**Reconstructing Sociological theory**
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**Should we integrate (racial, sexual, and/or post-colonial) “local knowledge’s” to reconstitute sociological theory?**

The idea of local knowledge or traditional knowledge has come to the forefront recently. In sociology, the idea of traditional or local knowledge is that empirically the process of knowledge is a local process. In other words, the ideas exist, and they drive the new findings in any field of research. For this reason, knowledge cannot be standardized or be made absolute. This focus on traditional knowledge opens the chances for a comparison between the knowledge and the concepts that are produced by different cultures in different timings(Bourdieu 1984). These comparisons have never been part of the sociology before. In doing the comparative study, the methodologies, their logic, the socio-economic contexts, and their cognitive structures can be changed but one thing that must be common in this study should be its localness. There are many different forms of local knowledge. Depending upon their classification by a different social scientist, it becomes impossible to list them all. Some of the important local knowledge in sociology pertains to the field of social stratifications, religion, and secularization, sexuality, and post-colonialism. Totalizing or universalizing of knowledge, on the other hand, is projecting the knowledge on the ontological basis. The ontological basis is to project the knowledge of the scientific background. As in this world of today, the scientific interpretation of the knowledge is considered enough to give it an outlook of the Law, the totalizing knowledge concept appears to be the final score of knowledge(Bourdieu 1984: 94).

*Neo-Marxism and Bourdieu*: According to Karl Marx, the working classes are the real actors of change in the history of mankind. He believed that every change in the universe should be associated with the working classes. If this working class has never opted to work for, they would otherwise have the potential existence. The ideas put forth by Marxism depicts that Karl Marx never presented himself as from the working class, rather he opined for himself as belonging from the objective community, in which hands are the destiny to create history. In nutshell, Marxism did not substitute his own power. Doing this had taken from him the opportunity of symbolic domination. But why the Marxism will let the opportunity of symbolic dominations go. In searching for that one can argue that Marxism has failed to recognize the emergence of the symbolic world. It has remained unsuccessful in anticipating the emergence of new fields like sciences, arts, journalism, etc. This all-new emergence challenges the ideas put forth by the Marxism. Marxism has remained to fail in understanding the class struggle, it has not taken the hold of the understanding that social classes are represented by some figures that have the symbolic powers in their hands(Bourdieu 1984: 94). In failing to do so, the class Marxism talked about- the working class, remained stick to the paper. It remained no longer effective. When the economics was being established as the new field in the nineteenth century, the ideas presented by the Marxism were quite meaningful. But when the bureaucratic, cultural, scientific and other fields emerged, the ideas presented by the Marxism lost their grip gradually. With the emergence of these new ideas, the theory of Marxism became retrograde.

Bourdieu had remained critical about Marxism. He has considered the ideas of Karl Marx as illusionist knowledge. Why knowingly one will remain opposing to the popularity? What comes in hand while keeping yourself away from the charms? Bourdieu argues that knowledge is produced freely, the same is true for art. For him, these all are not the products of the specific material conditions. He calls this as a scholastic fallacy. This fallacy he has taken over to the criticism on other thinkers too. According to Bourdieu, Marx has contravened from his own critique on idealism, thus making a place for a fallacy. This critique goes on over the aspects of local and universal knowledge. Bourdieu argues that since the real workers are busy in making better the lives of their own, therefore they don’t make themselves part in creating local knowledge(Bourdieu 1984: 101). Although they exist somewhere beyond but will never go farther from the economic advantages.

*Sociology Universalizing- Gramsci:* The ideas of universalization put forth by Gramsci can be better understood by comparing it with what Karl Marx has provided. Since Karl Marx rested his opinion on the ideas of capitalism and opined that there is the accumulation of wealth in some major hand. He has also disconnected this whole process of accumulating wealth from the will of the persons. Compared to Karl Marx, Gramsci has viewed everything based on structures. For him, the universalization is the apex and for reaching there, a class struggle is required. Gramsci has, therefore, rested his work on these structures and some ideologies. For substantiating his thoughts, he has based (or tried to base) his work on theory(Go 2013: 29). He has divided the structures into institutions, He believes that universalization cannot be achieved by institutionalizing the system. He has also based his arguments on the basis that since intuitions are formed to secure the interests. They, therefore, become a hurdle in making the system go toward universalization. He has further divided the institutions into two forms, the coercive one and the ones who are not coercive. For both, he opines that they are the hurdles in making the knowledge expanded. He has also presented one other reason for this which are the relations of productions. For example, the civil society, the political society, and the state. Taking this debate presented by Gramsci forward, he argues that the class divides, the institutional divides and some other factors of the society finally restrict the expansion of knowledge making them stick to some areas(Goffman 1978: 18). This stops incorporation of local knowledge, thus restricting the creation of universal knowledge. There is one other perspective to this, which is when restricting knowledge has become the ultimate end, everyone becomes a spectator. No one according to Gramsci is then in a condition to evolve and hence becomes a tool in stopping the knowledge from becoming universalized.

*Gramsci’s War of movement/ War of Position*: Antonio Gramsci’s used these terms such as the war of movement or the war of position to describe the different phases of the class struggles. Based on these perceptions, he suggested ways to the revolutionaries to take. The war of movement, Gramsci has described as the conflict between the classes. The opposing parties in this conflict remain different classes of society. The war of position, Gramsci has mentioned as the hidden clash. He describes that in the war of position the class struggles remain hidden. This scheme of a war of position and the war of movement is important for describing the situation of our society(Bourdieu 1990:23). On one side the war of position is to gain the influence in the society or to win this world, whereas the war of movement is the struggle of force- to get oneself on to the position that benefits one’s interests. For a very simple understanding presented by Gramsci, one can put it in this way that the war of position is just to take get over to the upper strata in the society, whereas the war of movement is the class struggle. Gramsci then goes on to mention that such positions have always be achieved by the capitalist or the political elite of the society. He mentions that the capitalists use their economic influence and the politicians used their personal influence to get in the favored positions in these wars of movement and position. As like Gramsci has gone against the ideas of Karl Marx, Mackinnon has argued against the class struggle concept offered by Gramsci. He mentions that there are no two facets in the class struggle, rather it is all about the totalization or domination(Bourdieu 1990:58). He argues that domination is the hold of the all means of production and they can, therefore, be not shared with those that are the resources for that- the lower or the working classes. This has been done with the work of Gramsci because his contributions lacked the sense of totalization's concept of society.

*Foucault’s eminism:* Like all other postmodernists, Foucault had based his theoretical paradigms on the local knowledge. He remained opposed to those who thought that the local knowledge remains unimportant. The concept of feminism has not remained that much apparent in the work of Foucault. He has in fact based his ideas on the notion of gender. Many of the feminists that have embraced his ideas just to carry on with their political narratives. He has talked about the condition of women just in the comparison of men. In his books, he had shared sympathy toward women but nowhere he had based the class struggle solely on women. In short, he had remained passive in his thoughts about women. In his works, Foucault had just explained the class struggles of women(Go 2013: 27). For example, he mentions that shaved Women were used to fulfill the sexual desires of the Germans. One other aspect of Foucault’s scholarship is that he has never interpreted gender and feminist perspectives. It comes as no surprise that; the feminist has gone much far to interpret the Foucault's view of women. For just their political gains, the feminists have presented Foucault as an ambassador of women's right. These feminists had never studied the bottom to the top approach of knowledge related to women. For them, the local knowledge regarding women remains unimportant, as it is not something that will bring positiveness to their campaigns. The pre-colonial notions of feminism could have added to their struggle, but not the post-colonial. Foucault's work has invited critique. The basic reason for all the critique remained his incomplete understandings about feminism and the rights of the women. There are many ways in which the work of Foucault had been criticized. Hill Collin was one such scholar, who remained critical to the work of Foucault. She mentions that sympathy for women is her efforts against the patriarchy. The other sympathy with the women is including the efforts of the Black women's too(Go 2013:37). Hill Collins argues that the efforts of the black omens are much worthy, compared to those of the White women. . She mentions that they all had remained oppressed under the regime of men(Go 2013:39).

*Bourdieu gender or race*: Bourdieu has added a different dimension to the debate of gender and race. He has inculcated the policy of segregation. As like Gramsci, Bourdieu has added the class divide in the debate of gender. His division, in this case, is very easy to understand. For example, he compares the opportunities available to the children of an upper-class family, and that of the lower-class family. In another case, he adds the dimension of sex. The female, he mentions could have more opportunities, compared to that of the males. This time again, he had developed the segregation based on gender(Bourdieu 1984:321). The gender is what according to him defines the opportunities. He also extends his views to that of the culture. He argues that different cultures in the world view the gender divisions differently. For the cultures that are a kind of conservatives, thinks that male domination is workable, and the females are inherently limited to an area. This could also be said as opposite in liberal cultures. In such culture women either gets equal opportunities and they are not limited to any specific area. The totalization theory in this regard also suggests that bringing together the cross-cultural concepts regarding the class divide may add something positive to society. There has been many critiques of the ideas of gender division by Bourdieu. Bonna Silvia considers in this regard that the gender division or the class segregation remains of the less important. He argues that Bourdieu has done so by viewing the things from an outsider perspective. For him, the theoretic underpinnings of Bourdieu are like an outsider perspective. For this reason, he goes on to state that the practical manifestation of some phenomena's remains important. Bonna Silvia also argues that this much-complexed view of the class division, the race segregations or any other social division remains indifferent to the classical sense of the sociology(Bonilla-Silva 2004:934).

The sociological theories remain an ever-evolving phenomenon. There is various reason for this. For example, the class divide still exists and there is a continuity in this process too. On the other hand many other things that constitute importance in sociology are improving or in other words, are impacting on the society of this day. The researchers in Sociology are dependent on such changes to draw their outcomes. Therefore, the accumulation of racial, sexual or postcolonial local knowledge remains important in developing the sociological theory to some extent.
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