



The Relationship between the Concepts of Agency-Structure in the Thought of Beheshti

Mohammad Hosein Ghandi¹, Garineh Keshishyan Siraki^{2*}

¹Department of Political Science, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University,
Tehran, Iran

²Department of Political Science, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University,
Tehran, Iran

Received: 22 Nov 2017 ; Accepted: 20 May 2018

Abstract:

In the present paper, we have been trying mainly to define the concepts of agency-structure, so that by understanding the concepts of agency-structure, we sought to discover these concepts in the mindset of Beheshti. The concepts of agency-structure are among the fundamental and vital concepts associated with how governments are recognized. By identifying the extent of the powers, the rights and the function of each of these two concepts and the degree to which they can benefit in a society, one can understand the division of power and the areas of decision-making in a society and government. The main focus of this paper is the recognition and discovery of these two concepts in the thought of Mohammad Hosseini Beheshti, one of the thinkers of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The authors try to explain the connection in the core of the political system, which is referred to as "the system of the Ummah and Imamate" in the mind of Beheshti, by various reasons. From the perspective of Beheshti, in this system of community management, one must stand with each other from the Ummah and Imams. The results of this study represent the principle of interrelatedness between the two concepts, which by acting and responding, try to maintain the dynamism of the system. This descriptive-analytic study will examine the ideas of Mohammad Hosseini Beheshti.

Keywords: Agency-Structure, Beheshti, Islamic thought, Ummah and Imamate

Introduction

With the passing of the Islamic Revolution of Iran, the need to recognize the influential

factors in the division of power within this system is felt more. One of the most influential thinkers about this system was Beheshti.

*Corresponding Author's Email: G_Keshishyan@azad.ac.ir

He is one of the cores of the group that formed the system, which has been able to systematically shape its thinking in influencing the way of establishing and targeting of this government. One of the ways of knowing how to divide power and the state of governance is to know the factors and components of power in a political system. One of these gates recognizes the concepts of agency-structure. With a general understanding of the concepts of agency-structure, we will seek to know the case of these two concepts in the Behest's thought. Because the intellectual system of Beheshti is a system based on the teachings of the Islamic religion, it must be an automatic system of the Ummah and Imamate, in order to extract any of the components of the concepts of agency-structure from within it. Beheshti has named his system "Ummah and Imamat", and the intellectual foundations of this system can also be found in the thoughts of Shariati. By studying the works of Beheshti, we will understand this understanding of how he looks to a government that religious democracy has been an integral part of the thinking of this thinker. Looking at the field of activity of this thinker in the field of political, intellectual and educational activities, we reached the point that, if he was not the most influential person in the emergence and formation of this political system, we can see him as one of the most influential people in this field. Martyr Beheshti had a lot of emphasis on the sovereignty of the people in the direction of divine sovereignty. Therefore, he has explained the system of the Ummah and Imamate.

Statement of the problem:

Throughout history, scholars have been trying to understand the civilized life of humans

and the human community, which is becoming more complex every day and over time. As human societies have become more complex, new concepts have entered into the realm of community and communication between them. Among the concepts introduced in modern and postmodern societies are concepts of agency-structure. Each agency-structure has an independent school. In the same way, some thinkers pay special attention to the issue of agency and others to its structure and determination. Anthony Giddens is one of the first thinkers who have come up with valuable ideas in this regard, a contemporary sociologist. For this reason, Giddens will be aware of these concepts in defining agency-structure.

In his view, the agency is referred to as an activist, but not every agency is involved, unless s/he has the ability to influence social life. The definition of agency or action is, in Giddens's view, a form of behavior of the perpetrators, that they are aware of their behavior. (Giddens, 2005: 237) Those who are in charge of the agency have an emphasis on the individual so that they reject all social mechanisms without taking into account the importance and the individual's role. Of course, the concept of agency, although it is considered to be a small and individual level, can also be promoted to a set of actors. For instance, human factors can be expanded, both to the individuals and to organized groups such as organizations, associations, nations, and so on. Definition of structure is also referred to, by Giddens as social systems, referring to reproduced relationships among actors or groups, in which the concept of structure is used in the sense of human interaction. (Tohidfam, 2016: 91) Structuralists believe that social structures are imple-

mented independently of the individual. All political thoughts that seek to accurately explain the dimensions and angles of a desirable society, considering the role of agency-structure, and prioritizing each of them, are of the utmost importance. Nevertheless, many thinkers have focused on issues of agency-structure, or even the combination of these two. How it is possible to integrate agency-structure, and how it is done, has created a different group of thinkers, called communicators or integrators. Relational thinkers attach the importance to the main role of and focus attention to the factors that bring people together to form a community or structure.

Concerning this, some Western scholars, who prioritize the concepts of security, justice, freedom, and prosperity, considered the discussion of the structure merely to address the material dimensions of human life. Of course, some other Western contemporary thinkers, and especially many Muslim scholars, seek to meet both human needs either in terms of material or spiritual dimensions, as well as addressing the concepts of agency-structure in identifying Communities, even if this attention is in their hidden layers of the study, and do not have a clear and direct reference to this attribution.

In the context of the discussion, one of the contemporary Iranian Muslim thinkers is Dr. Mohammad Hosseini Beheshti. Ayatollah Beheshti is one of the most influential leaders during the Islamic Revolution and the establishment of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Its management and strong presence in the critical stages of contemporary Iranian history, especially in the establishment of the Islamic Republic Party, as well as in the parliament and the final examination of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran in 1978, is so important that every research and analysis of

the intellectual foundations of the Islamic Republic of Iran, regardless of its religious-political ideas, is unfinished.

In his definition of the party, and in defining the goals of forming a party, he seeks to reform society, enlightenment and change, and adds that if a party demands power, it no longer gives meaning to the party (Beheshti, 2011: 309). Many studies have been carried out on the political thought of Beheshti and various aspects of their thinking have been studied from a political, legal and jurisprudential point of view. Of course, the complexity of their thinking and their intellectual structure opens the way for extensive research and analysis, but what we are looking for in this study will be a reflection of the Beheshti's idea of the sociological dimension. Our priority in this research will be to investigate the concepts of agency-structure, and the type of priority of them from the perspective of Beheshti. Reviewing this, it seems that a new dimension of their study and thought is revealed. In the remainder of this article, we will discuss the main question in order to investigate it during the research. The main question: How is the relationship between the concepts of agency-structure in Mohammad Hoseini Beheshti's thought? In response to this question, the main hypothesis is: It seems that Beheshti sees the relationship of agency-structure to an interactive relationship, and ultimately the solution he proposes is the relationship between agency-structure below the Muslim biological. It should be noted that the agency or the activist in the idea of Beheshti is a major determinant because Beheshti was a believer in the republican system, and in this system is the principle of the choice of people and the status of the people. The structure also has a significant role in the idea of Beheshti, which has a religious-social approach to structures, and the structure of

the same definition of the religion of Islam, which considers the guardianship and the rule of law to be of God and the believers rightly believes. Beheshti believed that all decisions in an Islamic society should be based on the people's vote, but also emphasized the structures that were made by God for human salvation, and believed that people should think rationally to create this balance or they are aware of what they are doing. It seems that he was trying to create a sort of merger between agency-structure, without any direct reference to this issue.

Theoretical Framework

In the field of specialization, the concepts of individual, collectivism, agency (action) and structure (social organization), sociological theories may be divided into three main groups. The first range of activists can be divided into individualists and collectivists. Individualist thinkers emphasize the primacy and priority of the individual towards the community and then the structure. At first, attention was paid to the role of sociologists such as Lesterwr Ya.A.R., Franklin Giddings, Albuyon Small, Charles Horton, and others in general. This spectrum asserted that the human society was made by humans themselves and that the state was an obstacle to individual tendencies. In this article, by looking at the ideas of two individual theoreticians, Max Weber and Clifford Geertz, we seek a general understanding of the scope of individualist sociologists' thoughts. In the spectrum of collectivist sociologists, we will examine the ideas of Karl Marx and with a little bit of tolerance to George Simmel's ideas. These thinkers, prioritizing the concept of agency, considering collective action to be superior to individual action.

In front of this group of sociologists, there is another spectrum of sociologists that are considered functional and structuralist sociology. Initially, structuralism emerged in the works of Ferdinand de Saussure. The general idea of structuralism is that the superiority and priority of that structure is sought after the discovery of observable social processes through the identification and mode of operation of the structures in the processes. These thinkers have a structure-specific attribute, and this is the limiting form of structure that this constraint and determinacy is applied to the agency by the structure. This kind of view is expressed in relation to determinism. In general, the structuralist seeks to digest in the social sciences. In this section, we try to examine the ideas of thinkers like Saussure and Emile Durkheim, which are in the field of structuralist sociology, and to summarize it. The third approach in the conflict between the primacy of agency-structure is the result of the new thinkers' view of the relationship between these two factors and these two concepts, which intersect in a way to combine agency-structure, and this is the point of distinction between the domain of thought and thought of thinkers. The basics of interactivity originally appeared in the minds of thinkers such as George Simmel and Herbert Mead. Another theorist who is trying to explain his theory in this chapter is Norbert Elias. In the theory of this theorist, he attempts to present a new perspective on this conflict, as it rejects previous views. Elias believes that attention must be paid to the process of recognizing the community. (Henish, 2010: 129). Then the theoretical agreement in Anthony Giddens's sociology emerged in the form of a constructivist theory; however, the theoretical framework used in this study would be an emphasis on the Giddens construction theory.

Anthony Giddens is an influential contemporary theorist. The reason for this influence is to provide the theory of structuration and a holistic look to modern societies. Giddens is one of the best theorists in the composition of social theory of action and structure. Giddens, like Elias, is one of the theorists who opposed the micro and macro analysis separately. In such a way that "society is not merely a mass of activities at the small level, but on the other hand, it should not only be investigated at macro level, since one of them is always examined. This type of micro or macro defect analysis and the existence of this assumption are the confrontation and distinction between agency-structure, which leads to this kind of analysis." (Giddens, 2005: 17-18) Giddens seeks to establish a link between agency-structure, because Giddens and the structure are two sides of the same coin; in such a way that when we look at the process of applying a community, we examine the coin of the activists and perpetrators from the pot. From Giddens's point of view, structures and actions are interwoven so that the level of reason, or organized social actions, in the "time and place", shapes social systems and determines the mode.

In Giddens's view, the actions of individuals affected by the structural characteristics of the societies in which they lived and trained, and in the furtherance of this constructive property, human beings re-create their actions and cause them to change, that is, actions are always in are changing. (Giddens, 1999: 22) the social fabrication refers to a set of basic orders or patterns of behavior in the way people behave and in relationships that they create with other people (Giddens, 1999: 21).

The Meaning of Structure in Giddens Thought

Structures consist of the reproduction of active activists, which at the time and place

have two levels of micro and macro. The process of manufacturing structures is influenced by rules and resources (Craig, 2000: 243). An important feature of social structures is the influence of agency practices. The point is that structures are also influential on agencies (Giddens, 2005: 19). Giddens believes that the social system is structurally distinct. These structures are not predetermined, but are based on the re-production of perpetrators' practices in different time and space conditions (Sediqi, 2010: 152).

Giddens believes that the system is the actors and the commonly used social work that they are organizing, creating the relationships that are being reproduced. The important thing is to change the mode of the construction that produces the system again (Giddens, 1981: 43).

Thus, Giddens considers the dialectical relationship between agency-structure that social structures are made by actors, if the structure of the device and its tools are also the dialectical flow of action, creation, and consciousness flows into a historical and dynamic process in a reflective form (Ritzer, 2000: 511). Giddens, in relation to the structure, refers to two structuralist and functionalist theories, in the form of a structure as a model of social communication. In explaining how this agency works, how does a pattern known in the name of a structure acts in a system like a system? In the explanation of construct, it is said that the interdependence between the agency-structure, which is mutually reinforcing, is said to be constructed. In Giddens' view, these rules create practices (Giddens, 2005: 289). Giddens does not believe in two-sidedness (dualism) between the concepts of agency-structure. As life recognizes the structure of its structure. The structures and actions are interconnected. This tangle of workplaces where Giddens believes

the only possible way to make changes in structures depends on the actions. These actions also produce and reproduce structures. Giddens opposed the overall preference for the structure to action. Giddens sees action as a set of actions in relation to each other, which is also referred to as a continuous flow of behavior. For Giddens, actions have three characteristics. First, they are in the form of unconscious knowledge, and in describing this state of affairs, Giddens considers the subconscious as a human factor. On the point of this unconscious comes from a sense of trust. This sense of duty is to provide a sense of protection and protection from threats, which threatens to create a feeling of hint and fear in the human factor towards the future. The second aspect of the action is tacit knowledge (knowledge of how). In this kind of knowledge, which has acted as an awareness of action, it is said that humans are not able to express it, and this sense forms in another way through the socialization of humans, which is also said to be implied by the program. To be Giddens believes that activists often have implicit reasons to act for themselves to justify their behavior, which is why they hide the action from the perspective of others at first. The third aspect of the Giddens' perspective is the rethinking of knowledge (knowledge of what is). This knowledge is known as the self-consciousness and control that man has on his daily life. Giddens believes that actors have the ability to control and take care of their actions in each act of action, actors and scenes are monitored in a reciprocal manner, which is referred to as a supervisory review. Reactive monitoring operates in a systematic manner and monitors the interaction environment (Craig, 2002: 144).

Generally, Giddens' thought can be expressed so that Giddens believed that there is a model of behavior that people do with their consciousness and, according to Giddens, action has taken place. He states that these are actions that cause people to act, and these are actions that create structures (Tohidfam, 2016: 85). In Giddens' thinking, a structure is a model of social communication, which he considers necessary and essential for agencies, and these actors, who, by subjective factors, create objective social structures that are also obligatory (Ibid: 186). Now, the mental factors that have been mentioned are how to create structures, Giddens considers reproduction of social structures as inactive and considers this relationship to be two-way. He considers communicative action to be the basic element of language and the understanding of communicative goals (Giddens, 2004: 146) Giddens considers language as the main factor for communication. He believes that there is a dialectical relationship between agency-structure, which, in Giddens' terms, conveys them as two-faced realities, none of which exist, as in the case of two sides of a coin, none of which exists without the other. From Giddens' perspective, agency-structure together means. The meaning of this sentence is that we cannot merely focus on agency on our own. Or, conversely, the same applies to the notion that, in connection with this paradigm, we cannot solely pay attention to the structure. In other words, the actions of social agencies are a sign of the structure, and it should be noted that "the perpetrators rebuild their structures by repeating their deeds" (Sedighi, 2010; 155). Simply put, this can be stated as follows: Which, as a result of social structures, simultaneously affects the actions of the perpetra-

tors, in the same way as structures, also form the basis of the actions of the perpetrators. We can also state that this interrelationship between life and the true meaning of agency-structure is intertwined. If we look for the true meaning of these two factors, we won't be looking at the other side alone. Giddens do not have to adhere to agency-structure, but to agency-structure with a two-dimensional relationship (Giddens, 2005: 19).

But given the Giddens' approach to the relationship of agency-structure, he, in the form of an irrefutable, has some kind of implicit priority for agency, which explains why this priority is based on the priority given to agency. Social life might be seen in a series of routine and ongoing activities, which are the human factor that performs it, and at the same time, the perpetrators generating larger institutions (Ibid) are the foundations of the construction theory of social acts that are formed in time and place. Not based on the experience of individual action or any social inclusion model (Ritzer, 2000: 601).

Authority in Beheshti's Thought

Mohammad Hosseini Beheshti, the thinker, we considered in this article, thought-out Islam a ritual and a style for the social life of human beings. Hence, he is one of the religious leaders in the tradition against the traditional Islamists who considered religion to be personal in their own right. A new look in Islam's religious thought is seeking a deeper understanding of the community and social institutions and the extent to which human life is influenced.

Rationality and Ethics

Beheshti was among the Islamic thinkers whose thoughts had a particular order and connection. These thoughts have become more practical in the realm of the ideal Islam-

ic system and society. The main characteristic of Beheshti's thought, which will be considered before anything, is the rationality that the thought of the martyr Beheshti was based on. In considering the thoughts of martyr Beheshti, it should be noted that the issues raised by him in the framework of which tradition of moral research has been raised (Alikhani et al., 2011: 413) are the foundations of the epistemological and political thought of Beheshti deriving from the Islamic tradition. Now, understanding that the thought of Beheshti originated from an Islamic source, we should seek to understand the ideas of Beheshti with Islamic components. These components can be divided into two categories of revelation and rationalism. Martyr Beheshti did not make any difference between reason and revelation, he believed that "a man cut from the prophets has access to only one source of knowledge, which is the same experience and power of his thinking, but man continuously refers to the prophets, to two sources, both his experience and his thought, also the Revelation of the Prophets" (Beheshti et al., 2013; 117).

Beheshti emphasizes that human intellect is an analyst, who, with the help of the analytical wisdom that originated from the knowledge and experience of mankind, can be a guide to finding the happiness of human life. Beheshti considered the revelation to be more complete than reason, which is "the acceptance of revelation as a second source of the fact that this human wisdom accepts a more complete source of knowledge, whose value of enlightenment in terms of decisiveness from knowledge The other one that man receives is higher." (Alikhani et al., 2011: 413)

The Concept and Dignity of Man

By understanding the concept of rationality in the thought of martyr Beheshti, we seek to

understand human relations with the environment and, in general, realize the concept of man and human nature in terms of martyr Beheshti. According to Beheshti, man in his political space has two realms. The first realm of the individual domain of man and the second realm of the social sphere of man. In the individual realm of Beheshti it has been stated that in Islamic teachings the individual domain of man has been assigned to his own self-design and environment, and the social domain of man represents the influence of man from his environment, which in part is partly the fate of man the links are very different (Beheshti et al., 2012: 351).

Muslim Man

According to Beheshti, man is a multidimensional entity based on Qur'anic verses containing different and different elements. In this way, God has made man above other beings. The reason for this is not only because of his physical dimension, but also because of the spiritual dimension that God has placed in human beings. The martyr Beheshti, referring to the Qur'an, stated that according to the test of salvation, God created humans from mixed and different buds of each other. God has provided us with such powers as hearing and vision that man can pass through this test through the help of this hearing and vision, and the martyr Beheshti has drawn from these verses the conclusion that the purpose of human creation by God, human passage of the exam. This concept expresses the important point that God has made a difference between humans and other beings, one of which is the distinction between this power of electrification and the test of human beings. So in the definition of man in the thought of the martyr Beheshti,

we have reached two valuable points here, that, basically, man has a free creation, and along with it with the power of knowledge that he has, can choose to choose (Beheshti, 2007; 55).

Man is the subject of Beheshti thought has two dimensions. A dimension of that were spiritual and revelation and the other dimension that was considered a martyr for human beings, was rational later. From the perspective of the martyr Beheshti, man comes from God, so he is inherently right-oriented. Along with this feature, we can also argue that the true nature of man will lead him to absolute perfection. Then, this multidimensional human being most of all, will have the same characteristics as selection, factor, awareness and plurality. The ideal man must therefore have good qualities and deeds that his goodness makes him right in the cycle. (Darabi, 2006: 4)

One of the basic characteristics of the man in the eyes of Beheshti is the power of free choice of mankind, granted to him by God. Beheshti believed that "freedom in the worldview of Islam is achievable, continuous, and self-consciousness, self-actualization, self-consciousness" (Beheshti, 2002; 20).

Martyr Beheshti believed that to reach the right society, the most important pillar of the existence of believers and free human beings, and institutions that make the space for electing free to humans. His emphasis is on the fact that the realization of such a thing should not be in the text but also requires the presence of external and field effects.

According to Beheshti, the important responsibility for the Ummah was that the Ummah should have sufficient knowledge of their leader or Imam because responsibility is

the main duties of the Ummah. Beheshti on the general points of the Islamic society has stated that "the Islamic Ummah is a professional and purposeful society, and the Islamic law is the basis of the administration of this society, and all people are responsible for the maintenance and implementation of this law and people inevitably. We will do our utmost by creating a broad leadership and executive body." (Beheshti et al., 2012: 451).

The Structure of the Thought of Beheshti

Beheshti has put the best kind of governance in the school system, namely, school-based rule and Islamic religion. The main prerequisite for such a government is the recognition of the school for all people (Feirahi, 2012: 289).

His attention to the party's organization and party actions in a schooling society was another aspect of his way of thinking in the discussion of the structure. Beheshti has considered the party as its temple and has not had the proper role of the party. In other words, he believes that the party should be a diminished model of a society that is based on ethics. Martyr Beheshti, the party and partisan group, have been the agency of the development, discovery, attraction and cultivation of human talents. "Mustafa Beheshti has a major focus on theoretical and practical issues of management and religious leadership in solving economic and social disorders, and he has a particular role for the leader, the director and the people in various situations." (Mohajeri, 1996: 27)

Institutionalism

In the definition of institutionalism, there is no single definition. Therefore, they will consider any action and any thought that they will accept and take advantage of in their life's affairs. But, the other group notes that

"institution: the organized system of social relations." (Keyvani, 2006: 93) Other definitions have also been made for institutionalism. By studying institutionalism from the old form, it has become a new definition of institutionalism, which has considered institutions as structures, organizations, administrations and institutions of government. Institutionalism, in its new definition, will be said to be institutionalized (Lakzaii, 2012: 156). Beheshti has expressed values such as freedom, the power of electoralism, justice and justice in relation to human characteristics. These human values will be created as common institutions in a community. A new look at institutionalism is in the form of an institution as consolidated values of a society, which man must also seek to consolidate values such as freedom and justice in accordance with the current custom of their own society.

One of the Islamic thinkers, Beheshti, has been engaged in struggles and endeavors in the fields of thought theoretically and in practical fields in order to create a better understanding of institutionalism in Iranian society. Among these actions is the work of the group, organization, party and law-making. Hegemonic institutionalism has had a wide and diverse dimensions and angles such as the cultivation and cultivation of man, the establishment of a party for practical and theoretical implementation in Iranian society.

"Beheshti believes in the education of human beings. This means that he is entering the process of human development over the transformation of thought" (155). To create common thinking, belief, and belief among all people in a community has been the main reason for the importance of institutionalism in the practice and the works of Beheshti. In the field of theory in the context of institutionalism, Beheshti has written about the role of

freedom in the education of children. This book has been fundamental in creating a basic look at the issue of freedom in the nascent stratum of a community and institutionalizing freedom of belief in social relations. Beheshti believes in the root work. The preceding sentence means that children and adolescents should be told about freedom of action, and this is a humanoid work instruction. Freedom in Beheshti's thought is a social state. Because freedom, on the one hand, is the ability to overcome individual needs of humans and, on the other hand, the ability to create social reality. But, in the field of institutionalism, it seeks to institutionalize freedom as a social reality. Beheshti has only considered a bunch of values to become institutions, which are gradually, continuously and with training (Ibid: 158).

Explaining the importance of early childhood institutionalism, Beheshti seeks to create a back-up that continually, dynamically and fundamentally strengthens the potentialities of institutionalization and then, these groups will create institutions based on common belief and accept the majority. Then these newly established institutions will recreate human beings. In practical terms, Beheshti has expressed the effort to institutionalize institutionalism, to pay attention, to strengthen and to create organizational working conditions. Such as the "School of Expectation", which is due to the reform of the curriculum and the establishment of a new school as a religion and knowledge in Qom and in the field of practical politics by creating the Islamic Republic Party in the field? Basically, Beheshti believes that the solution to the problems of society is to institutionalize what all the people of society demand in the form in which the values accepted by society are institutionalized (112).

Beheshti looked at the impact of the role of man on the emergence and survival of institutions, which would have the role of establishing the norm and determining the role of values. The same institutions created by humans will affect human beings and their political, social and individual environment. This process between humans and institutions will create the maximum backing of the institutions within that community.

Liberal democracy / Representative democracy

In his ideal system, Beheshti, sought to create a representative democracy based on democratic principles and freedom. In the system of "Ummah and Imamate" we will become the master of the evolution of society, which will control our society. In this society, the martyr Beheshti has considered the basis of all actions taken by the people.

He has had an overwhelming emphasis on individual freedoms and liberty, but the limits of the freedoms must be based on the school of Islam and, in general, the reform of the "school citizen" has been created. The particular task that Beheshti has been pursuing in constructing the word "citizen" is that citizens of this society should be free to participate in all levels of this structure; when this structure was created by people's vote opinion, the structure should also be structurally act in order to promote freedom within the community and, therefore, citizens through the freedoms granted by the structure of electoral capability in relation to their fate. Concerning this, we need to establish a straight or direct link between citizens and the structure of government through institutions such as the party.

Islamic Society, the Community of Justice and Justice

By studying paradigmatic thinking, we have come to the conclusion that one of the goals of a professional society should be to establish the integrity and balance within society. Thus, the main task of the professional systems is to seek to create conditions for the development of human beings within their own society. This same principle reflects the importance of justice. Beheshti has spoken of the importance of the existence of justice in a professional society based on Islam, which states: "Our Islamic Republic has not fulfilled the mission of the prophets until it has succeeded in creating economic and social justice and social justice" (Beheshti, 2007: 14). Beheshti believes that justice cannot have a one-way mode. That is, in order to achieve justice in society we can not reach it only through a straight line, but as a broken line (Ibid).

Beheshti has expressed two principles of guidance and justice, the factors causing the movement of man and the Islamic society. In such a way that they put both of them into the attributes and functions of divine prophets. The issue of justice in Islam can be traced back to the concept of social justice. Hence, in order to establish an equitable society, we must first seek to create such a society, and the reason for this is that society itself can not be a society on its own just because its name is an equally-based society True justice. In other words, "faith by itself does not prevent man from absorbing the various attractions and strivings that human being finds in his life and does not lead to righteousness and truth, in the same way, The Islamic society will not have to take any steps towards the right to devote and to justice". (Alikhani et al., 2011: 427). When the importance of moving towards justice was felt, political

leadership should also promote social justice in Islamic society; this social justice will also come from referring to the Qur'an, Islam, the Prophet, books, tradition and religion. It should be noted that in order to establish justice as it is necessary to have political leadership, the same people in the same society are obliged to help to establish justice and diligence.

Similarly, to the extent that political leadership is necessary for the Islamic society to move the society towards justice, the believer must be humanized and his own self-improvement should be to witness the real Islamic society, otherwise perhaps there is an Islamic society within which religion and Islam exist, but there is no social justice in such a society, therefore, it should be noted that if religion is not in a society, religion and Islam are also fake (Ibid: 428).

Councils

Referring to the victory of the Iranian people's revolution in February 1977, Beheshti, sought to explain the importance of the people's role in overthrowing the Persian Empire. The importance of the presence of the Ummah in the victory of the Islamic Revolution of Iran has been recognized in all matters and in all aspects of personal life and society, which provided the revolutionary movement of the masses. Beheshti has considered the most important factor in the occurrence of this glorious revolution in active participation and the sense of responsibility among the people of Iran. Beheshti's relationship between people and government should be such that the people themselves oversee the entire system. The people themselves must determine the president and other officials. The importance of monitoring people is characterized in such a way, which should be controlled by the "government employee, the

head of the department, the commander of the post office, who, in a remote corner, more than 500 thousand kilometers away from the representatives, the president and the leader?" (Beheshti, 2004: 247)

Beheshti believed that "the councils of the people should be the governing and supervisory of this revolution" (Ibid: 248). The philosophy of the existence of the council from the perspective of Beheshti refers to this principle, which should be supervised from bottom to top. That is, in order to start monitoring and directing the social system from the masses of the people. Most importantly, the councils should not be restricted to popular societies, but also the ability and features of councils in small societies, such as the workers of a factory, companies and institutions. Therefore, the existence of any form of organization and community of humans in any place that is in this social system is a group of people in spite of commons. In every human society, the people or that group should have the ability to monitor the system. That is, people or members of the constituent of any human community can monitor social affairs that have an impact on their personal lives. (Ibid: 248)

The party

Beheshti was one of the scholars of his time who paid great attention to the party and partisanship. He considers the party as its temple. He considers the party to be a necessary political system with features such as dynamism, reform, and so on. In the definition of the party, Beheshti has stated that "the party means the organization. Formation and Formation of Forces" (Beheshti, 2012: 308) and called for the existence of any organization in the presence of" common ideology, common

strategy, common policy, and common point of view". (Ibid)

Beheshti believes that any revolution that had occurred initially shared its common purpose and goal. That common goal for all groups was to change the governance system and change the situation. Beheshti believes that at the beginning of the occurrence of any revolution, since it has common goals, it is not necessary to establish partisan organizations. Therefore, "in order to integrate the ideals of the people's revolution in all revolutions, it was accepted by the leadership." But, when it comes to building society and the continuation of the revolution, this is not very good enough. It is necessary, but not enough". (Ibid)

The party is a necessity and a requirement of social life in this age of human life. As parties are seeking to provide conditions for a group of like-minded and associate, that have worked on party desires and desires? This act of party members has often been to gain the power for both the party and its own party. This kind of partisan work may not only help to correct the system and political and social system imperfections but also create a power struggle and a faction within a political system. Beheshti considers this model dangerous to the parties, and it is useful for the party to be in the path of Islam and the ideals of the political system that shouted at the beginning of the revolution by all the people. By the way that he stated, "we repeatedly say that we wanted people who are thinking and acting in the direct line of Islam and who are interested in the political and economic independence of this country, believe that this society can be stand up and move forward and win victory in the next stages of the revolution, and a set up of an active organization

will be created that can be coordinated and planned "(ibid: 309)

Other reasons for the existence of the party with the idea of Beheshti can be noted in the function of party planning. When a massive social movement is looking for a change in the status quo, it needs to be targeted and planned. This is the planning and organization of the parties that has the ability to make changes. After the change in the status quo, now you have to enter the second stage of planning. Well, then, you have to formulate a targeted plan by well-trained and efficient forces who are looking for a specific purpose. In order to improve the living standards of a community, we must, by doing party work, be able to overcome all the defects and critique of the political system, rather than merely seeking division of powers and interests.

Beheshti has expressed the necessity of forming an organization or party in the sense of the social and historical necessity of human life. He considered the organization of work as a type of worship. (Ghasemi, 1982: 191)

The people alone cannot find the way to their goal without knowing the party. Organizations and parties are one of the manifestations of unity within a community. Another reason for the party's importance is to prevent corruption from entering into a system. As a society in which organizations are not represented, they will be subjected to internal corruption. That is to say, in such a way that interest groups will gather around an individual or a group that has influence, and after that, the criterion of value and choice within that society will be limited and when a society is subjected to a particular null rectification and will not accept other thoughts, currents, and other organizations, will be drawn to corruption as well, and from that point of view, we will see disputes within a system.

Relationship between Agency-Structure in the Thought of Beheshti

The structure of the system (Ummah and Imamate) is based on the school of Islam. In this system, they are people who will place Islam as a lifestyle and a basis for management in their society. Therefore, it can be concluded at the outset that Beheshti believes that it should be the chosen school of thought in all aspects of decision making. Hence, he used the orders of the school of Islam in various fields of his life and how to manage the Islamic society. The school of Islam will only determine the style and the manner of managing community by the will of the people and God.

In such a state, religious democracy can be achieved. In this manner, Beheshti has expressed the crystallization of this democracy in the Republican word system. The system of the Islamic Republic of Iran is a military system based on the sovereignty of the people and its Islamism is also a sign of God's sovereignty. Beheshti has defined this sovereignty in a twofold manner throughout each other. At the time of ratification of the constitution of Iran, Beheshti's defense in connection with the adoption of the fifth and sixth principles of the constitution, which is manifested in the same way, comes from the leadership of the people and the orders of the Islamic religion. Beheshti considered the most important necessities in the management of society and the system in accordance with the will of people, and crystallized this important principle in the name of the system that referred to the Republic. Another important factor in the management of the system is the attention to divine sovereignty. Because of the choice of the religion of Islam, people are able to manage their society in the same way that they want to have a divine sovereignty in all aspects of their lives.

Therefore, the sovereignty of the people and the divine sovereignty will be along, and complementary.

Beheshti's relationship between the two factors of agency-structure has been explained by an explanation related to the connection between the Ummah and Imamate. The intensity and extent of the connection between the Ummah and Imamate in the eyes of the martyr Beheshti is such that the Imam and the Ummah are interdependent and, along with each other, cause each other to move towards one goal.

To carefully examine this relationship, it is first necessary to determine who will serve the Imamate. It is better to remember that the structure does not have the ability to act contrary to the book of the Qur'an and the tradition of Islam. The tradition and school of Islam, as mentioned in the previous chapters, emphasize the will of all people. However, among the general population, those who are about to take root in the religion of Islam will have priority and priority.

Conclusion

Since we are looking for the concepts of agency-structure in the thought of Beheshti, all people will not be discussed with us because the martyr Beheshti built his ideal system on the basis of a school, which is also Islam. Therefore, as mentioned in the above lines, we must focus on the group of people who have formed a group based on belief and commitment to Islam. Based on the ideology of Islam and the principles of Islamic belief and practice, the Ummah needs a leader and Imam. From the beginning, the relationship between agency-structure appears in the mindset of Beheshti. In this way, the prioritization of communication will become appar-

ent with the knowledge of the perpetrators who will constitute the Ummah of Islam and the structure that will be Imamate and Leadership. In order for the Islamic Ummah to get together and make life, according to the orders of the Islamic religion, they will need a leader and Imam, who will be able to make the essential effort to achieve the happiness of his nation. This relationship represented the principle that Imamate and leadership, and in a simpler form, would have a structure in the concept of Beheshti with the right to the Ummah and the perpetrators. Therefore, it must be stated that the structure in the Beheshti's thought is not limited and conditional. In the same way that the attention of the perpetrators in this system of the Ummah and Imamate has been emphasized, the same attention has been paid to structure, leadership, and government. Beheshti for agency has assigned tasks that we mentioned at the beginning of the discussion. So, the agency-structure must both be active and dynamic. In Beheshti, you must be in such a way that, with the power that God has granted him, he chooses to select from when he comes to power, and people will be able to exercise power by his chosen authority. Pay attention, therefore, it can be concluded that Beheshti has been seeking an active, dynamic and reformer society. In such a way that dynamic and active society should be the manifestation of action and reactions, and these actions and reactions are in the form of reform and advisory in the context of structure and organization. The power of electoral mankind returns to Beheshti as the principle of freedom, which is often referred to in the Quran.

Beheshti considers the principle of freedom and selectivity for man, from the way God created mankind. He has paid particular

attention to the electoral power of man, inasmuch as he states that man has been a mixed entity, he has the power to elect to a degree that he will even go from the right to go and go back to the right way. It represents the freedom and being human. Therefore, in the political system whose human perpetrators have formed this system based on the Islamic school, the main responsibility should be the perpetrators. Beheshti has emphasized the principle that the system of the Ummah and Imamate is not predetermined and imposed in any way. Hence, the nature of the system of the Ummah and Imamate from the perspective of Beheshti should arise from the management of the Ummah to the leader of the chosen jurisprudence of the people. Imamate alone will not have the authority to make decisions and decisions for the system of the Ummah and Imamate but, the Imamate based on the school of Islam will be required by the will of the Ummah, so that it can be durable. In the discussion of the manifestations of the management of the Ummah, one can state that there is no choice in the system of the Ummah and Imamate that is not in the will of the people.

Thus, it can be stated that, by introducing such a system, Beheshti sought to manage in a mutual way and use the influence and influence of agency-structure. As it was repeatedly mentioned in the previous section, in the system of the Ummah and Imamate, management and leadership on the one hand, have been provided to the knowledgeable individuals of the school and jurists, on the other hand, Beheshti's leadership has come from the participation of all people have given. Beheshti believes that a true Islamic society was the culmination of a human-centered society, in which human beings within this society had reached civilization. In this society, humanization has been

formed. This man, who will be on the path to civilization, will, unwittingly, also lead the system to the path.

References

- Alikhani, Ali Akbar, et al (2011), Political Thought of Muslim thinkers, Research Institute for Cultural and Social Studies.
- Beheshti, Mohammad (2004), Provincial Leader, Clergy, Tehran, Bogheh.
- Beheshti, Mohammad (2007), the role of freedom in the education of children, Tehran, Bogheh.
- Beheshti, Mohammad (2011), Right and wrong from the point of view of the Qur'an, Tehran, Rozaneh.
- Beheshti, Mohammad, (2012), Party of the Islamic Republic of Iran: Speeches, Dialogues, Writings, Tehran, Rozaneh.
- Beheshti, Mohammad, Bahonar, Mohammad Javad, Ghafouri, Ali (2012), Recognition of Islam, Tehran, Poster, Second Edition.
- Craig, John (2002), Modern Theories in Sociology, Translation by Abbas Mokhber, Second Edition, Tehran, Agah.
- Craig, Yang (1999), Modern Social Theory: From Parsons to Habermas. Translator Abbas Mokhber; Tehran, Agah
- Darabi, Ibrahim (2006). Man and the world in the intellectual system of Beheshti, Weekly Pegah Hozeh, No. 185, 4
- Detailed form of parliamentary negotiation Final review of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, 1985, p. 1: 380-379
- Detailed Legislative Consultations Final Examination of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, General Directorate of Cultural Affairs and Pub-

- lic Relations of the Islamic Consultative Assembly, Tehran, 1364, 3rd
- Feyrahi, Dawood (2012). Leadership and Government in the Thought of Beheshti "The Ummah and Imamate Theory", 42 (16), 287-310
- Giddens, Anthony (1981). *The Constitution of the Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, Anthony, (1998), *the Consequences of Modernity*, Translator Mohsen Sollati, Tehran, Center Publishing
- Giddens, Anthony, (2004), *Abstract Anthony Giddens*, translator Hassan Chavoshian, Tehran, Phoenix.
- Giddens, Anthony, (2005), *Key Issues in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*, Translation by Mohammad Rezaei, Tehran, Sa'ad.
- Henish, Natalie, (2010), *Sociology of Norbert Elias*, Abdul Hussein Nick Gohar, Tehran, Ney
- Keyvani Amineh, Mohammad (2006). Familiarity with the School of Institutionalism, *Islamic Republic of Iran Law Research Quarterly*, 22 (30), 91-120
- Lakzaii, Sharif. (2012). Institutionalism in the thought and practice of Beheshti, *Islamic Revolution Research Journal*, 2 (3), 145-167
- Mohajeri, Masih (1996). Management and Leadership from the Viewpoints of Ayatollah Beheshti, No. 18, 54-27
- Qasemi, Farid, colleagues, (1982), *Ayatollah Seyyed Mohammad Hossein Beheshti*, Qom, Horr
- Ritzer, George (2000), *Theories of Sociology in Contemporary*, Mohsen Solati, Tehran, Scientific Publication
- Sedighi, Behrang (2010). Anthony Giddens Structural Theory: Theoretical and Methodological Consequences and Its Practical Application in Sociology, *Social Research*, 3 (9), 141-167
- Tohidfam, Mohammad (2016), *a Transition to the Third Wave of Sociology*, Tehran, Negah
- Tohidfam, Mohammad and Marzieh Hosseini Amiri, (2009), *Combining Action and Structure in Giddens, Bourdieu and Habermas, and its Impact on New Sociology*, in the *Political Science Journal*, 4 (3), 79-109