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Already at the start of the essay, we cansee that Robert King defends that English should be the national language by law, just because our native tongue shapes our personal identity, by letting us havethe same language and literature as the others, but also can shape ourpersonality and our habits.

This idea works the same way regarding countries, whose history and heritage are often based in their language. He then goes on by noticing that Americanpeople are very concerned that English could possibly be in danger in USA.  The reasons for that concern are basicallycaused by immigrants who came to America and refuse English as their languagein order to not lose part of their heritage and culture. So, he proceds to try to answer two importantquestions. If it was possible that because of their multilinguals, a countrywould be in danger, and the amount of importance that a language has to acountry in terms of culture and identity.

Robert King makes two important claimsregarding the first question: Thefirst one is that considering having a language riot has got to be a Jake, while in the second one be defends that i tis strange that a country likeAmerica could possibly believe that a language could be a political force thatcould divide a country. Despite all this, his ideas can be very well changing. This perception was caused by a several events that occurred like as an examplethe fact many people voted against English as the national language. However, in America English was alwaysregarded as the primary language without it being reflected in the law.  That happened just because there was no needfor that.  His top issue is about   having more languages than English inAmerica while speaking another language. Now regarding to the second question, theauthor goes on defending that in the past, language and nationalism were not asconnected as they are today.

Even more, there was absolutely no connectionbetween them. One King of a particular countrysometimes did not speak their country’s own language. The association between those two-startedd in the period of the Romanticism, which was one of the bases for the FrenchRevolution. Prior do that revolution, the French faced much opposition regardingto the national language. After the Revolution French became the language tospeak in France.

Language became vital in order to define countries. Forsupporting this statement, Robert King uses the redrawing of the European map, which used language as one of the European map, which used language as one ofthe criteria for the division. Aguably the most important idea of the authoris that I tis possible to have language tolerance and, for that to happen i tisneeded unique otherness. Finland, Switzerland, India and so on are used as exampleswith more emphasis on Switzerland and India. In Switzerland, despite having four national languages there are nomajor problems caused by that, while in India the same happens with nineteen languages.

This happens because of the unique otherness, which represents all thethings that contribute for their national unity like food, culture and society. That makes every single country different from others. Kinggoes on claiming that a free country government should not act against or infavor of any language.  In Ireland, even though having great political support, Irish hasbeen   spoken even less, while dealingwith great opposition welsh continues to be every alive in Wales. Tofinish is essay, Robert King defends that America has unique otherness to, withsports, different food and mentality. For the ones who are against English asthe national language, they have to see that our language, they have to seethat our language is not only the way we communicate, but also a national symbol. America will not stop being America because of the language and I tis not evenclose to the danger point.

Personally, i agree with pretty much what he said, using the importance of the language inpolitics as a great example. The only aspect I do not agree on is the fact thathe does not believe that languages could not divide America. when in the pastseveral countries were divided by much less.