All these pointers further convince us to be simple and precise in expression of our ideas. The lesser we try to decorate our speech with complicated jargon and pretentious words, the more easily our ideas can be understood. This is by no means to say that advanced English or bigger words should never be used. None of these rules are to thwart continuous learning. But to ensure that speakers and writers focus on expressing meaning and not superficiality.

It is the vicious cycle between our thoughts and the language we use to express ourselves. It isn't just unidirectional. We constantly are having an internal dialogue with our self. The language we use affects our thinking too. And this has become such a close part of how we think and talk, that it will take proactive effort to repair this problem. It is much better to delay the use of words to describe an experience or an object. It is best to familiarise oneself with it visually and in reality and then use the words that come naturally. This would prevent the usage of ready-made phrases and employ the creative acumen to a larger extent. And that is what communication is. It is a creative outlet which helps us to experience other people.

So what is important in order for our communication to be clear and useful?

In his work "Notes on Dialogue," Stringfellow Barr gave us a model to follow.

He rather suggested a mentor in Socrates. Socrates was a fan of "the

dialectic” Barr also gave us some rules in order to make the discussion of ideas a more productive exercise. He says that an effort at being complete discourages the conversational flow. Dialectic is often helped by describing outlines of an idea and letting the dialogue flow. He further narrated how asking questioning each other’s ideas can lead to a spontaneous flow of conversation. According to him, people should not worry about political, societal effects and be able to practice a freedom of speech. However, this is more of a societal change than an individual one. Showing respect to the speaker by listening is not just needed but absolutely necessary to healthy conversations.

Those familiar with Aristotle’s teachings may recall his theory on friendship. His concept of three levels of friendship is very much legit even today. He held the belief that there are three stages of friendship. Acquaintances or “contacts” is when people are useful to each other, and it is primarily based on what can be gained from that person. When people begin to look forward to and enjoy each other’s company, is when the second stage starts. However, the real level of friendship is the third one, where each person desires the good of the other. His thought was that in any republic, this is a relationship that must exist between its citizens. That is what would lead to the real development and progress of mankind.

I also agree with Barr’s idea of being playful and humorous in dialogue. Humour is always helpful in disarming insecurity and to helping people be free with each other. If we really are to smoothen sharing of ideas and experience better dialogue, we need to see each other as friends trying to arrive at truth. Helping each other, questioning each other and drawing each

other out are ways that will ensure higher quality of communication. This definitely is a tedious, time-consuming change but will lead to the growth of our society.

Works Cited

Orwell, George. " Politics and the English Language" 1946. Web.

30 Sep. 14 < <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/orwell46.htm> >

Barr, Stringfellow. " Notes on Dialogue " St. John's College. January, 1968.

Web.

< https://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/centers/boisi/pdf/f10/Notes_on_Dialogue.pdf >