CONCLUSION

The present study intends to comprehend the notions of cultural conflict and social harmony from a critical-creative perspective in order to determine the place of the human subject in a given cultural tradition. It is very difficult or rather impossible to give an exact definition of culture. Let us take an example of Love. It cannot be explained in any words since it is an experience and belongs to us which surrounds and shows the connection with the whole expanse of life which is around us. It is so different and unique in itself, therefore it is very hard to define.

When we speak of a cultured man, cultured behavior, a through gentleman, thereby we mean that a person has a refined taste and is often associated with having good qualities. Culture in other words can also mean to understand what his status in the world is therefore it would be good enough to say that every individual will understand the meaning and its importance in their own way.

Etymologically, culture is meant tilling or cultivating and thereby refining “the working of the ground in order to raise crops”. Education is considered an important aspect in the growth of culture. Thus it is also been considered that it is only through the culture that anything which is known is considered to have the highest quality. It is universally admitted that only man has an ethical evaluation and religion and it is the human subject who is capable of enjoying art. It is only man who is capable of ceremonies and rites resulting from his beliefs and magical practices. In short, man alone has culture. The development of culture, at least to certain extent, is dependent on man’s free will and creativity, which includes his desires, caprices, vices, knowledge and ignorance. This implies that man is as much the creator of culture as its product and carrier. Man, when he created a cultural form, reacted in a certain manner but need not be so given his free will and creativity. Man, on the other hand, is the child of a particular age, society, and convention, which we call as tradition. This prospect refutes cultural determinism and consequently, the development of culture cannot be worked out and foreseen in the manner of the natural sciences by generally valid laws and principles, which determine the course of cultural development.

Culture is the boundary marker differentiating humankind from another. There are some pointers which we find in the society and are structured and patterned by
symbols, norms and rules of behavior, which have their intrinsic values. Thinking in such a way helps us to maintain that, there are three distinct elements: (a) The thought patterns of a particular group of people and the cluster of ideas and ideals they uphold. (b) The material objects and the artistic forms which are created and given some values which talks about the traditions and the certain future aspirations. It is through the social institutions that these ideas and beliefs are given some importance and stability. (c) The art forms and the aesthetic objects which are created by the artist’s reprints’ the future vision and how the society is developing and progressing. Since the culture is based upon the values of a particular society, it indicates the vitality and quality of life to the individuals.

In order to understand culture of any society there should be the right and correct understanding of ideas which underlies it. But it is also said that in order to understand the roots of the culture and to participate into it, values occupy the most important space. Since each living culture is rooted in real and healthy traditions which can be further carried on by the development of new aspirations and new inventions. Therefore we can say that traditions are the running thread which join the past to present and carries to the future. However when we talk of the forms of culture and patterns of culture, there is so much diversity for example, poetry, religion and the arts, the sciences and the technologies, the network of communications, needs to be developed and kept as a heritage of mankind.

The above observations maintain that, culture gives us individuality and a credible frame of reference. That is to suggest that the system of standards and values implicitly underlie and to some extent control our action or the expression of attitudes, beliefs and ideas; but contrary to the explicit part of a culture, (fine arts, music, literature etc) there are implicit values, attitudes and beliefs that are experienced as a part of the culture that influences our experiences, feelings and behavior. In other word we can say different cultures have a different ways of eating habits, moral values, similarly there are acceptable and unacceptable ways of saying what is right or wrong beautiful and ugly, right and wrong. Hekman believes that the basis of human knowledge depends on the historicity of human conditions and not based on the transcendental or universal truths.
Defining Culture according to George Simmel:

Simmel has tried to define culture in a variety of ways. In his book *Philosophische Kultur* Simmel wrote an introductory remark and believed in developing a distinctive philosophical culture. Culture, in its own unusual way, brings the elements of life at a point of intersection of subject and object, in this way the concept can be legitimately interpreted in two ways. The concept of Objective Culture include those things which are extended, or to be a part of the way to attain great life of the community and individuality. On the contrary, Subjective Culture comprises of the degree of personal development that has been attained by any individual or community. The coordination between Objective and Subjective Culture occurs only if the former is understood in an abstract sense, means if one assigns to things a detached impulse towards perfection, a realization that they have to develop above their natural limits. The changes occur by human energies and it considered being the only source used by the things for this end. While describing the materialistic content of life ‘cultivated’ we reverse the whole and actual progress takes place within man. But when we try to understand this in a more precise way, we realize that the two senses assigned to the concept of culture are not corresponding. In fact Subjective Culture was the paramount target, and it assess the fact that it has those objective entities which are the part of that of the spiritual process of life.

Therefore there can be no Subjective Culture without an Objective Culture, because a subjective development or state constitutes culture only by virtue of its inclusion of such objects. Objective Culture, on the other hand, can, relatively speaking, become substantially (though not completely) independent of subjective culture, by the creation of 'cultivated' objects i.e. cultivating' objects, as they should properly be understood, whose value as such is subjectively utilized only to an incomplete degree.

Simmel maintains that the culture was a two-dimensional procedure. It’s one side are the free energies plus sake of life which become outlined as well as shaped through the forms of 'objective culture' this is to say the world of cultural variety or the arte-facts that with the passage of period get free of individual human presence. But on the second side, such artifacts and cultural forms were integrated within the
'subjective culture' of the person i.e. this form of the character which was the eventual impact of the civilization.

In this way Subjective Culture becomes the personal culture of the individual. Well interesting fact is that the “coordination or reciprocal interaction between ‘life and form’ and between ‘Subjective and Objective Culture’ is itself rarely ‘perfected’”. Infarct according to Simmel this relationship is marked by conflicts and crisis and understanding 'the disharmony of modern life' is very crucial for understanding of culture. The development of forms of objective culture in some cases is followed by intense discrimination between things (reflected by the variance of labour), abstraction, functionalization, and various forms of domination (like prevalent in the gendered nature of objective culture). By his discourse there was a clear indication about his purpose to develop a critique on the present culture and also recognizing conflicts in contemporary culture. Also, some debate on relationship between morality and culture were zeroed down under the sphere of the “cultural schisms (Zwiespältigkeiten)’ of subjective and objective spirit in which 'culture itself gets reflected as a permanent extension of this division, of the quantitative and qualitative conflict between subjective and objective spirit” (Simmel, 2017).

**Philosophical Culture**

When we try to justify material content which has seemingly no unity we look for justification from the overall intention which overshadows all the diverse forms of content and this internal justification such as intention emerging from the conception of philosophy. It rests on the fact that it’s not just the content which is known constructed that becomes essential for the culture rather it’s the specific intellectual attitude towards world and life which also matters that to for a great extent. It’s the functional mode and style of perceiving things and then confronting them internally that becomes all the more crucial. Another important thing is that it’s not always obvious that what is essential and significant from philosophical point of view should validate itself on functional grounds. Such a clear division between it’s “function and content, between the living process and its conceptual result, throw light on quite a general tendency of the modern spirit” (Simmel, 2007).

This process free the whole process from rigidity though in principle and helps to gets a flexibility and opportunity to widen to great extent without any bias.
counterpart whatever potential table of content. This otherwise would have been unimaginable when individual keep on trying to infer the core of philosophy or metaphysics on the basis of their targeting issues. Only the practical facet, attitude, personality, the deep tend plus pattern of the related procedure were considered as the elements to be called philosophical, then its objects will be limitless from the outset and it’s a common tendency in the pattern of thought ultimately acquire a unity even for the virtually assorted probe. (Simmel, 2007).

Historical experience points out that any rigid fixation of the metaphysical tendency to a given content has led to leaving many cosmic and social areas outside the sphere of philosophical interpretation. Simmel says in the full extent transitory or isolated superficial phenomena should remain outside the influence of this movement. It is generally believed that philosophical process should continue from the universal breadth of existence, but it is rather forced to run in innumerable directions. Like few phenomena’s, interactions or some connections of thinking spot towards the direction that would be actually be a shape of pantheism if it will be taken to the absolute, on the contrary others point toward another extreme which is individualism.

The metaphysical whim was not compensated just at the end of such directions; in fact it brings to light the point that necessity of uniform endpoint is inappropriate here and it creates the illusion which hinders the very purpose for which this integral conception of way and goal was created only a misuse of spatial analogies. According to Simmel if, productive philosopher tries to merge his individual nature into an total comprehensive conception of the world which however excludes others point of view simultaneously recognizing in principle the shift of emphasis in metaphysics then a perfect situation for 'philosophical culture' exists in a widen and progressive sense. He buttress the point that “Even if philosophy also remains in its inner orientation in the discontinuity of dogmatic partisanship, then there are still two uniformities on either side of the latter; the functional one, of which I first spoke, and this teleological one, for which philosophy is an exponent, an element or a form of culture in general. Both uniformities, as it were, are connected below ground; philosophical culture in any case must act flexibly and must be able to see and go back from any single theory of the functional common ground of all theories. The results of the effort may be fragmentary, but the effort itself is not (Simmel, 2009).
The philosophical culture is based upon the assumptions that was prejudiced that getting within or familiar with the things through the control over life the concerned layers of thoughts inside each of its respective development, or trying to give it meaning, must in any case take to a ‘single eventual point’ and essentially floated if it is not supported in the air or when it do not march its path from this point.

The effort to define culture we try to put all intellectualized parts of life, achievements of intellectual as well as practical labor into the categories to which they do not on their own belong by dint of their own objective significance. This renders all these projections as mere manifestations of culture as human represent them like “intensified displays of natural vitality and potential, intensified beyond the level of development, fullness and differentiation that would be achieved by their mere nature” (Simmel, 2008).

The ethical values of life appear to be civilized in nature; when we look at them from the angle of culture, they doesn’t possess the isolated importance which can be measurable from above similarly in the case with the feelings of joy, sharpness and stunner. Infact they seem to be developments of a kind that we called nature as well as powerful intergal content gets surpassed by them to the extent as they become culture.

Initially, it appears justifiable to define impersonal objects as cultured as a reference of speech. yet developed by will as well as intellect which was commonly given above the limits of its natural capabilities was set aside for us and for those objects whose progress in some way related to our whim plus it ultimately arouse and excite our impressions. Talking about the material elements of culture such as cultivated plants and furniture works of art and machines, tools or all books in which natural material was transformed into shapes which otherwise would not had been possible through their own energies, were actually the outcomes of our own wishes and feelings, impressions, and the impact of those innovative thoughts tend to use the already accessible theory of objects. This was precisely the case with consider to the culture which moulds their relationship to one another and especially to them self: influences morals, language, law and religion (Simmel, 2009).

By refining and cultivating objects, which means rising the worth outside performance of their normal abilities that actually cultivate us? According to Simmel,
the similar value-increasing procedure emerging out of us and coming back to us that moves or changes external character and our own individual nature.

A cultural development is not possible in pure formal independence of its contents even though it itself does not identify with the contents. Cultural contents include those forms, each of which is subsidiary to an independent ideal, although at this point they were perceived through point of view of the development of our energies or our being which is beyond the degree seem to be purely natural. The process of refinement of objects, man created their image according to his own energies and cultural procedure, being the supra-natural development of the energies of things, is the expression of the similar growth of our energies. Defining the borderline from where the specific life-content develops to its natural shape and crosses over into its cultural form was not distinct and prone to contention. (Simmel, 1976; 87).

To completely understand the creation of objective rational materialization, we had to keep it within the boundaries of particular sphere of categories for proper interpretation of the universe. The illogical relationship between objective and subjective culture, was the main focus of its concept of culture, will then get its exact place within these categories.

Thus we find that this perception of culture is filled with paradox, in contrary unresolved dualism is the precondition for culture to exist, while on the other hand it tries to mediate or synthesize the dialectically divided poles of existence. “Subjective life, driven toward perfection of its identity, "cannot by itself reach the perfection of culture yet culture is always a synthesis" of subjective life and the contents of life that "presupposes the divisibility of elements as an antecedent". Modernity takes into account such potential confusion which is otherwise beyond our comprehension.

Culture is meant not just for self-recognition, but it also is a kind of adobe place of repressiveness system. On one side culture proposes movement, positivity and possibility; in another side it presents rigidness and restrictions. Theory of Simmel's terms it as quality of cultural paradox, struggle, crisis, or sadness which is there in the conscious level, not aimed at abolishing or transcending it, -as it may destroy culture and its forms but it take their own development as a cultural paradox.
If this is the case, then what does Simmel's theory of culture has to offer us? What can be regarded as its most important achievement? The answer is clear that Simmel perception has opened to observation the dialectical interface that has given a new substance, life, way as well as form to culture – particularly to the modern civilization as a result of fight between life and shapes. Simmel point is that maintaining this fight, was fatal and required precondition for civilization. It is wrong on our part to think that we can find out a way out of this impasse and this thinking is actually the root cause of our difficulties. But it is clear until now that in this new world of ‘created wholeness’ the characteristics identified with life and its forms cannot and should not disappear, as long as objective and subjective culture continue to be the central main players in the drama of the modern world (Simmel, 1959).

- Another specific purport of this project is to inquire whether cultural groups can act as agents of profound transformation. Culture was regarded as an ‘object’ which was supposed to be revolutionized. Can culture now invert this position: from the position of object, can it become a subject and act as a transformative principle in the international world order?

- Simmel's thinking has been described through his various works, often in different forms and but always with the purpose of throwing light on the subject's inner response to the outward stimuli i.e. external, humanly created world of material culture. The peculiar and creative effect of his thinking was achieved side by side objective as well as subjective spheres of experiences.

- In the modern era, this contradiction between the simultaneous "increase" in objective (or material) civilization and the "decrease" in subjective (or individual) civilization has become more evident. This leads us to a conclusion that “whenever metaphorical language suggests that whereas the former becomes more and more refined, complex, sophisticated, expansive, comprehensive, and domineering, the latter in relation to it becomes cruder, simpler, more trivial, limiting, fragmentary, and anarchic” in the face of such spreading tendencies (ibid).

- Simmel talks about "the fragmentary life-contents of individuals" as well as "the insignificance or irrationality of the individual's share" of objective culture. In different words, the materialistic art, artifact and technology that was created turn against ourselves and very purposes for which these were created; in this way we lose
hold of our objective civilization, which attack and sometimes overwhelmed. There starts the negative and aggressive response to it. This duality of culture, along with its "two-faced" character, presented by Simmel through his sociological as well as philosophical issues: How is this opposition i.e. between us and our own culture is even possible? And what meaning it holds for human life in culture?

- Simmel considers this differentiation as such as “an irreducible general phenomenon and category of social life” whose actual place is found in the highly complex economy. But differentiation in no time spreading all over and leads to kind of “growing estrangement between the subject and its products” which then starts invading even the more personal spheres of our day to day life”(Simmel, 1959).

- Simmel's not just talks about opposition of object versus subject, he also takes into account another duality i.e. conscious personhood in opposition to a natural world. The following passage explains this duality:

- “Humans, unlike the animals, do not allow themselves simply to be absorbed by the naturally given order of the world. Instead, they tear themselves loose from it, place themselves in opposition to it, making demands of it, overpowering it, then overpowered by it. From this first great dualism springs the never-ending contest between subject and object, which finds its second tribunal within the realm of spirit (Geist) itself”.

- Simmel further adds,

- Another important specific intention of the present project is to answer to the question as to how cultural identity be elevated to a new theoretical value which would justify a new international set of rights and a new cultural model?

Simmel rejected to consider society "an absolute entity"; infact according to him society is only a secondary phenomenon when compared with the actual interaction of the parts". In this sense, then, society is “only the name of the sum of these interactions ... It is therefore not a unified, fixed concept but rather a gradual one", that is ultimately "merely ... a constellation of individuals" (Simmel, 2017; 162).

Society is what? Simmel says Society survive where different sometimes with one another, individuals for one another, or against one another take part in various interactions. Moreover, this interaction emerges from forces which can be \textit{terminus a}
which includes feelings like love, hunger, and instinct to play etc or another term used by Simmel *terminus ad quem* (acquisition, defense, nourishment, instruction). All these forces all together lead to the unity of human beings which we known as society. In an Empirical manner as such no other unity except for interactions of several elements exists. The ‘organism’ thus a unity as well as that happens since all its elements work in tandem with each other. Society is a unity in the sense that insofar as all its individuals interact (Simmel, 2007).

According to Simmel “Society as an objective form of subjective minds is possible, because of three *prior conditions*”:

1) “The individuality of one another cannot be known by others (Simmel 1959: 343). Hence, one's picture of other human beings is distorted to a certain degree; often it is a mere type.

2) Individuals are not associated completely – they had some "extrasocial nature" (346).

3) "Society is a structure composed of unequal elements" (351), yet every "individual is directed toward a certain place within his social milieu by his very quality" (353). "The objective totality offers a place to subjectively determined life processes, which thereby, in their very individuality, become necessary links in the life of the whole." (355)

**Society and Individuality**

According to Simmel, dynamic issues always exist among society and individual. This is because i by nature individuals was independent and innovative souls; still they were part of this big socialization progress. Simmel was confused and not satisfied with this relationship, as he consider modernize society was setting the individual free from historical as well as traditional bonds and baggage and thus providing freedom to individual at high degree, but on the other side the same individuals experienced a great sense of isolation among the civilization of advance urban life.
Simmel notes:

“The deepest problems of modern life derive from the claim of the individual to preserve the autonomy and individuality of his existence in the face of overwhelming social forces, of external culture, and of the technique of life” (Farganis, p. 136).

“Simmel gave three assumptions about the individual and society (Ashley and Orenstein, p. 312).

These are:

- Individuals are both within and outside society.
- Individuals are both objects and subjects within networks of communicative interaction.
- Individuals have the impulse to be self-fulfilling and self-completing, that is, they seek an integrated self concept” (Simmel, 2017; 123).

In the social world, the above assumptions are realized through various forms and styles of interaction as individuals interact with one another on day to day basis. He believes that they were conscious or innovative beings as well as their mind play a critical role their shared direction and interaction in social life. This originality and imagination provides space for flexibility and freedom to the individual, but simultaneously it helps to develop the restrain and smother freedom in objective culture. These long runs, social interaction gets regularize and develops form to it, or this ultimately become forms of association (ibid).

Further this proven that society don’t have independent realism of its own, still it’s a name given to the “number of individuals, inter related by interaction ... society is definitely not a 'substance,' nothing concrete, but its an event: it is the function of getting and affecting the outcome of interaction and development of one individual by the other." For Simmel, “Society is nothing but lived experience and social forces are not external to, nor necessarily constraining for the individual, rather it is individuals who reproduce society every living moment through their actions and interactions”(ibid; p. 170).

Society is generally understood as an organic whole. In such an understanding and perspective, the basic outlook is in its prime emphasis on society and its inter-relationship with institutions rather than the individual or group. How is social life
maintained and carried forward over years and years despite the complete turn over in the membership of society is an ever deeper issue which has logical and imaginative ideal reflections. Social life prevails because societies find means whereby they fulfill the needs which are either preconditions or consequences of organized life. How do the institutions contribute to keeping the society in operations is another issue that demands proper attention. Different structures and conditions re integrated to preserve the unity of society as a complete system.

Georg Simmel's concepts and ideas about Sociology are presently understandable received with the great enthusiasm by all those who take keen interest in the science of sociology. While Simmel's Investigations are very broad in scope, but his work is divided and incomplete at the same time as it was meant to be like this. He did not want—could not—offer a complete, closed study; as his only aim was to clear his fundamental concept on the issues of sociology through series of applications.

“As a consequence (of the basic conception), it is out of the question to attempt anything more than to begin and to point out the direction of an infinitely long path; and any systematically final completeness would be, at the least, self-deception. An individual can attain completeness here only in the subjective sense, by reporting everything he has succeeded in observing”.

The advancement of new sociology over the old one. Which were stuck with their craze for systems? Against this disapproving of incompleteness, Simmel added the delimitating of sociology as a science in a very fine way. Full credit goes to Simmel for making the indifference clear among the modern trend to look at the objective of different sciences according to sociological point of view but at the same time not detaching their individuality and self reliance, as well as like development of sociology as a advance sciences. Due to the high rational and academic needs of today's time, it recognized today with full enthusiasm “the objects of the traditional humanities (cultural and moral sciences [Geisteswissenschaften]) find their perfection only within the sphere of society”. This method of sociological to be used in the moral sciences was considered to be the most important bequest of the 19th century. The development and growth of sociology became altogether different things. “Although the latter cannot bring new facts, new material, to light, it draws a new line through otherwise well-known facts. It establishes new points of view, new abstractions”
(Dawes, 2013). According to Simmel, “the question of the position of society in the cosmos belongs to the metaphysics of sociology, while sociological epistemology includes the questions like, ‘Is society possible?’ and ‘Does society exist outside of us or only in our consciousness?’

In the biggest volume entitled ‘Sociology: Investigations into the Forms of Association, Simmel justifies his point that proffer an altogether new scheme was not his intention infect he was trying to bring home this point that it is possible to make kinds of generalizations in sociology with lost of example designed to prove it.

Simmel's concept of sociology was, from the very beginning, totally in contrast to contemporaneous to French sociology. The latter was based on those social facts which he assumes possess two peculiarities: externality and restraint. But French sociology traces its roots in traditionally and positively. Another characteristic of it is being anti-individualist and policy making. It has been explained in the following way as “A science which has barely begun to exist has, and initially is bound to have, only an uncertain and vague sense of the area of reality that it is about to approach, and the extent and the limits of that area. It can gain a clearer picture only to the degree that it precedes with its studies” (Fuchs, 1991).

**PLURALISTIC CULTURE**

Nobody doubts that spatial density and the increasing tempo of living have not only thought humanity closer, but have also caused more problems. These problems are not geographically specific they have become universal. They are our problems, so we are forced to find solutions. as such, no particular value, no individual, no single system, no culture is able to confront these universal problems. The past hope of finding a universal solution is given up.

This chapter takes into consideration pluralistic culture with two essential principles. The principle of participation and the principle of communion. Pluralistic culture forms an essential part of our life world and it reflects a new way of living guided by rational principles. It is constituted by human beings in a world of new emerging structure, According to the Pluralistic Culture it is accepted that, in a globalized world, no one is isolated, no one is untouched by one’s surroundings and no one can claim to be fully independent and free. Rousseau had declared in his famous book. The Social Contract that all of us are 'chained’ i.e. socially dependent
and related. But on the other hand, pluralistic culture which Kant fought i.e. for him, human beings are in a permanent process of emancipating themselves from the chains imposed on them, or of getting rid of idols and ideologies (Marx). Pluralistic culture, guided by reason, leads human beings to a state of freedom—i.e. a state in which human choice is autonomous. Although the globalized world forces us to live in a globalized manner, it cannot enslave us so long as we are able to transform it into a part of our life that benefits us. Thus, to live globally means to have many shared needs (wanted or unwanted), to participate in the process of producing commodities and satisfying them and to share duties and responsibilities to preserve and develop our life-world. Understood in this sense, the globalization process means a process of living which requires that all those living in the global world must have common or shared need and interests, and ii, participate in the process of satisfying needs and interests.

Since globalization cannot be avoided therefore our main purpose is how to participate in it, and how to make it fruitful for our lives? Socrates, Plato and Aristotle saw how globalization came into existence. It was followed by St. Augustine and St. Aquinas. It was further developed by Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. Since our intention is to look for the solutions, two principles are preferred: the principle of participation (pointed by Aquinas and principle of communion developed by Gadamer in his book Truth and method).

Participation means an active engagement in the construction of society. Active engagement means preserving, and furthering life. Since man is social by nature, and social nature is defined by one’s own act of participating in society. As such each individual is a part of society, and the more individuals engage in this task, society is bigger, richer and more efficient. Therefore social beings must be recognized as being moral beings. That is why according to Confucius true human being must be primarily a moral being. Kant points out that only participation for the sake of duty to humanity is a true participation.

Gadamer’s views of fusion of horizon stated in his book “Truth and Method.” Gadamer described the horizon as; “the range of ‘vision that includes everything that can be seen from particular vantage point’. Secondly, the horizon is not static, and not even real since the horizon moves, recedes and advances with us therefore it is not the same horizon. Thirdly, the expansion of the horizon implicitly implies a fusion of new
dimensions; situations Similarly On the basis of these two principles participation and
communion here we would argue that a pluralistic culture can be possible, if we
accept that all belong to the same family, that we all share a common hope for a
better world and that we all have the same characteristics that are essentially human
characteristics. Here Gadamer’s views on fusion of horizon can indicate towards the
possibility of pluralistic culture.

Gadamer compared to our own opinions, that they are also not static, we keep
on changing. Our views encompass our old views, just as the new horizon
encompasses the old one. Our historical consciousness is also a kind of fusion of
horizons. Our historical consciousness is not a simple consciousness of something,
someone, or some period. It is a single horizon that embraces everything in the past, ie
our traditions.

Thus we can say that not only our historical consciousness, nor our language
but our practical daily life follows the same way of life follow the same path by
transforming new views new, new knowledge and making them to be our life world.
Therefore the world is not closed or monolithic, but pluralistic, and such a life is rich
and encompassing.

But what I personally feel is that the challenge is intellectual and it has to be
tackled initially on the intellectual plane. “Since wars begin in the mind of man, it is
in the minds of men that social harmony must be constructed.”