

## **How English Destroys Interpersonal Relationships and An Antidote**

This essay is an effort to analyze the language that one speaks, in this case English, and to evaluate its affect on interpersonal relationships. To facilitate this endeavor I am suggesting the use of the imagery of a computer in understanding the English language and its affect on relationships. Specifically I am making a parallel between the internal operating language of a computer that runs all of its downloaded programs and the native language that one speaks. I am viewing the native language of an individual as the operating language, which runs all of the human programs, which are the individual's values, ideas, skills, communication efforts, etc.

It is obvious when we look at language, that language is the critical internal program that affects all aspects of our lives. Through language we think, experience relationships, and understand our selves and our world. Yet, it is extremely subtle in its affect on our lives because our lives are subconsciously filtered through our language program. I wonder who has actually analyzed their language program for its purpose, its design and its affect on their personal lives. It is my experience that when people have trouble in a relationship they blame themselves and/or the other person(s). In the United States this blaming process has led to an incredibly large number of marriages being dissolved. I wonder what would be the result if people concluded that instead of it being either themselves or the other person that was the cause of the need to break up, rather it was their language program that had undermined their relationship.

In the imagery of the computer, the personal blaming process is much like blaming the computer for a failure of a specific program to operate satisfactorily. It wouldn't make sense to throw the computer out when it is the program that has failed. We as humans are much like a computer; we operate and interact through life programs. In the case of English speaking humans I am suggesting that it is not people that are malfunctioning, rather it is their language, which has inherent design deficiencies that has failed. It is these design limitations that are the cause of the breakdown in their efforts to communicate through English. Specifically I am going to demonstrate that English is not designed for interpersonal communication, but rather it is designed strictly to gather and to manipulate information as well as to do computations in the effort to problem solve.

Linguists have told me that language doesn't control people, rather people control language. I wonder why they deny the possibility that language affects human relationships? Is not the design of sentences an inherent manifestation of the language program? Is it not possible that sentence design controls the manner in which a person converses? Are we not all generally using commonly "downloaded" sentences for similar situations?

At least for me it is through my life's experiences that I recognize that people are speaking in a culturally similar way, and in objectively viewing the results I see a correlation between their sentences and the types of interaction they are experiencing. From my observations, it is clear that regardless of their positive motives, the sentences they use and the way they use them are undermining those positive intentions. The sentences are actually promoting disharmony and confusion while the intent of the person is to demonstrate care, concern, and even love. If I was

using a computer program that was failing to satisfy my goals, wouldn't I seek another program to do the work? I definitely would look for a better program. If using the current program was destroying my work, I would immediately stop using it even before I found a more productive program. So, with the current design of the English language. Its continued use is only promoting more disharmony and confusion. Better to take it very seriously, and stop its use, and to choose to concentrate on developing an effective language program to communicate. That is the choice I made a number of years ago. I chose not stop speaking English, and to develop a more effective language program.

What I asked myself was what would I want to communicate that is not being well communicated through the current use of sentences that make up English. The answer was peace, love and harmony in relationships. Then I asked myself what sentences can I make up that when employed will promote that feeling of well-being. So, by using the same grammar and vocabulary, but by placing the words into different sentence patterns I crafted sentences that do in fact promote the feeling of love, and even unconditional love in communication. I call this new English language program, **Personal English**, which is designed to promote peace, love and harmony in its use. Further it also supports the healing of emotional wounds.

I believe that it will be beneficial to examine the current English language program, which from this point on I call **Technological English**, for its purpose and design. However, before doing that I would like to assist the reader to distinguish more clearly between these two forms of English. To assist this purpose, I have presented below in the first two examples, dialogues that are first presented in the normal **Technological English**, and then in the more effective **Personal English**. After the first two examples, I then have presented a third sample, where the two language programs are merged.

To more completely understand this concept of merging, one needs to develop the awareness that one's native language can to be individualized to a specific goal, and that when appropriate, it can be integrated with other individualized language programs. This is similar to the way computer programs are individual yet can be merged. In our discussion, we are splitting off the need to communicate interpersonally through the sharing of feelings from **Technological English** and shifting that function to **Personal English**. In this way we have two individualized English language programs, where **Technological English** as the problem solving program is like the a computer spreadsheet program and **Personal English** is the feeling language program and like the computer word processing program.

I hope that the experience of reading the three examples will facilitate the understanding and the integration of the value of developing the multiple individualized language concept of speaking English.

Example 1.

A. **Technological English Dialogue:**

Upon picking up the child at school, the parent asks with keen interest, "Hi, How was your day?"

"Fine!" responds the child.

"How was school?" asks the parent.

"OK." mumbles the child.

The parent, somewhat frustrated asks, "Well, what did you learn?"

"Nothing." whispers the child.

The parent, feeling put off and getting upset asks, "Hey, what's the matter? Are you OK?"

The child feeling defensive responds, "No, there's nothing wrong. Why?"

The parent feeling very frustrated responds, "Why? I asked you what did you learn and you said nothing. You can't mean you didn't learn anything today. You must have learned something."

### **B. Personal English Dialogue:**

Upon picking up the child at school the parent says, "Hi honey. I've been looking forward to picking you up since I heard that the surf is coming up. I can't wait to get down to 34th St."

The child looks up brightly and says, "Radical."

The parent beams back at the child, and heads back home to get the surfboards, and to change. On the way the parent says, "I've had a very busy day, you know, trying to get all my work done so that we could go surfing together."

The child responds, "Yeah, school was tough too. Mr. Johnson gave us a ton of home-work and so did Ms. Kimble. Don't these teachers have anything else to do?"

The parent nods and with concern says, "It feels unfair to have to be at school all day and then to be given work to do at home."

"Yeah!" says the child, "It's like if you had a boss that was always giving you work to do at home. You only get paid to work 8 hours and then they work you for free at home."

"Yes." The parent responds, "Children do seem to be worked too hard."

### **Example 2.**

#### **A. Technological English Dialogue:**

The parent asks their child, "What would you like to do today?"

The child responds with excitement, "Can we go to Disneyland?"

"No," responds the parent, "That's too expensive."

"Then can we go to Sea World?" asks the child.

The parent a bit frustrated says, "No, we can't go there either, because those kind of places cost too much. Where else would you like to go?"

The child takes a minute to think, then suggests, "How about the zoo?"

The parent a bit embarrassed says, "No, that's too far. Do you know how much gas costs to go so far? Come on, you must have a suggestion that we can do. Think!"

The child despondently replies, "I don't know. We can go wherever you want."

#### **B. Personal English Dialogue:**

The parent sitting with the child at breakfast on Saturday morning thinking out loud says, "There's so many things we can do today. I like going to the beach, or bowling, or to the movies. Hmmm, but I'm kind of unsure what else we might do. I think I need some help thinking of other things to do."

The child's eyes light up, and offers, "How about rollerblading, or skateboarding, or going down to the Fun Zone to play videos?"

The parent smiling, replies, "Those are great ideas. I wonder what else we can do?"

The child responds enthusiastically, "How about going to a baseball game, or Knott's Berry Farm or Disneyland?"

The parent laughingly says, "So many great ideas. We'll be able to do one or two of these ideas today, and some we'll save for the next few weeks."

"Can we go to Disneyland then?" asks the child.

"Going to Disneyland would be a lot of fun, and that's some place we have to save for a special day. Probably we'll be able to go there at the end of the month. Now, for today, we have a choice. We can either go rollerblading and to the movies, or to the beach, but I don't know which we should do. I can sure use some help deciding."

The child thinks for a second and then offers, "Let's go rollerblading and then to a movie. We can go to the beach next week."

The parent responds encouragingly, "Thanks. That really helped. Yes, going rollerblading and then to the movies is the perfect idea."

Example 3.: The following dialogue highlights the power of having two language programs, and learning to integrate the two together to communicate in a fulfilling way:

The child says, "I hate these vegetables. I'm not going to eat them!"

The parent responds, "It seems tough to have to eat them."

The child responds, "So why do I have to eat them?"

The parent pauses a moment in order to get a feeling for the situation, then says, "Because I feel inadequate as a parent unless I provide a well balanced meal."

The child is somewhat surprised by this answer, and asks, "Why did you give me Brussels sprouts? I hate them."

"Because", says the parent, "They were on sale"

"Well, how cheap are they if I won't eat them?"

The parent responds frankly, "Well, I never thought about that."

"Any way, how many times a week do you think I need to eat vegetables so that I don't get sick? That's the reason I have to eat them, right?"

The parent thinks about it for a moment then responds, "At least twice a week."

"So," says the child, "Why don't you give me what I like twice a week, definitely not Brussels sprouts. You'll eat what I like, and the other five nights you can have what you want, and in this way you get vegetables seven times a week and I get them enough not to get sick, and we're both happy."

The parent, smiling, says, "That was brilliant. I would never have figured that out in this way. Thanks a lot. That was great!"

In this example, the two language programs were integrated to provide a humanly satisfying exchange where the feelings of the two people were addressed and a problem was solved. Healthy interpersonal relationships require multiple language programs that safely express feelings, and foster appreciation and trust, and also can solve problems.

To get a more complete intellectual understanding of the two language programs, I would first like to explore the purpose and design of our common English language, which I call

**Technological English.**

Our language is designed to satisfy the requirements of a technologically and scientifically advanced society. Language is structured to implement the values and goals of the community. Questions are the appropriate starting point in problem solving, and problem solving is what a technological society does best. Problem solving is the mainstay of our society. Naturally, the language that we speak is designed to allow the greatest ease in this process. Questions generate information and data. This data is gathered, stored, processed, and used in developing answers to problems. English, as a technological language is extremely effective in this process. While English is perhaps the most powerful form of technological language as evidenced by the tremendous scientific strides the United States has made, it is almost totally ineffective when used for communication of a personal nature. The problem is that no one knows this, and not knowing this, everyone uses a technological language form of English that in effect destroys relationships.

How does **Technological English** destroy relationships? The **Technological English** language, operating on the precepts of science, first declares that the natural order is a threat to the welfare of humanity; that it is not good enough the way it is. With this assumption in place it takes something whole and complete, like nature, and breaks it down into its component parts, so that it can be manipulated, redesigned, and then reassembled into something useful, functional. As influenced by science, the **Technological English** operates within the principal of, for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. It demands taking control and developing expectations of performance, with a reward and punishment component for success or failure. It operates on the basis of removing human feelings from the process of interaction.

Applying the **Technological English** to interpersonal relationships forces polarization. **Technological English** causes extreme discomfort because inadvertently, without choice, by employing this problem solving language program, we are communicating to the other person that first, they are not good enough the way they are. Secondly, the problem solver then attempts through questions, and all too often coerced answers, to analyze the inadequacy. Coming to a conclusion the problem solver then forces a solution through a series of suggestions. The criticism and the attached expectations creates a feeling of being judged, which causes an equal and opposite reaction, that of anger. In this way the situation becomes highly polarized. By expressing the dissatisfaction with the judgment, criticism, and demanding expectations the one being helped frustrates the problem solver, who rationalizes the rejection of help as a consequence of the recipient's unbalanced emotional state. This disintegration is the consequence of the use of **Technological English** as the communication vehicle for the interpersonal relationship.

The easiest way to begin to understand the subtle complexity of **Technological English** is to set up the following situation to review: In this example, a parent is to pick up their child after school, and go on an outing together. Arriving at the school the parent picks up the child and asks the child, "How was your day?" The child responds, "OK." The child not saying anymore turns to look out the window. The parent then asks, "How was school?" The child answers, "Fine." and continues to look out the window as they drive from the school. Then the parent asks, "Did you learn anything?" The child looks at the parent and says, "No, not really. Can

we get something to eat?” The parent looks over at the child and wonders what else they can talk about.

The above conversation is repeated by millions of children daily. It’s kind of a cultural litany. The parent initiates the questions; always the same questions and the children of America come in with the response exactly on cue. Usually when this short question and answer routine is finished, the parent then ends the conversation with, “Well, great.” Then the child usually asks, “Can I go out and play now?” The parent then concludes with, “Yeah, but make sure you do your homework before too long, OK?”

In looking at this conversation, certainly something is a bit strange. The parent, in asking about what was learned, is given a negative answer, that nothing was learned. The parent seems unconcerned, readily giving the child permission to go out to play. It is interesting and puzzling. Let’s take a look at the dynamics for an answer.

First, to understand this, it is important to take a look at another common dialogue. Someone is walking through the mall, and they see someone they know, and to be friendly the person says, “Hi, how are you doing?” The other person responds, “Fine, how are you doing?” The first person says, “Great, take care.” Like in the conversation between the parent and the child, this series of questions and answers is culturally appropriate, but really, what degree of information is exchanged? Essentially no information is exchanged. Why don’t people give information of a personal nature when they are asked? Most people would answer that they are just trying to be polite. This is a good answer but probably there are deeper reasons for this conversation.

Why are people hesitant about sharing personal information with someone they know? Sometime in the past they did tell someone how they were doing, and the other person showed no interest in listening probably because they were in a rush. Still it was hurtful. Another reason why people don’t share much personal information could be because in doing so in the past, the information was gossiped about, and before long everyone knew the person’s business. This could have been embarrassing and even humiliating. Plus, the trust in sharing with the friend was shattered. It’s also possible that sometime in the past, when sharing a personal problem the other person took that information and began to analyze it, and then started to instruct the friend on how they must change their life if they really cared about themselves. This set of instructions of course is attached to the demand for following the instructions on reordering of life or else the friend will feel like the person with the problem doesn’t care. Instead of helping, the person offering the “advice” has inadvertently placed an anchor around the troubled person’s life. The unfortunate thing is that the person offering the help doesn’t even know what they have done. In reviewing this, it is obvious why experientially the correct greeting exchange is short and sweet. In this form there is nothing to risk.

With this insight to the casual greeting, it is now possible to understand how the exchange between the parent and the child developed into its current culturally acceptable form. What happens should the child respond to the parent’s question of how the day was with, “Not so good.” The parent follows up with a question about what’s wrong. The child says, “I’m having trouble with math.” The parent asks what the problem is and the child responds, “I don’t know. I just don’t get it.” The caring parent then says something like, “Well, instead of going out to

play, we'll take a look at your math book and see what the problem is." The child says, "Hey, I want to go out and play. I've been in school all day. Can't we take a look at it later? Anyway, I think I understand it now." The parent takes a strong stand and tells the child that it's more important to look at the math then to go out to play.

Let's take a look at this exchange. Certainly, the parent is coming from a good place, trying to assist their child. However, to the child, the offer of help sounds more like punishment. Instead of going out to play, they have to do more schoolwork. The parent isn't aware of the effect of the offer to help, and is confused why the child is resisting the offer. Thinking firmness is required, the parent "forces" the child to remain inside to get the help. The child is resentful and has a poor attitude. The parent is feeling that the offer of help is being rejected, and begins to lose patience with the child's resistance. Anyway, the child stays inside and does get the math book. The parent, feeling in control of the situation and good about the situation, takes a look at the math book and asks the child what the problem is. The child says, "I don't get division of fractions." The parent's face goes blank then turns to an off color of red. The parent doesn't "remember" how to do division of fractions. The parent feels overwhelmed with confusion and doubt, and is feeling humiliated by the situation. The child, in finding out that their parent can't "remember" how division of fraction goes is surprised, and also confused. This in fact may be the child's first experience with the parent not being able to help. The reaction to this situation may vary, but in most cases the long-term reaction is to follow the culturally acceptable formula of the initial exchange cited above.

"How was your day?"

"Fine."

"How was school?"

"Good."

"What did you learn?"

"Nothing."

"Great, have a good time playing, and make sure you do your homework before you go to bed."

This response sequence is safe. It doesn't allow any real problems to develop. Having experienced the unpleasantness of being open, most people have come to accept the polite and meaningless exchanges described above. No child, in its right mind would say anything to jeopardize being able to go out to play.

On another level, it is important to grasp why these culturally acceptable responses are in the form they are in. True, many people have bad experiences sharing how they are doing, but it is more complex than this. Questions and answers in interpersonal exchanges are not successful. Ask a person their name, their address, or their vocation, and answers come quite freely. However, ask a personal question, and the answer is polite, but mostly meaningless. Besides the reason given above for being protective, there is another side to the problem.

In the above interaction between the parent and the child and their effort to relate to the child's dissatisfaction with math, the scientific principal of for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction controlled the dynamics of communication because they employed

**Technological English.** The questions and answers, the method of problem solving led to feelings of rejection and resentment, even though they were motivated by love and concern.

This language form created for scientific investigation polarizes the subject addressed in order to establish a form of understanding. Polarization allows a scientist to evaluate, and to analyze a subject. Polarization allows us to measure and grade a subject. Unless there was polarization there would be a lack of definition: hot/cold, high/low, in/out, solid/liquid/gas, dark/light, etc. Polarization of a subject allows us to understand its properties. For example, solve the following using polarization. The subject is round, not a square. It rolls when pushed and doesn't slide. It bounces when dropped and does not break apart. What is it? A ball. In this process the **Technological English** works great. However, observe what happens when we apply this language to another personal relationship.

In an example of trying to help a friend, one asks a series of questions, and with the gathered information one formulates a solution. Offering the solution to the friend, the expectation that the solution will be used is built in. The one, problem solving for the friend, is coming from a caring place, but the one, having the problem solved, often feels that the solution, with its built in expectations, are perhaps inappropriate and overwhelming. Furthermore, the person can feel like they haven't really asked their friend for a solution, but rather was looking for someone to just listen. Hoping that the friend would just listen, and instead, having been analyzed, the person can feel worse off than when the exchange began. The friend naturally uses the existing language form, **Technological English**, and proceeds to problem solve through questions and answers, attempting through polarization, to understand the problem. Through polarization one believes that one can begin to "understand" the parameters of the difficulty, and see the limits and boundaries that exist, be they rigid or fluid or even non-existing. Problem solving/Polarizing a relationship in order to understand what is happening creates judgment, criticism and expectations. Problem solving/Polarization in a relationship creates distance and alienation.

We have all been brought up to speak English in an acceptable way. Anyone who is native born has been introduced to speaking in a correct way. A "correct style" is modeled through parents and teachers in school. No one questions the effectiveness of the sentences that we are taught, but in reviewing the above, it has been demonstrated why questions of a personal nature are so difficult to answer. Understanding leads one to conclude that the last thing one would say to another person, should one really care to know how another person is doing, is the question, "How are you doing?" It seems that **Technological English**, while effective in problem solving in the area of science: in gathering data, computing data and providing possible solutions, is ineffective as a vehicle for relating with people about subjects of a personal nature. This leads one to conclude that a **Personal English** program needs to be developed, with its own group of sentences that are designed to affect successful interaction.

The following, **Personal English**, is a suggested language form that promotes harmonious personal relationships.

In order to demonstrate this language form, the example of the parent picking up their child at school is provided with the **Personal English** in effect:



The parent picks up the child at school and says, "It looks like a lot has been happening. A lot has been happening with me today. After I dropped you off this morning I went to the store. They were having a special on chocolate chips, so I bought a few bags and thought it would be fun if we made cookies sometime soon."

The child looks up with a big smile and asks, "Can we make them today?"

The parent says, "That would be fun. Maybe after you go out to play, we can make them when you come back in."

The child agrees and says, "You know a lot happened at school for me. I was able to share about the garden we are growing, and the teacher asked if we could take a picture and bring that in to share next week. But, I did have some trouble later in the day. The teacher was mean."

The parent responds, "Gee, that must have been upsetting."

The child looks at the parent and says, "Yeah, it was. She called on me to answer a question, and I didn't know what to say."

The parent listens, and then says, "Not knowing the answer can be embarrassing." The child thinks for a second then says, "Yes, it was. She told me that if I had been listening, I would have known the answer. I told her I had been listening, but I just didn't get it."

The parent says encouragingly, "This really sounds confusing." The child agrees and says, "When I told her I was listening, that I just didn't get it, she got upset, telling me that I was talking back. I told her I wasn't, and she said I was, and then she told me to go to the time-out room and to remain there until I knew how to behave. So I went to the time-out room, and everyone was laughing at me. What should I do?"

The parent thinks for a moment or two and then says, "This is a tough situation. It is hard to know what to do? I'll have to give it some thought."

At the end of this interchange, the child asks for guidance, "What should I do?" The parent doesn't leap in with the common cultural answer, "Why don't you speak with the teacher?" The answer doesn't appear to solve the child's circumstance, and many people would be uncomfortable with this. Let's look at the effect of responding with the problem solving answer, "Why don't you speak with the teacher?" How many children in the United States could go speak with the teacher? Probably none! The result of this is that the child is being sent on an impossible mission, and when seeing the parent the next time, with the parent asking, "So, how did it go with speaking to the teacher?" the child is caught in a trap. If they answer that they didn't go, which in fact there was never a real possibility, the child will be further pressured by the parent in a number of ways, from disappointment to a diatribe on the need to assert oneself. The consequence of the unfulfilled expectation on the part of the parent develops into frustration, with the child taking the brunt of the outpouring. Even with all the listening, upon responding to the question by the child, "What should I do?" the result is the erosion of the feelings of trust and confidence.

In short, to answer a question of an interpersonal nature, regardless of the good intentions, often leads to the opposite effect than one seeks. A good rule of thumb is to not ask or answer questions. It is not successful. Sharing a feeling when asked the question of what to do leads to a more effective result. The parent admits that it is a tough situation, and while no direct answer to the question is offered, at least no unreasonable expectations are being developed. The child

feels supported, and the parent shares the child's dilemma, which in itself creates a feeling of bonding.

What initiated this complete sharing, between the child and the parent, was the parent employing **Personal English**. The parent never asks the child the question, "How are you doing?" Instead the parent opens the conversation with a completely unusual statement, "It looks like a lot has been happening. A lot has been happening with me today." The parent then shares with the child, and the child then begins to share with the parent. The parent listens in a new way. No questions were asked, rather statements that reflect that the parent was in touch with the child's feelings were expressed. The result was encouraging to the child, and more of the story was unveiled.

There is a major difference between listening and questioning/problem solving. Questioning shifts the power to the questioner. The questioner gains control in order to find out what happened, and then directs the interchange through the questions. Unfortunately, the feeling for the one questioned is that of a loss of control, and naturally, the child feels with the loss of control, a growing feeling of defensiveness.

In the **Technological English**, should a child tell their parent that the teacher was mean, the parent would naturally ask them, "What happened?" The child would probably answer, "I don't know." This response while normal would still be surprising to the parent who would then begin a more intensive inquiry to the details to the situation. The parent would say then, "What do you mean you don't know? Did you do something you shouldn't have done?"

The problem with questions is that with the loss of control the child becomes quickly overwhelmed and defensive. Really, what has happened is that the child never hears the full question by the parent of what happened. Instead the child heard something like, "What did you do wrong?" In the child's world, whenever there is a problem between a child and a teacher, the normal parent usually assumes that the child did something wrong. The child in hearing the beginning of the "What" question leaps to where it is going to go anyway, which is, "What did you do wrong?" Knowing that nothing was done wrong, the child responds with, "I don't know," which is the correct answer to the question that the child heard, but the wrong answer to the question that the parent actually asked. The parent doesn't know that the child didn't hear the question, and the child doesn't know they haven't heard the parent's question, so of course confusion reigns. Most of us know that what we say is often not heard, and what we hear, may not have been said. Yet, during a conversation, we can't remember this. If we could remember this axiom, most conversations would develop in a more caring way.

Listening, in personal relations, if it is dealing with a feeling, is not a data situation, therefore, questions are an inappropriate way of understanding. When the child tells the parent that the teacher was mean, the parent, culturally and automatically began to problem solve. Superficially, the issue is that the teacher was mean, but to the child the issue is that an upsetting feeling has been experienced. The function of the parent is to assist the child into accessing the feeling that has been disturbing. Listening in this context means asking oneself what the other person is feeling, and then presenting that possible feeling with a **Personal English** sentence that demonstrates being in touch. When the parent says, "That must have been upsetting," the child

feels supported, still in control, and encouraged. The child senses that the feeling has been heard and that degree of intimacy gives the message to the child that it is safe. Feeling safe, and still in control the child feels comfortable enough to share more. But, it must be understood that listening to a person's feeling does not imply any degree of expectations. If the child responds to the parent's feeling statement with, "Yes, it was upsetting," and says nothing more, then that is OK, because there are no expectations in listening to feelings. Listening, through the employment of **Personal English**, encourages the feelings of trust, confidence, support, encouragement, care, thoughtfulness, and respect, which are the feelings all parents want to communicate when they respond culturally with **Technological English**.

In **Technological English** the vocabulary words of feelings are in place, but there just are no access sentences to those words. In science or business, where **Technological English** thrives, feelings are superfluous. A researcher doesn't want to ask how the Rhesus monkey feels about being experimented on. When the businessperson decides to develop land, they don't want to ask how the plants and animals will feel about being destroyed, or displaced for the "welfare" of a future buyer. Parents don't want to respond to their child's plea not to have to go to school, because it causes many problems.

The clearest example of the power of science and technology to repress feelings is in the following example. No healthy person would want to live next to a toxic waste dump. Yet all of us in urban settings do. What are our parking lots and streets made of? Asphalt. What is Asphalt? The residue of the gas making process. This residue, or toxic waste, is recycled in the making of asphalt, which is spread around all of our residential streets. This toxic waste, once it is called asphalt, and is spread so wondrously to make our cars ride so smoothly on an illustrious black surface, with the brilliant yellow stripes, gives us a great sense of satisfaction. Of course, we don't like its smell when it is freshly poured, and at that time we know that it is poisonous, for we hold our breath as we drive past. Yet, with the power of science, and the repression of feelings, we don't acknowledge its toxicity, rather we admire it for what it provides. With awareness in place, should we not repress our feelings, asphalt would be a banned substance.

**Personal English**, however, is specifically designed to offer access sentences to the listener in order for them to get in tune with another person. The following are some of those access sentences:

1. "How frightening."
2. "Gee, how disturbing."
3. "It's upsetting."
4. "It feels confusing."
5. "It seems unfair."
6. "I can see how exciting that was."
7. "That must be confusing."
8. "It appears to be delightful."
9. "That must be uncomfortable."
10. "I can imagine that would be surprising."

As important as it is to develop access sentences to another person's feelings, it is equally as important to develop access sentences to one's own feelings. The following are some access sentences to personal feelings:

1. "I would like to share how confusing this has been."
2. "I feel inadequate, and this really "bothers" me."
3. "I'm unsure of what's happening."
4. "I can't help but to feel overwhelmed in this situation."
5. "I hate to feel depressed."
6. "This has been really tough for me."
7. "I think I have lost it today."
8. "I can't believe I feel so distressed over this."
9. "It has been very satisfying for me today."
10. "I hope that I can feel meaningful in this relationship."

These access sentences are the nucleus of **Personal English**.

It is critical that people not be forced to use **Technological English** ignorant of its evolved design for solving problems of science and technology. With awareness and with choice, people can now employ **Personal English, which** is designed to promote and support healthy interpersonal relationships. With this as a foundation, problem solving is tempered and when combined together with a language of feeling, and it satisfies the needs of people in their effort to relate with others. **Personal English** promotes appreciation, understanding, trust, support, respect, and most important when sharing feelings, safety. **Personal English** encourages the healing of emotional wounds, for when the individual is able to share their feelings safely, they tend to feel better.

When merged, the two programs effects harmonious communication, and the power of technology can at last gain the human component, which people of consciousness have been seeking to promote.