Dr. Sayed Nooroddin Alavi
Ph.D., Department of
Philosophy and Sociology,
Social Sciences Faculty
Kabul University, Kabul,
Afghanistan

Faisal Amin
Associate Professor,
Department of Philosophy and
Sociology, Social Sciences
Faculty Kabul University,
Kabul, Afghanistan

Migration and socio-cultural pluralism

Dr. Sayed Nooroddin Alavi and Faisal Amin

Abstract
Concerning the phenomenon of migration, due to the extensiveness, diversity, and complexity of this phenomenon, we are still exposed to many ambiguities. Regarding the fact that large waves of international migrations have emerged in our country in recent decades, and also since this phenomenon, at the global level, has attracted the attention of thinkers, policy-makers, civil activists, state-nations, and great international unions, it has given rise to a serious idea in minds concerned with the necessity of international migration management (global migration management). The present paper, besides giving a definition of migration and its management, addresses the relationship of this phenomenon with pluralism. In this regard, initially, the problem and the necessity of discussing this issue will be presented. Then, the most important theories pertaining to identification and pluralism in relation to migration will be described and criticized. Subsequently, Anthony Giddens's triple models, human capital theory, and theory of discrimination will be discussed. This paper also discusses the performance of three top European immigrant states (France, Germany, and England) and identity EU-orientation and then, relying on a philosophical and value basis, criticizes the concepts of citizenship, citizenship rights and obligations, democracy and pluralism, and existing streams of homogenization in immigrant countries. In the "Conclusion" section, this paper confirms the necessity of respecting the values of citizenship and dynamic and evolutionary pluralism and the author of the present paper believes it to be essential for the participation of all the human groups in their common destiny.

Keywords: Migration, homogeneity, identification (assimilation), pluralism, citizenship, monotheistic humanity-orientation

Introductions
As declared by most of the great culturologists and civilizationologists throughout the history and according to the indisputable historical evidence, migration, as a dynamogenic and identity-forming principle, has been one of the most important factors and causes of dynamism and development of the individuals, groups, and human societies. Migration, in its sense that is emphasized in this paper, is the outstanding characteristic of those individuals and groups that endeavor to move from their suchlike "staying" and "being" toward becoming their ideal. Although, sometimes, the environmental crises, various social problems, and blood-shedding rivalries of the human groups enforce extensive unwanted and mandatory migrations and, thus, it is viewed as a negative phenomenon, the present paper is aimed to show the necessity of the link between "migration" and "cultural-social pluralism", which reflects, on the whole, the author's attitude toward this phenomenon as a great historical opportunity.

It is also worth noting that migration is undoubtedly a multi-dimensional and complex phenomenon. Therefore, the analyses pertaining to this phenomenon might be exposed to understatement, uni-dimensional viewpoint, and even magnification. The present paper doesn't seek to explicate the numerous factors of migration and its diverse outcomes and consequences that embrace different minor (micro) and major (macro) levels and multiple dimensions including cultural, social, political, and economic dimensions. On the contrary, the basic objective of this paper is to find an answer to the following question:

What is the relationship between migration and pluralism?
This question has a dialectic structure and content, meaning that a mutual relationship can be assumed between them. Migration can lead to the enhancement of social-cultural pluralism, and the existence of pluralism, along with the values hidden in it, would be one of the probable factors that enhance the migration.

In the investigations on this issue, notwithstanding our emphasis on fundamental research, the life experiences during the period of migration (more than 20 years) could have affected the formation of our particular viewpoint and judgment.

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Sayed Nooroddin Alavi
Ph.D., Department of
Philosophy and Sociology,
Social Sciences Faculty
Kabul University, Kabul,
Afghanistan

Compilation of this paper is coincident with the fact that:

1. The occurrence of the scientific-industrial revolutions and, especially, the revolution in the informational and communicational technologies as well as the world's increasing bipolarization toward the centers of comfort, welfare, and richness, on the one side, and insecurity and crisis, on the other side, have led to the emergence of the greatest waves of migration throughout the world.

2. Afghanistan, as a country of origin, has more than 6 million emigrants outside the country. On the other hand, during the years 2002 through 2018, it has more than 9 million returners, more than 3 million of whom have returned to the country in the last four years (2015 to 2018). The exposure to this phenomenon is one of the requirements of writing this paper.

At the end of this introduction, it should be noted that in a comparison between the domestic (also called internal or national migration) and international migrations, the focus of the present paper is mainly on international migration. The increasing and rapid international movement of people has resulted, in practice, in the emergence of new multi-ethnic communities within the boundaries of the state-nations, which makes it essential to investigate the relationship between migration and pluralism regarding the human rights and philosophical basics.

Presentation of attitudes
Migration: Homogenization or pluralism
As mentioned in the "Introduction", our focus in this paper is mainly on international migration and its correlation with pluralism. Besides, it may suffice for us to express merely some general definitions of migration yet, in the meantime, we should avoid the excessive simplification of the subject. In the UN's Glossary of Demographic Terms, migration is defined as a form of geographical movement or spatial movement that occurs between two geographical units. This geographical movement is to change the residence from an origin or place of departure to a destination or place of entry (Zanjani, 2002: 212) [8]. This definition is suitable rather for permanent migration and lacks sufficient comprehensiveness regarding the classification of various types of migration based on different criteria. Such a limitation can be also seen in many of the other definitions propose for it. Alfred Sauvy states that the movement of a group of people on a certain scale can be called migration, but the soldiers' movement is an exception to this rule (1998: 616). There is no general-accepted definition for migration, so the term "migration" and its associated concepts such as "refuge" and "displacement" should be applied cautiously and carefully. Considering various types of migration including family migration, individual migration, agricultural or industrial migration, mandatory or voluntary migration, real or virtual migration and virtual-real migration, committed migration, scientific migration, economic migration, mental and human migration, etc., it can be inferred that it is very difficult to give a comprehensive definition for it. However, by comparing different definitions and classifications, the author of the present paper proposes the following definition:

"Migration means a mental-spatial movement of individuals or human groups from an origin to a destination in order to prevent the contingent damages, preserve the material and identity assets, and or to modify them aiming for improvement and development."

The migration, considering its factors and causes as well as its consequences and outcomes, requires management. The term "migration management" encompasses a wide range of planned governmental, non-governmental, and extra-governmental activities aimed to control the situation and circumstances, reduce the critical and problematic aspects, and develop diverse material and non-material capacities (economic, environmental, cultural, political, legal, executive, etc.) belonging to the migrants, origin, destination, and other areas related to them. Unfortunately, not only the countries of origin, but also the destination countries and, in general, the current global system are exposed to the migration management crisis. Our ultimate goal by broaching such discussions is to make a contribution to crisis management as the minimum possible responsibility that one can undertake.

After these preliminary explanations about the definition of migration and its management, the following section briefly outlines some of the attitudes pertaining to the link between migration and the concepts of homogenization and pluralism.

Anthony Giddens's approach
Giddens, the British sociologist who is still alive, considering his studies on England and Western European immigration countries, when discussing the interactions of the ethnic-racial minorities and immigrant groups with the existing dominant culture and other micro-cultures inside it, introduces three models: (1) "assimilation" model – based on this model, the immigrants give up their own habits and customs and form their behaviors in accordance with the values and norms of the host society. Assimilation is rather concerned with the infants and youths, compared to the parents; (2) "melting pot" model – in this model, instead of the dissolution of the immigrants' traditions in the dominant values of the host population, all of them are combined and form new and evolving cultural patterns. This is believed by some of the experts as the most desirable consequence of ethnic diversity; (3) "cultural pluralism" model – in this model, the best path for helping a society to be discovered is the realization of a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society in which several cultures have equal credits and nobody from another culture never feels to be in minority (Giddens, 2008: 306) [15]. In criticizing and analyzing Anthony Giddens's approach, it should be said that assimilation is not something unimaginable or impossible, yet it is not proper to understate and reduce it to the changes occurring in the outward appearance and superficial aspect of life and some aspects of the thoughts and values. Cultural latency sometimes persists over the course of several generations, meaning that the changes in the dimensions of civilization can occur more rapidly. But the thinking-mental systems and cultural realms can survive for multiple generations within these new civilization frameworks. In this regard, an example can help you understand the issue. In the discussions on the philosophy of the social sciences, it is interesting to note that in the territories of England and America, the "'experimentalist" approaches have been more emphasized while in the territories of France and Germany,

the humanistic, interpretive, and hermeneutical approaches are welcomed more than others. According to some of the great theorists such as Ivan Shirt, at least one of the main reasons for such circumstances has been the historical continuation of ancient Greek culture, wherein Hermes (a hermeneutic concept) was one of its gods, in German and French territory, and its historical disconnection with England and America. Therefore, the complete dissolution of the immigrants' culture in the existing culture of the immigrant societies and their separation from their historical culture is very complex and difficult. The historical memory of the ethnic and religious minorities has continued to exist throughout the generations for several centuries and even millennia. Another notable point is that the culture of the host society also is characterized by a relative fluidity and variability, resulting in further ambiguity of the concept of assimilation.

Regarding the patterns of "melting pot" and "cultural pluralism", these two models overlap. The "melting pot" model, which is claimed to constitute new and evolving cultural patterns, can be a manifestation of some kind of cultural pluralism that results from the combination and integration of diverse cultures of the immigrants and the micro-cultures and national culture of the host country. Thus, the melting pot, despite creating more common chapters, doesn't mean homogeneity and can lead to a new cultural diversity that won't be necessarily, and in all aspects, more evolutionary and humane. It is not unimaginable that the melting pot can be associated with some damages within the interacting micro-cultures. The cultural pluralism model, when presented along with the melting pot model independently, is still questionable. Although in some immigrant countries, some neighborhoods have been formed for immigrants' settlement and led to the emergence of some sort of marginalization, yet some degrees of the melting pot would be inevitable. As such, we will see a dynamic, not a static, pluralism. Equal accreditation of various cultures does not mean their recession and stagnation, but the intercultural interactions can yield further internal dynamics, even though this dynamism is associated with the continuity of some elements of the historical culture.

Finally, it would not be irrelevant to point out the viewpoint of Ashraf Narimani, the Iranian scholar, about how the immigrants are acculturated and integrated into the new society in order for further revealing the limitations of Giddens's analysis. In his point of view, there are five ways for acculturation of the immigrants in host societies:

1. Urgent marginal status, which means anxious attempts to meet the demands of both cultures;
2. Isolation, which means to avoid and disregard the norms of both cultural groups;
3. Traditionalism, which means secluding and living with regrets and dreams about the old culture;
4. Radical acculturation, which means ignoring the original culture and adopting the values and norms of the new society; and
5. Bi-culturalism, which means the integration of the best features of the two cultures.

Giddens's triple models don't include the "urgent marginal status", "withdrawal", and "radical acculturation" items since these models are rather idealistic statements and their full matching with reality is very difficult. It is noteworthy

that the five ways of acculturation introduced by Ashraf Narimani also lack the essential comprehensiveness. For instance, bi-culturalism doesn't necessarily mean the integration and merging of the bests of the two cultures and such a claim is very ambiguous and questionable. Apropos of the question that what are the bests (best features) of the two cultures, it is very difficult to reach a consensus.

Human capital approach
This approach allows a clearer understanding of Anthony Giddens's triple models and the criticisms leveled at it. According to the human capital theory, the status of immigrants in new societies can be described proportionate to their human capital (educational level, training courses, language skills, experiences, and cultural characteristics). On this basis, depending on the extent of their enjoyment of the human capital and material capital along with it, identities may take passive, dynamic, selective, or even aggressive positions when interacting with other cultures and identities. The passive position is rather in line with the "assimilation" model, but the dynamic and selective positions are in line rather with the "melting pot" and "cultural pluralism" models. The theory of human capital, which has been presented by Sajas Tard (1962) and Gary Becker(1964) at a micro-level, is indeed an economic theory that seeks to explain and clarify the immigrant women's participation in the labor market. This theory assumes that the labor market is a competitive arena, so the major determinant factor of economic and occupational success in this competition is individual efficiency and capability (potential), and the elements such as migration, ethnicity, and gender do not play an effective role in this competitive market. Accordingly, the immigrant women's status in the new society and also their labor market must be described proportionate to their human capitals (Foroutan, 2013: 77) [12]. This theory, if integrated with Giddens' theory, exhibits more capability of elaborating on the realities of immigrants' lives and the host countries. But the underlying presumption hidden in this theory is that the immigrants, just like the citizens of the immigration state-nations, can participate in the competitive market and their identity destiny is dependent, in terms of cultural-social dimension, on the extent of their enjoyment of their previous and current identity and human capital.

Another group of theorists does not accept the presumptions underlying the two previous theories. For example, advocates of the theory of discrimination believe that immigration and discrimination have been ingrained with each other. According to this theory, non-acquired characteristics such as ethnicity, race, and gender are the main origin and roots of discrimination and, therefore, the immigrants and ethnic minorities are usually the most vulnerable social groups in immigrant societies. Such a discriminatory situation is especially sensible in the labor market (Sorenson, 1993; Carojen, 2004). This approach underscores the impact of the immigrants' human capital, which is one of the key and determinant components of identity and represents the acquired characteristics. It also argues that if there were discrimination against immigrants in society, two certain groups of the immigrants would be exposed to discrimination more than others: first, the immigrant women, and second, the immigrants who have maintained their native culture (Anker, 1998; Foroutan, 2011) [12]. In other words, discrimination is also indicative

of the imposed pressure for the immigrants' assimilation and prevents, in practice, the dynamism and pluralism claimed by the liberal-democracies within their own territories.

Europe, immigrants, and convergence approaches
The viewpoints and theories presented in this paper have been, undoubtedly, formed in association with realities of the social life and are described here aiming to improve our precision and accuracy in the analysis and clarification of the realities currently existing in the immigrants' lives and in the countries of origin and destination. Besides, as it is necessitated, this section explains the performance of the political parties and the immigration state-nations as the main role-players in the field in order to provide the ground for adopting a clearer and more rational position concerning the under-study subject.

In reality, the truth is that the migration of immigrants from Muslim countries in the Mediterranean, Middle East, Africa, and Western Asia has led to the superiority of the composition of the non-European immigrants and also has engendered a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic social system across this continent. As a result, the management of this phenomenon through social convergence of the immigrants has been highly regarded and taken into consideration more than ever. The philosophies and approaches of social convergence in Europe are inspired mainly by three patterns (models), namely the French republican, British multiculturalism, and German post-nationalism (Bolzmann, 2006; Kastoryano, 2002).

French and English approaches to immigration also accorded the teachings of the earlier colonial eras of these countries. In addition, the French pattern relies upon full assimilation of the foreigners with French national identity, the English pattern on the relative guarantee of the immigrant community's identity, and the German pattern on the segregation and exclusion of the immigrants.

After the 1789 Revolution, France considered its culture a universal phenomenon and thus the francization of its colonies based on the French ethnos' mission of civilization dissemination was put on the global agenda. The concept of republicanism and political Jacobinism, which is assumed as the underlying basis of the social convergence approach in this country, has also been influenced by this tradition. This approach, with a narrow definition of citizenship, has contemplated assimilating the immigrants' behavior with French citizens and has pursued the ethnic origin-based immigration policy while not recognizing the cultural diversity and disregarding the cultural and religious distinctions of the immigrants (Molayi, 2009; 45) [21].

In this regard, educational institutions, especially public schools, are considered as some tools for assimilation. Those immigrants who accomplish covering the process of adaptation to the culture of the new environment are granted new opportunities while the others exposed to the risk of social suburbanization (marginalization); therefore, the cultural dimension of this pattern overshadows its legal, social, and political dimensions (Brittle, 2000: 116). The Muslims' hijab crisis in France is an outstanding example of this identity-oriented policy that has given rise to extensive political and social debates since 1989.

With the rise of the controversies concerned with this policy among the political parties in France and the engenderment of suburbanites' dissatisfaction with social discrimination, unemployment, and suburbanization resulting from the

immigration policies and a series of human rights-related debates, France incumbently accepted that the adopted approach, which is based on the integration and assimilation regarding the diverse cultural origins and backgrounds of the immigrants residing in this country, was infeasible in practice. Meanwhile, France's immigration policies have exhibited "de facto" inclination toward some kind of multicultural nature and facilitation of relative acceptance of the citizenship right based on homeland and place of birth in order for the convergence of the immigrants' offspring (Molayi, 2009: 46-47) [21].

The social convergence approach in Germany is based on the segregation of immigrants in society and considers the cultural, lingual, and racial components as the organizing and guiding principle of citizenship. As the reflection of such a belief within the society, the migration is considered a temporary phenomenon and, eventually, the guest workers will return to their own countries and also the political refugees will leave the country.

This approach, which views Germany as a kind of multi-ethnic society and an integrated culture, not a society in its territorial and legal sense, is an ethnos-oriented and culture-oriented approach and assumes the foreigners as alien (stranger) elements (Rapnik, 1994: 1-9). But Germans gradually found out that immigration was no longer a temporary phenomenon and was considered as an undeniable aspect of the country's contemporary life. The redefinition of the concept of German citizenship, traditionally based on the principle of ethnicity, took place in this passage with a relative orientation to the land-based principle in the new German nationality law adopted in year 6. Therefore, the children born to foreign parents can naturalize to citizens if at least one of their parents has been living in Germany as a lawful resident for 8 years (Molayi, 2010: 48) [21]. It cannot be claimed that Germany enjoys a comprehensive and responsive immigration organization model. The formation of parallel societies and the presence of a population of 7.3 million foreigners on the outskirts of the large cities across the country in the form of diverse identity islands are indicative of the decline of the idea of a multicultural society in this country.

Analysts of the social policies of the European countries often consider Britain a role model of multiculturalist pattern that allows, to some extent, the diversity of society based on the assumption of permanency of the migration phenomenon and aiming at the maintenance of social discipline as well as the management and improvement of the inter-racial and inter-ethnic relations. However, this approach has stoked on the alienation and islandization of the immigrants' life world, and this is what has led Britain's traditional convergence to a deadlock.

Notwithstanding, convergence, as a sociological concept that implies social cohesion, is a process for the socialization of the immigrants as a part of the host society. However, the ethnos-oriented approaches to social convergence in Europe have resulted in the ethnic segregation of the immigrant communities and the EU-resident immigrants, not considered as full-fledged citizens, cannot make benefit from the advantages of the European public sector. The neighborhood settlements of the Algerians in France, Moroccans in Spain, Turks in Germany, and Pakistanis in England are indicative of the suburbanization (marginalization) and islandization of the immigrants in European countries (Molayi, 2009: 5) [21].

In the present paper, we have put our focus mainly on the immigrant community in general, whereas if we addressed the Muslims' status and conditions in particular, the positions adopted by the host countries would become rather political, hostile, cautious, and restrictive. Islam is the second wide-spread religion in 16 European countries, but only four countries, including Belgium, Austria, Spain, and Hungary, have recognized it; so that, in other countries, the Muslim immigrants are deprived of their cultural, social, political, and economic rights equal to those of other citizens.

In addition to the above analyses of the performance of the European state-nations, we can also point out, in general, a kind of Europe-orientation against the non-European immigrants. European-orientation, either in its traditional form that is embodied on the basis of the Judeo-Christian common experience or in its modernized form that is manifested in the European common space relying on secularism, pluralism, education, technics and communication and the like, has come to existence based on the dissociation from non-European others who are viewed as inferiors in terms of cultural, political, and technological aspects (immigrants). This Europe-orientation is resulted either from the dominance of the Universalist mission-based discourse (with a tendency toward digestion of others in itself) or from the authenticity of the particularism and absolutism discourse that eventually leads to the alienation and the formation of aggressive European nationalism. In any case, a question that must be answered is concerned with how proportional are these approaches and discourses to the values claimed by liberal democracy and universal human rights.

Citizenship, democracy and pluralism
In this section, we are going to continue discussing the concepts of citizenship, democracy, and pluralism in relation to migration by broaching a paradoxical point in the assimilation and multi-culturalism programs.

Assimilation is considered as a response to the problem of social unity and cohesion while its practical consequence is the infringement of the rights of some specific groups and the dominance of a culture over another culture. The French government's approach against the Muslim girls' hijab seems to be a suitable example in this regard. This project (assimilation) can cause a sense of deprivation among the minorities and the immigrant groups. On the other hand, multi-culturalism is subject to the risk of group self-orientation, ethnos-orientation, and exclusivism. An example of this type of multi-culturalism is my own country, Afghanistan. However, it is evident that all types of multi-culturalism wouldn't necessarily lead to such adverse consequences; instead, a reasonable type of it, in contrast to the assimilation that causes a sense of deprivation, can facilitate achievement of further integrity. Let's continue this discussion by asking a question: "How can the assimilation or multi-culturalism patterns be advocated, rejected, or doubted relying on the citizenship rights and democracy?"

"Citizenship" is one of the prevailing concepts in modern philosophical, political, legal, and sociological literature. Notably, citizenship is embodied rather in societies with a democratic background. In other words, in developing countries, broaching this concept is considered as a social and liberating force for the confrontation with the authoritarian and totalitarian governments that, by putting the emphasis on "we" and "alien others", expect complete obedience and submission from the others.

The concept of "citizenship" has been always changing, throughout history, from narrow semantic realms, such as what can be observed in the state-cities of ancient Greece, to wider realms, like what is observed in the modern state-nations, and ultimately to the supranational and global realm. According to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's viewpoint, the citizenship role is the most excellent role that an individual may dream (Iranmanesh, 2016: 27) [3]. In modern legal-political literature, citizenship is an opportunity for the membership in a political society, as a consequence of which the individual is granted a set of rights, duties, obligations (commitments), as well as the right of participation and determination of fate in the society. This situation is reliant upon the principles of equality, freedom, and civil individuality, the underlying block of which is the existence of a democratic civil society, governance of law, and civil political culture (ibid: 24). Citizenship involves political inclusion as a connector or mediator between the individuals and the political society; while, nationality refers to the national belonging in terms of membership in a cultural, ethnic, or civil society. Of course, it must be noted that citizenship is associated with numerous and diverse nationalities. A very complicated and determinant factor, among others, that is highly important in relation to citizenship is the main components and elements of citizenship.

Some of the inseparable components of citizenship include the strategy of empowerment of citizens for harnessing the chaotic, irrational, and authoritarian circumstances, participation, cooperation, collaboration, interaction and negotiation with others, expansion of human relations, committed behavior, acceptance of differences and conflicts, constructive listen to others, sense of commitment and responsibility, philanthropy, caring for public interest, ethical living, critical thinking, knowledge-orientation (knowledge-based), mood of tolerance and patience, tolerance of dissenting opinions, social confidence, peaceful living and avoidance of despotic behavior, daring to think and express opinion, ability to access information and viewpoints of others, sense of equality and freedom, obedience to the law and so on.

Another important point in this regard is that citizenship, in contrast to the "task-oriented" world of the past, involves a combination of rights and duties. Citizenship rights have gone beyond the model emphasized by T.H. Marshall and currently covers a broader scope. Citizens' "civil rights" include freedom, individual's immunity against outrage, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, protection against government's unlawful actions such as forced labor or imprisonment, equality before the law (legal equality), prohibition of discrimination based on gender, race, origin, language, idea of ownership rights, right to conclude a contract, and the like. "Political rights" encompass items including the right to vote and undertake responsibilities at different levels of government, freedom of assembling and founding the associations, and freedom of information. "Social rights" put the emphasis on the right to work, equal opportunities, entitlement to make benefit from health services, welfare advantages, and social services in the case of unemployment or disability, and entitlement to enjoy a certain educational standard. "Sexual rights" consider some other forms of enforceable rights far away from sexual

oppression and discrimination for men and women and struggle with any kind of marginalization and deprivation of women. And finally, "cultural rights" include the right to full access to the culture and language of the majority, the right to preserve the languages and culture of the minority, the right to have different traditions and lifestyles within a legal public framework that is not based on a cultural prejudice, educational equality, and the right to have intercultural and international communications (Castells & Davidson, 2004: 285-289).

Apropos of the issue of citizenship, the necessity to enjoy the aforementioned rights also entails the commitment to respect the rights of others. In addition, concerning the analysis of the citizenship commitments, it seems to be appropriate here to point out issues such as participation, respect for the fellowmen without discrimination, enhancing the principle of mutual tolerance and respect, dialogue and counseling, etc.

Citizenship within the framework of the state-nation discourse has followed rather the following models:

1. The "legalistic model" emphasized by liberals, which insists on the citizens' rights against the government and their priority over the society and government.
2. The "conservative model", the principal feature of which is its emphasis on the citizens' duties and responsibilities to the government.
3. The "participatory model", the basic emphasis of which is put on the active components of citizenship.
4. The "communitarian model" in which citizenship is something beyond the rights and duties and includes also the issues of problemology and identification. In this model, citizenship is closely bonded to culture and national identity and the citizens are considered as a national community.

But, within the framework of the "globalization" discourse, the new pattern of citizenship known as "global citizen" pattern is emerging. Globalization influences citizenship in three main aspects:

Firstly, globalization impugns the concept of the relative autonomy of the state-nation on the basis of which the separate national citizenship instances have been founded. Secondly, it weakens the ideology that advocates the distinct and quite independent national cultures, which has been merely a legend. Globalization has led to rapid growth in the field of communications and cultural exchange and, by exerting pressure on the national and local cultures, has resulted in the re-emergence of the ethnocentrism and emergence of a new form of pluralism. Thirdly, globalization entails the increasing migration and displacement of people beyond the national boundaries. Therefore, due to the diversity of populations and cultures, this aspect has engendered many disputes concerning the homogenization or multiculturalism (Lipset, 2005: 47-154) [16, 17, 18].

In the debates on globalization, although some theorists believe that the state-nations are still the major players of the global system, yet new citizenship models have emerged, including:

1. European citizenship model (with EU-orientation): It emphasizes the European identity and thus runs counter to the general and universal principles and fundamentals of the citizenship rights.

2. Kymlicka's multicultural citizenship model: The Multicultural citizenship model, by focusing on the critiques of liberal ideal citizenship models, emphasizes collective rights. The liberal citizenship models including Marshal's model, by putting the focus on the acceptance of a public viewpoint by the individuals, tend toward the rejection of social differences and, with the domination of the "ideal of equality" over "difference", indeed reaffirms the victimization of diversity, which is the characteristic of a society, just for the sake of an abstract and unachievable impression of citizenship.

These models ignore the specific and diverse needs and requirements of individuals and groups by concealing the unequal and unjust relationships of power and wealth. In Kymlicka's belief, a comprehensive theory of justice in a multicultural state encompasses both the public rights, which are granted to the individuals regardless of their membership in a particular group, and the special and distinct collective rights or "special position" for minority cultures (Fox, 2002). In his point of view, there are three types of collective rights:

First, the right of autonomy (self-determination), which means the delegation of authorities to the minorities. This type of right is also associated with a probability of some form of federalism and, as some critics believe, can be exposed to the risk of secession.

Second, the multi-ethnic rights, by consideration of which the collective identity is protected through funding legal and public grants and financial aids to the minority cultures.

Third, the right of specific representation, based on which a guaranteed representation is granted to the minorities in the political institutions of society.

In two of the above three types of rights, namely the specific representation and multi-ethnic rights, the attraction of minorities into the political society is accomplished not by denying the cultural differences but by accepting these differences as an essential component of a stable multi-cultural government.

In spite of the fact that the multi-cultural citizenship model has been introduced in response to the challenges of the liberal citizenship models, some critics believe that as long as the liberal models are subject to an essentialistic individualism, the multi-cultural model is suffering from essentialistic collectivism because of disregarding the important intra-group differences.

1. Constitutional Patriotism Citizenship Model: It is an attempt to break the relationship between ethnicity and citizenship identity through granting the citizenship on condition of loyalty to some general principles. This model was presented by Jürgen Habermas who believed that the borders between countries are purely for administrative purposes and should not be used to refer to the boundary point where the commitments end and the suspicions begin.

The advantage of the constitutional patriotism model is that it provokes the citizens to have a commitment to the institutions of their government without being forced to rely on a false and improper cultural unity. In this model, the political borders are fluid, democracy matters, the future is built not by looking backward to the past and feeling a sense of shared national destiny but through counseling, the

encounter between the dominant and marginal cultures is handled, it is not aimed at identity integration through denying the identities of the minorities or foreigners, citizenship is separate from governments' exclusive discourse and can be multiple (Fox, 2002).

2. Multilayer Relational Citizenship Model: This model emphasizes both equality and difference. Equality and difference are assumed to complement each other, and basically the existence of difference is considered as the prerequisite for equality. The goal is to respect the rights of all people regardless of their individual identities and attachments. One can be loyal to one culture and, meanwhile, equate all cultures. In this model, the individual's "self" is at the intersection of a plurality of identities and should constantly choose from among them. Other features of this model are the consideration of rights and responsibilities at the same time as well as the link between the privacies and, consequently, the existence of no distinction between man as an individual and man as a citizen (Barat Alipour, 2006: 5).

Conclusion

We emphasized a definition of immigration that represents it as being a positive action. This phenomenon is so complex and extensive that it requires to be managed, and this management necessitates serious and thoughtful cooperation of the state-nations and, on the whole, the entire global system. The attitudes and theories presented in this regard are aimed to elaborate and clarify the facts and realities concerning the life of immigrant minorities, the circumstances and conditions in the immigration countries, the future of the relationships between the origin and the destination, and the like. According to these theories, a variety of identity-relevant outcomes and consequences can be assumed for the interaction of the immigrants and the culture of the host countries. Subsequently, we discussed the performance of the large European immigration countries and, at its macro level, the European Union, which indicated the prioritization of the imposed project of assimilation of immigrants and their annihilation in the dominant culture of society. Meanwhile, such actions have led to the creation of concepts such as quasi-citizenship, second-class citizenship, isolationism, deprivation, discrimination, and other concepts that represent a kind of dichotomy between the immigrants' life worlds and the dominating life world of the immigration society. In addition to these facts, we addressed the ethical-legal fundamentals claimed by the countries dominating the global system and, specifically, Western Europe.

The concepts of citizenship, human rights, and democracy are concepts that almost all of the west European state-nations, the USA, and even the powerful socialistic countries attempt to legitimatize themselves by resorting to these concepts. The components of citizenship, human rights, and democracy, as well as the dimensions, indices, and values hidden in them, run counter to the performance of immigration state-nations particularly due to the changes and transformation of these concepts from their narrow and limited form to their wider and deeper form over the course of history. Actions of these countries and, on the whole, the performance of the dominant poles of the world are indicative of the truth that migration (of course, not absolutely) is a project from which the dominating liberal-

democratic world is making benefit smartly in favor of its interests.

The components of civil law, social law, political law, sex law, and cultural law, which are the components of a more general concept of citizenship rights, are entirely the inseparable constituents of democracy at the same time and reaffirm the ethical-humane pluralism. This claim becomes more serious when we speak about global citizenship, global democracy, and universal human rights and emphasize the idealistic meaning of the democratic policy. In all of these concepts, which are the most fundamental concepts in legitimatization of the performance (functional) system of the groups, organizations, political parties, state-nations, and the dominant global system, the hidden shared value is that any imposed relationship between the human groups cannot be legitimate unless when these values are exposed to a threat. Authoritarianism and dominance of the male world over the female world, white over black, Europeans over non-Europeans, Americans over non-Americans, Christians over Muslims, employers over workers (employees), power elites over commonalty, a civilization territory over another territory, and vice versa, altogether run counter to the values hidden in the citizenship and democracy concepts.

According to the author of the present paper, the homogenization of the immigrants and the annihilation of their identity in the dominant culture of the immigration countries is a kind of very extensive symbolic, cultural, and meanwhile disguised violence and is rooted in the policies made in the power and wealth centers. Furthermore, attempting to execute the assimilations based on "blood" or "land" (soil) is indeed a manifestation of some kind of the relationship of domination and despotic governance of the majority over the minorities; such that, the veneration of the values of "selection" and "indulgence" (permissiveness) will inherently result in pluralism and, thereby, trampling these values and denying the pluralism will be construed as trampling the transcendental values claimed by us.

Here, an important point that is the emphasis of the present paper and should be added to the above-mentioned points is that:

a. Pluralism and diversity in the world is an existential fact. Our world is decorated with diversity and discrepancies. Nevertheless, such diversity and plurality don't mean that the phenomena in the overall system of creation are irrelevant and have no relationship with each other. In contrast, all the components and types, being engaged in mutual bonds, not only preserve their own dynamic and evolutionary existence but also help the overall system of the universe to move toward its evolution.

b. Pluralism is a definite and evident fact in the history of humankind. Even in the empires, totalitarian and absolutist governments, and in modernity, the diversity of languages, cultures, and various lifestyles constitute an undeniable truth. In almost two hundred countries throughout the world, there are more than 6000 languages and in each lingual territory, there are numerous different micro-cultures (sub-cultures.

It is due to such pluralistic existence of the phenomena and human groups that the necessity of observation of them in modern democracies and within the framework of global democracy is considered as an indicator of respect to the

citizenship rights or human rights of the minorities and immigrant groups.

The diverse existences, and here the diverse and plural social-cultural existences, entail various methodologies as well as diverse thinking-epistemic systems. Of course, it must be noted that pluralism shouldn't be simply considered the same as relativism. Yet, it is important to accept that no ethnos and no human group have innate superiority over others and also the truth is not owned exclusively by a specific individual or group. This means that the assimilation, as a project not as a natural and non-imposed process, is a kind of violence and trampling of the human values. Moreover, pluralism never means that there is no human communication, ethical relationship, and cultural, social, and economic relation among different social groups such as the ethnic-racial and religious minorities and different social classes and each of these groups is engaged with itself in itself just like a sole island. Pluralism doesn't mean isolation the isolation and lack of relationship is one of the major causes of the emergence of "we" and "alien others" and many of the framework suppositions of the ethnos and groups versus each other and also one of the reasons for prejudice, lack of confidence, and authoritarianism.

Pluralism is a possibility that allows more effective participation and contribution of different groups, cultures, and minorities to our shared human destiny. As such, the immigration of different human ethnos and groups to the immigration countries is necessarily associated (in terms of realistic, philosophical, and ethical aspects) with maintenance to the pluralism and its dynamism. Hence, it is due to our reliance on such a fundamental basis that we believe that the realization and dynamism of the constitutional patriotism citizenship and multi-layer relational citizenship models, which have been introduced recently, are rather more defendable than the previously experienced models.

Based on the above-mentioned points, the ultimate and compressed emphasis of the author of the present paper is as follows:

Our world requires anthropocentric pluralistic management that is a manifestation of unity in plurality and plurality in unity. Such management can be implemented in the form of a monotheistic anthropocentric model. The monotheistic anthropocentric model consists of the following axes:

1. The anthropocentric innate essentialism in the human world: This type of essentialism can neither be reduced to liberal essentialistic individualism nor be transformed into essentialistic collectivism of the collective models. In the historical practice and performance of the individuals and groups, the interests of the individuals and groups are sacrificed for one of them with a one-sided authenticity. Human self-consciousness is necessary for eliminating the contradictions between individual wishes and collective interests. This type of self-consciousness is reliant upon the anthropocentric innate essentialism.

2. Unit origin: In this perspective, there is a single unit origin of sense making, and it is the superior (supreme) truth. Human is a manifestation of the truth since humans cannot tolerate any kind of relation for weakening a human by a human through various forms of dominance including sex, ethnic, lingual, political, religious, economic, national, individual, collective, intellectual, etc. forms of domination and considers any kind of one-sided determination relationship or the dominance of a component (constituent part) over a human whole as a barrier to the formation of a monotheistic pluralistic system. In this model, the unit human origin plays the axial role; besides, diversity and plurality are the manifestations of a unit origin and the transcendental human system can be realized merely by maintaining this diversity and connecting the humans via collaborative bonds among them. Any kind of imposed relationship among the human groups is an indicator of hidden or visible violence and a damage to the corpus of humanity as a monotheistic whole.

3. Unity finds its meaning in the existence and continuity of the pluralities, and pluralities excel in unity.

4. The artificial classifications in the form of state-nations is neither authentic nor persistent. The original homeland of any individual person and group is the earth, and the system of communications, exchanges, and programming of leadership, management, and division of works among the individuals and groups would be justifiable merely by applying the principles and measures of monotheistic anthropocentrism not considering the interests of some particular group or individual interests. The earth, nature, and all of its resources must be considered as the shared capital of all people. The existence of a realm (territory) in prosperity and in difficulties is an indicator of the humans' unawareness of their shared destiny and human excellence.

5. And finally, human relationships not only with other humans but also with all components and constituents of the universe is a kinship relationship with mutual acceptance, which is based upon a dialectic evolutionism. Over the course of studies on human and human groups and even during the investigations on the nature and the world, human doesn't enter the one-sided subject-object; in contrast, in every relationship, the "self" is engaged in an inseparable bond with the object and any type of view and valuation of the object will imply the reflection of a kind of view and valuation of his/her "self".

Suggestions

The governmental organizations, civil activists, scholars, intellectuals, and authorities of the Ministry of Migrants and Returners should address the large international institutions and governments in a pre-planned and guided manner and by emphasizing the values of democracy, human rights, and citizenship rights concerning the observation of the rights of the minorities and immigrants in the immigration countries. Besides, they can also impugn and level a criticism at great projects of assimilation and identity annihilation of the immigrants, which is in contrast to the above-mentioned values.

The government and civil institutions should bring into practice a clearly defined program in order to improve the immigrants' awareness and knowledge in relation to their human rights, maintenance of the national values, the necessity of dynamism and development of their identity, as well as respect for the human pluralism values.

Holding scientific-cultural and, if necessary, economic and political conferences for the immigrants on the issues such as the maintenance and continuity of their national-historical

interests, identity dynamism, self-belief, self-confidence, and independence.

The Ministry of Migration Affairs should encourage the migrants in different countries, particularly the European countries, America, Canada, and Australia, to found the unions and associations of immigrants in order to provide the necessary social capital among the immigrants and prevent their identity metamorphosis in the dominant culture of the host society

Besides having precise and prospective program concerned with institutionalizing the values of the immigrants' citizenship rights both in the host country and in Afghanistan, the government and civil institutions' can improve the individuals' life expectancy for living in their own country and enhance the spirit of welcoming the returners in the society.

One of the essential issues in terms of the prioritization of the programs is concerned with the development and expansion of the monotheistic anthropocentric model through creating the media and civil activities in different international languages around the world.

References

1. Amoli Javad. Fundamentals of Sociology of Migration; Tehran, Kavir 2004.
2. Ershad, Abdolhossein. Causes of Migration; Tehran, SAMT 1985.
3. Iranmanesh, Mohammad Reza. Concept of Citizenship; Tehran, Negah-e-Moaser 2015.
4. Baratalipour, Mehdi. Citizenship and Neo-Virtue-Oriented Policy; Tehran, Institute For National Studies on Iranian Civilization 2005.
5. Hafeznia. Social Displacement; Tehran, Negah Moaser 2001.
6. Dayyani, Mohammadreza Geographical Movement in Traditional Societies; Tehran, Chapakhsh 2002.
7. Ritzer, George. Contemporary Sociological Theories; Translated by Mohsen Salasi; Tehran, Elmi 2001.
8. Zanjani Habibollah. Demographic Analysis; Tehran, SAMT 2004.
9. Souvey, Alfred. General Theory of Souls; Translated by A. Shah Hedran *et al*. Kabul; Puhenton Kabul 1988.
10. Shariati, Ali. Migration and Civilization; Tehran, Agah.
11. Falcs, Kate (2002); Citizenship; Translated by Mohammad Taghi Alforouz; Tehran, Kavir 1984.
12. Foroutan, Yaghub. Demographic Analysis of the Relations of Identity and Migration; National Quarterly Magazine 2012;2.
13. Caster Stephan, Davison Allister. Migration & Citizenship: Tehran, Research Center for Strategic Studies 2003.
14. Christens Gurden *et al*. Global Civil Society; Translated by Hossein Sharifi Tarazkoohi; Tehran, Mizan 1998.
15. Giddens, Anthony. Sociology; Translated by Manuchehr Sabouri; Tehran, Nei 2005.
16. Lipset Seymour Martin. Encyclopedia of Democracy; Vol.1; Translation supervisor: Kamran Fani & Nourollah Moradi; Tehran, Specialized Library of Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2004.
17. Lipset Seymour Martin. Encyclopedia of Democracy; Vol.2; Translation supervisor: Kamran Fani & Nourollah Moradi; Tehran, Specialized Library of Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2004.
18. Lipset Seymour Martin. Encyclopedia of Democracy; Translation supervisor: Kamran Fani & Nourollah Moradi; Tehran, Specialized Library of Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2004;3.
19. Mashhadi Ojtaba M. Sociology of Migration; Qom; Farhang Eslami 2003.
20. Malek Setiz. Migration; Kabul, Association of Civil Society and Human Rights 2002.
21. Molayi Abdollah. Migration and European Identity-Oriented Policy; Foreign Policy Quarterly Magazine 2008;1.
22. Narimani Ashraf. Migration and Acculturation; Scientific Studies Quarterly Magazine 2013;2.
23. Waald Franswa *et al*. Indulgence since long ago up to now; Translated by Mazyar Mohaymeni, Mohammadreza Sheikhi Mohammadi; Tehran, SALES 1999.
24. Ministry of Migrants and Returners, Return Magazine; Publication Organization of Migrants Affairs 2007;4.
25. Ministry of Migrants and Returners; Report by Ministry of Migrants and Returners; Kabul 2006-2009.
26. Habermas Jürgen. Globalization and Future of Democracy; Post-national System; Translated by Kamal Puladi; Tehran, Markaz 2010.
27. Rupnik Jacques. Europe's New Frontiers: Remapping Europe. Daedalus 1994;23(3):1-9.
28. Habermas Jurgen. Citizenship and National Identity: Some Reflections on the future of Europe' Peaxis International 1992;12(1).
29. Brettell Caroline B, James Hollificld F. Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines New york: Routledgcs 2000, P137.
30. Spenccr, Sarah. The politics of Migration: Managing Opportunity, Conflicts and Change, Oxford: Blankwell 2003, P25.
31. Bolzman, Claudio et Manuel Boucher. De fimmigration a I'intcgration, Le Monde Diplomatique, (Luin) 2006.