CHAPTER - V

GEORG SIMMEL AND PHILOSOPHY OF CULTURE

Introduction

Events falling in a series and taking place due to human activity can be termed as nature, in other words, it is also describes as “as a causally determined development in which each stage must be explicable in terms of the configuration and dynamic forces of the preceding situation, Nor need any distinction be made between nature and history, thus understood” (Simmel.et.al, 1997; 40). What all which is called history takes place, if we consider all that as purely order of events, occurring between sphere of self-generated effects happening in the objective universe, wand this could be informally understood. Except the moment these all elements or any of these are clubbed together under the name or general idea of civilization, the idea of nature immediately proceeds over a very confined narrow particular meaning. Further the development of culture was over taken the development of nature at certain point.

Thus we can say that all this refinement, as the word intends, was not an act of improving by expanding any element which is far from the form achievable through a process existing in unsocial. It was the evolution which occurs in concurrence of opinion with a real internal gist, the excellence of an entity in the context of its own importance, its most insightful impulse. But at a natural stage, this perfection is unthinkable as the process we call natural consists in the simple ‘development of first unplanned integral energies’. It takes place, infects, by the integration of those energies and the new teleological advancement and intervention, but this intervention has to be in the probable course of the entity itself, and this intervention known as culture of that element.

To say in the strictest sense of the word, this implies that only human himself was the actually a tangible or visible entity of culture as human was the only living being known in the world that has strong inclination of an ideal instance. He was 'potential' not just because of his possible muscularity, and also not the circumstance as well as meditation which arise in the mind of an observer, but to simply say it has its own unique language. The things which can be achieved by the development of the soul already exist either ‘as several unseeable internal forms’ or ‘as a notion of
urgency’. Yet if this element were realized unclear, in a segmentary way in any case, a optimistic vibrant notion of direction. Overall progress, either as fate or as capability, was too closely bounded with the subsistence of the individual human being that these two cannot be separated. Only this association possesses the possibility for development towards its aim and purposes that are solely intrinsic to the teleology of this world. Nevertheless, these goals cannot be achieved by alone specially through which we called ‘natural growth’, yet after a particular level it needs a ‘proficiency’, as well as proper process going to be oriented through will. So when we discuss about the ‘cultivation of plants, lower organisms, and animals’, what we mean is only transference relied on the ‘loose analogy between man and other organisms’. “For even if the state to which culture develops such entities is a potential of their organization and is in due course reached with the aid of their own energies, it is never inherent in the same way in the intrinsic meaning of their existence, it is never predetermined in their natural state as a kind of activity, in the way that the perfection attainable by the human soul is inherent therein” (ibid; 42). This deliberation, nevertheless, brings forth the need for further analysis of our concept. Even if it is said that culture in a way is a perfection achieved by man, it is no sense taken to mean that any perfection attained by man can be put under the category of culture.

There are, in contrast, many developments which are achieved by soul solely from inside, or as the form of ‘preternatural relationship ability, or in relation to honourable, erotic or excited human relationship among people’, and it could not be considered as a general idea of culture. “Religious exaltation, ethical dedication, strict preservation of the personality for its own unique task and mode of existence all these are values which the soul achieves instinctively by its own nature or by self-improvement” (ibid;57). People completely concur with our abstract of culture: the advancement in the growth of person’s capabilities was the impact of its physical phase, because of the real innate way of the specific charisma as making it a compulsion the interference of the utmost religious ability to direct his energies. Still, after that it was not an issue of culture diverse as we think.

In many ways culture implies that overall development of human incorporates in itself ‘something external to man’. “Certainly, Cultivatedness is a spiritual state, but of such a kind as is attained by the use of purposively formed objects” (ibid; 42).
Such prospect which was quite external and objective cannot be fully apprehended as to purport the meaning. For example, etiquette, tastes reflected in crucial judgment; the acquiring of tact, making the human being an acceptable member of society such types of culture that lead a step forward and clinging to the process of perfection change these types into actual and ideal spheres which is far away from the imagination of individual. So perfection not just ends up being a strictly subjective procedure, except all it also uses the kind of ‘a specific version and teleological interlace by object as well as subject. Whenever the maturity of the immanent soul do not pay attention to the objective artefacts and also the stage of its progress, then no matter how high the values were make, inside the soul or elsewhere in the outside universe, not just because of ethics to be taken in that particular signified of the culture. It may highlight that why some strongly reticent mortal, to whom it is objectionable that the soul should look for own paragon if not directly then through anything external to itself, can in the sense of hater of culture. Obvious dichotomy existing in the phase of culture that could be used as equivalence which consider to its target component.

We get familiar automatically to name cultural ethics “the great series of artistic and moral, scientific and economic achievements”. In most cases they all are; but this is not because of the moral excellence of them being solely aim, “as it were autochthonous significance. The cultural significance of any particular achievement is by no means equivalent to its significance within its own series as determined by its specific nature and purpose. For example, a work of art is subject to quite different criteria and norms when considered within the sphere of art history or aesthetics, than when its cultural value is involved” (ibid; 43).

Every one of this important series can be termed ‘as an end in itself’, in order to various series comprises of a value which is reflected in direct enjoyment and also in providing gratification. In the contrary, it can be unified with the cultural series, i.e. taken into consideration in regard of its overall importance for the comprehensive progress of individuals in particular cultural community in general. Standing on their firm foundation, all these values are reluctant to be included in the cultural series. “A work of art aspires only to perfection as measured by purely artistic criteria. In scientific research, all that matters are correct results; for the economic product, only the most efficacious manufacture and profitable utilization are of importance. All
these spheres of the inner and outer world are developed teleologically beyond their 'natural' limitations; they thus, of course, become capable of functioning as cultural values” (Simmel.et.al; 1997; 43).

But, as independent objective spheres, these comprise not those values per se, infact follow dependent on the criteria as well as standard resulting of their objective rudiments, not just from the necessities of the main eye of human being. Their inputs for the overall progress of human personality, especially for the cultural ethics, are totally different assorted subject. Their standing in that context in any case is not the same as in the connection to the needs of that particular involvement catering merely to one particular targeting facet of our own lifespan. No matter how beautifully they may fulfill individual particular ends, their worth in our lives as a whole, for our own welfare especially in its fight for development, may be very low.

Simmel asserted “symbolic aspects of society, like signs, ideas, social forms, etc., though created by people and the interactions between them, can exist independently of the individual and can influence individuals and interactions” (Angula, 2016). Direction of perceiving the things, led to the distinction among subjective as well as objective culture. Simmel explains subjective culture as “the ability to embrace, use, and feel culture”, it is the manner in which we establish interactions or state our way of culture and this includes “wearing ceremonial clothing specific to a cultural holiday, taking a picture with someone close to you to symbolize your relationship, or lighting a candle at a funeral” (ibid). This subjective culture would form by individuals, small as well as large groups/ collectives, in spite of all this, these individual expressions relate the social shape of individual in such way that permits them to understand as well as realize the connection. Culture had been expressed, then, impact on the thinking as to “how the individual sees and experiences the world”.

On the contrary Objective culture consists of those targets of culture formed by either groups or individuals when divided from each other as well as takes power to direct and gets on a life of their own. These details or contents of objective culture turn into “discrete object”, sustaining itself objectively as well as independently from the culture or groups that actually make it. As explained by Simmel: “You don’t have to be a part of the culture, or even understand or feel a connection to that culture and it’s values, to take part in the objective culture that spawns from it. Objective culture
can also exert its own influence over individuals and how they interact’ (ibid, 2016). The influence from which thought of Georg Simmel had on American Sociological theory varies to a great extent especially by the three leading theorist and they are Durkheim, Marx, and Weber.

The Concept of Dyad and Triad in the notion of Culture

Simmel believed that it is the social action takes place in various size of the group and it can be determining element in deciding the nature of the group. Simmel actually consider the form of the group, instead of elements of the fundamental interaction. In the dyad, a human relationship which occurs is taken to be comparatively straightforward, in the sense that individual can make them available to the other in a way that sustains their individuality, and any of the party can stop the relationship by retreating from it. There are different procedures that come forth in the triad that modify the shape or the way mutual understanding take place in the dyad. But in the triad, there can be other sort of schemes that “lead to competition, alliances, or mediation”. The triad appears create a group structure which is autonomous of the individuals living in it, but this condition is less likely to be possible in the dyad (Ritzer, 1992:166).

*With the increase in group size, Ritzer observed that “the increase in the size of the group or society increases individual freedom.”* (Ritzer, 1992:167).

“Modern culture in terms of language, production, art, science, etc. is at an ever increasing distance.” This is the result of the growth of the division of labour and the specialization in individual pursuits that is a necessary part of this. Subjective culture is “the capacity of the actor to produce, absorb, and control the elements of objective culture. In an ideal sense, individual culture shapes, and is shaped by, objective culture. The problem is that objective culture comes to have a life of its own” (Ritzer, 1992:162).

“The individual has become a mere cog in an enormous organization of things and powers which tear from his hands all progress, spirituality, and value in order to transform them from their subjective form into the form of objective life” (Farganis, p. 143). This seems quite familiar with the Marx’s alienation, Durkheim’s anomie, or Weber’s rationalization, nevertheless Simmel links it with the city, instead of the entire society, as in the case with another classical writers.
Individual Culture

Although Simmel theories and concepts are quite different from these other classic writers, in the way as Simmel sticks to the individual, to analyze how the individual face the ever growing demands of developing modern society, and also takes into account how the individual personality takes shape in that situations. Simmel explains the way in which individuals reflects his personality is by being separate and by being flexible in adopting ways, modes or styles, “to appear concentrated and strikingly characteristic.” The conciseness as well as anonymousness of contacts in the city highlights the permanent and formidable belief cannot be formed only on the basis of regular and habitual interaction.

In these situations, attaining self-pride and gaining “the sense of filling a position” can be developed through obtaining “the awareness of others” (Farganis, p. 143). This shows that individuals can be little flexible in adapting to some characteristic features which include some fashions and also in their individual mannerisms which perhaps try to make themselves visible exactly “to the point.” It is to be noted that the individual personality was not an alienated entity excluding social entity also; it was totally depend on interaction. A mutual attraction, seeks the reaction of one another, and obtaining the recognition, acknowledgement and awareness of another’s that becomes a inseparable prospect of individual personality. So in that way Simmel clubs united the both aspects like the individual as well as the social, and creation of both depends on the existence of each other.

Objective Culture

Thus Simmel defines objective culture “as having an effect on the individual, but at the same time considers how this alters the development of the individual, how the individual understands this and develops in this context, how the individual interacts with other individuals, and how these interactions form the social life of the city. Simmel concludes his essay by noting how the city influences individuals and provides the opportunities and the stimuli for the development of … ways of allocating roles to men. Therewith these conditions gain a unique place, pregnant with inestimable meanings for the development of psychic existence, allocating roles to men rather than men to roles as the structural functionalist might describe this process. Although Simmel is concerned with the possible negative effects of objective
culture, but he also considers it possible for personalities to develop within these conditions” (Farganis, p. 144).

**Individual and Society**

Simmel explains the relationship between individual and society as to be very dynamic or of dialectical tension — in which individuals are no doubt considered free and imaginative feelings, thus far they are integral element of the socialization development. Simmel himself got quite confused by this relationship, further he determine that modern society which set the individual free from the bondage of traditional ethics and historical ties and thus create a large space for greater individual freedom, but at the same time a person realize the feeling of great isolation and disaffection within the way of urban culture lives. Simmel describes:

> “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 gives the three significant assumptions on the individual and society (Ashley and Orenstein, p. 312). These are:

1) “Individuals are both within and outside society”.

2) “Individuals are both objects and subjects within networks of communicative interaction”.

3) “Individuals have the impulse to be self-fulfilling and self-completing, that is, they seek an integrated self-concept. Society also tries to integrate itself (like Durkheim noted), although the effect of this may be in opposition to individual integrity” (Ashley and Orenstein, p. 312).

**Creative Consciousness**

People do experience the above mentioned assumptions as keep on interacting with each other. Ritzer further stated that humans had a very “creative consciousness”, the foundation of social life is “conscious individuals or groups of individuals who interact with one another for a variety of motives, purposes, and interests” (p. 163) so to say it other words people were aware and are individuals were very innovative and fundamental role plays in one’s mind in this process of
social interaction and mutual exchange. This creativity and flexibility let the space as well as exemption to the individual which he always craves for, but at the same time it facilitate creating the structures of objective culture which may restrict and choke this exemption. That means, social interaction gets a very regular and a specific pattern to it, and these in turn takes the form of tie-up. Irrespective of their content, these patterns and forms, is something which sociologists should critically analyze.

**Society as a vane of mutual action**

The society is not an independent reality of its own, but “society merely is the name for a number of individuals, connected by interaction … society certainly is not a ‘substance,’ nothing concrete, but an event: it is the function of receiving and affecting the fate and development of one individual by the other. For Simmel, society is nothing but experience, and social forces are not external to, nor necessarily constraining for the individual, rather it is individual who reproduce society every living moment through their actions and interactions. Ritzer notes that Simmel disagreed with Durkheim that ‘society is a real, material entity’ and did not view society as merely a collection of individuals. Rather, he adopted the position of society as a set of interactions” (Ritzer 1992;170).

In a social unit individual was considered to be an entity or essential part of the unit, and Simmel makes distinction between ‘a personal self and a social self’. He believes that there is an existence of “no self-consciousness, symbolic interaction would disappear and human experience would just be the responses to stimuli”(Frisby, 1993; 23). Whereas, it is these responses which make our life worth living and these responses are completely subjective but also meaningful — i.e. we try to aspect ourselves in accordance with the reply of other people and these people are those whom they have never met even once.

He made a clear distinction between ‘objective and ‘subjective’ culture. But he raises a very important point in this regard by asserting that this split between objective and subjective in present day times has a very tragic dimension. He further adds in his essay on Metropolis that the gravest of the problems arises with the claims of the individual to maintain its independence as well as individuality for his creation in the context of growing pressure from the social strength, historical ties, outer pressures from culture and of course the way of life at that time. The natural struggle
used to be undertaken by the primitive man for his survival takes a much modified form (Simmel, G. 1950). So in this regard he explains “Objective culture as the collection of rules, tools, symbols and products created by human beings and Subjective culture is what individuals have been able to absorb and integrate into them from objective culture” (Nisbet, 1980). This difference between objective and subjective have always been a key task in sociology and it was George Simmel who finally laid stress on this relationship in relation to special social groups on the other hand Marx and Durkheim has highlighted this difference only in the context of advance human being.

Simmel explains “the whole modern tendency of culture is to become even more objective to man or ever less intimately or subjectively a part of man. Only by objectifying ranks, positions, offices which compose a social order can there be individuals who occupy them” (Nisbet R.A 1980).

There goes the constant struggle against the continuing internal and external pressures of a de-individualizing small town (Simmel, 1950) which led to the great and strong personalities highlighting themselves and over shadowing the weaker ones, thus forming a universal human quality in the overall progress of our human taxonomic group. Conflict not just facilitate harmonious conduct within the group but at the same time provides new zeal, dynamisim and a existent social organization. Simmel believes that to a certain extent of struggle is good for maintaining human relations. It is because of the conflict of objective spirit over the subjective spirit, individual is unable to understand himself in a better way but he always consider himself as just a constituent element of the external objective culture. While explaining further Simmel adds, “The individual has become a mere cog in an enormous organization of things and powers which tear form his hands all progress…and it is the Metropolis that harbors this internal and external conflict of defining the individual’s role in society. Simmel explains Metropolis as a collective and individual to humans in the social process and community and detachment are the two aspects to man's external struggle” (Simmel, 1950; 56). This conflict reflects a very sad side of it as there is till now no option to this theory. These theories were quite relevant in present times. But still there is probability of humanizing ourselves across a period of time on an off day or on a separate from exhausting life of the city.
Simmel reflects on this crisis of modernity and trace it on the basis of inner contradiction in terms and he tries to understand and developing mark of its viable balancing.

Through his studies on culture, until the contradictory breach which he takes "The Conflict," Simmel's foundational describing of modernism as revolves around the tensity between objective and subjective culture. While working among the sphere of Hegel's pattern i.e. naturalized dialectical. He explains “man as a being who objectifies his life in cultural forms, such as technology, science, art, philosophy, and religion, which then demand that life conform to their constraints and standards” (Simmel1976; 253). Beneath the perfect stipulation the form-providing action of human life gets the ability to muster all its externalize conception to be filled properly and also increase the content of individual subjectivity, that is, “the objective culture of things serves the subjective culture of personal development. In ‘The Crisis’ Simmel gives one of his best accounts of the normative grounds of his cultural theory, arguing that ‘improvement of the soul’ is culturally achieved indirectly by way of the intellectual achievements of the species, the products of its history: knowledge, life-styles, art, the state, a man's profession and experience of life - these constitute the path of culture by which the subjective spirit returns to itself in a higher, improved state" (Simmel1976; 253).

Simmel's cultural theory is based on the actual result of ‘triadic relation of form creation’ – ‘objectivized form’ – ‘form appreciation’, which works appropaitely as a self-generating and self reward procedure by which human products enter the lives of their creators in order to enrich and enlighten their lives too. Simmel's description and analyses of various concepts and his related criticisms of culture all marks his normative ideal, thus reflecting on the different paths through which the reciprocity between “the three moments of the fundamental dialectic is broken in modern life” (ibid). Sometimes this question is raised as “Had Simmel followed in Hegel's footsteps he would have endeavored to show how the idealized dialectic of culture was the actual form of historical development, but his deepest insight into human life was that the three terms of the relation were inherently unbalanced” (Weinstein and Weinstein, 1999). "The Crisis" integrates the Simmel's sad sensation of culture by clubbing untidily his min lines of statements by asking the question on the objective culture of modern day society is not able to cater to the needs of the individual's personality development. His influential point is that the
‘form-giving activity’ keep on perfecting its objective innovation infinitely by creating the distinction between both the independent cultural region, that further progressed in accordance of their own internalized rules, and by creating ever more ‘intensive and extensive means’ to accomplish these norms. In this process, bounded individual subjectivity continues stick to its normal limits as well as end up becoming “progressively incapable of assimilating and appropriating the vast array of cultural objects for its own perfection, and increasingly lost within the jungle of means to the point at which it even loses sight of its native goal”(ibid). The tragedy of ‘impoverished subjectivity’ encountering an ‘overpowering objectivity’ was further stretched through ever increasing needs for service that all the area of objective culture put on mortal spirit. Objective culture, instead of helping someone according to the norms as it is supposed, turns into an ‘oppressive master of subjectivity’ in the development of history. As per Simmel there was no escape from this sad situation or to say crisis, which is firmly based in the relation between the “indefinite perfectibility of objective culture and the inherent limits of individual subjectivity: the highly developed objective culture is in a state of chronic crisis” (ibid).

The future crisis was takes place in exhausting issues inside the person among the pressures of objective culture and the resistance of the self for its own expressing life in their own way. The peculiar response of subjectivity to deep crisis is ‘defending and preventive’, that is, to take a back step within an unconcerned position and to restrict loyalty to targeting aims. These aims become devoid of any meaning that they once probably had for entire person life as well as different pathologies come to the forefront like “the equation of technological with cultural progress, overt covetousness and craving for pleasure, and a desire for money that far exceeds the desire for the things it can buy” (ibid). Subjectivity makes itself irrelevant like a shield and protective mechanism opposed to the pressures of the objective soul, which endure by a sense of uselessness instead of taking care of its own individual enrichment. This also makes a beginning towards more optimistic opposition like warfare, which gives an intervening ending to the group endurance throughout modernism, and life which he explains in "The Crisis" was actually a battle to attain subjective culture in the era of washed out kind. Warfare, according to Simmel, was a time being recovered by vigor and sincerity in the continuing like uselessness as a consequence of having no practical result, and between the middle of all this
desolation it may express to them how their norms and sentiments had been turned upside down by their antipathy over the ever expanding needs of a segmented objective culture. On the contrary, modernism was the other utmost pathology of peaceful time of the life, the self-contradictory resist the indigent subjectivity, the triggering like ‘fatal cultural disease’.

While his essay arrives at a conclusion by making an affirmation that the "chronic crisis" was even more progressed objective culture which cannot be inverted over a longer period of time, Simmel (1976a:265) in spite of all this nurture a desire of that inclination of such a culture to "disintegrate into futility and paradox" were recurring that can be controlled through "the fundamental dynamic unity of life". According his thought the "concept of life now seems to permeate a multitude of spheres and to have begun to give, as it were, a more unified rhythm to their heartbeat. Simmel here buttress the point that the form-giving activity of life, has its own thoughtful integrity, its own inherent pre-intellectual and self-preservation and self-renewing direction”(Simmel, 1976a:263). Culture crisis leads to the depletion of variety as well as “its pathological manifestations are the currents of modernism which attempt to dispense with form only because they are unable to create it” (ibid). In fact, "The Crisis" life or form are captured a stress against one another it called "process of interaction" – “they are not antithetical forces, but are defined reciprocally in terms of the polarity flux and fixed, each one a necessary moment in the totality of the life process. The real antithesis here, as it is through all of Simmel's work from The Philosophy of Money until The Conflict of Modern Culture, is between objective culture (objectivized form) and subjective culture (form appreciation). Life itself as form liberal action is not problematized and, thus, can be dogmatized, can remain a repository of hope for spontaneous renewal, encircling the tragic opposition between the two cultures” (ibid). In "The Conflict," nevertheless, the tilt switch suddenly and Simmel tries to problematize the connection of form-giving activity with objectivized kind, thus leaving the remaining leftovers of his “metaphysical optimism and opening the door to postmodernist perspectives on culture. He gets rid of the waiting game of the interregnum and enters the age of radically contradicted life” (ibid).

Simmel’s perception of his dialecticism of "form creation - objectivized form - form appreciation" ruled over his integral matured rational progress, simply he laid stress on various tensions inside their dialectical sphere around a period of time.
While reaching in the mid of his carrier (1900-1910) he got more attentive about the fight between “objectivized form and form appreciation”, raising an argument that the objective culture of things had been inverted the capability of someone to integrate it into a fulfilling and cheering subjective culture of individual enrichment. He did not paid heed to the moment of form-giving life; during this period ending up turning it into an unanalyzed ground and which used to take for given the "chronic crisis" of that much developed objective modernize culture. But in his former articles, nevertheless, a momentous switches their focus and noticed which ends to the "The Conflict of Modern Culture." Meanwhile in the his introductory stage of thinking process, objectified form were the central character taking overpowering sort of form admiration, which then took on a number of “compensatory and defensive measures to maintain some semblance of integrity, in his thought during the War period the form-giving activity of life itself becomes the protagonist, seeking to deconstruct objectified form; to capture it, assert sovereignty over it, and assimilate it into itself”. Gradually the interest of subjective culture in his thought fades away with time, as it had turned into something anachronistic, as well as innovative energetic faces its products in the absence of intervention of the admirable culture: “creative life itself tries to become the self-sufficient appreciator of itself, of its own creativity” (Weinstein and Weinstein, 1999).

Simmel started the "The Crisis of Culture" through explain the culture subjectively for "the improvement of the soul attained indirectly through the intellectual achievements of the species. The ground shifts decisively in ‘The Conflict’, which he initiates with the reflection that we speak of culture when the creative dynamism of life produces certain artefacts which provide it with forms of expression and actualization, and which in their turn absorb the constant flow of life, giving it form and content, scope and order (Simmel, 1976b:223). Culture is here primarily a product of creative life, not an object of appreciative life. In light of this new focus the site of the conflict of culture moves to an antagonism between creativity and its creations” (ibid).

Accordant to Simmel “form-giving life produces objectivized forms which have their own logic and laws, their own significance and resilience arising from a certain degree of detachment and independence vis-a-vis the spiritual dynamism which gave them life” (1976b:223). The autonomy of objectified
appearance completely detached through the life which forms the foundation of cultural theory. Such elements shaped by the life procedure condition in total contrast of it expecting that the process restrain itself within them. Life being an innovative and creative activity, thus, at once part its way from them and expects to stimulate various forms and ways to carry itself. Objectivized variety importantly shifts and became antagonistic to life, and that take the form of cultural history through endlessly producing and restricting a chronological sequence of forms, and none of these can all time completely gratify “its restless and multifarious drive for self-expression”.

History of religious life, that also becomes cultural history, seems to have no formal integrity and sense. According to Simmel yet it is not able to attain “an intelligible crisis in the twentieth century”. Still in the contemporary era, culture issues had been refused through the substitution of one form of objective by other, as all the meaning boasts of dominating obeisance as “an objective imperative and then giving way to others after a struggle. Interestingly during the nineteenth century a very peculiar and far-flung eruption occurred within modern culture: life started to take itself as its own object of meaning, first in the thought of such philosophers as Schopenhauer and Nietzsche and then in every region of culture; that is, life at last understood itself as the generator of all of the forms to which it had pledged obedience and could no longer tolerate subservience to objectivized form which it knew to be its own product” (Simmel, 1986; 45). In the early of 21 century cultural social movement entered into the procedure that not only wanted to remove ripened forms with new ones, also protested against the compliance to any objective demand: “We are at present experiencing this new phase of the age-old struggle, which is no longer the struggle of a new, life-imbued form against an old, lifeless one, but the struggle against form itself, against the very principle of form” (Simmel, 1976b:225) in this era want to come-out from the boundaries of the "cultural pessimism of much of his generation”. Now he was end up the rendition of modern history by the depletion of form but led to the discovery of the rebellion of life, toward which he feels a mixed feelings or emotions. So, in Simmel's theory of culture he depicts "The Conflict" was always regarded as an facet of that ambivalence.
Analyzing the development of concept of Tragedy in Simmel’s Modern Culture

Simmel expressed modernity as a created the limits for a promising atmosphere through which an individual can turn into group by the process of civilization still restrict unicity of his inner self from being drastically modified (Simmel, 1950: 411). Acquaintance or bonding to the ethnical conception, even if they were representative of culture and working services, stimulates a strong feeling of community group. However, with time, cultural differences become clearer, traditional meanings and understanding of the concepts starts disappearing and a opposite effect starts landing upon the modern era. The newly created vacuum was tried to be filled with numerous ‘hollow combatants’ that triggers cultural tragedy (Simmel, 1950: 411).

Objective and Subjective Culture

Simmel’s in his study stated the basic argument occur in the metaphysical universe, where we start to comprehend the complexity and variety of subjective and objective culture. This issue becomes the center of attraction that must be truly taken to consideration that different kinds of progress and development of life actually occur from crossing above the limits. A social group who actually wants to show its position must be trained to go beyond the institutional and social ends (Anton, 2013: 173). These assumptions are based on the fact that the inter-relations of subject and object which reflects itself by cultural pattern try to reach up to a “highly developed level of refinement, specialization, and organization” (Simmel, 2004: 296). Simmel afterward tried to give explanation that subject and object maintain between them appropriate period that give space for their individual progress. (Simmel, 2004: 451-52). While elaborating on the essence of objective culture, Simmel (2004) stated that, “Objective culture is the historical presentation or more or less perfect condensation of an objectively valid truth which is reproduced by our cognition. This is to say that an objective culture is perpetually in cultivation as individuals experience and learn from these experiences. The discrepancy, however, is conceived through the imbalance between the two” (Simmel, 2004; 457).

Objectivity and Subjectivity as leading fundamentals to guide in one’s individual life may appear to be a bit theoretical; nevertheless, Simmel’s constantly highlights the issue of logical philosophy. An individual confronts a innumerable
“both blatant and subliminal messages on a daily basis”. A piece of information which is chosen to enrich were actually play a great role in one’s life. What can be learnt from Simmel’s writing was that it was important to remain aware with the impacts as well as implications liked “Money, media, institutions, popular ideology, and the environment have on your identity” (ibid). Concluding in a very humorous way at the calamity of culture by citing some other instead of thoughtful thinker, Friedrich Nietzsche, he explained, “…And if thou gaze long into an abyss, the abyss will also gaze into thee” (ibid).

**Relevance of Simmel in present day Globalization Era**

In to-days time Georg Simmel’s writings and theories and concepts have triggered off great attention than he previously did. This new found attention raise a very important and interesting question “why does Simmel re-earn an academic legitimacy in the current social context?” this can be due to the Simmel’s critical analytic thinking of the concepts “group expansion” as well as “enlarged social circles” which could clubbed untidily in the present day whim of “globalization” as a logical account of present social universe (Simmel 1971, 251-293) and a thoughtful comparison has been formulated by Simmel such as “the transformation of social bonds”, “collective individuality”, “individuation of the economic sphere”, plus “empiric observations on globalization in the 21 century”. In other words, the questions arise is: “Is the idea of group expansion relevant to the transformations we can observe in modern societies?” In this regard Roland Robertson’s assertion can be relied upon which goes on like this: “in case of Simmel, we can see that his relative detachment from social matters per se […] in the frame of his concern with forms of life in general led to the production of ideas, which are relevant in theoretical terms with the concept of globalization” (Simmel, 1992; 24). What he meant by this does that relational access sociology by Simmel help in the better understand the sequence of progression of group in society in a very appropriate way. It was considered as Simmel’s greatest contribution for today’s world which needs to be discussed in thorough and adequate manner.

**Defining “Globalization” in contemporary terms.**

First we need to understand what globalization is and what it stands for? Sheila L. Croucher explains globalization as the procedure of modification,
transmutation and linking of localized and regional development to global ones (2004). This could be understood as a procedure by which the people of the universe together becomes a part of a single society plus mapping as a single unit and Robertson calls this process as the “crystallization of the entire world as a single place”. This procedure was a result of coming together of movements which may either be economic, social, cultural, technological, or political. Focus is mainly on two kinds of movements: first one was being the economic movement which takes place through the flow of cash economy and the second being socio-cultural one arising as result of the metamorphosis of social alliance. Simmel has dealt with these two movements in a great detail. The interesting fact is that he does not completely fix a time or a paradigm to figure his theory which gives enough space to rearrange his aim in the context of 21 century so that an interesting though provoking understanding of globalization can be attained. This has been explained by analysis the affect of secular dynamisms on group enlargement and then hard to take hold of the movement within sphere of social bonds in Simmel’s work. Simmel’s theory has gained a visionary-ness as it has been studies in the background of two emerging global phenomenon: the economic globalization and the cultural one.

Exploring Monetary Economy and Economic Globalization in Today’s World through Simmel’s Work

Simmel explained in detail the process of monetary economy in order to put some light on the passage from “insular economic circles” to “a large group interconnected and interdependent ones”. The existence of money exchanges instead of payment to be made in sort take recounting “into unboundable distances” (1971, 276). Some unique characteristic of money, for instance ease of its transit plus global interchange, make trade relations easy to be maintained beyond the home social circle and hence widening the single circle into a unified economic circle. According to Simmel, “this gathering has three effects: the creation of interpenetrating interests, of complementary sectors of productivity and of similar practices. In other ways, it creates a uniformization of social practices, interests and hierarchies and a flattening of the world which are two consequences very often mentioned as features of globalization” (Saint Bris, 2009; 32).

The second very important point raised by Simmel on cash economy describes the circulation of ‘monetary means of exchange’ makes clear the differentiation of
individuals as well as fastening of the progress of their own peculiar personality (as they become much specific and different from each other) also the individualization of their actions (which happens all over the section of the labour process and the specialization of out-put procedure). It is commonly believed that cash wages leads to more independence in general and independence of movement in particular. But at the same time this process also put the individuals in a free competitive market (Simmel names it “liberal economy”) in which they struggle hard for a high salary and finest working situations thus leading to a condition called Survival of the fittest. So the natural adaptations that take place because of this configuration is actually the ‘specialization of functions’ and to a great extent individualization/differentiation of every one involvement in the economy.

Therefore the circle of economy can expands and it keeps on putting individuals together in an ever expanding circle, which so soon consists of interdependent individuals that in their own way are all different from one another but also simultaneously require each other. This economic expansion leads to a group expansion that keeps on adding progressively individuals, because “differentiation and individualization resulting from the adjustments to monetary economy loosen the bond of the individual with those who are most near in order to weave in its place a new one – both real and ideal- with those who are more distant” (Simmel 1971, 256). This procedure of integrations almost everyone in the monetary policy was most important especially in the context of present day economic globalization, which assimilates every one into an ever widening group –revolving around economic interests –all over this global sections of labor which is in a way the ‘broadest form of specialization and social differentiation’.

Simmel and Cultural Globalization.

Simmel explains the concept of group behavior in their study by conceptualizing two groups – M and N – that are actually “sharply distinguished from one another both in characteristic attributes and in opposing systems of shared belief”. When he puts them into the increasing competitive context as a result of rise of monetary economy, he highlights that both groups will have to become specialized in their own respect to “compete for a livelihood” (Simmel, 1971, 252). So he tries to explain that in other social organization M and N can exist individual from each other as well as no need to come into contact with each other often but on the competitive
market they start differentiating even more from one another and as a result the frequency of their interactions also start increasing. With the objective of explaining what they are, they start pointing at what they actually are not. Nevertheless, “this intensified differentiation process” has to face one great hindrance which is “there are not many different fundamental human formations upon which a group can build and it can only slowly be increased” (Simmel 1971, 252). Hence, in a society consisting of increasing number of interactions between M and N, the number and frequency of human fundamental formations also rises in both groups. They were bounded to have something in common, plus they give rise to “structures in one group that have their equivalent in the other group” (Simmel, 1971, 252).

Last but not the least types of social differentiation turn into something familiar and we can say M and N’s social organizations are quite identical. All social groups end up having the similar targets, the same restrictions or similar hierarchies. Infact “deviation in all directions from what had thus far been the prevailing norm in each group complex must necessarily result in a likening between parts of the two complexes” (1971, 252-253).

In present time, globalization in cultural is defined in the following manner: “the transmission of culture globally facilitated by the movements of people, objects, signs and symbols. This process identifies well with Simmel’s deep analysis of socio-cultural transformations. In fact the rise in differentiation will turn up to a likening between the first social complex (the one resulting from M and N relations) and the second one (resulting from X and Y relations). Thus the social world moves towards a global likening, which entails the creation and the transmission of a global culture (an aggregate of particular group differentiations on the basis of common human fundamental formations). This can actually be empirically verified throughout the process of regionalization within globalization: if, on the one hand, M and N were the countries of South America, and on the other hand, X and Y the ones of Southeastern Asia, we could notice how M and N first tried to differentiate one from another (due to their geographic proximity) and so did X and Y before creating a third social complex (as a result of the likening of each social complex)” (ibid; 257).

The new scenario of globalization was complex and it reflected these days in various trade organizations and trade agreements that in reality consist of a common socio-cultural basis that takes place from last transactions and encounters. Such trade
organizations were actually a part of cultural globalization; then it turn into factors of the group enlargement all by the relationships they have maintained among one another, it keep the procedure of differentiation on a large global scale.

**Importance of Relational Approach to Globalization**

The above scenario to a great extent explains “how group expansion through the means of social differentiation and increasing individualization is an explanation of the phenomenon of globalization experienced nowadays” (Saint Bris, 2006; 33). However there is another approach which can be of great importance in understanding the globalization in a more critical way and this approach is relational approach which was clearly sum-up here: “the relational, transactional approach embeds the actor within relationships and stories that shift over time and space and thus precludes categorical stability in action” (ibid;32). Infact Simmel reminds us of the fact that it is the ongoing dynamics taking place a result of relations between individuals that give birth to the social movement of differentiation and thus a “need and an inclination to reach out beyond the original spatial, economic, and mental boundaries of the group and, in connection with the increase of individualization and concomitant mutual repulses of group elements, to supplement the original centripetal forces of the lone group with a centrifugal tendency that forms bridges with other groups” (Simmel, 1971, 253). Hence it was clearly depict that the getting rid of social limitations as well as the producing an interlinked social universe that exists and sustains itself in a *global society* is possible only as a impact of human relationships, a unique dynamical that produces strength and radically modifies the whole social word.

The gravest problems of present day life result from the hue and cry of the individual to maintain and preserve “the autonomy and individuality of his existence in the face of overwhelming social forces, of historical heritage, of external culture, and of the technique of life” (ibid). The encounter of primitive man which he used to have with nature on daily basis for his bodily existence takes its modern form in its latest modification. In the 18 century gave a voice to man to get rid of all the historical bonds of the state as well as of the religion, also in morality and in economics. It is believed that man's characteristics, which is primarily nice and general to all should be allowed to progress without any hindrance. Besides this individual liberty, the nineteenth century give rise to the demand of the “functional
specialization of man and his work‖; this specialization makes the comparison between one individual with another almost impossible and at the same time made each of them essential part to achieve the highest possible goal. So it was observed that this specialty made every one more and more dependen upon the auxiliary actions of others. This complexity raises a billion dollar question: “how the personality accommodates itself in the adjustments to external forces” (Simmel, 1950; 419).

With its complex crossing of the street, and equally or infact more complex and multiple economic, professional and social life, the city sets itself in complete contrast with small town and rural life especially in the context of sensorial basis of psychical life. The metropolitan city life takes away from man who stands as a diacritical fauna, a peculiar amount of cognizance relative to rural life. The rhythm of life in cities becomes very fast but “sensory mental imagery flows more slowly, more habitually, and more evenly”. Exactly in this connection the highly complex quality of metropolitan psychic life can be understood to certain extent. In contrast to small town life which is basically based on deep felt emotions and relationships?

“In order to accommodate to change and to the contrast of phenomena, the intellect does not require any shocks and inner upheavals; it is only through such upheavals that the more conservative mind could accommodate to the metropolitan rhythm of events. Thus the metropolitan type of man—which, of course, exists in a thousand individual variants – develops an organ protecting him against the threatening currents and discrepancies of his external environment which would uproot him. He reacts with his head instead of his heart. In this an increased awareness assumes the psychic prerogative. Metropolitan life, thus, underlies a heightened awareness and a predominance of intelligence in metropolitan man‖ (ibid; 422).

Metropolitans had always been regarded as the centre of the economy. The multiplicity and intensity of economic exchange leads to increasing significance of means of exchange which the meagerness of rural mode of business could have never permitted. Another interesting fact is that money economy and the supremacy of the intelligence are closely interlinked. They share a “matter-of-fact attitude” which is actually used with things; and with men throughout this nature; a formalized justice is often clubbed with a thoughtless insensibility. The intellectually high and sound
person is unaffected to all genuine individuality, as relations, associations and reactions resulting from it cannot be ruled out with reasonable logics.

Money is significant only to what is common for all: “it asks for the exchange value, it reduces all quality and individuality to the question: How much? All intimate emotional relations between persons are founded in their individuality, whereas in rational relations man is reckoned with like a number, like and element which is in itself indifferent. Only the objective measurable achievement is of interest. Thus metropolitan man reckons with his merchants and customers, his domestic servants and often even with persons with whom he is obliged to have social intercourse” (ibid; 423).

At this point of intellectuality was in sharp in the contrast life and to the small circle in which the basic knowledge of individuality becomes inevitable and this leads “to a warm tone of behavior, a behavior which is beyond a mere objective balancing of service and return. In the context of the economic psychology of the small group it is of utmost importance that under primitive conditions production serves the customer who orders the good, so that the producer and the consumer are acquainted” (ibid;422).

The advance metropolis hence, provided supply with almost completely through the output of the market, that is completely strange purchasers who never in person enter the arena of the producer and his sphere of imagination. The ambiguity turns the involvement of company to attain an “unmerciful matter-of-factness; and the intellectually calculating economic egoisms of both parties need not fear any deflection because of the imponderables of personal relationships”.

Through money economy days of almost everyone gets filled with “weighing, calculating, with numerical determinations” with a decreasing of qualitative values than quantitative ones. The calculative character of money brings accuracy, a kind of sure thing in the defining the individuality as well as the differences, non agreement in treaties and arrangements in the realms of life-elements. The money defines all qualitative differences of things in context of "how much?" Money, inspite of its colorlessness and indifferent attitude, turns to be the uniform denominator of all values; in the process, it takes out the actuality of things, individualism, peculiar value, and non-comparability.
In large cities it is considered as the basic center of the money changing which highlights the purchase ability of products in a more impressive way compared to smaller localities. This is the reason that the cities were always considered the main center of the blasé attitude. So in the blasé attitude the compactness of human beings or the things triggers their nervous system to its greatest possible extent so that it achieves highest goal. Only by this quantitative intensification of the similar situation factors this attainment was metamorphosed into the stark opposite and seems in the specific alteration of the blasé attitude. Throughout this phenomenon the nerves find in the negation a kind of reaction to their stimulation the only possibility of adjusting to the contents, elements and forms of metropolitan life. “The self-preservation of certain personalities is brought at the price of devaluating the whole objective world, a devaluation which in the end unavoidably drags one's own personality down into a feeling of the same worthlessness” (ibid; 413).

This type of existence had to be fit in such reality for him-self also for his-self preventing so that it can deal with the huge city demands from him which is also in a way negative behavior but in a social nature. This sort of mental attitude of residents of metropolitan especially towards another it may assign, from a formalized point of view, as reserved. If large number of internal reactions were responses to the actual as well as continuous external contacts with numerous people belonging to the small town, where there is close proximity among the people and where one has a very positive Connection to almost everyone, one would in a complete way be immersed internally and this will lead to an unimaginable psychic state. To add further:

“Partly this psychological fact, partly the right to distrust which men have in the face of the touch-and-go elements of metropolitan life, necessitates our reserve. As a result of this reserve we frequently do not even know by sight those who have been our neighbors for years. And it is this reserve which in the eyes of the small-town people makes us appear to be cold and heartless. The whole inner organization of such an extensive communicative life rests upon an extremely varied hierarchy of sympathies, indifferences, and aversions of the briefest as well as of the most permanent nature. The sphere of indifference in this hierarchy is not as large as might appear on the surface. Our psychic activity still responds to almost every impression of somebody else with a somewhat distinct feeling. The unconscious, fluid and
changing character of this impression seems to result in a state of indifference. Actually this indifference would be just as unnatural as the diffusion of indiscriminate mutual suggestion would be unbearable” (ibid; 412).

What seems to be direct as dissociation in the life style of metropolitan and it is actually one of its basic foundational forms of civilization: it gives to the individual that kind and that amount of individual freedom which has no precedent whatsoever under any other pre-conditions. The initial stage of social organization which were found in historical or in present social context was that: a comparatively small circle strongly closed against the adjacent one, strange, or in other way opposite circles. But, this circle is tightly consistent plus gives its individual members only a thin line for the progress of very peculiar qualities as well as individual, self responsible activities which include kingship group, political parties and religious group. The sustenance of very naïve young associations needs a kind of establishment which fix strict limitations and a strong bond. Hence they cannot afford to permit the personal liberty and peculiar inner and outer progress. Here onwards development in social moves at once in two diverse, but complimentary, ways.

“To the extent to which the group grows - numerically, spatially, in significance and in content of life - to the same degree the group's direct, inner unity loosens, and the rigidity of the original demarcation against others is softened through mutual relations and connections”(ibid;410). Simultaneously, the person attains liberty of movement, away from the “first jealous delimitation”. Individual also gets a peculiar individuality to which this division of labor in the expanded society provides both occasionally and necessary. So accordingly, Christianity and the state various associations like trade, political parties and guilds, numerous different groups have grown to this proportion according to this formula, but at the same time, the generalized scheme and formula has been modified several times according to the setting limitations or external forces groups respectively. But the factual as well as historical validity is maintained because of the followed links: “the most extensive and the most general contents and forms of life are most intimately connected with the most individual ones. They have a preparatory stage in common, that is, they find their enemy in narrow formations and groupings the maintenance of which places both of them into a state of defense against expanse and generality lying without and the freely moving individuality within. Just as in the feudal age, the free man was the
one who stood under the law of the land, that is, under the law of the largest social orbit, and the unfree man was the one who derived his right merely from the narrow circle of a feudal association and was excluded from the larger social orbit - so today metropolitan man is free in a spiritualized and refined sense, in contrast to the pettiness and prejudices which hem in the small-town man” (ibid; 416).

In the reciprocity of the opposite or indifferent attitude and high intellectual sounding life structure of large circles are never understood more strongly by the individual especially in the context of their effect in their independent state rather than huge crowd of the big cities. The reason being the physical proximity and thinking of space widens the mental distance make it more and more visible. So obviously under the facade of this freedom only if, under some special situations, one does not feel alone or lost as in this metropolitan world. It does not in any sense means that individual freedom must be reflected in his emotions as the comfort or the luxuries of life. It was not because the large area and the number of people which as a result of the “universal historical correlation between the enlargement of the circle and the personal inner and outer freedom” had actually fixed the metropolis as the locale of liberty. It is actually possible in crossing the visible expanse that any of the given cities turns out to be the seat of cosmopolitanism.

The sphere of the city widens in a way parallel to the manner in which wealth grows; a particular amount of property rises in a quasi-automatically way in ever increasing speed. As soon as a particular boundary was crossed, the fragile, individual, or rational relations of the citizens and the horizon of “intellectual predominance of the city” over its hinterland, grows in geometrical progress. “Every gain in dynamic extension becomes a step, not for an equal, but for a new and larger extension. From every thread spinning out of the city, ever new threads grow as if by themselves, At this point, the quantitative aspect of life is transformed directly into qualitative traits of character”(ibid;413).

The life in small town was, in actually, self-contained as well as self generated and sometimes autocratic. But the decisive and monopolistic nature of the metropolis leads to overflowing of its inner life into a far-away national or international area. Cities are, in the first instance, seats of the intense economic division of labor. While measuring its enlargement, the city provides more and more the monopolistic situations for division of labor. It creates a circle which through its sheer size can
absorb innumerable various types of services into its hold. Simultaneously, the concentration of individuals and their continuing fighting to attract customers forces the individual to attain specialization in an action/occupation so that he is not easily displaced by another in this profession. It is through this deciding nature that city life had modified the fight with nature for livelihood into a purely inter-human hardship for benefits, which are actually not provided by nature but by other fellow beings. For specialization not only results from the competition for personal profit but also from the major underlying fact that the seller must try to cater to the ever expanding, new and differentiated needs to lure the customer. Thus for getting a permanent source of income which is never taken away or replaced by something else, it becomes mandatory to specialize in one’s services. So this process stimulates differentiation, more and more refinement, and also the improvement in the way public’s needs are fulfilled, but at the same time it also leads to increasing personal differences within the sphere of public.

“All this forms the transition to the individualization of mental and psychic traits which the city occasions in proportion to its size. There is a whole series of obvious causes underlying this process. First, one must meet the difficulty of asserting his own personality within the dimensions of metropolitan life. Where the quantitative increase in importance and the expense of energy reach their limits, one seizes upon qualitative differentiation in order somehow to attract the attention of the social circle by playing upon its sensitivity for differences. The temptation to appear to the point, to appear concentrated and strikingly characteristic, lies much closer to the individual in brief metropolitan contacts than in an atmosphere in which frequent and prolonged association assures the personality of an unambiguous image of him in the eyes of the other” (Simmel, 1950; 409).

The major and deepest of reason, that why the metropolis cater to the press for the highest level of personal creation – without paying heed to the fact that whether it is warrant and success – seems to be the following:

“The development of modern culture is characterized by the preponderance of what one may call the objective spirit over the subjective spirit. This is to say, in language as well as in law, in the technique of production as well as in art, in science as well as in the objects of the domestic environment, there is embodied a sum of spirit. The individual in his intellectual development follows the growth of this spirit
very imperfectly and at an ever increasing distance. Indeed, at some points we notice retrogression in the culture of the individual with reference to spirituality, delicacy, and idealism” (ibid; 406).

This inconsistency is actually because of the increasing section of labor. As the division of labor pushes the individual to move towards only one-sided achievement, and the more the individual advance in a one-sided achievements the more it leads to isolation and alienation in individual personality. In any circumstances, he is not able to deal with the excessive demands resulting from the overgrowth of objective culture.

“The individual is reduced to a negligible quantity, perhaps less in his consciousness than in his practice and in the totality of his obscure emotional states that are derived from this practice. The individual has become a mere cog in an enormous organization of things and powers which tear from his hands all progress, spirituality, and value in order to transform them from their subjective form into the form of a purely objective life. It needs merely to be pointed out that the metropolis is the genuine arena of this culture which outgrows all personal life. Here in buildings and educational institutions, in the wonders and comforts of space-conquering technology, in the formations of community life, and in the visible institutions of the state, is offered such an overwhelming fullness of crystallized and impersonalized spirit that the personality, so to speak, cannot maintain itself under its impact. On the one hand, life is made infinitely easy for the personality in that stimulations, interests, uses of time and consciousness are offered to it from all sides. They carry the person as if in a stream, and one needs hardly to swim for oneself. On the other hand, however, life is composed more and more of these impersonal contents and offerings which tend to displace the genuine personal colorations and incomparability” (ibid; 412).

This situation triggers the demand for liberty and equality and also raises concern in the faith in the individual’s complete independence of social move in all spheres of social and intellectual relationships. This liberty could immediately allow the gentle substance which is general to all to come to the forefront, a substance which is believed to be present in every man and given by god or nature and which it is believed has been deformed and suppressed to a corner by the society and history. In the 19 century, with the help of Goethe and Romanticism, on the other side, stated
that the economic division of labor, in contrary was other very important ideal growth: “individuals liberated from historical bonds now wished to distinguish themselves from one another. The carrier of man’s values is no longer the general human being in every individual, but rather man's qualitative uniqueness and irreplaceability” (ibid).

Simmel concludes that by saying ‘objectivity also regarded as the procedure of distanciation could not be separated from its subjective firm which was based on the closeness of the historian's own individuality, nor can these contents of subjectivity be wiped out from the impacts of historical knowledge’ (Simmel, 1977). The hindrances that restricts or restrains knowledge – “the subjectivity of the recreation of experience – is also a condition under which knowledge is possible”

In the Simmel's opinion, overshadows the positivist perception of objectivity in which the achievement of ‘real’ knowledge is grounded on the scientific procedure of neutrality where subjectivism obstructs instead of facilitates the formation of awareness. On the contrary to this, Simmel indulge himself into the argument that the process of knowledge construction was club together objectivism with subjectivism, in which the concept of objectivity is a mirage because the thought of objectivism is based on the integration of the subjective.
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