

Pr 10 krikorian and danticat

[Linguistics](#), [English](#)



Krikorian and Danticat Mark Krikorian journal writing response According to the oxford dictionary, the term enemy refers to any individual who has emotions or intends to take action that fosters hatred against an opponent another individual. Personally, the word enemy refers to any individual who performed, or has feelings of performing actions that portray hatred toward me, my family, friends or my country. Personal enemies differ from enemies of the state. Personal enemies usually have intents of taking revenge or simply acting negatively upon me or another person. The motives of such actions are usually caused by personal problems or occurrences that happened between the two or more individuals in the past. An enemy of the state is any individual or party that feels like the United States has not respected their doctrines or principles through the implementation of any of its policies and thus acts negatively upon the citizens, or government officials.

Safety through immigration control debates the United States of America is a country that should find it necessary to strengthen its border control patrols and policies in order to counter and decrease future terrorist assaults.

According to Krikorian, America is a robust power that could not be defeated by conventional techniques (Davies 489). He also reasons that the state's novel that is from individuals who realize this situation and immigrate in the county. Afterwards, they are commonly recognized as the "fourth-generation" rivalry in opposition to us. Personally, I believe that Krikorian has spent an immoderate amount of time on military strategies, enemy concerns and border patrols to the issue. As a result, he has distorted the problems. Krikorian fails to clearly realize who the "enemy" is and does not mention

the faults made by the United States government. Already, a number of critics of his journal have reasoned that his points have backed and remain supporting the issue (Davies 490).

Edwidge Danticat journal response

In high school, I was a great friend to a classmate of mine who was one of the members of a six-member group and movement. This movement believed that school uniform was a policy that suppressed our rights. As a result, they decided to take action by demonstrating in a way that could greatly catch the attention of the school administration. The group planned to wear blue armbands, neatly a quarter-inch in breadth with no inscription on it on Friday, September 17, 2009. After reports of the plan reached the media, school administrators proclaimed that pupils' with the armbands would be suspended from school for six days. I received the news before my friend and decided to inform him immediately before he got himself in trouble he couldn't get himself out of.

I caught up with him later in the day and the news did not seem to scare or alert him. He was with the rest of his group and they decided to carry on wearing the armbands. The group was summoned in the evening and questioned about their intents. Unfortunately, the school believed that there were more students siding with them on this issue. Turns out that it was true and eleven more students were called into the principal's office to answer questions about the armbands group. Unfortunately, my friend had included me in the list of the group and did not seem to care much about my side of the issue.

While in the office, I tried to countlessly defend myself by stating I was called

in by mistake by one of the members of the group. This is because at the moment, I was not aware it was my friend who added me to the list just to avoid getting into trouble alone. The principal gave me a deaf ear and the situation got harder for me when the group began reasoning about how the government officials attempt intimidation on people from exercising their liberated speech freedoms. We got ourselves into deeper trouble when my friend began telling the school administrators about silencing protests that fight for rights of students and citizens of the country. This eventually landed us a suspension of two days. I was very angry at my friend for getting me into his trouble and cleaning up his mess simply because we are friends, and also because he felt like he shouldn't have to go through the situation on his own. We shared varied thoughts on the issue and I was punished unjustifiably.

Works cited

Davies, Samuel. *Argument and Persuasion*. London: Heinemann Educational, 1990