



Ideological Discourse: Based on Subjective Conditions Towards Objective Consciousness of Intellectuals Understanding Reality Sociological Perspective of Knowledge

Surahman Cinu*; Hajir Bahrin Maula; Nanang Wijaya

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Tadulako University, Palu, Indonesia

INFO ARTICLE

* Corresponding author;
surahmancinu@gmail.com

Keywords:

ideology;
knowledge;
objective consciousness;
reality;
sociology;

ABSTRACT

The sociology of knowledge examines how the subjective thoughts and ideological backgrounds of intellectuals influence their perception and understanding of reality. Ideological biases often shape their analysis, creating a gap between perceived and objective truth. This study aims to explore how these subjective conditions affect the ability of intellectuals to attain objective consciousness and the development of scientific knowledge within the framework of the sociology of knowledge. Employing a phenomenological qualitative approach, the research captures perceptions through interpretive analysis, drawing on the theories of Karl Mannheim and Clifford Geertz to analyze the interaction between cultural systems, ideology, and knowledge construction. The findings reveal that ideological influences significantly shape how intellectuals interpret facts and social phenomena, often leading to partial or biased understandings that hinder objectivity. The sociology of knowledge serves as a crucial tool in unveiling these subjective influences, encouraging self-awareness among researchers regarding their social and cultural conditioning. The conclusion emphasizes that achieving objective consciousness necessitates an awareness of the social and ideological factors that shape perceptions. The discipline offers vital insights into the relationship between subjective beliefs and objective realities, advocating for reflexivity and contextual understanding in scientific inquiry to foster a more accurate and comprehensive grasp of social phenomena.



INTRODUCTION

How does the sociology of knowledge understand the subjective thoughts of intellectuals? This question is important to reveal in order to trace the relationship between ideology and the subjective thinking tradition of intellectuals. The sociology of knowledge is a discipline that studies the ontology and epistemology of subjective thinking related to the elements of rational thinking and all academic ambitions, we call it utopia, Karl Mannheim (1993) understands it as one of the latest branches of the discipline of sociology that seeks to analyze the relationship between knowledge and existence as a historical sociological study.

This branch seeks to trace the form of such a relationship to human intellectual development, social scientists are tasked with tracing the essence of objective facts behind the phenomenon. A cultural anthropologist named Clifford Geertz (1974) traces two views that contain different discussion areas, namely ideology and cultural systems. According to him, ideology is part of a cultural system or belief that influences various subjective elements of humans, although its basis does not go beyond empirical facts inherent in every human cultural life. In the narrative of the world book encyclopedia, ideology is defined as something that is not based on factual information to strengthen beliefs. People's acceptance of a particular system of thought tends to reject a system of thought that is not in line with its principles, although the difference in logical argumentation is in accordance with scientific principles.

Adherents of certain ideologies have difficulty understanding and combining the two differences will be difficult to compromise, this phenomenon has befallen intellectuals since the post-Immanuel Kant era and at the same time violates the dialectic process. Ideology as a guide for intellectuals provides perspective in every analysis of various background events, although understanding something behind the phenomenon becomes subjective due to the intervention of the thinking system, but according to Geertz (1974) it is important for scientists to discuss phenomena, trying to build a synthesis between ideology as a framework of knowledge with the culture inherent in the value system in society.

Causality between the construction of facts of thinking in order to understand that reality does not stand alone, but as a unity of cause and effect in a paradoxical cycle, C. Wright Mills (1956) calls it with support from inter-relations and coexistence of the causality of the relationship between facts and ideology. He emphasized the importance of understanding the relationship between ideology and the structure of society, so that this thinking system can work double, namely as a control tool as well as an instrument of manipulation, this was expressed by Mills in his book *The Power Elite* (1956) explaining the role of ideology in maintaining power. It is carried out because it is considered as a basis for truth even though it is contrary to the work of universal laws that move using the principle of rationality.

The world is a relationship between facts formed by subjective consciousness, creating interrelations, presenting objectivity from the process of thinking through building subjective relationships, by Bertrand Russell (1946) understanding the world and all its subjective processes is irrational, moving based on certain laws, revolving around the relationship between facts and knowledge so that the function of science tries to capture the irrational causality based on rational laws, even so the belief that ideology will succeed in revealing reality as truth becomes "utopian," but it is intended that through this way of thinking intellectuals try to bring reality closer to the truth, although it is not singular, perhaps this is also intended by Karl Mannheim.

Mannheim's sociology of knowledge intends to understand the importance of science being read based on the socio-historical context of society, the formation of science is based on the social context based on the findings of its historical facts, the society that forms its social facts he calls not a collection of events that stand alone, but become part of the explanation of the existence of human interrelation with the existence of reality. Does the entry of ideology into science mean that the position of scientific objectivity represents reality over actual facts? This question leads us to the assumption that reality, although consisting of various empirical facts, has differences in substance between one and another. Facts are revealed par excellence based on the researcher's wishes, but reality is something unknown, the real, can only be revealed correctly if scientists succeed in communicating by constructing facts as participatory phenomena, not artificial.



LITERATURE REVIEW

This study builds a paradigm of the sociology of knowledge approach. This approach is understood as a new perspective in the study of sociology, one of the focuses of the study is tracing the minds of intellectuals by understanding their subjective background before determining paradigmatic partisanship. This study is recognized as dominant in one paradigm, a strong tendency towards Marxian analysis. Non-Marxian analysis is also carried out although there is minimal discussion, proof of the two things above can be traced by looking at the literature of this study. Why are Marxian references dominant, the reason is that the sharpness of critical social construction is in Marxian social intellectuals, one of the reasons why critical awareness is present, perhaps because of their background as social movement figures. Readers can see in the bibliography point, the use of references refers to Marxians, such as Karl Mannheim, Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser and others, they are always positioned as strong defenders of Karl Marx.

METHOD

This study uses a phenomenological research methodology, capturing facts in the author's perception, then analyzed based on perception is a way of understanding that subjective awareness comes from the interaction between researchers and objects of study as an experience of reality. The researcher's contact with various references allows facts to be managed intersubjectively, namely bringing together various literatures, the process of interaction between these arguments opens up space for the presence of objective awareness. The reason is that various comparisons of thesis descriptions finally lead to a synthesis in the form of reality. One of the steps in literature research is taking the *verstehen* step as a methodology in phenomenological research, namely interpreting facts, interpreting them in analysis as an effort to understand objective reality.

The sociology of knowledge is a scheme for understanding reality based on objective human conditions but has a relationship with the background of the researcher, then forming a paradigmatic bias. Based on a paradigmatic angle, intellectuals determine their ideological choices. As a result of the strong bias in one of the paradigms, the relationship between intellectuals becomes mutually negating each other, saying that outside of them is utopia.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Subjective Construction of Ideology

The sociology of knowledge emphasizes how individuals construct the meaning of relational reality in their interactions understanding facts, often feeling the relation of facts in a different sense from something that must be interpreted, so that the real can only be understood as it should be, if scientists understand their thinking structure is not trapped in the phenomenon as it is but rather on how intellectuals ideally understand it. The first concept explains an experience, while the second locus is based on the intervention efforts of the scientist's thinking structure on sensory experience by giving interpretive meaning to various symptoms, the relational position between phenomena and reality has an intersubjective relationship. The discussion above understands that there are two contradictory terminologies in it, first the diction about ideology, second in the phenomenological aspect, both have arguments that negate and also need each other. Ideology, besides as previously stated, also has an interpretive meaning, allowing intellectuals to build relationships with the social structure of society as a product of interpretation and then giving birth to an interpretation of the meaning borrowing Weber's thinking method is *Verstehen*. It is difficult to find it in the positivistic realm, so that the relationship between ideology and interpretation of empirical facts invites the meaning of interpretation of reality, perhaps we also call it a phenomenon of social progressiveness or borrowing Eyerman's language (1985) when defining intellectuals as a group that challenges and questions social structures in the name of progress, or borrowing Mannheim's term (1991) utopia, as an academic condition that requires continued efforts to carry out social construction of the phenomenon of progressiveness.

Ideology is a small part of the cultural system, the history of modern science is attached as a basis for analysis, aiming to strengthen scientific arguments, as an initial concept it is merely an argumentation



instrument for the presence of knowledge discourse, but has not become a prerequisite for argumentation. Uniquely, political practitioners have recently encouraged and even strengthened it to become a method of thinking that is practiced, in several phenomena it functions as a social romance such as the political behavior of Napoleon Bonaparte for example. The relationship between ideology, the relationship between theory and practice according to Webster's that there is a postulate of the unification of theory that carries out its consultative function as a social romance, politicians often use it as a propaganda tool such as the German and Italian fascists, but such a function also becomes an instrument of destruction for the ideology. The history of ideology comes from a certain part of a subject of knowledge, initially initiated by Destutt de Tracy in his book *Elements d'ideologie*, the emphasis on the presence of ideas as science and the importance of expanding criticism, one of which was conveyed by Francis Bacon about idols in his book entitled *Novum Organum* published in 1620 discussing the terminology of consciousness transformed into the Perspective of reason, further see Giddens (1979). Further developments, ideology cannot be separated from as Mannheim (1991) said, glued together with the development of the situation of people's lives as science works, this is recorded in the struggle of various parties, especially ideological politicians, including elements of ideas over beliefs in the methodology of thinking and work schemes.

Through this way they try to maintain the value then transform the idea into a ratio as well as a tool for the purpose of interest, thus ideology is understood as a model of systematic rational ideas that have evolved into a belief system that has intervened in the realm of science. Marxian sociologist Althusser consistently distinguishes between science and ideology, he displays the difference between theoretical and practical even though according to him the system of thinking is the basis of science. Althusser's (1972) interesting work on the ideology of his relationship with intellectuals can be traced to the diction of over determination, he connects the idea with Lenin's assumption about the weakest link, namely the ongoing main contradiction in the structure of Russian society, according to Lenin it allows the state to easily encourage the ongoing social revolution, but Althusser believes that the contradictions in feudal capitalist society do not directly impact the presence of social transformation, because according to him, at the same time there will be an accumulation of other contradictions that combine into an unstable unity or over determination, so according to Althusser it is necessary to understand that the social changes that occur in Russia are not contradictions between social systems, so that the presence of capitalist ideology in such a situation allows the transformation to socialist ideology to take place through the state mobilization scheme.

The failure of the symptoms of over determination opens up space for consolidation in other zones, so that the social revolution does not have to be designed in areas with such conditions. Tracing the terms above, Althusser seems to be trying to understand the Russian situation from a more sociological perspective, but does not abandon the theory of revolution based on Lenin's ideology. The consistency of separating social theory from ideology maintains the belief that social theories move in the ideological run way. This perspective does not negate Habermas's view (1988) understanding ideology as an element contained in the symbol system in the social sciences. A neutral language to understand science works in ideal conditions even though the subjective nature of scientists understands phenomena based on their internal situation, as Mannheim said, ideology is an act of thinking or knowledge of intellectuals influenced by social structures involving space and time. Mannheim traced it as a sociological knowledge system, placing the historical context between social structures and the position of society. Marxians call it utopia, intended as an ideal phenomenon touched by the concept of unity of analysis, as Marx said, ideology becomes part of the expression or justification of the interests of the dominant class. The question is, how is the relationship between intellectuals and utopian consciousness personified in the modern context as a progressive force to achieve future hopes?

Tracing the answer to such a question, the starting point is based on Michael Foucault's (1988) assumption regarding the classification of social categories, namely specific intellectuals and general intellectuals. The first group refers to those who intensely discuss the relationship of power with knowledge that has been taken for granted. Because according to him, the ideology of intellectuals must be involved together in various issues of backwardness and oppression, not just researching the facts that occur without being involved together, in the language of Ali Syariaty (2001) a *raushan fikr* (intellectual) is someone who has



a clear and critical mind, is actively involved and processes together with society to build social transformation. Intellectuals in relation to progressive ideas are always associated with socialist ideology, Mannheim is one of the references related to this, raised in the Jewish tradition of Budapest in addition to his contact with the revolutionary movement. The most prominent thing is his involvement in the Soviet Republic of Bela Kun which was colored by the progressive ideological ideas of Geog Lukacs and at the University of Budapest itself where he and his group developed free cultural thinking. Another reference is Antonio Gramsci (1971) who was also a communist socialist leader, the largest political party in Italy during Mussolini's reign. Gramsci concluded that organic intellectuals should be involved in the problems of their society, ideology according to Gramsci plays an important role in the formation of hegemonic, namely conditions formed by consensus and recognition from society. Another Budapest scientist named Ivan Szelenyi explained that an intellectual is someone who organizes his society based on rational and teleological principles towards social transformation, that power must be in power (Konrad and Szelenyi 1979).

Tracing the life history of progressive intellectuals allows us to understand their position on two sides as Emerson (1969) said they gave birth to abstract ideas and concepts that are universal, free from the voices of social groups outside themselves. Second, it can be said that intellectuals are free people, because their position is behind the line of their citizens. Szelenyi's explanation opens up space to review the history of social transformation that has occurred so far, when intellectuals were actually involved in managing authoritarian power connected to the time and political space at that time. The dominance of progressive ideology is in the area of Marxian intellectuals, but their background greatly determines the discourse of science in that direction, scientists have different institutional positions allowing space and time to underlie analytical power including partisanship. Disappointment with the condition of social structure also explains how ideology is born from the subjective background of intellectuals, so that this term is quite difficult to separate from the concept of utopia. Utopia is a form of individual knowledge ideals based on the previous disappointment, there is an interpretation of the "social dream" for the presence of a contradictory system such as the experience of scientists.

Ideological Awareness of Intellectuals

The idea of historical romanticism and the movement of political intellectuals" as a subjective basis for building prejudices about the ideal type of thinking system, paved the way for conservatism such as Mannheim to describe his approach to ideology not only as a form of scientific analysis, but also to encourage different beliefs about social structures outside the subjective beliefs of scientists, finally presenting the term utopia. Conservatism if interpreted as a romantic movement of socialists then for capitalists the social structure is a utopia and vice versa. How do Marxian conservatives understand organic category scientists? This perspective gives rise to dualism as well as ambiguity as according to Eyerman (1981), the Marxian assumption that social scientists must get out of the bourgeoisie path with the same background, so that articulate offers provide alternatives to the presence of radical theoretical formulations for the sake of consolidating the proletarian class struggle can be fulfilled.

On the other hand, ideological Marxism such as the Leninist group does not give enough trust to intellectuals and even accuses them of being agents or groups that can get out of their original class at any time, even having no class at all, even though the methodology The social structure of Marx becomes a historical recognition of the position of the bourgeoisie class, according to him, intellectuals have the opportunity to commit class suicide, a phenomenon of the transition process from their original class as the bourgeoisie to a new class as the proletariat. The formation of ideology through the process of epistemological articulation is based on the essence of awareness of the phenomenon of feudal structures becoming stronger, intellectuals are present with a background of ideological awareness of anti-establishment, pursuing utopia based on the formulation of the ideal type of society guided by their ideology. Scientists are not a neutral community when understanding humans and social structures, they maintain science based on subjective steps. The sociological view of knowledge states that scientists think and act based on the influence of the social structure of the environment or history related to their position in the vortex of subjective consciousness, namely social conditions along with various phenomena that surround them, although ideological opinions are in the

Page 55 of 60



dimension of the state. Forms of contradiction must still be defined because the ideal state gives freedom to every individual and intellectuals to express and manage various thoughts as Hegel said, in the state subjective thoughts gain freedom, this is a form of public agreement borrowing Kant's term, or public opinion by Hegel. The state is an institutional representation of two opinion-forming forces, civil society and state society. The first diction shows the institutional status quo, second those outside are formed by public consciousness, but both can represent a certain ideological network, depending on individual consciousness. According to Hegel, the state is a facilitator institution for these two interests to interact with each other. Further see Giddens (2009).

The concept of ideology is expected to be consistent in scientific values, free to be believed from a rational phenomenon, how fascism is politically authoritarian and anti-democratic shows the term of resistance to all forms of thinking systems, The emphasis of the concept of ideology is also openly explored by Talcott Parsons (1951), he gave an example of the theory of social deviation, his writing on the Essential Criteria of ideology discusses at least two elements that are transmitted in humans, deviations and discrepancies. The first concerns the handling of deviations from values in society and the emphasis as a real element of life, the existence of compromise for individual freedom. Second, society pays attention to its contribution in terms of realizing welfare as a cultural instrument that forms stability. Parsons' perspective that a system of thinking that focuses on analysis strengthens solidarity and social cohesion is tied to a system of values, so ideology functions as a controlling instrument for building social welfare. Parsons' background spent his academic life in an area where pragmatic ideology and sociological theory journeys developed well in America after the arrival of a French academic from the Durkheim school named Pitirine A. Sorokin, teaching at the University where Parsons studied at the institute, also explains a similar thinking context with radical progressive scientists, such as Althusser, Mannheim or others as explained previously.

Parsons' AGIL theory (an abbreviation of Adaptation, Goal Attainment, Integration and Latency) repositions Durkheim's cultural approach in the study of harmony as an effort to provide a new perspective in the tradition of American multicultural cultural society, although it is understood that the role of the state in the formation of civic harmony is very strategic, thus providing cultural space through a political approach to state institutions as important agents for programs to form citizen solidarity. Discussing the problem of socio-political ideas such as the trial of abinitio, that's how the word is given to the social science, maybe because ideology is one of the social parts that directly touches the political situation, especially its intellectuals, originating from a combination of several disciplines of science and until now social sciences based on the contradiction of the system of thought have experienced various polemics. Confirming how the system of thought explores various social resources, becoming a strategic engine for the development of community civilization as according to Surahman (2015), ideology is tasked with raising the mystery of reality into social facts. The perspective of social action is fundamental and has no end to the struggle against tyrannical power according to Machiavellianism is an opposition to the existence of the state, this perspective views power in this case the government as working for the interests of all elements inherent in the elements of the state, one of which is society, so that for the sake of the state's interests all its actions become legitimate, even though the decision was born from an authoritarian system of power.

Ideology as the understanding of absolute power from authoritarian power, then the cunning hand of the ruler is tasked with suppressing the desires and voices of public rights that function political control for the actualization of rational subjectivity as the task of intellectuals, for Machiavellians consider it a form of rebellion against the system of thought, they interpret ideology as the absolute authority of those in power who are given authority in the name of a social contract, carrying out the function of absolute power in order to achieve the final goal. On the other hand and at the same time social theory, especially sociology, focuses on the approach of individuals and groups in the structure of society that have special functions, explaining two social classes, namely the state and civil society, allowing equality as the personification of the creation of relations between the two in the public space. Public space functions as an integration medium for every subjective idea, then transmitted to the rational realm presenting various ideas as a result of testing subjective logic held by each element in the communication space. Hegel explains that the owner of the authority to manage and bring



together ideas is the task of the absolute spirit (read the state). Public space must not reside in that absolute spirit, this institution does not merely function as an arena for the battle of social classes or as a referee in the arena of competition, the state is actually present with a mission for the interests of the dominant class, so that the fight takes place unfairly, in accordance with the ideology of power of the Machavellianists, a term commonly referred to as the word absolute. This argument explains the importance of public space being presented and then functioning not only so that the discourse of ideas develops, but also functions as a medium for the meeting of communication awareness between various social groups, thus the escalation of science towards one order for the presence of equality between power and civil society, This can be created if the substantive dimension of public space that moves on the basis of subjective rationality is transformed into the objective realm, public space is an arena for the meeting of ideological ideas as well as objective control from civil society.

The existence of personal development, friction or social pressure appears at a certain level of each individual, psychological pressure is the experience of community behavior and the contradiction between character and prevailing values, good and bad impacts are consequences for the ongoing interaction so that it affects all elements, explaining that society and individuals are a unified system that reacts due to pressure from norms or rules from the value system. The pressure is related to the ideal situation that encourages emotional symbols to deal with the phenomenon of inequality and injustice, the task of intellectual ideologies is to find new patterns and take part in past thinking where the situation also changes. Eyerman (1990) explains the interrelated relationship in the process of social change when analyzing the relationship between intellectuals and modernization, the claim that today's intellectuals are products of the 17th and 18th centuries, then giving birth to the ideology of modernity that rejects all academic approaches that were products before the Renaissance, such as skepticism and atheistic communism and various other systems of thought, borrowing Mannheim's term, utopia. Mannheim understands that individuals in society are determined by two patterns, first influenced by the existing situation, in this situation humans find a model of thinking resulting from the formation of previous behavior, individuals understand themselves as ideologues, consistent in their intellectual choice, on the other hand, individuals assume that in the social structure a hereditary order has been formed, the function of ideology bridges the inequality of the two sides as referred to in the Marxian diction, intellectuals come from the ruling class who are transforming themselves to encourage the realization of the interests of the oppressed class, their steps present various segments of the interests of the proletariat class in local discourse, then universalized so that a humanitarian discourse is built so that it becomes a global argument for revolution. Second, the liberal perspective, intellectuals are social agents of change for the sustainability of public space as a place to exchange ideas, the results of this dialectic give birth to strong ideas for the interests of society.

The differences between them are not only in the realm of scientific methodology but also substance, it is possible that the dialectic of Marxians and liberals formulates the ideal type of one system of thought, maybe this is utopian, but the idea of the importance of democratic values for pluralist societies and the diversity of problems has transformed various political ideas to arrive at the discourse of civil citizenship, in a different perspective but together positioning society as according to Surahman (2025) is the main element of civil society to be sovereign in dealing with power. The ideology of power is a network of various citizen communities connected to each other that will experience problems if faced with a multicultural society, the pluralist character has a tradition of developing issues capable of exploring broadly, including conflicting with the state's belief system. The difference in the ideology of power with its citizens brings its own social problems for the consolidation of civil society vis a vis the state. This opens up space for demands and the probability of an ideological agreement taking place, this possibility has sufficient opportunity because history is upheld by the power of the dominant mode of production, while civil society has recently existed.

The history of authoritarian ideology was built when hegemonic practices had taken place in the colonial era, the feudal nature of the social elite along with the presence of the stigma of the lower classes in the lower classes, contributed significantly to the birth of an authoritarian state. When the era changed along with the changes, power continued to maintain the political representation of all social institutions closely related to



the model of state leadership. Sapir (1986) explained that leadership is a committee tasked with carrying out administrative functions as a sign of a person's authority, according to him, ideally society feels this administrative function because this condition is the smallest part of the symbol of social relations, leadership must recognize various community groups including small communities, an important factor is that support can also come from these groups.

The awakening of constitutional awareness of citizens as owners of sovereignty along with the ongoing social contradictions by itself civil society, especially the enlightened, borrowing Ali Syariaty's term, *raushan fikr* is a class that is freed because of the system built by the state, for example the modernization of education for civilians. Civil society resistance is present as a form of sovereignty owner, this class is carrying out its constitutional duties and functions as sovereign in the name of the people. This condition opens up space for transmission between power and citizens holding sovereignty, opening up space for ideological consolidation. Public communication space thus contributes significantly to the birth of civil society that functions as a balancing force in the political system of power, but the movement of civil ideology is hampered if the consolidation is used to build a power block with power, transmission between the two classes occurs not based on ideology for the sake of controlling the state, but merely the politics of the spatialization of the civil class opens up space for the opportunity to enter the state arena, then together manage the authoritarian political system. This phenomenon explains that the consolidation space of different groups if not based on ideological foundations, especially in the middle class, the result is merely the consolidation of political spatialization aimed at entering the space of power, the weak point comes from civil society who do not have a strong intellectual habitus adhering to the principles of the ideology of equality. Ideology is a confusing, complicated and annoying phenomenon, full of metaphors, analogies, ironies and paradoxes accompanied by various hyperbolic languages. Do we still have the ambition to understand it, or do we immediately become part of that system of thinking.

CONCLUSION

The discourse of ideology in relation to intellectuals is trapped by two dimensions of articulation due to the influence of the individual background of each scientist. The first articulation departs from the awareness of the existence of the presence of intellectuals in the cycle of their environment, the intensity of social and even political struggles opens up a collective consciousness of humanity for every phenomenon of deinstitutionalization events due to modernist influence, seen as a starting point for intellectuals to construct reality based on data, but the entire scientific action is thus persistent between at least two major streams, namely socialist and liberal intellectuals. Marxian ideological criticism of the rationality of modernists, which according to him, has destroyed the moral legitimacy of civilization by various contradictions of collective logic. The attack of modernity is also present as an academic response accompanied by arguments about the utopia of the Marxians because according to him it has failed in various arenas of social change. Second, Ideology increasingly emphasizes the subjective position of intellectuals increasingly at odds, the other side of the sharp debate actually confirms that ideology is a discipline of science even though it starts from subjective elements, it also becomes an objective basis for intellectuals to understand reality based on facts that are read objectively, the reading is then integrated into the situation and historical background of individual scientists, Ideology as an intellectual discipline of social theorists, especially sociological theorists, offers one tool, namely the sociology of knowledge.

The main thesis of the sociology of knowledge, said Karl Mannheim, is that unclear social origins also make our mindset unclear, the difficulty of understanding reality makes scientists think non-contextually. The sociology of knowledge seeks to understand the thoughts and concrete background of certain historical social situations so that they present different thoughts, humans generally do not think but rather certain individual groups develop thinking schemes in a series of responding to special situations, characterizing their general position. Analysis without considering bias towards all factors in a particular social situation can influence



thoughts, becoming the task of the sociology of knowledge. Historical ideas aim to provide modern humans with a view of the entire historical process of science, including the historical background of intellectuals and the responsibility of ideology, slowly the term ideology in the discipline of the sociology of knowledge begins to gain a clear understanding. This alternative approach follows two fundamental things, first, encouraging individuals to pay attention to the relationship between the intellectual perspective offered and their social position. Second, the effort to understand the epistemology of knowledge is not an absolute thing but an ideal type for the paradigmatic dialectic process as in the tradition of past philosophy of science.

REFERENCES

- Almahdali, H., Ramadani, H. Z., Dadi, A. F. P., Wibowo, D., Januru, L., Patmawati, S. A., Hasni, K., Puspitasari, R., Cinu, S., & Dahliani, S. (2025). *Sosiologi politik*. Yayasan Tri Edukasi Ilmiah.
- Althusser, L. (1972). *Politics and history: Montesquieu, Rousseau, Hegel and Marx*. NLB.
- Emerson, R. (1969). [Review of the book *International systems and the modernization of societies*, by J. P. Nettl & R. Robertson]. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 386(1), 228–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000271626938600180>
- Eyerman, R. (1981). False consciousness and ideology in Marxist theory. *Acta Sociologica*, 24(1–2), 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000169938102400104>
- Eyerman, R. (1985). Rationalizing intellectuals. *Theory and Society*, 14(6), 777–807. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00174050>
- Eyerman, R. (1992). Intellectuals: A framework for analysis, with special reference to the United States and Sweden. *Acta Sociologica*, 35(1), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000169939203500103>
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16–49). University of Massachusetts Press.
- Geertz, C. (1974). "From the native's point of view": On the nature of anthropological understanding. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 28(1), 26–45. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3822971>
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis*. University of California Press.
- Giddens, A. (2009). *Sociology* (6th ed.). Polity Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith, Eds. & Trans.). Lawrence & Wishart.
- Konrád, G., & Szelényi, I. (1979). *The intellectuals on the road to class power*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Mannheim, K. (1991). *Ideologi dan utopia: Menyingkap kaitan pikiran dan politik* (F. Budi Hardiman, Trans.). Kanisius.
- Mannheim, K. (1993). The sociology of intellectuals. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 10(3), 69–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026327693010003004>
- Mills, C. W. (2000). *The power elite*. Oxford University Press.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Free Press.
- Russell, B. (1946). *History of Western philosophy*. Routledge.
- Sapir, E. (1986). *Language, culture, and personality*. University of California Press.
- Shari'atī, A. (2001). *Abu Dzar: Suara parau menentang penindasan*. Muthahhari Paperbacks.
- Surahman. (2015). Keluar dari alienasi alam terhadap manusia: Perspektif teosofi transenden. *Jurnal Ushuluddin*, 23(2), 209–228. <https://doi.org/10.24014/jush.v23i2.2493>
- Habermas, J. (1988). *The theory of communicative action: Volume II: Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Beacon Press.