

Already at the start of
the essay, we



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Already at the start of the essay, we can see 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 have the same language and literature as the others, but also can shape our personality 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 American people are very concerned that English could possibly be in danger in USA. The reasons for that concern are basically caused by immigrants who came to America and refuse English as their language in order to not lose part of their heritage and culture. So, he proceeds to try to answer two important questions. If it was possible that because of their multilinguals, a country would be in danger, and the amount of importance that a language has to a country in terms of culture and identity.

Robert King makes two important claims regarding the first question: The first one is that considering having a language riot has got to be a joke, while in the second one he defends that it is strange that a country like America could possibly believe that a language could be a political force that could divide a country. Despite all this, his ideas can be very well changing. This perception was caused by several events that occurred like as an example the fact many people voted against English as the national language. However, in America English was always regarded as the primary language without it being reflected in the law. That happened just because there was no need for that. His top issue is about having more languages than English in America while speaking another language. Now regarding to the second

question, the author goes on defending that in the past, language and nationalism were not as connected as they are today.

Even more, there was absolutely no connection between them. One King of a particular country sometimes did not speak their country's own language.

The association between those two started in the period of the Romanticism, which was one of the bases for the French Revolution. Prior to that revolution, the French faced much opposition regarding the national language. After the Revolution French became the language to speak in France.

Language became vital in order to define countries. For supporting this statement, Robert King uses the redrawing of the European map, which used language as one of the criteria for the division. Arguably the most important idea of the author is that it is possible to have language tolerance and, for that to happen it is needed unique otherness. Finland, Switzerland, India and so on are used as examples with more emphasis on Switzerland and India. In Switzerland, despite having four national languages there are no major problems caused by that, while in India the same happens with nineteen languages.

This happens because of the unique otherness, which represents all the things that contribute for their national unity like food, culture and society. That makes every single country different from others. King goes on claiming that a free country government should not act against or in favor of any language. In Ireland, even though having great political support, Irish has been spoken even less, while dealing with great opposition while

continues to be every alive in Wales. To finish his essay, Robert King defends that America has unique otherness to, with sports, different food and mentality. For the ones who are against English as the national language, they have to see that our language, they have to see that 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 it is not even close to the danger point.

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