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Georg Simmel’s assertion that strangeness organizes nearness and remoteness helps to understand how the social category of First Generation College Student (FGCS, first in the family to attend college) is used at a public university in the southwest of the United States. Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) is applied to ethnographic data. Difference categories and devices morph into those of distance in an interaction where a recruitment convention substitutes for a handshake between a boy and some adults in the hallway of a student center. These changes overlap with those found in the analysis of a student-persistence sequence of an educational marketing recruitment DVD. As evidence of glocal practice or the global impact of local contact gestures of student body diversification or massification policies directed at FGCSs (and others), they appear to coincide with distribution and recognition social justice projects that are inviting us to reach out across distances, short and long.


Drawing on Durkheim, Simmel, and Luhmann, this article grounds the polysemic character of privacy and its contingent legal determination in the functional differentiation of social communication systems. It demonstrates a previously overlooked common denominator among privacy conflicts and an emergent principle for their legal resolution. Case-law examples from the US Supreme Court and the European Court of Human Rights show how functional relevance turns ‘private’ events into ‘public’ ones, or ‘reasonable limitations’ of privacy into ‘unwarranted violations’, and vice versa.

The author deals with the key role of analogical reasoning in the thought of Georg Simmel. The first step in this direction is a recollection of those fragments of the history of the analogy concept which most likely influenced Simmel’s thought. The author also collected all the instances of analogy that could be identified as such from Simmel’s two most influential books (viz., the Philosophie des Geldes and the Soziologie). Finally, the author analyzes in detail some of the collected analogies, focusing on those which shed light on or bear some relation to other key features of Simmel’s sociological and philosophical thought.


Georg Simmel’s treatment of the lie – in the essay ‘The Sociology of Secrecy and Secret Societies’, but in other, lesser known texts as well – is an aspect of his thought that has not received a great deal of attention among theorists. In this article, the author brings Simmel’s work on mendacity to the fore, and shows how a consideration of it sheds new light on some of his most familiar claims. Barbour further argues that Simmel’s work on the lie illuminates a very old and vexing set of philosophical debates, and especially the debate over self-deception, or whether or not it is possible to lie to oneself. Along with providing a close study of his comments on the lie in ‘The Sociology of Secrecy and Secret Societies’, and in the chapter of his monumental Sociology that is based on that essay, he proposes a reading of Simmel’s neglected fable or fairytale ‘Der Lügenmacher’ – one of the eight short pieces that he published under a pseudonym between 1899 and 1903 in the cultural journal Der Jugend under the heading ‘Momentbilder’ or ‘Snapshots, sub specie aeternitatis’.


With reference to specific examples from canonical and non-canonical sociological writers from the 19th and early 20th century, and taking Georg Simmel’s insight into the quantitative determination of social groups as its
theoretical frame and thematic point of departure, this essay considers the diversity of knowledge formats which characterizes some of the founding texts of sociology. In particular, the authors focus on the use of statistical tables, surveys, and other ways of generating and displaying empirical knowledge in the work of classical social theorists such as Durkheim and Tarde, Marx and Engels, Max and Alfred Weber, along with the figures they drew upon or influenced, including Quetelet, Kay-Shuttleworth, and Du Bois. They conclude by considering how an examination of empirical and statistical methods in classical sociology helps us to see that the conflict between qualitative and quantitative approaches which divides sociology today is largely an effect of the subsequent development of the disciplinary division of labour and the professional specialization of knowledge, a problem which Simmel’s work helps to expose and address.

Classic work suggests that intergroup conflict increases intragroup cohesion and cooperation. But how do group members respond when their peers refuse to cooperate? Simmel argued that groups in conflict quell dissent by sanctioning group members and supporting centralized leadership systems. This claim has important implications, but little direct support. This research investigates how intergroup conflict shapes individuals’ tendencies to sacrifice for their groups, enforce norms by sanctioning their peers, and relinquish decision-making autonomy to a leader. The author tests the predictions with two small group experiments, which find that conflict increases enforcement of norms when outgroup participation in conflict is high and increases contribution to the group regardless of outgroup participation in conflict. Evidence on support for leaders is mixed and suggests that the performance of the group may affect support for leaders. The research has broader theoretical implications for the study of group processes, collective action, and institutions.

This dissertation shows how rationalization emerged as a central concern of German social theory in the first half of the twentieth century. The author focuses on analyses of bureaucracy, culture, war, and an especially rationalized form of labor – white-collar work. The roles played by
bureaucracy and rationalized culture in the implementation of genocide have proved to be among the most controversial subjects in Holocaust historiography. The author deconstructs the roots of these debates by tracing their lineages back to earlier analyses of rationalization. Over several decades these analyses coalesced into two mutually enforcing discourses and culminated in descriptions of the Holocaust as bureaucratized genocide. The first discourse runs from Max Weber’s analysis of bureaucracy and the "iron cage" of rationalization through to post-war Critical Theory. The second discourse considers how cultural critics, beginning with Georg Simmel, analyzed the impact of bureaucracy and rationalization on the individual. Siegfried Kracauer and his Weimar-era reportage on white-collar workers, or die Angestellten, exemplifies this second approach at best. This group was imagined to be most representative of a particularly modern problem – the ordering of daily life by rationalization and the declining power of effective individual and collective response to this control. The figure of Weimar’s embittered white-collar worker foreshadowed that of the lowly but lethal bureaucrat made famous by Hannah Arendt, in her description of the Nazi bureaucrat Adolf Eichmann, exemplar of the “banality of evil”. These figures presented challenges to the enlightenment ideal of the rational individual, capable of independent and critical thought. Benner concludes that the first and second discourses converged in post-war debates about the meaning of the Holocaust for “enlightened”, modern civilization.

BERLAN, Aurélien, 2012, La fabrique des derniers hommes : retour sur le présent avec Tönnies, Simmel et Weber. Paris, La Découverte, 342 p. [Thesis, Univ. of Rennes 1, 2008: La critique culturelle et la constitution de la sociologie allemande: Ferdinand Tönnies, Georg Simmel et Max Weber.] At the turn of the century, as industrial capitalism, bureaucratic State and organized science brutally established themselves, Ferdinand Tönnies, Max Weber and Georg Simmel identified with a merciless lucidity the constitutive pathologies of our era: generalized marketing, erosion of social boundaries, loss of meaning and freedom, increased influence of bureaucratic controls. The main interest of their sociologies rests in the fact that they analyzed these evolutions by asking which kind of world they create as well as which kind of human beings they generate.
This paper aims at reconstructing and interpreting Simmel’s vision of love. According to him, love is one of the forms that life takes. In this topic Simmel is therefore able to combine the themes of Lebensphilosophie with social reality. Firstly, love makes it possible for two different people to achieve a unity from diversity. That means that love builds sociality by starting from the deepest parts of each individual. It also means that the building of society is the result of a shifting from the individual to the super-individual level. Secondly, Simmel believes that love is a dynamic process transforming both partners. Finally, the different forms (expressions) of love have been evolving: from the Platonic one to the universal one towards humanity, to Christian love, to modern love; in particular, the characters of modern love appear to be more dynamic.


A recent resurgence in interest in the philosophy of Georg Simmel, especially by postmodernists, warrants a closer examination of his life and thought, particularly in light of the fact that he is little understood and generally misperceived. Simmel’s philosophy is relevant not only because, unlike most postmodernists, he does not slide into the realm of nihilism, although he did maintain an ambivalent pessimism regarding the future. Simmel was a member of a generation who, like postmodernists, rebelled against the grand narratives of the Enlightenment and lived in an era stereotyped by rootlessness and a decline in meaning for life. Simmel’s era was given articulation by the philosophy of Arthur Schopenhauer, to whom Simmel is greatly indebted intellectually, although this debt is generally not recognized. The author argues that to understand Simmel better, particularly in light of his being embraced by postmodernists, he must be perceived from the perspective of the times in which he lived, which entails examining the Schopenhauerian roots of his philosophy. In this manner, generally negative stereotypes of Simmel can be shown to be false, and the relevance of his thought for our postmodern world becomes clear in that the world in which he lived was extremely similar to ours.
This book examines alienation from both a sociological and psychoanalytic perspective, revisiting classic treatments of the topic (Marx, Simmel, Weber) and exploring its relevance to understanding post-modern consumer society. It examines the escapist potentials for good and for ill in modern society – these fostered by commercial interests, and those maintained by individuals and groups as their form of resisting alienation.

Contents: Section 1
III – Conclusion.

Highlighting the lack of critical attention directed to the tragic as a distinct concept in Simmel’s thought, this paper seeks to elucidate the tragic as a specific dialectical process and to draw attention to the grounding of this concept in the German philosophical tradition that Peter Szondi has identified as ‘the philosophy of the tragic’. In the course of the argument care is taken to illuminate Simmel’s understanding through reference to tragic drama itself, thus emphasizing the properly aesthetic context of the tragic as a distinct philosophical idea relevant to socio-cultural life. In recovering Simmel’s
definition of the tragic, the author seeks to counter the common conflation of Simmel’s use of the tragic concept in his understanding of socio-cultural life with a normative position akin to ‘cultural pessimism’, and to elucidate the way in which the tragic ultimately indicates a form of affirmation, albeit one replete with nihilistic implications.


This article explores the neglected idea of fate in Simmel’s thought. It examines the specific definition of fate present in Simmel’s writings and the relation of this definition to tragic drama. The argument operates under the assumption that tragic drama represents the ‘natural habitat’ for the exploration and expression of the fate problematic. In this context, it is argued that Simmel’s rediscovery of the relevance of fate emphasizes the modernity of tragedy. The article explores Simmel’s translation of fate from drama and philosophy into sociology, but into a sociology replete with a distinctly existential and metaphysical consciousness. It is argued that Simmel’s application of fate to modern social life constitutes a sociologization of fate, but that rather than involving a reduction of fate to society, this sociologization actually involves a form of re-enchantment of the social through life. In relation to this sociologization and building on the argument of Peter Baehr, it is argued that the concept of fate is uniquely endowed with a capacity to encourage a sense of *pathos* conducive to the development of a reflexive and critical sense of collective social responsibility and of shared future. In this regard, the article examines Simmel’s engagement with Naturalist tragedy and the transition from ancient to modern drama. Throughout, it is argued that the experience of modernity, where ‘all that is solid melts into air’, is conducive to a rediscovery of the relevance of fate and tragedy.


Current interpretations of Heidegger’s notion of *das Man* are caught in a dilemma: either they cannot accommodate the ontological status Heidegger accords it, or they cannot explain his negative evaluation of it, in which it is treated as ontic. This paper uses Simmel’s agonistic account of human sociality to integrate the ontological and the ontic, indeed pejorative aspects of Heidegger’s account. Section I introduces the general problem, breaks the
exclusive link of Heidegger’s account to Kierkegaard and delineates the general form of a solution. Section II then sketches Simmel’s conception of sociology and sociality. Section III determines what Heidegger is trying to do in Chapter Four of Division I in *Being and Time* in order to formulate a strictly ontological account of *das Man*. Section IV uses Simmel’s account of sociality to build into this ontological account an inherent tendency to display the negative features Heidegger ascribes to *das Man*. In conclusion, section V points to how the proposed account of *das Man* intimates the character of fundamental ontology as a nascent form of critical theory. It also explains the extent to which Heidegger’s pejorative characterisations of *das Man* and the *Man-selbst* are legitimate.


Individualism was one of the central themes of the great works of sociology at the beginning of the 20th century. The density and complexity of Georg Simmel’s analyses of individuality offer ample justification for the view that he was among the most remarkable theoreticians of modernity. The present article highlights the originality of his analyses in contrast with those of Émile Durkheim and Max Weber. Simmel’s originality resides in his linking of individualism with the development of personality, which he saw, in opposition to Durkheim, as a distinctive singularity and as enabled by the eradication of personal dependence relationships that had been brought about by the proliferation of the money economy. While acknowledging the heuristic force of this interpretation of modern individualism in relation to a phenomenology of life, the article also points to its limitations, which stem from the confrontation with a sociology that accords, as did Max Weber, greater importance to analyses of institutional logics.


The recruitment of the next generation of workers is of central concern to contemporary HRM. This paper focuses on university campuses as a major site of this process. Simmel’s study of modernity poses ethical questions and gives answers that can help us understand the ‘ethos’ of the ideal future
worker. At the heart of this ethos lies what we call the ‘principle of potentiality’. This principle is explored through the analysis of a sample of graduate recruitment programs from the Times Top 100 Graduate Employers, interpreted as ethical exhortations in HRM’s attempt to shape the character of future workers. The paper brings the work of Georg Simmel to the study of HRM’s ethics and raises the uncomfortable question that, within discourses of endless potentiality, lie ethical dangers which bespeak an unrecognised ‘tragedy of culture’. The author argues that HRM fashions an ethos of work which de-recognises human limits, makes a false promise of absolute freedom, and thus becomes a tragic proposition for the individual.

DARMON, Isabelle; FRADE, Carlos, 2012, Beneath and Beyond the Fragments: The Charms of Simmel’s Philosophical Path for Contemporary Subjectivities, in «Theory, Culture & Society», vol. 29, 7/8, pp. 197-217. The authors’ purpose is to explore the reasons for the continued attractiveness of Simmel’s thought today and to probe the contemporary affinities to his philosophical stance towards the world. Simmel anchored the ‘philosophical attitude’ in the philosopher’s particularly developed disposition for Erlebnis, i.e. the unified pre-conceptual experience of each moment of reality and life, as well as in a particular mode of objectivating this experience. Darmon & Frade provide an illustration of such an approach and its implications through Simmel’s analysis of ‘remoteness from oneself’ and the restlessness it entails in The Philosophy of Money. They argue that Simmel’s attempt at phenomenologically unveiling the contours and depths of life moments and fragments, as well as his emphasis on constant movement, provide much reassurance to contemporary subjectivities. But his philosophical stance is also driven by a quasi-mystical yearning for the One that lies beneath and beyond the fragments. The authors propose an initial assessment of the main implications of such a stance by relating it to the philosophical path it opened up (a path directly linking to Heidegger and his followers, but also in part to Deleuze) and by placing it in what one could understand to be the new philosophical situation today.

DENEAULT, Alain, 2012, L’argent comme écran psychique. L’étiologie des névroses et de la perversion en économie à partir de la Philosophie de l’argent de Georg Simmel, in «Sociologie et sociétés», vol. 44, 2, pp. 165-180. In The Philosophy of Money, Georg Simmel examined both the modalities by which monetary processes may be perverted and the manner in which money may, in turn, pervert a culture. Having analyzed what may be considered in
Simmel’s thought to deal with perverse structures contradicting interactionist and vitalist dynamics, this article aims at examining more closely a social modality of action motivated by a specific money culture: that is, cynicism. More than simply a psychological disposition underpinning a certain relationship with money, this attitude is socially conditioned by the interference of a fetishized media within sociological elaborations of social actors in relation to value facts.


Simmel’s analysis of secrecy, which marked a sociological turn away from Enlightenment philosophy, includes a specific vision of interpersonal “knowledge”. Interpersonal knowledge can serve as a framework for research into online social networks, allowing for the study of groups within a reference grid of “public” and “hidden” data. Yet it also raises epistemological difficulties, which seems to suggest, in fact, that the image of the other is composed through the aggregation of factual elements. In order to avoid this conclusion, which is incompatible with Simmel’s fundamental texts, a new reading of the chapters of *Sociology* is proposed in the light of the notion of understanding that Simmel developed in his later writings. An original conception of the social bond is elaborated, articulating the operations of “knowing” and “understanding”.


This article explores the notion of ‘perfect’ money that Simmel introduces in *The Philosophy of Money*. Its aim is twofold: first, to connect this idea to his more general arguments about the nature of society and the ambivalence of modernity, and, second, to assess its relevance for contemporary debates about the future of money, especially following the global financial crisis. The author argues that Simmel’s concept of perfect money can be understood as utopian in two senses, conceptual and ethical, that correspond to the two interpretations he develops, in *Soziologie*, of the idea of a perfect society. This sheds light on an aspect of Simmel’s writings that has attracted relatively little attention, namely his views on the relationship between money and socialism.
Characterizing this relationship as a ‘formal affinity’, his remarks resonate with a long tradition of thought on monetary utopias that aim not for the abolition of money but its radical transformation as a means of improving society. This tradition is coming to the fore once again today, as the financial crisis has given new impetus to constructing forms of money – for example, LETS, Time Dollars, mutual credit, peer-to-peer lending and digital currencies such as Bitcoin – that provide viable alternatives to big banks. Understood in conjunction with his account of the ‘tragedy’ of individualism in modernity, such resonances demonstrate the enduring relevance of Simmel’s work to the empirical and theoretical investigation of money.


Although sociology can be commonsensically and parsimoniously defined as the study of society, the problems of defining such terms as ‘society’, ‘the social’, and ‘the social system’ remain an ongoing irritant of sociological theory. In addition to these traditional conceptual problems, there is currently a strong sense that ‘society’ as an empirical reality and ‘society’ as a concept are in crisis. Given the contemporary view of ‘the end of the social’ there is also manifestly a potent and nostalgic interest in the past as a time of comforting solidarity and meaningfulness. To clarify this debate, the authors start by making a distinction between three approaches to society, namely structure, solidarity and creation. Nostalgia hinges around the certainties that followed from reliable social structures, and from the comfort of community. They illustrate these forms of nostalgia through an examination of the social philosophy of Alasdair MacIntyre. Recognizing that his criticisms of the loss of virtue represent a powerful indictment of modernity, they argue that past societies were also fractured by moral discord. More importantly, MacIntyre rules out the possibility of moral re-invention by excluding the rise of human rights as a moral framework. In conclusion, the forms of social creativity may not enjoy the ‘sticky’ solidarity of the past, but they do testify Georg Simmel’s idea of the social (Vergesellschaftung).

FEDERICI, Maria Caterina, PICCHIO, Marta (eds.), 2012, Pensare Georg Simmel: eredità e prospettive, Perugia, Morlacchi, 751 p.
Contents: M. Picchio: Georg Simmel: un classico, nostro contemporaneo; M. C. Federici: Nimia observantia in Simmel; M. L. Maniscalco: L’ambivalenza sociologica simmeliana dalle società solido-moderne a oggi. Permanenza

FIELDMAN, Zeena, 2012, Simmel in Cyberspace, in «Information, Communication & Society», vol. 15, 2, pp. 297-319. Research in the humanities and social sciences is increasingly concerned with social media technologies and their use. This article argues that such research could benefit substantially by drawing on the work of the sociologist-psychologist-philosopher Georg Simmel. Simmel’s conceptualization of belonging, social space and domination are among his many contributions to
social media theory; yet, the significance of this work remains woefully overlooked in studies of computer-mediated communication (CMC) and the information society, more broadly. To redress this disciplinary obscurity, this article fleshes out some of Simmel’s most relevant contributions to CMC scholarship and provides a close reading of his 1908 essay, *The Stranger*. The author suggests that the subjectivity to which social media give life can be best understood as a resurrection of Simmel’s stranger archetype – a figure of paradox beholden to the competing demands of inclusion and exclusion, proximity and distance, mobility and stasis. Ultimately, this article insists that not only does Simmel’s work help scholars to unpack the sociality of social media, but it also helps locate the changes and continuities of discourse surrounding the relationship between sociality and knowledge.


In an epoch of ‘liquid modernity’, normativity assumes unforeseeable forms. Neither the theories of normative integration nor post-normative approaches can explain its contradiction: binding normativity still prevails, but its validity is limited in space and time. Only a ‘transnormative approach’ can therefore address the issue. An ideal-typical reconstruction of sociological theories as a contrast between normative and transnormative approaches allows the author to appreciate the decisive contribution Simmel makes to the understanding of complex societies. A precondition is, however, to explain the epistemological efforts he made to overcome axiomatic assumptions about human sociability that unconsciously guide sociological thought. To this end, Simmel develops two different nuclei of sociological and philosophical theory: sociological epistemology and philosophical anthropology of complex societies. These are analysed as a process of relationship-building in a transnormative sense. To interact, individuals are required to comply with expectations of the other. Therefore living in society always presupposes a dialectic between the public and the private person. Enquiring into this issue allows Simmel to ground a non-normative theory of social integration. As long as individuals realize their potential through social interaction, this process permits society building even though there are no shared value orientations.

Our societies are becoming increasingly “multicultural”. The phenomenon is a prominent element of political and scholarly debate, yet it escapes unequivocal definition. Communities with characteristic languages, religions, and customs produce distinct identities, which are shared with varying degrees of success across the common social space. Will they be able, eventually, to integrate into a common society, or will they always remain in a state of latent conflict? According to Simmel, the crisis of culture characterizes the modern life of humanity, since people are unable to arrive at a subjective synthesis either of the objective contents of culture or of the social roles they themselves play. The Simmelian theory of culture today faces questions stemming from the sociological interpretation of multiculturalism: is it to be seen as a reductionist strategy in response to modern social complexity or as a conflict between “multi-communitarianism” and societal pluralism? The article provides a Simmelian perspective on the arguments involved.


This dissertation deals with the forms of collective expression and the spaces of sociality developed during the conflicts and negotiations with the State during the elaboration of the urban plans for the Campeche region in the south of Florianópolis, from the 1990s until the middle of the first decade of the 21st Century. The study strove to identify the primary actors and manners in which people associated, as well as the networks of relationships that were developed in the process. The dissertation analyzes: 1) the perception of citizens about the urbanization process of the region, 2) the actions of the state and the production of urban legality, 3) the legal devices consolidated in Brazilian and municipal law on land use, public participation, and municipal administration, 4) public events and political strategies of citizens. Other resources include official documents, periodicals, electronic bulletin boards and email lists, interviews, observation and participation at many events (assemblies, association meetings, festivals, public meetings and meetings with officials, assemblymen, and citizens), as well as academic papers on the subject. The theories used as a basis for the study include, 1) The notion of theatrality and its relation to the symbolic dimension of power, and politics as a structure of action in Clifford Geertz, 2) the notion of sociability proposed by Georg Simmel and the relationship with the development of subjective cultures and
forms of association, 3) the notion of power as action over the action of the other, and resistance as constitutive of power relations in Michel Foucault, as well as Foucault’s notion of the economy of illegalities, 4) and finally, some of the issues brought up by the methodology of Bruno Latour in his actor-network theory, bringing to the fore concepts like association, spokesman, mediator, and controversy, in addition to questions related to science and politics.


Georg Simmel is the seminal author on trust within sociology, but though inspired by Simmel, subsequent studies of intersubjective trust have failed to address Simmel’s suggestion that trust is as differentiated as the social relations of which it is part. Rather, trust has been studied within limited sets of exchange or work relations. This article revisits Simmel’s concept of trust as social form in order to investigate this differentiation. From an interview study, the differentiation and limits of trust are analysed within different types of social relations. Trust is found to vary greatly in scope and mode influenced by the intersecting dimensions of relations, objects and situations. Furthermore, trust exists between an outer threshold of expected deceit and an inner threshold of confident reliance. The findings from the qualitative study contribute new knowledge on the diversity of trust, opening new avenues of sociological investigation of trust outside exchange and work relations.


This paper aims at demonstrating that in light of Simmel’s concept of ‘whole man’ or ‘personality’ a certain structural isomorphism between the Kantian ethical man and the economic modern man becomes apparent. The author analyzes at first the criticism which Simmel directs from that concept at the anthropological conception presupposed in the Kantian ethics. The paper then examines the relation generated between man and culture as a consequence of the development of money economy and of what Simmel calls ‘tragedy of culture’, seeking to demonstrate that the mentioned relation produces a type of individuality which, from the whole man’s point of view, appears as equivalent to the one presupposed in the Kantian ethics. Finally, the author
compares the ways of valuation of Kantian ethics and money economy with the type of normativity that suits the whole man.

GIORDANO, Valeria, 2012, *La narrazione della metropoli: Baudelaire, Simmel, Benjamin*, in «Sociologia e Ricerca sociale», vol. 33, 97, pp. 76-84. The words of modern narrators help bring to surface the contradictions and conflicts typical of the metropolis, transforming it into a sort of cultural instrument that reads the different languages, images and forms of life, by which it is defined. The crisis of perception of space and time, the difficulty of using a language that is able to give meaning, the shattering of personal identity, all make it hard to accumulate experiences and transform them into stories to pass on. The only way to start a relationship with the other and with the world is, as Charles Baudelaire and Walter Benjamin state, the moment of shock, the moment lived and that cannot be transmitted. The urgency is to not become a prisoner of nostalgia for the past, but to let the intrinsic oppositions of the metropolis be productive.

GRONERT, Siegfried, 2012, *Simmel’s Handle: A Historical and Theoretical Design Study*, in «Design & Culture», vol. 4, 1, pp. 55-71. This analysis of the article "Der Henkel. Ein aesthetischer Versuch" by Georg Simmel is intended to be a contribution to the history of the meaning of things. Later critiques by Ernst Bloch and Theodor W. Adorno have shifted how we understand Simmel. Integrating Simmel’s text within a chronological progression of relationships creates a particular history, the events of which can be commented on reflexively. As industrial design has become an integral component in today’s culture, Simmel’s position on the role of the applied arts within a modern society is now particularly significant. Our understanding of his cultural philosophy has been shaped by early modernism and postmodernism. But Simmel’s "Henkel" can also act as an iridescent symbol reflecting the meaning of things in relation to their interpretations. This article should indicate that the handle’s aesthetic as well as symbolic dimensions can still elucidate the society of its time.

Recent debates about the knowledge society have furthered awareness of the limits of knowing and, in turn, have fuelled sociological debates about the persistence and intensification of ignorance. In view of the ubiquity of the notion of ignorance, this paper focuses on Georg Simmel’s insightful observations about *Nichtwissen* (nonknowledge) as the reverse side of knowledge. The paper seeks to relate the notion of nonknowledge to Simmel’s conceptualization of objective and subjective culture. In Simmel’s view, modern society produces cultural objects in order to satisfy the individuals’ inherent drive to become social beings. Ever more nonknowledge can be understood as an outcome of the growing difficulties of subjective culture in absorbing objective culture. To illustrate the crucial importance of such a view of the unknown for today’s debates on the knowledge society, the paper uses examples ranging from the strategic acknowledgement of nonknowledge in personal relationships to public encounters and the right not to know one’s own genetic identity.


French foreign relations to the Holy Roman Empire relied on the existence of local personal networks which may very well be described as "crossborder"-clientelism. Most of these ties proved to be extremely volatile and unstable due to various conflicts of interest and Hapsburg “counter patronage”. Nevertheless, French diplomats kept relying heavily on their clients. This raises the question how trust was possible in these relations. Trust here must be distinguished from notions of trust which focus either on psychological and emotional aspects or on conditions of trust provided by society at large.

Drawing on Georg Simmel’s definition of “trust as the hypothesis for future behavior, which is certain enough thereby to ground practical action”, trust is founded on the fulfillment of normative expectations and rational predictions of behavior of the other. Other theories posit that trust is a mode of reducing social complexity (Niklas Luhmann), requiring certain modes of granting “credit” accompanied by practices of symbolic control and self-assurance. In this respect the notion of trust in question is linked to practices of communication and observation, as is extensively documented in French diplomatic correspondence for the present case. Trust relations could be limited and controlled by predefined “thresholds”, anticipating situations and incidents, where trust would end. Even though those can be identified in
French correspondence, they rarely served their purpose. On the one hand they could provide further possibilities to ascribe unfounded trust, on the other hand relations broken by mistrust could eventually be fixed by strategically “forgetting” the circumstances that led to their breakdown in the first place and thus undermined attempts of controlling trust.


The article discusses the relations between sociology and the social issues, exploring the cultural dimension of science in the organization of society in the modern age, in which sociology is at once the resulting effect and the producer of this order. The text is divided into three parts: the first examines the invention of the social property and the role of social protection by the State. The second contrasts the *homo sociologicus* and the *homo œconomicus*. The impoverishment appears as the empirical phenomenon against which the critique of utilitarianism is mounted. The third presents three theses on poverty in capitalist society (Tocqueville, Marx & Engels, and Simmel). To conclude, this article presents three contemporary paradigms: that of the contract; the second based on the law, and the third based on the theory of gift exchange trying to redefine social protection from the perspective of a unconditional right to a universal basic income to all citizens.


This essay takes Georg Simmel’s conceptualization of space as a form of sociation (*Vergesellschaftung*) in his 1908 masterpiece, *Sociology*, as a framework for critically re-reading two 19th century classics in the sociology of empire. Alexis de Tocqueville’s *Democracy in America* (1835/1940) is shown to illustrate Simmel’s understanding of social-spatial boundaries by portraying the cultural and historical geography of America as an ‘optic space’ of racial (in)equality. Similarly, Harriett Martineau’s study of morals and manners in *Society in America* (1837) exemplifies Simmel’s ideas on social-spatial sensibilities with its attention to how everyday settings serve as a kind of ‘acoustic space’ of gendered (un)freedom. Drawing on related arguments by recent thinkers and critics, and rectifying the relative neglect of how socio-
spatial dynamics are addressed in the texts of classical sociology, the essay examines a description in each work of a particular personal encounter with strangers which exemplifies how the spatial sense of empire disrupts assumptions that new-world democracy has superseded old-world colonialism. Considered as illustrations of Simmel’s thesis concerning the spatial orders of society, the ‘traveling and anecdotal theories’ of Martineau and Tocqueville provide ‘sociological allegories’ designed to instruct reading publics on how law, empire, and social mores constitute bounded fields of struggle within the contact zones of modern empire.


As founder of the humanist version of sociology, Simmel sent powerful messages that are identified and explained in this book: *interpretation* – things are often not what they appear to be; *change* – culture and society evolve over time; *interaction* – reality is socially constructed; *alienation* – people define the value of money without taking responsibility for this construction. Simmel sees humans defining objects in interaction as valuable or worthless, but then they refuse to acknowledge having anything to do with the process of value attribution. He is critical in politics as well; Simmel is concerned that socialism is treated as a political movement and not viewed as a potential form of social interaction.

This article examines the Simmelian conception of the relationship between history and sociology in order to determine whether it can further our understanding of the epistemological specificity of history. The article traces the varying definitions of historical science that Simmel successively adopted. He first conceived of the study of history as the first level of knowledge in the
humans and, later, as a science governed by the distinct \textit{a priori} knowledge of individuality. Ultimately, although he developed this perspective least, history was for Simmel the study of the historicity of social phenomena, insofar as the object of study was not confined to the reciprocal actions with which Simmelian sociology is concerned.


This paper relies on Simmel’s sociological approach of conflicting relationships as a process of social creation of links. The main focus of this paper is to analyze the nature of institutionalized compromise in Argentina and its possible economic reproduction based on violence. The author carries out the conclusion that in Argentina, violence is embodied into the rentier’s behavioral dynamics. In this case, violence is articulated with the pursuit of emancipation of the social, economic and political constraint. Even though this feature is inherent to capitalism, it takes an important dimension in a society that has been founded on a high concentration of wealth and, most particularly, in the concentration of land ownership.


Georg Simmel’s final work, \textit{The View of Life}, concludes his lifelong engagement with Immanuel Kant by ‘inverting’ Kant’s Categorical Imperative to produce an ethics of authentic individuality. While Kant’s moral imperative is universal to all individuals but particular to their discrete acts, Simmel’s Law of the Individual is particular to each individual but universal to all the individual’s acts. The authors assess the significance of Simmel’s formulation of the \textit{Law of the Individual} in three steps: first, as an articulation of an ethical moment consonant with his relational approach to formal sociology, hinted at earlier in \textit{Sociology} but not developed as such. Second, as a completion of the framework for Simmel’s formal sociology: the \textit{Law of the Individual} conceptualizes a decisive but under-theorized relationship in Simmel’s vision of ‘society’ that is a woven fabric of social relationships, namely one’s relationship with oneself. They follow with a third proposal
about how Simmel might have continued the line of thought he opens in *The View of Life*, suggesting that one could take the Law of the Individual as an invitation to fold the self-relation back into analysis of social relations, and to theorize how forms of association are shaped by forms of self-relation. The authors thus narrow the theoretical gulf between Simmel’s vitalism and his sociology, which commentators usually hold apart. In so doing, the paper sketches a distinctively Simmelian approach to an ethics of individuality in sociological inquiry.


Contrary to common perceptions of Simmel’s work as dividing into three stages of Darwinism, Kantianism, and Goethean/Bergsonian Life-Philosophy, consideration of the full scope of the *Georg Simmel Gesamtausgabe* demonstrates Simmel’s concern with both Kant and Goethe as life-long, just as was his engagement with core principles respectively associated with them: Form and Life. What changed in his mind over time was how those two principles were construed and related. In this view, Simmel’s *Soziologie* can be read as a treatise on the properties of social forms that emerge out of vital processes – following a dynamic akin to Blumenbach’s *Bildungstrieb*, whereas the *Lebensanschauung* puts more emphasis on the ways in which forms channel, constrain, and inspire the streams of life. This opens the door for creative work pursuing lines of connection between the two disciplines – a sociology of authentic individuality and a kind of existentialized sociology – and, beyond that, to a unified theory of action and evolution.


A number of sociologists and other researchers have focused on the role of third parties since Simmel’s seminal conceptualization of the social organization of the triad. However, less attention has been given to third party presence in qualitative interviews, despite the fact that third party participation in interviews with people with chronic illness and/or disability occurs frequently. Here too it is assumed that third party presence promotes conflict, ignoring the role of third parties as facilitators who enable informants to articulate their perspectives. Therefore, the author focusses on Simmel’s
concept of the triad, concluding that the role of facilitator must be added to the types he describes.


By means of two “virtual interviews” to sociologist Georg Simmel and Irish essayist and literary critic Clive Staple Lewis, the article addresses how modernity affects our mental life, our understanding of what can be considered human and, more specifically, how the processes of modernity influence the practical reason in economic and political actions. Maggioni and Beretta thereby aim to achieve a deeper understanding of the consequences of modernity on the contemporary world.


This paper reflects about a possible positive dimension of the conflict, starting with an exhibition that addresses the world of journalism interviews. Using the positivity attributed to the conflict in the theorizing of Georg Simmel as a complement to the dialogical movement developed in Martin Buber’s theorizations, the authors perform the analysis of an interview conducted in the Globo News guided by the discrepancy between the interviewer/interviewee. From this point, the concepts are articulated with an emphasis on a pragmatic framework, so that it discusses the conflict as an element with potential to promote destabilization on conventional frames of journalism, managing the public and inviting him to debate about a specific problematic field.


The article examines the various instances at which Simmel’s work confronts the necessity to reformulate the liberal conception of obligation. If — as the emergence of social rights suggests — responsibility for action is no longer imputable to individuals alone and if the rationality of the law is not determinable through positive law or the abstractions of natural law, a
sociological revision of the modern conception of freedom is indispensable. Beyond the naturalist, positivist, and historicist framework of the 19th century, this revision must necessarily include a critical analysis of the close link that the Moderns posited between universalism and legal-economic formalism. In this perspective, Simmel’s thought at once represents an acceptance of the historical dimension of this phenomenon, but also seeks to transcend it through an ethico-political reflection that allows for the emergence of a new type of universalism, which is immanent in modern formalism.

MAROTTA, Vince, 2012, *Georg Simmel, the stranger and the sociology of knowledge*, in «Journal of intercultural studies », vol. 33, 6, pp. 675-689. The Simmelian stranger has been extensively studied and critiqued. This paper suggests that although this body of literature has contributed to a conceptual refinement of the category, its analysis confines itself to Simmel’s seminal essay on the stranger. A broader and deeper analysis of Simmel’s stranger is possible when one contextualizes it within Simmel’s broader intellectual project and links it to his conception of historical knowledge, his reflections on the third element, the cosmopolitan aesthetic sensibility and the genius. It is suggested that the affinities between the stranger and other ideas within his work allow to ponder the contribution that Simmel can make to the debate on standpoint epistemologies.


This article analyzes the Simmel’s thinking about freedom, a crucial topic for understanding a historical period. Simmel identifies a break between the philosophical reflection and the approach of the social sciences to freedom and proposes some alternative routes for overcoming the limitations that closed off freedom within an a-historical conceptual paradigm. Using a three-pronged, anthropological, ethical, and cognitive approach, the author offers important contributions for redefining the concept of self; considering freedom an experience preceded by responsibility; and for leading freedom beyond a mechanical view of life.


The following article outlines in a systematic way the main ideas of Simmel on this set of issues. The general thesis is that the German sociologist discerned and seized anthropological, structural and cultural conditions (ideational but also normative) of modern individuality with an exceptional acuity. Indeed, the question “How is individuality possible?” is the mirrored equivalent to the question “How is society possible?” Though Simmel did not pose the question in exactly these terms, he developed a systematic reflection on the structural conditions and the cultural prerequisites of this modern ideal. The “tragedy of individuality” results from the gap between structural and cultural development. The former, for the first time, enables modern freedom
and individuality; the latter, however, from a moral point of view, almost renders impossible the realization of this option generated by the structural development. In Weberian terms, one could say that the “life chances of individuality” are not met by a “style of life of individuality.”

MÜLLER, Michael R., 2012, Apartheid der Mode: eine symboltheoretische Revision der formalen Modesoziologie, in «sozialer Sinn: Zeitschrift für hermeneutische Sozialforschung», Bd. 13, 2, pp. 281-303. Georg Simmel coined the axiom of “Gleichgültigkeit der Mode als Form gegen jede Bedeutung ihrer besonderen Inhalte”. But this axiom leads to a marginalization of fashion within the theory of fashion. Analyses of current fashion waves do not show a kind of parellellism with ‘dionysischen Kunstwerk’ (Nietzsche), but rather a repertoire of forms for distinction strategies within society. The author concludes to the necessity of a wider sociological description of the significance of fashion (‘Kulturbedeutung’ (Weber). Nor is fashion always a class-fashion (Simmel), nor is it a priori politically emancipatory. It belongs rather to those symbolic forms through which societies organize the (partial) challenges addressing their systems and regimes.

NORIEGA HERNÁNDEZ, Joana Cecilia, 2012, Sociabilidad de género en los espacios públicos de la Nueva España dieciochesca. Un acercamiento sociológico, in «Historia 2.0, Conocimiento Histórico en Clave Digital», vol. 2, 4, pp. 30-46. This paper analyzes the public spaces as sites of intense sociability. Particular attention is paid to the New Spain’s tianguis and temascales as places where men and women concurred, and that for this reason, allow the author to analyze the type of relationships established between sexes. The approach taken in the analysis of sociability is the theoretical perspective of George Simmel.

Georg Simmel makes the following contention: a frontier is the spatial expression of a social demarcation. Which means that any frontier, any boundary, has to be interpreted in the light of its own social determination. Human beings are constantly creating boundaries as ways of linking or separating themselves from others, but humans themselves are also frontier areas, which are reconfigured socially to the point of seeming to be boundless. Any person’s territorial situation in fact reveals their position in relation to others.


Together with the modern capitalism, instead of satisfying needs, consumption became the need itself. Individuals who are transformed from *homo sapiens* to *homo consumens*, are living in a hyperreality and headed towards pleasure and psychological satisfaction. In this hyperreality, individuals’ existence is strongly related with consumption. Simmel, Veblen and Sombart all underlined the fact that consumption becomes individuals’ center of life, their main aim is to reach to an utopia by satisfying the needs which will never be satisfied completely. In this study, the roles of the concepts of *negotium* and *otium* are analyzed together with the luxury concept and hedonic consumption reached today from Veblen, Simmel and Sombart’s theoretical point of view.


Often used interchangeably in the hermeneutics of religious experience, the concepts of individuality and existence actually overlap only in a very partial way. The first part of this essay investigates Schleiermacher’s idea of individuality and emphasizes the non-subjective character of his concept of
“feeling”, its natural openness and transcendence, with reference also to the Heideggerian interpretation of the second *Rede*. Then the essay focuses on Kierkegaard’s distinction between the “religiosity A” (dialectics within the immanence) and “religiosity B” (dialectical paradox, leap of faith). The conclusion outlines a “cosmic” concept of individuality, consistent with a “metaphysics of the within”, in reference to the idea of “immanent transcendence” by Georg Simmel.


The article suggests that Simmel’s thought should be interpreted as a coherent series of continuous attempts to solve philosophically the dilemmas entailed in the German ideal of *Bildung*. By analysing Simmel’s three short essays on Italian cities, and by placing them in the context of both his own intellectual development and the intellectual context of his time, the article will show how ideas expressed in these essays reflect this basic character of Simmel’s thought. In other words, far from being independent momentary images, Simmel’s essays on Italian cities reflect his concern with whether and how culture in general, and works of art in particular, may help modern personality reconcile itself with the world.


One of the most striking characteristics of the initial reception of Georg Simmel’s thought in Italy is that it began with the translation of some of his most important philosophical treatises. The only exceptions to this were his sociological essays *Das Problem der Soziologie* and *Zur Soziologie der Armut*, translated respectively in 1896 and 1906. Thus, in opposition to his reception elsewhere (Deutschland included), in Italy Simmel was discovered and valued — by those who first came into contact with his work — as a philosopher first and foremost. The 1980s saw a renewal of interest in Simmel’s *corpus* of work, resulting in the translation of some of his most important sociological works, as well as providing the stimulus for numerous studies that have since demonstrated the importance of his contribution to the development of sociology and the complexity of his thought beyond the confines of any single discipline.

The article argues for the relevance of Simmel’s life-philosophy (Lebensphilosophie) for the contemporary thought about life and death. By considering life, paradoxically, at once as a pre-individual flux of becoming and individuated, Simmel manages to avoid both reductionism and mysticism. In addition, unlike Deleuze, for example, Simmel thinks that we can experience and know life only in some individual, actual form, never in its pure virtuality, as an absolute flow. During the course of examination, Simmel’s insights are also discussed in connection with Heidegger. The article maintains that what remains on the Simmelian side beyond the striking affinities between the two thinkers is a kind of animal vitality. Though Simmell’s life-philosophy is mainly concerned with the world-relation of humans, when it comes to death, it places humans on a par with all living organisms. A death that is immanent in life is appropriate to anything that is living. Thus the human individual, too, is dying precisely as a living organism, as some-body that is alive.


The article records the three stages of work undertaken to assemble a single organized corpus of Simmel’s dispersed writings after his death in September 1918. This includes a first phase of work by Gertrud Simmel and Gertrud Kantorowicz from the years of the Weimar Republic, a second phase from the post-1945 period, overseen by Michael Landmann and Kurt Gassen, and a third phase, inaugurated in the 1980s by a team of scholars at Bielefeld University headed by Otthein Rammstedt and – initially – Niklas Luhmann, which resulted in the 24 volumes in print today with Suhrkamp Verlag.


In his essay, Salvagnini suggests that some of the most relevant thoughts on light of Italian painter Renato Birolli were influenced by Simmel’s considerations expressed in his book Rembrandt. The latter work was introduced in Italy in 1931 by one of Simmell’s Italian students, the
philosopher Antonio Banfi who had attended Simmel’s cultural evenings in Berlin and who later, as professor, had organised cultural evenings in Milan. According to the author, the influence of Simmel’s *Rembrandt* on Birolli appears when he addresses light in its physical meaning as an almost material moment which gives the sense of the becoming of life, as Simmel suggested in his book.


SCOTT, Susie, 2012, *Intimate deception in everyday life*, in «Studies in Symbolic Interaction», vol. 39, pp. 251-279. The purpose of this paper is to analyze the patterns of deception that take place at five different levels of intimacy: fleeting encounters between strangers, performance teams and their audiences, competitive game play between teammates, intimate partners, and individual selfhood. Symbolic interactionist and dramaturgical theories are applied alongside Simmel’s dialectical model of social relations. Findings – Symbolic interactionist theories posit that deception can be socially good, regardless of whether it is morally right or wrong, because of its facilitative effects on interaction order. While applicable to the tactful ‘polite fictions’ that characterise some routine encounters in everyday life, this model of pragmatic rationality becomes complicated when one analyzes its deployment in more intimate forms of social relationship. Drawing on Simmel’s dialectic of fascination and fear, the author suggests
that the relative influence of these factors shifts as intimacy increases: cautious reserve gives way to trust, excitement and risk taking, experienced through both collusive deception and honesty. This culminates in the Goffmanesque ‘transceiver’, an agent who can take the view of both fraudster and victim simultaneously, viewing the social drama from both perspectives; fear, suspicion and cynicism then paradoxically re-emerge. The consequences of transceivership are explored in relation to self-deception, through the example of academic impostorism.


This article contributes to an ongoing theoretical effort to extend the insights of relational and network sociology into adjacent domains. The authors integrate Simmel’s late theory of the relational self into the formal analysis of social relations, generating a framework for theorizing forms of association among self-relating individuals. On this model, every “node” in an interaction has relations not only to others but also to itself, specifically between its ideality and its actuality. The authors go on to integrate this self-relation into a formal model of social relations. This model provides a way to describe configurations of social interactions defined by the *forms* according to which social relations realize participants’ ideal selves. They examine four formal dimensions along which these self-relational relationships can vary: distance, symmetry, scope, and actualization.


In this paper, the author addresses the question of personality in Durkheim and Simmel by distinguishing between two distinct but interrelated questions, each of which will be specifically analyzed. 1) Question of philosophical anthropology: the concept of “individual personality”. It will be to discern what notion of the human being is implemented by the two authors. Terrier focuses in particular on the question of the difference between individual and individual, and between mind and body, on the other, in the conceptual schemes of Durkheim and Simmel. 2) Question macrosociological: here Terrier tries to make sense of the term “collective personality”, that is to say, “subjectivity of society” (understood as the more inclusive context of
One must determine here whether it makes sense, in terms of both authors considered, to posit the existence, for a social entity, a “character traits” individuals. If the notion has obvious political benefits, it is not without methodological difficulty. As well as Durkheim, Simmel has been reluctant on this issue.

The availability of Simmel’s entire body of work allows to examine the misunderstandings occasioned by his moderation of strictly scientific forms of inquiry in his later writings. The examination is not bounded by the outward aspects of his works, offering instead an opportunity to examine his style of thought and, thereby, the fundamental intent of his work, which involves a sustained effort to link sociology with philosophy. The analysis proceeds in three stages. First, a survey of the *corpus* of Simmel’s works will identify the (‘non-scientific’) elements in question. Subsequently, the author examines the role of form in Simmel’s work and career, in his seminar practice, in his conception of sociology as centered on “forms of socialization”, and in the nature of the essay, in contrast with Adorno’s conceptions in particular. Finally, an analysis of the philosophical underpinnings of Simmel’s though on language will demonstrate why he considered the question of scientific forms in contrast to the meaning of problems.

In the last study of his *Logik der Kulturwissenschaften* (1942), Ernst Cassirer criticizes Simmel’s conception of a “tragedy of culture” as too pessimistic. He distinguishes himself thereby from a position that remains otherwise closed to its own. In this paper, the author attempts to show – against the main dominant scholarship – how Simmel’s analysis of the cultural development still contains a finer interpretation of modernity’s pathologies than Cassirer’s optimistic assumption.

This volume presents the theory of culture of the Russian-born German Jewish social philosopher David Koigen (1879-1933). Heir to Hermann Cohen’s neo-
Kantian interpretation of Judaism as a religion of reason, he draws upon philosophical anthropology and the sociology of religion to go beyond Kantian formalism. The resulting primacy given to religious consciousness brought him close to Martin Buber, with whom he shared an interest in East European Hasidism as a source of religious renewal. Author of *Ideen zur Philosophie der Kultur* (1910) and *Der moralische Gott* (1922), among other works, Koigen enters a much wider debate on the relation between religion, culture and conceptions of the nation, developing a non-essentialist approach to religion and ethnicity. Enjoining the concept of *ethos* as the arbiter of *ethnos* and ethics he formulates a theory of culture on the basis of Jewish monotheism that would pose a challenge to Liberal Judaism and Liberal Protestantism alike. Among his interlocutors were Max Scheler, Georg Simmel, Ernst Troeltsch, and Max Weber. His elucidation of the complex interplay between Judaism’s concept of covenant and its attendant *ethos* offers a novel approach to the construction of a modern Jewish identity. The theoretical value of the notion of *ethos* for the sociology of religion is most succinctly expressed in a lecture on the *ethos* in Judaism which is presented and annotated for a first time in this volume.


Heidegger’s conception of “the fourfold,” or *Geviert*, and the meaning of its various aspects (“earth and sky, divinities and mortals”) is notoriously elusive. As a remedy to this situation the author proposes to read the fourfold as a programmatic blueprint for critiquing *idolatry*. Heidegger’s central concern lies with idolatrous aspirations toward immortality, which are typically generated in certain cultural milieus. To make this case, Weidler draws on recent commentaries by Julian Young and Mark Johnston as well as on one of Heidegger’s near contemporaries, Georg Simmel. Specifically, Simmel’s milieu-based analyses in *Philosophical Culture* (1911) provide the much needed illustrations that may allow to render Heidegger’s own culture-critical insights more concrete, with respect to the fourfold’s dynamic structure and inner tensions.

The assumption of competition among nation-states is a well-established premise of historical and sociological research on the modern state-system. The literature, however, typically focuses on certain forms of competition: States are seen as engaging in a continual power struggle for “hard” goods such as territories and natural and human resources while competition for “soft” ones such as attention, legitimacy, and the achievement of prestige tends to be neglected. This paper draws attention to the latter goods and presents a sociological model of public forms of competition that combines Simmel’s concept of competition with insights from communication theory, media, and globalization research. This model draws attention to the influence of external observers of the state system – universalized third parties such as international organizations, social scientists, and journalists – and to different forms of competition created by such processes and third parties. On this basis, the paper outlines three historical trends in competition between nation-states (and national collective identities) since the late 19th century: competition for the prestige associated with modernity, for the prestige gained by specific cultural achievement, and for attention/legitimacy.