

# Journal 3



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Political Immigration Discussion and A Headscarf During times of election to high office, politicians seeks to debate those issues which hold great relevancy in the mind of many people. One such issue, especially during the current election year, that would remain relatively misaddressed would be that of immigration. “ Pollsters tell us that immigration is one of the hot-button issues roiling voters in todays primaries. But as a New York Times article put it recently, " When national politicians have tried to seize on such anger, they have usually failed -- and failed quickly." Scholars of immigration almost unanimously agree,” Adding that, “ Debates over immigration can continue for decades, resulting in significant policy changes without -- or even in opposition to -- presidential leadership. Scholars point to the lengthy debates of the 1840s and 1850s, when nativists particularly feared the growing political power of Irish Roman Catholics. From roughly 1880 through 1930, the " new immigrants" from Asia and Southern and Eastern Europe provoked many Americans into predictions of what they called racial " mongrelization.",” (Gabaccia, p. 1).

In consideration of the high level of immigrants which traveled to the Americas long ago and to a certain extent to this day, it is quite intriguing to see the lack of discussion that occurs on a political level as it comes to the debate over such an issue that possesses great historical relevance to the history of any nation, including the United States. In the case of current debate, often times the subject of immigration is placed heavily on the issue of border control between neighboring countries. When it comes to choosing political candidates, it becomes quite commonplace to view them first in foremost through such means as categorizing based on ethnic background, nationality, or even gender. Despite the continued desire among many to

see those who live within the borders of the United States through such means that are not legal, it continues to be an issue for discussion that appears to have no clear cut way for attempting to solve the matter at all. In the end, “ Race, ethnicity, religion, and nativity can figure prominently in presidential campaigns precisely because they symbolize the depth of contradictions in the shifting political coalitions that uneasily unite national parties. That was certainly the case in 1928. It is equally true today,” (Gabaccia, p. 2).

One of the basic things which many take for granted is that of the chance to wear what we want and to do so when we please. Such accommodations to be made that protect the freedom of expression, as well as the freedom of accessibility to services. As such, “ In order to count as " reasonable accommodation" there has to be an equality right being restricted. A request for " reasonable accommodation" might be a misnomer for those requests that do not rise to the level of a legal right. While the right to wear the hijab or other religious head dress is a right, it doubtful the Hasidic community had a right to have the YMCA fog its windows. But there is no real harm in asking, any more than asking a neighbour, as I did last week, if it is okay to barbecue a lamb in the back yard for a big party. He did not have to agree,” (Eliadis, p. A25). In return, it is quite understandable to note that, as the author cites within their article, there does in fact have to be an issue of restriction of some sort, as it comes to having proper access to goods or services. A request for such reasonable access to be given can be primarily based upon those rights that fall within that which is legally guaranteed. Laws, after all, do explicitly state those things in which citizens can feel that they are allowed to have and that which they should have.

Personal interpretation of the key elements is quite necessary as a way in understanding the legal impacts of those things which the general populous feels they have the right to request. “ There are important exceptions to reasonable accommodation in its correct legal sense. No one is bound to do the impossible. Excessive costs that impose undue hardship are a defence. So are genuine risks to health and safety. Note the word " genuine." Where is the evidence that head scarves have killed or injured tae kwon do or soccer playing adolescent girls? And how do those (I will wager) very few cases stack up against the injury caused every year to athletes - mostly boys - who play rugby, football and hockey? Why do we cheerfully accept the annual injuries and even deaths in those sports? Simple. It is in our culture,” (Eliadis, p. A25). In the quest for just accommodation, indeed there are many factors to be taken into consideration while seeking the answer to that very question. Further reminding of the defenses given as a means of responding to such requests put forward & maintaining a cultural image.

#### Works Cited

Eliadis, Pearl. “ We should not need permission to wear what we want;

Starting point in

Canada should be liberal- we shouldnt have to fight for rights.” Published:

Thursday,

April 26, 2007. The Montreal Gazette. Section: Editorial/OP-ED, p. A25.

Gabaccia, Donna R. “ Immigration and Presidential Politics.” Published:

Friday, March 21,

2008. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Section: The Chronicle Review, p.

12 Vol. 54

No. 28.

<https://assignbuster.com/journal-3/>