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Samuel Huntington’s writing holds a stronger position than does Louis Menand. Huntington is pointing out facts in his article, while Menand is less fact based and seems to merely indicate Huntington is wrong because Menand thinks so. Pointing to key aspects of Huntington’s argument and how Menand ‘ refutes’ them will show that his opinion is less factual. Where as Menand uses his interpretation of what Huntington basis his writings on to form his conclusions. In Huntington’s article, One Nation Out of Many, Huntington chronologically goes thru the immigration of the United States detailing how early immigrants had a desire to become American in both nationality and core culture. He illustrates how American business and government used their resources to assist in the teaching of immigrants both the language and culture. It was a time when an industrial powerhouse like Ford Motor Company was thinking in line with US Government, both creating schools that taught “ American ways, the English language, and the right way to live. " Huntington goes further to explain how immigrants had a desire no only to assimilate, but how they internally believe in the United States as their Country. The decline of this belief in Core Culture is explained by way of Government trying to move to a multicultural position even as the American public remains strong to the Core Culture. Huntington details how in several cases the Government was out of touch with the voters. Where both presidential candidates in 1988 opposed official English language measures on ballots in Florida, Arizona, and Colorado. Joined by many other government agencies and officials, the view of both candidates differed from elections results where all three measures passed easily. Huntington further goes on to explain the strong Hispanic influence in the United States and how that culture in particular resists molding into American Core Culture. Where America actually is bending to accommodate the Hispanic culture, Huntington points out how newspapers and television stations are more popular in Hispanic versions than in English. Louis Menand on the other hand points out that Huntington is flawed in his writing, but seems to do so by making the assumption that he knows what Huntington is thinking more so than Huntington himself. Although Huntington spells out what the core beliefs of early immigrants were taught to embrace, Menand uses phrases like, “ Huntington’s core values are rather abstract. " Implying that Huntington does not know what core values he should be talking about, rather than indicating what a better set of core values would be. Menand goes on to say, “(Huntington) thinks the erosion of any ideal leads to weakness. " Although Huntington never says that, Menand takes it upon himself to tell us what Huntington is really thinking. Menand does not stop with Huntington. He continues his ‘ all knowing’ ways by pointing out that Huntington mentions Bill Clinton, Al Gore, Michael Walzer and Martha Nussbaum who all would be astonished to learn they are deconstructionists. Menand likely has no personal knowledge of what any of these people believe. Menand continues to belittle Huntington’s work, with almost child-like attacks, pointing out that a book of similar topic, by Mae Ngai is a “ work a hundred times more nuanced that Huntington’s. " Although Menand may have raised some valid oppositional points to Huntington’s book, they were presented in such a manner as to be without merit. Menand merely attacks Huntington as someone with such unsubstantiated beliefs that the book may as well been written by a child who knows nothing of the topic on which he writes. It is difficult to look past the ‘ better than thou’ attitude in Menand’s writing to take it seriously. Menand appears to be jealous of Huntington’s success when they should be equals. It is easy to see Huntington’s point that America is becoming a global country and may no longer be a melting pot of cultures diluted into a Core Culture of Americanism. Government no longer takes the approach that immigrants should become American citizens down to their core belief. Rather Americans should embrace immigrants and their cultures. As Americans, we should accommodate every nationality by spending tax dollars to print a driver’s manual or voters guide in 20 different languages. There is some hesitation to accept if you can not speak the language of the country that you should be catered to, making sure every person can participate. It is clear that as more immigrants move to this country and want, naturally, to be around similar people that the pockets of immigrant areas will continue to expand. As we see in South Florida becoming more and more Cuban, as Muslim cultures decide to come to America and elect to move into Dearborn, MI to have a sense of belonging. When we see 74% of all Russian immigrants living in just 5 of the US states, it become vividly clear that these groups will hold on to their culture, beliefs, and religion in greater numbers than ever before. In the 1800’s immigrants really came to America to become Americans. The same fleeing of oppression that created this country is still evident. It is just no longer a necessity to assimilate into American culture when the culture you come from, can easily be found alive and well in the US. We must continue to defend this country and the core beliefs of the constitution while accepting immigrants will want to hold onto their culture. The question for the future is how does one instill patriotism for America when millions are arriving annually and may be here for reasons other than becoming American. Is it possible to instill in an immigrant, who is only in America because they can earn a decent wage, what it means to be American? Just like a student who does not care to learn, they can not be forced to take in the knowledge. Far fewer immigrants are coming here for nothing more that what America has to give. Maybe it is time to revisit what John F. Kennedy said, “ Ask not what your country can do for you–ask what you can do for your country. "