



*Aseorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.  
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898475*

RFC: AT1120618V12

**Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.**

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/>

**Año: VI**

**Número: Edición Especial**

**Artículo no.: 24**

**Período: March, 2019.**

**TÍTULO:** Un estudio comparativo de la sociedad civil en las teorías sociológicas.

**AUTORS:**

1. Abbas Naeemi Jourshari.

2. Termeh behboodi.

**RESUMEN.** En la presente investigación, se ha intentado centrarse en la evolución conceptual de la sociedad civil en una perspectiva sociológica junto con el estudio de la historia conceptual de la sociedad civil. Este artículo se desarrolla en base a la cuestión del significado de sociedad civil y la obligación de su consistencia en el mundo moderno. En este sentido, se ha abordado la explicación y la ilustración del concepto de sociedad civil, con énfasis en los puntos de vista y pensamientos de sociólogos como Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, Jurgen Habermas, Pierre Bourdieu y Robert David Putnam. El método de investigación es descriptivo y el método de recolección de datos es bibliotecario.

**PALABRAS CLAVES:** sociedad civil, teorías de la sociología, Marx, Gramsci, Putnam.

**TITLE:** A comparative study of civil society in sociological theories.

**AUTHORS:**

1. Abbas Naeemi Jourshari

2. Termeh behboodi.

**ABSTRACT:** In the present research, it has been attempted to focus on the conceptual evolution of civil society in a sociological perspective alongside studying conceptual history of civil society. This article is developed based on the question of the meaning civil society and the obligation of its consistency in the modern world. In this regard, the explanation and illustration of the concept of civil society, with emphasis on the views and thoughts of sociologists such as Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, Jurgen Habermas, Pierre Bourdieu, and Robert David Putnam, have been addressed. The research method is descriptive and data collection method is librarian.

**KEY WORDS:** civil society, sociology theories, Marx, Gramsci, Putnam.

## **INTRODUCTION.**

Civil society equivalent in English and *civitas* in Latin means the citizenship or *societe citet* of French or *burgerliche* in German means city or *siwa*, meaning city-state, which was called *Polis* in ancient Greek. In the ancient Greek, The *Polis*, or the power organization, was addressing a society which includes citizens of the inhabitants who are under governmental (or state) support and restrictions. From ancient Greek and ancient Rome, where the city-state has existed, until today in the urban community due to complex information technology, different interpretations of civil society have been spoken. In this respect, civil society can be considered a historical concept. Now civil society is a set of people who establish groups and associations independent of the state, by their own will and choice, and the purpose of establishing these groups is to follow the interests and benefits of the members (Vaezi, 1999; Jenaabadi & Issazadegan, 2014).

Ferguson of the Scottish intellectuals defined civil society as a civilized form against a primitive society or a natural situation. That means, in civil society there is law and order, and unity, cooperation, collaboration, tolerance, understanding and opposition of votes flows in such a society. The simple or barbaric (Primitive) gatherings of human beings or primitive tribes in which the inner

relations of the members of the group is based on the instinctive and natural exchanges, namely gathering food, hunting and the feeling of a partial protection from external danger .

The 19<sup>th</sup> century thinkers, like Alexis de Tocqueville, found that the modern democracy-based governments are much stronger and more powerful than anticipated, thus they called for the reduction of state power in a civil society. De Tocqueville considered institutions and non-governmental organizations – which voluntarily hold the responsibility of managing people’s civil affairs - as the most effective way to take government’s power under control. His civil society model was shaped by the activity and expansion of the activities of non-governmental organizations in a society, which this organizations ensure relations between society and government.

Based on De Tocqueville’s schema, these institutions on the hand regulate views and demands of the majority of their members, and on the other hand they reflect this demands and views to the ruling political system and society, in order to effectively participate in social and political decisions. Such organizations, on one side, prevent the excesses of their members in response to unreasonable demands and, on the other side, they prevent the monopoly of power in a particular group or class and prevent dictatorship and replace unhealthy race in politics and unions with healthy and legitimate competitions in society. This interpretation of civil society, which emphasizes the limitation of ruling power by civil institutions, is a new conception that has emerged from it (Marefat, 1999; Golkar et al, 2014).

The 21<sup>st</sup> century dictionary defines civil society as the sum of non-governmental organizations and institutions which reveal the rights and interests of citizens, or individuals and organizations in a society that are independent of the state. Although concepts of society and civil are not from a single base and historical origin, but are strongly linked to each other. The community emerges from the active, organized, and mutually beneficial effective relationships of individuals and social groups,

and the civilization is resulted from the establishment of social, cultural, political and economic institutions which have a sustainability characteristic, respond to needs, interests and prospects.

## **DEVELOPMENT.**

### **The historical transformation of the concept of civil society.**

The classic understanding of civil society as a people-based political organization with common interests was first formed in ancient Greek cities. The classic Greek philosophy that emerged after the Peloponnesian wars emphasized that public good is achieved only through public discussion and organization by using general action, and it was believed that civil degradation was the result of personal and individual interests.

Many political intellectuals of this age, including Cicero, use the Latin term "societal civil" to describe the urban state, which means a framework of ordered laws. When Cicero writes in his book "Republic": "The law of the civil society bond," he refers to the civil society of a politically and juridically organized population, and Cicero is referring to it as "res publica", the public affair. Cicero uses the concept of "societal civil" meaning civil society, in conflict with the term "societal generis humanism", that is, the human society, and in the same vein it speaks of civil rights (just civil) in opposition to natural rights (just natural). In other words, "societal Civilis" means a public society composed of individuals, that is, a urban state which is a natural society in comparison to a family, and humanity like global community (Jahanbegloo, 1993).

Plato was matured in an atmosphere formed by the Athen's military defeat, economic chaos, political instability, and moral confusion. His motivation to establish the ethic principles in government was also a direct response to the uncertainty and disorder of his time. The priority that he gave to political science and cognition of power resulted in the formation of the theory of civil society.

Plato's intention to unite all aspects of human's experience around the concept of "eternal goodness" made him the first advocate of systematic and governmental censorship. His civil society, which was based on recognition of diversity and a proper understanding of the division of labor, was being led to a frozen unity and a stability in silence.

Plato, because of the emphasis on unity, knew that civil society coordinates peoples' activities of with different skills and talents. His insistence that civil society can be integrated with political power was based on the assumption that the political organization is defined within specific political boundaries. Unlike Plato, Aristotle considered unity of all aspects of the universe, impossible. Aristotle also had the same idea with Plato that the bond of human beings is rooted in material need, and the division of labor is the heart of civil society. Since the family was the primary and producer unit in the ancient world, Aristotle put it as the foundation of the government.

If Plato had sought to systematize all areas of civil society in the same way, Aristotle was prepared to absorb the intrinsic potential of sub-levels, although limited. The family and the village are the domain of moral action, but their domain is limited because they are formed on the basis of the initial need, personal effort and inequality (Ernberg, 2016).

Plato portrayed a society in the Republic, in which each of the social groups, such as workers, the military men, and philosophers had fierce effort and at the same time an independent task, and only by their struggle, Plato's justice community could be formed (Sharia, 2003). Aristotle's government was based on the unit of the family, just as public life was based on privacy and public boundaries. The difference that Aristotle considered between a healthy and a distorted social structure was the difference between a structure serving the public against a structure serving the comfort of the rulers (Ernberg, 2016)

In the Middle Ages, the Roman *societas civilis* meant social political of people. In the 14<sup>th</sup> century, Marcel Dupadou speaks of civil society as a *politia*, a political system that involves members of the community. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century, for the first time in French translation of Aristotle's *polity*, *societas civilis* is used as civil society. In 1677, Bossueau writes in a book titled *Biblical politics*: "Civil society is a community of people living under the rule of a law and a state."

At the same time, Thomas Hobbes presents civil society for the first time in modern sense in a book called *Citizen*. The title of the first chapter of Hobbes's book is "about the Situation of Humans in Civil Society". Like many 17<sup>th</sup> century thinkers, it does not separate the concept of civil society from the concept of state. Therefore, he defines the term civil society in the book of *Principles of a Frameworked Political Law*, which, according to him, is the *polis* of the Greek, the city government. Following Hobbes, Pufendorf speaks of civil society as a community of citizens, which is in contradiction to the natural society in which humans come to a common agreement to form a political institution. Pufendorf in agreement with Machiavelli and Hobbes, knows the government as the equal, because he considers research and survey in the political and legal arrangements of individuals is important for individuals who have been gathered under the rule of sovereignty over a specific geographic area.

The influence of Hobbes's political philosophy in the 17<sup>th</sup> century reveals itself in the emphasis of the thinkers of this century on the place and civil society. John Locke also uses the term "civil society" in conflict with the concept of "natural state". But Locke, unlike Hobbes, considers the ultimate goal of civil society not to escape fear and death and violence, and to create peace and tranquility for humans, but to preserve and secure ownership. So Locke adds a new economic and legal dimension to the concept of civil society, which is the continuation of the political meaning that Hobbes had previously spoken of. For this reason, Locke may well be the first modern political thinker to

anticipate the difference between the state as a political institution and civil society, like an economical system (Jahanbegloo, 2009).

In an attempt to identify the historical regions of Europe in search of the deepest roots of the democratic method of organizing society, Geno Sachs considers the most important feature of the West to be the structural and theoretical separation of society from the state, and this is the unique development which lies in the heart of Western democracy. But the absence of this separation in the east is due to the evolution of tyranny to totalitarianism. According to Sachs, the roots of this development lies in Western feudalism.

### **Sociological theories of civil society.**

In this study, we examine the views of Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, Robert Pathnam, Jurgen Habermas and Pierre Bourdieu.

#### **Karl Marx.**

Marx considers the bourgeois society to be equal with the term civil society, and places civil society in the foundational part and production relations of the society, apart from the state. Therefore, acknowledges a socio-economic structure for civil society. In his view, the government represents the ruling class, not the entire society. Marx comes from the Hegelian tradition. For him, like Hegel, the government's relationship with the civil society is very important. Unlike feudalism, the modern state (government) proclaims all factors of difference like wealth, education, employment, religion, race as non-political. It is only in this way that it can claim to represent the interests of all citizens (Alamdari, 2015).

Marx had a particular look at the economic or commercial aspect of civil society. In his view, the development and expansion of civil society, although was initially for freedom, autonomy, individuality and social justice, but has now become fundamental for new forms of domination, oppression, human self-alienation and inequality.

According to Marx, the sphere of work and life or civil society is a domain in which greed, selfishness and exploitation dominate people. On the contrary, in the political sphere, the concepts of justice, freedom and equality are dominant, and therefore, these two domains are not related to each other and should be separated from each other (Dneprov et al., 2016).

He regards civil society as the bourgeois society that replaced the feudal society. According to Marx, civil society has been growing since the 16<sup>th</sup> century, when capitalism was found, and peaked in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In this "free competition" society, people are free from natural limitations of the prior times or traditional restrictions. In this period human is made by history, not by nature. Marx distinguishes between the man of the civil society and the citizen man (member of the political community). A human in a civil society is a person with natural rights, while a person who is a member of the political community (citizen) has legal rights. Civil society includes the field of human needs, such as work and private interests and civil rights. A civilian human is noble and a citizen is independent. The requirement for a complete human liberation is to end the separation of human from the civil society and human of the political community. Also, the separation of the two private and public areas is an affirmation sign of the existence of democracy in society, and the integration of these two is anti-democratic (Alamdari, 1997).

Marx's proposal to confront the civil materialization is to form a communist society. In a communist society, people are members of the international community and, as much as they are lucrative, they do not think of their specific political work in a commune (Shariat, 2003).

### **Antonio Gramsci.**

Antonio Gramsci proposed a three-dimensional model of society, namely, economics, civil society, the state. As Gramsci says, civil society exists between the economic infrastructure and the state with the legislature and the legislative apparatus and its security apparatus. The characteristic of Gramscian civil society is not that civil society itself has built itself from an independent economy or state, but

in its special type of relationship with the state and the economy, which is based on the agreement meaning the exact behavior of the elements.

Gramsci considers the bourgeois state as an interventionist government. Civil society is not isolated from the bourgeois state and it is dependent on the state and even within the state. But those who are in civil society are satisfied with this situation, and this satisfaction is a false consciousness, and civil institutions participate in creating this deceptive consensus (Gherayagh Zandi, 1997).

The goal of the state is to create a new and evolved form of civilization and adaptation of this "civilization" and the morality of crowds of people with the requirements of the continuous development of the society's economical production system; hence, even the development of humanity which has a new physical construction, is on the agenda of the state (Gramsci, 2009).

To Gramsci, hegemony is a cultural domination, which is more or less based on the voluntary consent and consensus of the social subgroups. What should not be neglected for the realization of hegemony is that satisfaction is obtained if the dominant group considers the favors, interests and demands of all subgroups more or less.

Hegemony also requires the ruling group to be able to pass its economic prosperity and reach a moral prosperity stage, in a way that its domination would not base on pure economic power, but on the basis of social norms and values and be freely accepted by all dominated groups.

Although, here, satisfaction and agreement are obtained on the basis of absolute validity of certain social values and norms, but this absolute validity is not possible without a certain amount of controversy about the ideal validity of each norm and value. This feature returns to the controversial nature of social phenomena.

The more societies are in the conflict between social groups, the less they achieve a compromise to solve these social conflicts at the normative level. At the stage of social conflict, the ruling group

should introduce its political goals in a fashion that does not express the political orientation of certain classes, but of a public and credible goal: for all citizens and ultimately for all humanity.

The hegemony according Gramsci's view, is a process by which the government, with its continuous reference to the events of civil society implies, regulates and arranges its domination over people. In result, a hegemony-based state is a state which is based on civil society-based and relies on it rather than an institution that receives its power from itself. So, domination or hegemony is not something that can be produced and fortified once and for all, and then be released to defend itself, but continuous hegemony needs to be ordered, recited and reconstructed.

In Gramsci's view, every state government, including the bourgeois state, seeks to establish and preserve a particular civilization and citizen in accordance with its cultural patterns. Even the law, along with other institutions, is making this happen. In terms of Gramsci, civil society is, by its very nature, an outrageous and violent atmosphere. He regarded civil society as a part of the capitalist system, in which the capitalist class was able to find a chance to force its own values, norms, culture, ideas and ideologies on the proletariat through its civil and governmental institutions and organizations. The struggle for power takes place not in the state, but in civil society and against civil society. Hence, civil society is a battlefield of different sociological classes to impose domination. In terms of Gramsci, civil society does not have an unchangeable and constant nature, but it's rather an atmosphere that depends on the function of its members, and thus varies and changes. Because of the instability of civil society's atmosphere, it may be conquered by non-dominant class or classes, but each class must -before it seizes political power- should rebuild social relations within civil society in order to achieve new domination and establish the basis of state's new morality (Gherayagh Zandi, 1997).

**Robert D. Putnam.**

Robert Putnam believes that there are many situations in social life that, in case of cooperation from members of the community, will benefit everyone. But they do not engage in this cooperation due to a kind of actional logic calculation, which is called the collective actional logic, and based on this logical calculation, they decide to step down, slip away and be opportunist. Therefore, it is imperative to overcome this collective actional logic to prevent these problems and to do so it is only possible when members of a society trust each other and based on this trust, they ensure that the response of cooperation, will be a collaboration and a mutual deal, not opportunism and dishonesty (Golmohammadi, 1998)

With the critique of Thomas Hobbes's classic solution to this problem, Putnam emphasizes that the complicated conundrum of lack of cooperation is not derived from bad spirit or human-induced intolerance, although these feelings may be exacerbated by the bad outcome of the lack of cooperation. He concludes that success in overcoming the problems of collective action and opportunism that ultimately are harmful to themselves, depends on the social context in which it is being played, as a result, voluntary cooperation in a society which inherits an enormous social asset in the form of norms of interaction and networks of civil partnership takes place more properly (Roshanfekar, 2005).

Some theorists believe that a third party must provide this trust to another person, which is a condition of civil life, and that third party is the state (Hobbesian solution). But the solution itself poses another problem: how can the state be trusted and what is the guarantee that this third party does not abuse its position and power. So the best way to overcome the collective actional logic is through voluntary cooperation, and not forced cooperation. According to Putnam, the way to overcome the collective actional logic action is the most important feature of developed and undeveloped societies. In developed societies, compulsion plays a very minor role in solving the riddles of collective action,

while in undeveloped societies, the collective actional logic dominates in many domains, and overcoming this logic is mainly possible by force.

Therefore, in the societies of first type, the level of accountability and efficiency of institutions is very high and in the second type societies is very low. If optional cooperation is the key to a large part of the political and economic problems of societies, then conditions for the possibility of such cooperation should be carefully examined. In a more literal statement, it should be checked in what conditions voluntary co-operation becomes possible and it can be expanded. Putnam, in response to this fundamental question, puts forward the concept of "social asset", which is the axis of his theory. Based on evidence and Experimental research, He shows that in societies without social asset, voluntary cooperation does not have a meaning. Methodologically, there is a positive relationship between social asset (trust, social norms and communication networks), and the functioning of governmental institutions (Golmohammadi, 1998).

Putnam's theory of social asset there are certain similarities with Durkheim's ideas of solidarity. His use of words such as productivity and efficacy suggests that he sees social asset as functional, but his work framework shows that he does not depict an individual activist who takes the theory of rational choice into account (Field, 2009).

In every society, there is a network of formal and informal communications that are either vertical or horizontal. In the context of vertical communication networks, relations are usually unequal, and the two sides of relations are formed by upper class and lower class. In societies where vertical communication networks dominate, an unequal relationship is fostered, and exploitation becomes widespread, and opportunism, distrust, and individual isolation become widespread behavioral features. Therefore, there would be no suitable field for voluntary trust and cooperation, but in the context of horizontal communication networks or civil partnerships networks of based on equal relationships, such as local communities, choir groups, cooperatives, sports clubs, parties with mass

bases and so on, an appropriate field for optional co-operation is provided, because civil partnership networks:

1. Increase the potential costs of evasion, procrastination and opportunism in the process of any trade and social commerce.
2. Promote strong norms for mutual cooperation and communication.
3. Facilitate communication and reinforce that information streamline about trustworthiness of individuals, resulting in more mutual trust and easier cooperation.
4. Publish past successes from voluntary cooperation. Communities with horizontal communication networks or civil cooperation networks, which are components of civil society, provide a very suitable social platform for overcoming the logic of collective action and the prevalence of voluntary cooperation, and democratic and efficient institutions also grow in such an atmosphere. In Putnam's view, perhaps one of the causes of capitalism's more efficient use in comparison to feudalism in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and democracy in comparison to autocracy in the 20<sup>th</sup> century has been the effectiveness of horizontal communication networks in overcoming the logic of collective action (Golmohammadi, 1998).

Putnam, in his "Bowling alone" book, shows that civil society in general, and social asset, in particular have been fundamentally downgraded in post-war America. He cites a number of key reasons for this downward trend, including time and money pressure. But eventually these revolutions in technology and media, especially the rise of television entertainment as the main source of entertainment in the United States, have been identified as the main cause of decline in social communication and the disappearance of social commitment in the United States, with deeper effects on younger generations (Pourmusavi, 2002).

**Jürgen Habermas.**

Jürgen Habermas believes that the term "civil society" has a different meaning from the meaning of the "bourgeois society" of the liberal tradition, which, according to Hegel, is a system of needs, a commercial system that includes two realms of social work and the exchange of goods.

The meaning of "civil society" in the present day, contrary to its application in the Marxist tradition, no longer includes the economy as defined in private law and was flowing in the realm of the market in terms of labor, capital and goods, but the institutional core that includes voluntary associations and non-economic and non-governmental relations that are the mainstay of the public domain communicational structures in a part of the life world and is called Society. Civil society includes those types of semi-private associations, movements, and organizations, which reflect the social issues in the personal zones of life and also refine them, and transform them to the public sphere in an escalated form. The core of civil society is a network of relations that help to institutionalize discussions that address the issues of interest to everyone in the organized public sphere. These "dialogue-oriented" approaches have flexible and egalitarian structures, which project the main characteristics of a kind of communication that these approaches form around it and lead to its continuity and survival.

The public sphere is a zone in which people come together to participate in open and scholarly discussions, and without knowing this zone, it is not possible to know of the modern society. In his opinion, the prerequisite for the public sphere is the need for individuals to privatize personal and civil relations. This should be done in all aspects of life, especially in the economic dimension. In his opinion, with the freedom of domestic and foreign trade, the prefield of bourgeoisie and then liberalism growth was provided. This foundation, which was created in the field of civil society, gradually provides grounds for the formation of the public sphere. In this regard, the public sphere of the bourgeoisie of Habermas is rooted in the private sphere, which is formed by the discussion of

citizens about public issues. Hence, there is a close correlation between the public sphere and the civil society (Ghasemi, 2010).

The political system, which should always be sensitive to the impact of thought, is linked to civil society and the public sphere through the activities of political parties and public elections. This bond is preserved through three factors: first, the right of parties to "share" in shaping the political will of the people; second, the rights of citizens to vote, either actively or negatively; and third, other cooperative rights. Another point is that the network of relations in civil society can only maintain its independence and self-motivation until it is endorsed by numerous forms of subcultures, worldviews and life companies.

The protection of the law from "private life" leads to greater integrity of the areas of private life; rights relating to personality, freedom of conscience and belief, freedom of action, privacy of mails, postal packages and telephone calls, the protection of the person's place of residence from any offense, and Violations and, finally, support for families make the uninvadable domain of personal integrity and independent judgments specified and safe. Legal guarantees alone cannot protect civil society and the public sphere from all kinds of sanctions and conflicts. What is needed to keep public communications structures healthy is a powerful civil society.

Transformation in the public domain begins with the commercialization of the press. This transformation has led the press to turn to commercial and political affairs and shifted to journalism in its modern sense, instead of being a means of informing, in an honest and straightforward way. Thus, readers are also on two poles of influential and active or merely passive and receptive masses (Stones, 2000).

A strong civil society grows and develops only in the context of a liberal political culture and its socialization patterns, and only relying on the private sphere. The informal flow of public opinion promotes beliefs that have been tested in terms of belonging to public interests and benefits. What

legitimizes political decisions is mere "influence", but the changed influence into communicative power. Public sovereignty is not realized solely by the influence or impact of public and informal talks, even when these dialogues come out of the independence public domain. Creating political power requires that these dialogues affect the regular and democratic debate of parliamentarians, who have been democratically elected, and adopted and legislated as official decisions.

The history of social movements has shown that the impact of free communication processes in a public civil sphere can be very effective for both collective education and indirect policy-making. As Habermas has recently pointed out, all the public spheres of the wisdom which caused by the ordinary language, remain permeable to each other. Just as the general sphere of abstraction of readers, listeners and scattered spectators in the national level is permeable in each other and they come together through the media.

### **Pierre Bourdieu.**

In order to understand the concept of civil society from Bourdieu's perspective (1930-2002), his ideas about social asset should be considered. For Bourdieu, the creation and effectiveness of social asset depends on the membership of a social group whose members form the boundaries of the group through the exchange of objects and institutions. These relations may be guaranteed through the use of a mutual name (family, nation, association, party) and a complete set of actions for institutionalization, such as material exchanges and symbols.

In Bourdieu's view, the amount of social asset depends on the possession of every social factor in two things:

1. The size of the communication network that can be well gathered by a social factor.
2. The amount of asset (economic, cultural, symbolic) of each of the social factors associated with them. **He writes** with the emphasis on the difference between social asset and other types of assets:

"Although social asset is not reduced to the economic and cultural capital in the possession of each

of the factors (agents), or even the full set of factors associated with the individual, yet It's never completely independent of it" (Bourdieu, 2011).

According to Bourdieu, the agents' position in the field and the social scene are determined depending on the amount and level of their relative capital (asset), and through specific strategies that they are pursuing for achieving their goals (Field, 2009).

In Bourdieu's view, social activists are influenced by two factors: social fields and habits, to acquire a variety of assets, based on which they determine their place in the social sphere and within social fields. Fields form the objective and structural aspects and habits make up the mental aspect of social life. The relation of these two determines the actions and the actions lead to their stabilization or change. Bourdieu believes that social asset, as a network of relations, is not a natural deposit or even a social deposit, but something that has to be tried over time to be achieved. In other words, social asset is the result of a kind of individual or collective investment, whether conscious or unconscious, aimed at consolidating or reproducing social relations that are directly usable in a short or long term. Thus, with the help of social asset, activists are able to facilitate social relations and through that, act to maintain and strengthen social solidarity and union (Bourdieu, 2011).

He sees social asset as an exclusive characteristic of intellectuals, which is designed to provide their relative position. He emphasizes on the role of family-based social asset, and it seems that, regardless of his concern for the introduction of factor, his theory is rooted in a relatively static model of social hierarchy (Field, 2009).

According to Bourdieu, the strategies for boosting social assets are:

- 1) Measures to facilitate social action and eliminate all political, cultural, social and economic barriers for any kind of productive and positive social activism.

2) Strengthening the active and constructive "civil society", so that social forces, especially groups of youngsters, can engage in action in the framework of civil society and provide the necessary grounds for strengthening solidarity and social alliance.

3) The civil and welfare institutions' Support of disadvantaged individuals and groups so that "mutual trust" can be promoted at the micro and macro levels of society.

4) Strengthening social connections and interactions at micro and macro levels, including individual and institutional relationships; because we already observe a kind of breakdown or weakening in these interactions, which is a major obstacle for maintaining and strengthening social asset.

5) Preventing any disappointment, frustration, self-alienation and social indifference that underlies the degradation of "social trust" (Bourdieu, 2011).

## **CONCLUSIONS.**

In the present study, with exploration of the historical evolution of the concept of civil society, its comparative study of sociological theories was surveyed. It was shown that Marx illustrates civil society by emphasizing on political economy. Gramsci describes the role of the ruling hegemony in relation to the content of civil society. Habermas focuses on the public sphere, and Putnam and Bourdieu talk about civil society in accordance social asset. The following theoretical chart represents the aforementioned categories.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.**

1. Alamdari, K. (1997). Civil society. *Adineh Journal*, 9(2).
2. Alamdari, K. (2015). *Civil Society, Speeches, Fields and Experiences*. Tavana
3. Bourdieu, P. (2011). *Differentiation, Social Criticism, Judging Judgments*. Hassan Chavoshian translation. Tehran: Saales Publications.

4. Dneprov, S. A., Telepova, T. P., Naumova, O. A., & Izmaylov, A. M. (2016). Algorithmic Presentation of the Independent Work of the Students of the Vocational Pedagogical University in the Conditions of the Synchronous Pedagogical Control. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 11(8), 2884-2902.
5. Ernberg, J. (2016) "The Wisdom of Civil Society from Greece to the Modern World." *Homme Translator*. Mighty
6. Field, J. (2009). *Social Capital*. Translation by Gholamreza Ghaffari and Hossein Ramezani. Tehran: Kavir Publications
7. Ghasemi, Y. (2010). Government and Civil Society's Relations in Iran from the Perspective of Historical Sociology. *Social Sciences magazine of Faculty of Humanities and the Religions, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad*.
8. Gherayagh Zandi, D. (1997). The Relationship between Civil Society and Government, Locke and Gramsci's Comparative Study. *Strategic Quarterly Journal*, 14.
9. Golmohammadi, A. (1998). Civil Society, Social asset. *Journal of Discourse*, 2.
10. Gramsci, A. (2009). *Government and Civil Society*. Translation by Abbas Milani. Tehran: Akhtaran Publications
11. Golkar, M., Golkar, A., AbbasianKasgari, A., & HosseiniToudeshki, E. (2014). Determining the Factors Influencing the Brand Equity from the Perspective of the Consumer in Iran Chocolate Industry (Baraka Chocolate).
12. Jahanbegloo, R. (2009). *Modernity, Democracy and Intellectuals*. Tehran: Markaz Publications.
13. Jahanbegloo, R.(1993). The Philosophical Evolution of the Concept of Civil Society. *Journal of Discourse*, 1.
14. Jenaabadi, H., & Issazadegan, A. (2014). The analysis of personality features, coping strategies and stress relations in drug addicts.

15. Marefat, M. H. (1999). Civil Society. Qom: altamhid.
16. Pourmusavi, F. (2002). Civil society and social asset. Strategy seasonal journal, 26.
17. Roshanfekar, P. (2005). Social asset, Civilization and Institutional Function. Roshd Quarterly journal, 2.
18. Shariat, F. (2003). The Transformation of Civil Society in Western Political Thought, Aristotle, Virtuous Friendship, and Modern Life. Political-Economic Information Quarterly, 182-181.
19. Stones, R. (2000). Great thinkers of sociology. Translation by Mehrdad Mirdamadi. Tehran: Markaz Publications.
20. Vaezi, A. (1999). The religious community, civil society. Tehran: Research Center for Islamic Culture and Thought.

#### **DATA OF THE AUTHORS.**

**1. Abbas Naeemi Jourshari.** Professor, Department of Social Science, Kooshyar higher education institute, Rasht, Iran. Email: [Abbasnaeemi.j@gmail.com](mailto:Abbasnaeemi.j@gmail.com)

**2. Termeh behboodi.** M.A Student, Department of Social Science, Kooshyar higher education institute, Rasht, Iran. Email: [Abbasnaeemi.j@gmail.com](mailto:Abbasnaeemi.j@gmail.com)

**RECIBIDO:** 4 de febrero del 2019.

**APROBADO:** 16 de febrero del 2019.