

The state of mutual social relationships in which the possibility of the number of a social group, enjoying exclusive spiritual. and material interests under its internal order in a continuous way is guaranteed.

b. Max Weber(1864-1920)

a. Who is Max Weber?

By Jinwoo

Max Weber was born in Erfurt, Germany. He was continually beset by psychic torment. It is impossible to understand his work- without reference to the inner conflicts that attended his intellectual production. His ambivalence toward authority 'in his personal life and his fascination with the topic in his writings, his double concern with rationality and with the ethic of responsibility, his attraction to 'Innerworldly asceticism and his partial identification with the heroic life-styles of charismatic leaders--these and many other themes in his work have their source in his biography.

b. Ideas : *Rationalization as the master trend of Western capital society*

Weber was primarily concerned with modern Western society, in which, as he saw it, behavior had come to be dominated increasingly by goal-oriented rationality, whereas in earlier periods it tended to be motivated by tradition, affect, or value-oriented rationality.

1) Social actions:

Four types of action(traditional, effectual, instrumental, value-rationality)

Action is to be distinguished from behavior in that it involves meaning or intention.

2) Protestant ethic &- the spirit of capitalism(1904,5)

Protestantism emphasized the autonomy and 'independence of the individual rather than dependence on church, priesthood and ritual.

## II. Research

1. Connections

1) Max Weber - Social relationship

Weber's primary focus was on the subjective meanings that human actors attach to their actions in their mutual orientation within specific social-historical context.

2) Social relationship - Social contract theory

Social contract theories seeks to explain the origins and binding forces of mutual obligations and rights in society.

2. Agenda

Part 1) Social relationship - presented by Byung-il

Part 2) Social contract theories

Thomas Hobbes                      presented by Byungil

John Locke                          presented by Young

J. J Rousseau                      presented by Minjee

2001.3.20 Sociology 9521020 Byung-il Oh

**Social Relationship ( Max Weber )**

There are several concepts of social relationship. For example, conflict relationship, communal relationship, open and closed relationship, market relationship, rational relationship etc. Instead of these concepts, I will focus on the definition of social relationship.

The term "social relationship" will be used for the meaning-content by which a circle of persons relates each other and to which their behaviors are oriented. The social relationship thus consists entirely and exclusively in the existence of a probability that there will be, in some meaningfully understandable sense, a course of social action. For purposes of definition there is no attempt to specify the basis of this probability.

Thus, as a criterion of the concept, there should be at least a minimum of mutual orientation of the action of each to that of the others. Its content may be of the most varied nature; conflict, hostility, sexual attraction, friendship, loyalty, or economic exchange. It may involve the "fulfillment," the deviation, or the violation of the terms of an agreement; economic, erotic, or some other form of "competition"; national, status or class community.

Social relationship is always the empirically intended meaning-content of the members in a given concrete case, on the average or in a theoretically formulated pure type. It is never a normatively "correct" or a metaphysically "true" meaning. Even in such social formation as a "state," "church," "association," or "marriage," the social relationship consists exclusively in the fact that there has existed, exists, or will exist a probability of action in some definite way related each other to this meaning-content. It is vital to be continually clear about this in order to avoid the "disorder" of these concepts. A "state," for example, ceases to "exist" in a sociologically relevant sense whenever there is no longer a "probability" that certain kinds of meaningfully oriented social action will take place. This probability may be very high or it may be negligibly low. But in any case it is only in the sense and degree in which it does exist or can be estimated that the corresponding social relationship exists. It is impossible to find any other clear meaning for the statement that, for instance, a given "state" exists or has ceased to exist.

The meaning-content need not necessarily be the same for all individuals who are mutually oriented in a given social relationship; there need not in this sense be reciprocity. "Friendship," "love," "loyalty," "contractual fidelity," "national sentiment," on one side, may well be faced with an entirely different attitude on the other. In such cases the individuals have different meanings with their actions and the social relationship, so far objectively "one-sided." It may nevertheless be a case of mutual orientation if, even though partly or wholly erroneously, one party presupposes a particular attitude toward oneself on the part of the other and orients one's action to this expectation. This can, and usually will, have consequences for the course of action and the form of the relationship.

A relationship is objectively "mutual" only as, according to the average expectations of the parties, the meaning for one party is the "same" as that for the other. Thus the actual attitude of a child to its father may be at least approximately that which the father, in the individual case, on the average or typically, has come to expect. A social relationship in which the attitudes are completely and fully corresponding is in reality a marginal case. But the absence of reciprocity will, for terminological purposes, be held to exclude the existence of a "social relationship" only if it actually results in the absence of a mutual orientation of the action of the parties.

A social relationship can be of a temporary character or of varying degrees of continuation. That is, it can be of such a kind that there is a probability of the repeated recurrence of the behavior which corresponds to its meaning-content, and which is an understandable consequence of the meaning and hence is expected. In order to avoid false impressions, let it be repeated and continually kept in mind, that it is only the existence of the probability that a social relationship "exists" and a certain type of action, corresponding to the meaning-content, will take place. Thus that a "friendship" or a "state" exists or has existed means this and only this: that we, the observers, judge that there is or has been a probability that on the basis of certain kinds of known subjective attitude of certain individuals there will result in the average sense a certain specific type of action.

The meaning of a social relationship may be agreed upon by mutual consent. This implies that the parties make promises covering their future behavior, whether toward each other or toward third persons. In such cases each party then normally counts, if he or she acts rationally, in some degree on the fact that the other's action will client to

the meaning        of the agreement as he or she (the first actor) understands it. In part, they  
orient their        action end-rationally to these expectations, to be sure, varying degrees of

subjectively "faithful" intention of doing their part. But in part also they are motivated each by the value-rationality of the "duty" to adhere to the agreement in the sense in which he or she understands it. This much may be anticipated.

## Hobbes' Social Contracts Theory

### 1. Hobbes' Premises of the Natural State of Human Society

By Wonjoong

Human nature - Man is not by nature a social animal; society could not exist except by the power of the state

The state of nature - No society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man becomes  
isolated, poor, nasty, brutish, and short

Knowledge of natural law - Our Knowledge of objective, true answers on such questions is so feeble, so slight and imperfect as to be mostly worthless in  
resolving practical disputes. In a state of nature people cannot know what is theirs and what is someone else's. Property exists solely  
by the will of the state, thus in a state of nature men are condemned to endless violent conflict. In practice morality is for the most  
part merely a command by some person or group or God, and law merely the momentary will of the ruler.

Epistemology - It is the naming, that makes it so. Sometimes Hobbes comes close to the Stalinist position that truth itself is  
merely the will of the ruler

Conflict - Man cannot know good and evil, and in consequence can only live in peace together by subjection to the absolute power of a common master, and therefore there can be no peace between kings. Peace between states is merely war by others.

## 2. Conclusion of the Social Contract Theory by Hobbes

The Social contract - If you shut up and do as you are told, you have the right not to be killed

Violation of the social contract - No right to rebel. The ruler's will define good and evil for his subjects. The king can do no wrong, because lawful and unlawful, good and evil, are merely commands, merely the will of the ruler.

Civil society - Civil society is the application of force by the state to uphold contracts and so forth. Civil society is a creation of the state. What most modern people would call civil society is "jostling", pointless conflict and pursuit of selfish ends that a good Government should suppress

Rights - You conceded your rights to the government, in return for your life

Role of the State - Whatever the state does is just by definition. All of society is a direct creation of the state, and a reflection of the will of the ruler.

Authorized use of Force – The concept of just use of force is meaningless or cannot be known. Just use of force is whatever force is authorized.

## 3. The criticism to the social contract theory of Hobbes

- According to Hobbes' theory, humans are self-interested by nature, but actually many people have transcendent interests which focus on social, religious or political aspect.

- It is not clear that people who are fundamentally equal in the state of nature would be rationally motivated to attack each other, given only a 50% chance of survival.

- The moral rules arrived at make demands of an agent which go beyond what is necessary for the agent's self-preservation, which is the agent's sole motives for making the contract.

- The moral rules arrived at are only rules of prudence for people motivated by egotistic concerns. Thus it is difficult to call this a "moral" rule and a "moral" theory.

It is not clear why we should consistently follow a moral rule like a prohibition against stealing if it can occasionally violate that rule without being arrested. Further, according to Hobbes's theory, since a person is only motivated by self-interest, he or she would have strong reasons to occasionally violate rules when those rules are against his or her self-interest.

## 4. The Influence of Hobbes' Theory of Social Contract

Natural law theory	->	Hobbes	->	Weber	- Totalitarianism – Fascism and Nazism
			->	Marx	- Communism
		è		Locke	

## About the Social Contract of John Locke

By Youngjae

Hobbes theory was started from each persons self-preservation and it aimed political-socially social realization, but Lockes goal was to deepen to natural right of property, so civil society as the political society which is an artificial system to protect every persons property, further more the order of exchange is based on peoples agreement. Even if it is evident that Lockes theory of the state is developed criticizing Hobbes spirit of natural philosophy, Lockes was different from Hobbes. Locke explained that the relation of power is realized by trust which means people participated in social contract should entrust a specific person with the power and if the sovereign is against the trust the people have right to resist. Unlikely Hobbes, Locke justified peoples right to resist when the government is invading the goal of the political society, peoples right of property, against peoples trust, the government is entering a fight against the people.

Locke explained the natural law as essence, inherent and unbreakable right demand to every person. That is, Locke transformed the natural law to his theory of the natural right. Especially he recognized all natural laws in the same line of the right of property. In other words Locke understood every natural right as inherent belongings of each person which can be unbreakable right demand and claimed to the society and the government.

Locke attacked Hobbes' theory of the nature as every men's fight against every men. Locke insisted that nature is the state of "peaces, good intentions, mutual assistances and preservations of the species." This claim was supported because the natural law offers a perfect instrument of human rights and duties. A defect of nature is that the executive doesn't have any systems like prescribed penalty needed to carry out a statute law so the nature can't take effect on the law of rights. In the state of nature every person have to protect one's own property in full, but duties on the right of property and the respect of other's property are completed under the government.

Locke explained the natural state as a term of peace and mutual aid, further more defined the natural right as the right preceding the society analogize from the right of property, made clear that the civil society is resulted from the agreement of members. He defined the civil right as the right making laws containing the punishment to protect the right of property and the right mobilizing the power of community to enforce these laws, he also said "every this act is for the public good." This authority is born under members' agreements though the agreements were watched silently these are the agreements for every one's own. Because the civil power couldn't have the right except from the personal right to protect his/herself and the property. The government's legislative power and executive power to secure the property are not to survive without the natural right of every person's "transfer to the public", this transfer is justified cause it is better than people's self-reliance to secure the natural right. This is "the first contract to unify people to one society." So to speak that is a kind of pure mutual consent "unified to one political society", this consent is "every contract needing or existing in people to enter or found one republic."

## **Rousseau, in The Social Contract**

By Minjee

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in *The Social Contract*, propounds a doctrine which already had a long history in the struggle against the older view of the divine right of kings, namely, that government gets its authority over us by a willing consent on our part, not by the authorization of God.

The work is divided into four parts. The first sets forth the idea of the social contract, and the various principles and issues associated with it. The second concentrates on the relationship between the Sovereignty (or exercise of the general will), the law and legislators, and the people. The third discusses the institution of Government in general, the divisions of the different kinds of government and how they can suit different countries, the reasons government degenerate and their methods for maintaining themselves. The final book looks at the general will again, voting and elections, examples from Roman government, and civil religion.

Rousseau also recognized the importance of the social contract, but his view of the state of nature was very different from the views of Hobbes. Writing to justify political authority, and to support the idea that freedom is best obtained in a state, Rousseau believed that Hobbes had made fundamental errors. He stated that they had

given men, in the state of nature, characteristics that they would only acquire in a political state. Rousseau saw the natural condition very differently than other philosophers. He believed that freedom was political, not individual, and that people were not truly free in the state of nature, and thus formed a state in order to gain genuine freedom. People, in the state of nature, were unsophisticated, solitary, and independent. Their lives were dominated by mundane routines simply in order to survive, and therefore they were not truly free. Rousseau saw that the social contract was a inevitability, in order for rational human beings to evolve, they were 'forced to be free'. Rousseau's view of the social contract was also very different from Hobbes.

He rejected the idea that it was a once only event, he believed that it was constantly being renewed by societies. In a state, Rousseau identified three separate wills, the general will, the private will, and the will of all. His most famous work, *The Social Contract*, Rousseau stated that only the general will could achieve the common good. However, as people tended to follow their private wills, or the sum total of, the will of all, a legislator was required to "make our general happiness his concern". This legislator represented the state, and it is at the core of his justification of authority. Rousseau saw the social contract as the creator of a state.