

## **Abstract: Revisiting Indigenization of Social Sciences**

What does indigenization of social sciences mean? Does it have the same meaning to all those concerned with this project in social sciences and humanities or does this concept have different meanings for different schools of indigenizers? Some would argue that indigenization refers to nativizing social sciences in contrast to westernization of knowledge as though knowledge pursuit is a local-bounded so by nativizing social sciences we could overcome western values which are embedded within occidental frame of references. But there are others who argue that indigenization of social sciences is similar to the project of Islamization of knowledge which did not yield to any substantial result within academic social sciences and soon will fade away. However, this problematique is a serious one and if we take only the Iranian context into consideration then we see that the challenges are serious and grave in consequences. Here in this article we shall raise this question that at what level is possible to talk about indigenization? For instance, if we agree, as Ibn Khaldun mentions, that there could be five levels of knowledge, i.e. demonstration, dialectics, rhetoric, poetics and sophistry, then at which levels can we talk about 'native' form of knowledge or 'local' forms of episteme?