

Paul Aguirre

World Civilization II

Professor O'Hara

4/20/23

Language alone does not necessarily change global politics to a large degree. Most countries have access to translators, whether human or digital. Most countries also have some accessibility in learning languages though it may vary. With fewer language barriers, yes, speaking the same language may be more relatable, even through politics. However, I don't believe it would considerably change how things are today. In any case, I also think that for countries or people who put little effort to translate when it comes to global problems, there may be people they trust to translate that may be misleading them. This only makes something more accessible since the ability to translate pretty accurately can be done with enough effort (especially in the modern age with digital technology).

I want to accentuate that knowing the same language as another person does not mean you understand the cultural and ethnic conflicts that another person is going through. A Latin American individual won't know the ethnic conflicts a person from Spain may have. Almost identical language spoken, totally different environment and global association. Nevertheless, there is a case to be said that if, for example, I spoke French, I could more easily access information that may talk about the ethnic problems that French people experience.

Regarding separatist movements, learning new languages could make me a little more sympathetic toward them. This is because I can more easily understand the people advocating for such movements. At the same time, otherwise, I could more easily access an understanding of

people who were against them. I am still separated from the actual issue occurring in that country or location (unless it is happening in North America), so there is still a mental disconnect.

Without the ability to speak many languages, I understand the desire for some groups of people to become separatists because they feel they are different from most people in their location.

Separation causes a country or state's weakness, and people who want to be separated can just go to a place where they are already separated (for people who can move to other locations).

However, having all of North America as one state makes me feel like such a task is unrealistic and unappealing, which adds to the sympathy for separatist movements.

Such a state is not necessarily bad, at least language-wise, because I advocate for education, especially applicable education. There are not many negatives to learning more languages; the only one I can think of is that children may have less “fluency” learning multiple languages simultaneously. This can be solved if children learn farther down their lives than at their developmental times reserved for grammar. When it comes to just being a single state, I feel it is a bad change. I believe that decreasing the number of states to one decreases identity since everyone comes from the same state, and the country has no boundaries that say otherwise. I also believe that grouping people from all over North America to decide on political matters would be incredibly different as Canadians and Americans tend to have different views on their political ideologies. It also becomes even more complicated when you think about the political diversity already present in America, and then you add another country on top of that. There must be multiple states to bring more order, a sense of identity, and comfort. However, there has to be a balance between making more states because it could potentially lead to internal conflicts and, consequently, weaken the country.