In my opinion, agree to the view that nonverbal communication is more important than verbal communication in intercultural communication because nonverbal communication can bring information whether the verbal communication is successful or not.

Firstly, the nonverbal communication accounts for much of the message we derive from conversation. For example, in kinesics, we can know a man’s attitude through his posture -- if he is in open posture, he can be open and welcoming. But if he is in a close posture, he must be shutting others out. Secondly, the nonverbal communication is spontaneous reflecting of the speakers’ subconsciousness. Just like the postures, we can guess how a person thinks about the things he is talking about or how the relation is between speakers. If the distance between two speakers is close, it always means their relation is close, too. Instead of close space, speaking in public such as giving a speech, the distance is always above 3 meters. And we can find how the mood is through nonverbal communication. In the famous photo of Yalta Conference, Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt were all happy because the war was on the way to victory. But in some other photos, Roosevelt is in an unhappy expression and a close posture which shows that he was not very interested in playing political game with England and Soviet because of the urgency of ending the Pacific war and his illness. Thirdly, in some extreme situation, nonverbal communication can help to finish whole communication. For example, if a foreigner who cannot speak local language totally wants to communicate with the local, maybe he can use only posture and software to achieve this goal.

In short, the nonverbal communication can show information that verbal communication cannot express well and it can also have remarkable position in communication. So I think nonverbal communication is more important than verbal communication in intercultural communication.