

Course Name- Sociology and Sanitation: An Introduction

Professor Name- Prof. Ashish Saxena

Department Name- Sociology

Institute Name- University of Allahabad

Week- 1

Lecture 03

Perspectives on Sociology of Sanitation

Friends, we are going to speak about the third aspect within the sociology and sanitation and it basically deals with an understanding about how we can speak about the perspectives which are related to sociology of sanitation. And I think within that framework we have to speak about that who were the basic key social scientist who has contributed, what are the various perspectives which have been used and apart from that we are also trying to speak about the Indian theorist which has contributed to that particular discourse. Now I think when we try to speak about the perspective I think there are certain things which we have to keep in mind like we have to speak about the various sociological theories and the sociological theories in that sense help us in understanding about the fact that how the social theory provides the necessary analytical and philosophical framework within which the social science can develop. And the social theory that we have been sustaining and achieving the past note that leads the limitation of the present and in that framework we try to see that social theory which is basically seen as having the international framework it helps in recognizing the discipline and also it helps in describing the things in a more sophisticated way. I think we try to speak about the Polish sociology which has started earlier and then we try to speak about the American sociology and gradually we try to see that in Europe especially in the 19th century after the world war first we try to see that there is a development of sociology in Europe and France. Especially I think the contribution by Thomas Hobbes and John Locke who were basically seen as an important pillars and they were basically trying to speak about the question of social order that how social order is possible and they were trying to see it in terms of the political terms in the theory of social contract.

And that is how we try to see that the theory plays a crucial role in understanding the whole phenomenon. Now the point of course is that in the 18th century the most important thing that happened of course is that there was the era of enlightenment we have people like Emile Durkheim we have Rousseau Montesquieu and they were basically treated as the founders of sociology and along with that we have the social contract theory which has been published and we have the whole idea that how sociology

in that sense has come into the prominence. So I think when we try to speak about the sanitation definitely it has certain bearings from sociology and the basic idea in that sense is that how we can speak about that sociology can play a crucial role in substantiating the discipline of sanitation and that is where we try to discuss about this issue of sociology and sanitation and this is basically the perspective which is giving you the color in that sense that how sanitation has to be seen in a specific discipline framework. And the most important thing in that sense of course is that we have to speak about the emergence of sociology because I think sociology has its bearing with regard to the understanding of sanitation as a discipline to some extent and that is how we are trying to develop the linkage between the sociology and sanitation.

I think we try to speak about the French revolution which was basically seen as an important aspect especially we try to speak about the post revolutionary theories which has come into prominence along with the enlightenment. We try to speak about the intellectual factors which has helped in the emergence of sociological theories and these social forces which has happened across the globe they were basically responsible for the emergence of discipline and also in terms of theorization and basically we try to see that they are basically seen as that how we can come out with certain natural laws how we can speak about the amount of theorization in that sense and how we can put it in terms of the rational understanding of the world. Now we try to see that the French sociology in that sense which has bearing with regard to the French revolution and we have people who had contributed towards its emergence especially we try to speak about the contribution of Saint Simon and the founding father of sociology that is the Grescomte and how they try to develop the sociology in terms of a discipline and I think when 1839 we try to see that sociology as the discipline has come into prominence we try to speak about that emphasis was given more on the positivism. Positivism basically is the scientific way of looking to the things and it is basically dealing with the positive philosophy and the whole idea in that sense of course is that how we are going to build up that particular discipline which has certain bearing with regard to the objectivity with regard to having certain scientific temper and these are certain things which we try to see in terms of the sociological method. I think the initial contribution of Emile Durkheim who is basically considered to be responsible for what you say the subject matter of sociology in terms of his famous work that is the rules of sociological method it was basically trying to argue that how we can have the understanding of social fact in terms of the sociological methods and the Durkheims understanding in that sense was based on the social fact.

So basically we try to see that when he said social fact the whole idea in that sense of course is that he was trying to put things in terms of how we can quantify things in terms of an object or in terms of things and that is where I think Durkheims contribution is going to be important because he relied on the observation, he relied on experimentation and based on that he was trying to build up his things. I think Durkheims understanding

in that sense was basically trying to speak about two broader types of social fact. One of course is the material and another is the non-material. So the material social fact in that sense was trying to speak about the architecture, the form of technology, the legal codes and other things in that sense and which was basically trying to argue that these are certain things which are to be seen in terms of the material forces. On the contrary we try to speak about the non-material which of course are to be seen in terms of the moral forces where I think the whole idea in that sense of course is that the morality the sort of the values in that sense which are going to be important and that is where we try to see that the understanding of sociology has come into prominence.

So in spite of the fact that the physical things in that sense are there we also have the role of the non-material social facts which are equally important to develop certain amount of social order in the society. Similarly I think when we try to speak about Karl Marx he was basically trying to speak about that how the modern life can be seen in terms of the material sources and the whole idea in that sense of course is that he was trying to see that the capitalist society which was based on the basic nature of human being and how it was basically leading to certain amount of change logy. Basically capitalism is a structure in that sense which has certain amount of bearing with regard to the barriers on individual and the production processes and within that framework he was trying to even expand it to the phenomenon of alienation that how it tries to bring about alienation. So the whole idea in that sense of course is that we try to see that similar things in that sense happens which are basically seen as an outcome of the society and within that framework we have to see the understanding of class in that sense which has been highlighted by Karl Marx and we basically try to see that Marx was basically trying to speak about the centrality of contradictions with regard to the historical changes and these contradictions he was trying to locate in the era of capitalism and these class contradictions in that sense are seen as the source of change and that is where we try to see that the whole idea in that sense has come into the picture that when we try to speak about the changes in that sense we are basically trying to speak about that how the sociological bearings in that sense are related to the material conditions in that sense and it is the economy which is going to be crucial with regard to the understanding of the society in general. And carrying forward that particular debate Max Weber who was also seen as an important pillar with regard to the issue of rationalization and his concern was that how we can speak about the formal rationality which has been talked about by Weber in a specific sense and the basic idea in that sense of course is that we have to speak about the Weber in terms of the creation of the bureaucracy in that sense and also he was trying to speak about the formal rationalization through bureaucracy which is basically leading to certain amount of what you can say differences in the society in terms of overcoming the traditional society.

So virtually we try to see that the classical thinkers in that sense on sociology either it is Durkheim or for that sake Marx or Weber they were basically trying to speak about

sociology in terms of a discipline where it tries to give a specific perspective and this perspective in that sense is going to give a color to the understanding of the discipline in a scientific way. And I think Weber's understanding in that sense which has its bearing with regard to the issue of Verstehen that is hermeneutics and hermeneutics basically we try to see is a special approach whereby we try to interpret the things and based on that we try to understand the social action of a human actor and that is where we try to see that he was even trying to speak about the ideal type which was basically seen as an important source for understanding or analyzing the society or the societal structure in that sense. So virtually we try to see that the interpretation of the action which has a subjective meaning also is going to be equally important. So apart from that objective understanding of the society I think the subjective analysis or the creation of subjectivity and how it is may lead to certain amount of scientific next that also has been pointed out by the classical thinkers and that way I think if you try to see the perspective which we are trying to discuss with regard to the issue of sanitation it may have certain aspects in that sense especially when we try to speak about the framework of the social scientists we may say that we have the evolutionary school of thought the evolutionary perspective we have the structural functional perspective we have the structuralism in that sense we have the conflict perspective in that sense we have symbolic interaction and we have the ethnomethodology which were basically seen as an important perspective for understanding things. And in the later phase we try to speak about the contribution of subaltern perspective and the postmodern perspective which were basically trying to negate the previous understanding about the so called classical perspective.

So I think we have to see that how these perspectives in that sense can play a crucial role how the theorization which has been developed in sociology can play a crucial role with regard to the understanding of the phenomenon of sanitation and the allied themes. I think let us go point by point especially when we try to speak about the evolutionary theory I think we all know that the society has to be seen in terms of complexity how it is leading to the compounding in that sense increase in the size of the society and the whole idea in that sense of course is that it leads to certain amount of differentiation. And we basically try to see the contribution of Herbert Spencer who was basically treated as the social Darwinist and he was trying to speak about that how the society is moving from the simple to the compound to the doubly compound and to the trebly compound. So we try to see that evolutionary theory was seen as one perspective and we can apply this aspect when we try to speak about the sanitation that can we have the evolutionary perspective to look into the sanitation that how things have evolved how the things have become complex and how it has been evolved through history. So that is how we can make use of the evolutionary perspective when we are trying to see the issue of sanitation.

Similarly I think we have another perspective which of course is quite significant that is

the structural functional perspective and this structural functional perspective it tries to speak about the fact that the perspective which was having a belief that the units which are contributing towards the sort of an integration of the society how they are going to be interdependent and ultimately how they are going to build up the larger social structure. So the functionalist in that sense argue that society has to be understood in terms of the system of interdependent parts and the most important thing in that sense of course is that we are trying to see things in terms of the cause-effect relationship and functionalist basically tries to argue that we have to see that how different cause in that sense can have the significant effect and they all can be put in a specific format. I think there are classical theories like Durkheim in that sense and also for that sake Parsons who was basically trying to speak about the sort of an interconnected system and through that he was trying to understand that how we can understand the society. So Parsons understanding as a structural functionalist in that sense was more on certain issues of social system which tries to incorporate the individual in terms of personality, the cultural system and also the social system which was going to be equally important and we basically try to see that there is this whole idea about how the social system in that sense can help us in understanding the various positions and roles and for that I think Parsons was trying to develop the whole idea of the agile scheme and this agile scheme in that sense was basically having certain amount of implications. I think he says that there are certain functional prerequisites which are helpful in understanding the society and in order to have the formation of the social system the functional prerequisites plays a crucial role.

For A I think he was referring it to the adaptation and this adaptation in that sense is with regard to how the external environment and the utilization of the resources can be seen in terms of an important understanding and there his adaptation in that sense was basically inclined towards the derivations from the economy in that sense. He was saying that it is the economy in that sense which is basically responsible for the creation of certain amount of the facts. Similarly I think the second important thing which he says is going to be crucial or important is the goal attainment in that sense. G is for the goal attainment in that sense and for that he was basically trying to see that any social system in that sense any social organization in that sense has to have certain amount of goals and these goals in that sense are going to be crucial because they are seen as the motivating factors through which the people they try to achieve that particular goal. The goal attainment in that sense which of course is been seen in terms of the functionality and this goal attainment in that sense is to be decided by the polity, polity that is the government in that sense.

So, the polity in that sense is responsible for the creation of the goal attainment and the whole idea in that sense of course is that we have to speak about things in terms of how the society pursue towards the goal. So, adaptation is the first thing which is coming from economy and the second thing in that sense is the goal attainment. Now, if you try to see

basically the adaptation which is economy in that sense has some inclination towards the Marxian understanding about the role of economy in that sense which is going to be important and then the goal attainment in that sense which is to be seen in terms of what Weber was trying to speak about that the rational action in that sense are goal oriented in that sense. And then I think we try to see the third thing in that sense that is the I and that I is the integration in the Agil schema and this I in that sense is basically responsible for certain amount of integration in the society and the whole idea in that sense of course is that how this integration in that sense is coming and this integration he says that this integration is basically coming from certain cultural system in that sense which are

Practiced in that sense and the basic idea in that sense of course is that these integration in that sense is basically seen as coming out of from the symbolic arrangements in that sense and this integration in that sense is responsible for coordination among the various unit and in order to bring about certain amount of harmony. And this integration in that sense of course, has certain variations in that sense which is going to be an important aspect for the emergence of sociology of the society in a specific framework.

And the last thing which is I was trying to emphasize upon is the issue of latency and this latency which he was trying to refer to in terms of L is the pattern maintenance and tension management. And the whole idea in that sense of course, is that this pattern maintenance and tension management this is been helped by or this is been substituted by the so called what you can say the institutions in that sense either it is the family institution or it is the educational institutions or it is the religious institutions which basically see are seen as a sources for socialization of the individuals in the society. So, basically we try to see that the parsonian understanding in that sense was relying on the fact that the social system in that sense whenever are happening they had to had certain functional prerequisite in terms of agile and these agile if they are formulated if they are been completed in that sense then only we can speak about the equilibrium or balance in the society. So, this is how we try to see that the role of system social system in that sense was been seen important and I think somewhere Parson was trying to move away from what the classical thinkers were emphasizing upon because their concern was basically towards the social structure which was seen as a unit in itself where the individuals role in that sense is going to be secondary. But when Weber try to speak about the role of an action and certain amount of choices of individuals, but again he was also restricted.

But when Parsons try to speak about the social system he was trying to speak about that how the actor can play a crucial role in making the social system and how he is been influenced by the social system. So, the basic idea in that sense of course, is that certain amount of voluntarism and that is how I think Parson was trying to speak about the voluntaristic theory of action where he was trying to emphasize upon the role of an individual in creation of the social system. And I think in extension to that R.K. Merton in that sense was further trying to speak about the issue of functionality and the whole

idea in that sense of course, was that Merton was trying to emphasize upon the fact that we have to see the functionality in terms of the observed consequences which makes for the adaptation or adjustment of a given system.

And that is where we try to see the strength of Merton in that sense because he was trying to see or speak about the positive and the negative consequences both. And for that I think he was trying to speak about not only the functions, but also the dysfunctions which are there in the society. So, virtually we try to see that Merton in that sense was trying to make certain changes with regard to the understanding of functionality and then gradually he was trying to speak about that how this functionality in that sense can play crucial role. And along with that I think his emphasis upon the enemy in that sense which was been seen as the distinction between the cultural norms and the goals was going to be important. So, virtually I think the structural functional school of thought played a crucial role and we basically try to see that this structural functional school of thought was basically concerned with that how we can speak about certain amount of harmony and certain amount of integration in the society.

And within the framework of that if you try to see the issue of sanitation I think we can just say that we have to locate that how with regard to the sanitation we have to speak about that the different units in that sense they try to contribute towards the maintenance of order. Because I think either it is a question of the pure and the impure or it is the question of who is doing what in with regard to the sanitation, but all these things in that sense are basically meant for the issue of social order. So, we have to see that sanitation in a larger framework has to be seen in terms of maintenance of the social order and that is where we try to see the contribution of the structural functional framework with regard to the understanding of this particular phenomenon in that sense. Then I think we can speak about the issue of structuralism and this structuralism in that sense is basically seen as an another perspective and the whole idea in that sense of course is that when we try to speak about the understanding of the structuralism I think the important people like saucer in that sense or we have the contribution of cloudy levee straws which are considered to be very prominent in that sense. And gradually we try to see that structuralism in that sense was seen as an important aspect to understand the society in a very different framework.

And the basic idea in that sense of course is that structuralism was trying to speak about the structure in a different way where I think the human actor in that sense was trying to build up that particular thing without being aware of that. And that is where I think he was trying to speak about that the role of a language in that sense or sometimes the signifier and the signified which is going to be important and the whole idea in that sense of course is that structuralism was trying to speak about the undercurrents or what you can say the under process which have been there with regard to the formulation of structure and the basic idea in that sense of course is that it is basically seen as a mental

construct which has been created by human being in an unconscious way. And gradually we try to see that it has certain limitations and then we try to speak about the contribution of so called conflict theory. And this conflict theory in that sense was trying to speak about the fact that we have to see not everything is in an order in that sense like when we try to speak about the understanding of sensation it is not that everything is in order. And we have to see that conflict theory was trying to promote certain idea about that how we can speak about the contradictions, how we can speak about the differences and for that I think there are scholars especially I think Karl Marx in that sense was seen as one of an important pillar for the conflict theorist in that sense.

And along with that we have also the contribution of the indirect conflict theorist like we try to speak about the contribution of Louis Kosar in terms of a critique that is equally important but more significantly in that sense we have Ralph Dahrendorf who was basically trying to speak about the conflict theory and he was trying to speak about the conflict and consensus as an important principle to understand the society. And basically when we try to speak about that we try to see that conflict and consensus in that sense they both of them are the integrated aspect of the society and both of them are equally important and Dahrendorf in that sense was trying to recognize that society could not exist without the conflict and also without the consensus and this he was trying to locate. So in terms of that how the authority is attached to the specific position and authority which plays a crucial role with regard to maintenance of conflict and consensus in the society. So basically his understanding about the relationship of authority was based on the super ordination and subordination and we basically try to see that this authority in that sense is going to be an important issue which basically leads to certain amount of conflict resolution and also in terms of maintenance of certain consensus in that sense. So basically the legitimate authority which is to be seen in terms of legitimate power with certain sanctions in that sense are going to play a crucial role.

So when we try to see the issue of sanitation we can apply the conflict theories especially the role of an authority in that sense either it is the state or it is the legal body in that sense which can play a crucial role a compulsive role in that sense through that we can speak about that the job is being done or sometimes the sort of a formulation or certain law building in that sense which has been done in that sense has to be put into the practice. So I think the role of authority in that sense is going to be important like we can speak about the various what you can say urban development authorities in that sense all over India their basic role in that sense of course is that the authority itself is in a position to make out certain amount of practices for sanitation in terms of harmony in terms of putting the authority for streamlining the things in that sense either it is the beautification of the city or we try to see that we are speaking about certain elements which are related to a certain amount of what you can say hassles in that sense or the sanitary practices in that sense all these things in that sense directly and indirectly are been taken by the

municipal authorities in that sense by the developmental authorities and that is how they try to make up the issue of sanitation in terms of perfection. Now along with that we have another framework another perspective through which we can also try to understand the issue of sanitation and that is the symbolic interactionism. I think here the contribution of G.H. Meade in that sense is going to be crucial because he was trying to see things in terms of socio psychological analysis and when we try to speak about the Meade in that sense he was basically trying to speak about that how we can have the different arrangements in that sense he was basically giving emphasis upon the issue of gestures in that sense which are going to be important which are basically seen as equally important with regard to understanding the things and Meade in that sense when he was trying to speak about the mind self and society he was basically referring to certain things in which the individual is important his own mind in that sense is important and then also the societal aspect in that sense is going to be important. So basically we try to see that Meade's understanding in that sense was based on the fact that how certain symbolic elements in that sense can be seen in terms of practices and how we can make a meaning out of that specific gestures and later on this particular aspect in that sense was carried forward by various scholars especially I think the contribution of Herbert Blumer in that sense is going to be quite crucial because he was trying to speak about certain things which are basically related to the understanding of the use of symbols in that sense how the symbols can be meaningfully addressed and how the meaning is been created out of the symbols in that sense. So I think the issue of sanitation in that sense has certain bearings with regard to the issue of symbolic understanding in that sense I think along with that we have people like Erwin Goffman who was trying to speak about the presentation of self in everyday life and the basic idea in that sense of course is we have to speak about the issue of dramaturgical understanding in that sense where the actor in that sense can present himself in terms of impression management and through that he basically tries to speak about whole setting. So virtually we try to see that the symbolic interactions in that sense is going to be quite crucial in that sense because there are certain part which are part of the interaction and which also has to be decoded in order to understand the things like when we try to speak about the sanitation the basic idea in that sense of course is that we have to see that how and to what extent we can speak about that the different symbols which are been used like the symbol of green in that sense the symbol of gray in that sense or maybe we try to speak about the symbol of blue I think they have a specific meaning and how they can be used or interpreted in that sense how they have been communicated to the society and in that way we can say that the symbolic understanding the gestures which are been attached maybe I think certain specific symbols which are been made for making the people to realize that what is what. So virtually we try to see that the sort of a distinction which has been there with regard to the lanes or sometimes we try to speak about the garbages with the colors in that sense all these things in that sense are basically related to the symbolic interactionism in that sense

the symbols in that sense which are meaningfully attached and how they are trying to be internalized in that sense that is going to be an another important aspect.

And then I think we have the contribution of the ethnometallurgy in terms of a perspective and I think the contribution of Harold Garfinkel in that sense is going to be crucial because he was trying to speak about the people's method and the whole idea in that sense of course is that we basically try to speak about that how the ethnometallurgy in that sense was trying to speak about the fact that we have to build up we have to realize that certain conversation in that sense which are going to play a crucial role and especially when we try to speak about the breaching experiment where the people during the breaching phenomenon in that sense they try to construct their own ways they try to make their own methods and through that they try to come out. So basically we try to see that these sort of understanding in that sense are equally going to be important because I think through time we try to speak about that the understanding of sanitation has changed in that sense and how the situation changes and people then they try to create a new situation or sometimes in the new situation the people they try to deploy the new methods in order to resolve that. So basically we try to see that ethnometallurgy in that sense can also be a helpful perspective in that sense to understand the issue of what you can say sanitation and how we have to analyze it in a specific framework. And then I think similarly we have another quicker perspective in that sense that is phenomenological perspective and the contribution of Edmund Husserl in that sense is going to be important and his understanding is resting upon the fact that what is going to be important is the intention behind the phenomenon in that sense. And I think people like Alfred Schulz for that sake Peter Berger and Luckman all of them were basically trying to speak about the philosophy behind what is what the things are themselves in terms of understanding the consciousness of the matter prior to what the understanding is.

So basically we try to see that the sociology demands a special method in order to understand or encode the what you can say intentions which are there behind the so called phenomenon in that sense is going to be important. So I think when we try to speak about the sanitation practices in that sense the sanitation and the theoretical and the theoretical theorization I think phenomenological understanding in that sense can also play a crucial role. I think somewhere we try to see that the gradual distinction which has happened from classical theories, theorization, the various perspective which we try to speak about either it is the functional perspective or it is the evolutionary perspective or we try to speak about the conflict perspective for that sake. We try to see that they have a specific way of looking to the world but when we try to speak about the interactionist when they have developed through time we try to speak about the contribution of ethno methodology, phenomenology in that sense for that sake and the interactionist itself. So they try to give a very different meaning to the interaction, the action and also the actor in that sense how they try to behave in a society.

So we try to see that these aspects in that sense can give a very different understanding about the discipline of sanitation and that also is going to be a meaningful understanding. Now apart from these understanding in that sense which are seen as the landmark contribution in terms of the perspective we can also speak about the perspectives which are directly indirectly related to the newer perspective in that sense which I was sharing earlier especially we try to speak about the subaltern perspective and the postmodern perspective which can play a crucial role. Now for sanitation I think subaltern perspective have its own value because subaltern perspective in that sense basically tries to visualize the things from a very different viewpoint and I think for that sake we try to see the contribution of Antony Gramsci who was basically trying to speak about that how the history of the subaltern groups is going to be important in that sense and the subaltern groups in that sense are to be seen as the people who are in subordination and we basically try to see that how their understanding in that sense has to be put into the surface and the basic idea in that sense of course is that people like Ranajit Guha in that sense was trying to emphasize upon that there is a need for locating or surfacing subaltern groups in that sense into the academia and the basic idea in that sense of course is that through that we will be in a position to really understand the things in totality and because when we try to see things from one side I think that totality cannot be maintained. So I think if the subaltern representation is there with regard to the understanding of the society then it is going to have a bigger meaning. So I think subaltern studies in that sense are to be seen as quite significant with regard to that I think the different volumes which are from what you can say the Oxford books in that sense of course publications try to speak about at least 13 volumes which are related to the subaltern studies and which has been what you can say documented by different scholars in that sense and the basic idea in that sense is that how we can understand the subaltern groups from the different perspective and the contribution of Ranjit Guha in that sense is going to be quite important because in 1982 he tried to speak about these particular issues in terms of his specific understanding and the basic idea in that sense of course is that what subaltern includes or what it can be.

So it was basically that it can be referred to any class, the caste, the age, the gender or maybe the specific authority in that sense. So we try to see that different scholars either it is Shahid Amin or we have David Arnold, we have Dipesh Chakravarty or we have Partha Chatterjee or for that sake David Hardiman all of them were trying to speak about the subaltern in their own way and we try to see that these things are to be seen through history and the historiographical discourses in that sense are going to play a crucial role and the most important thing in that sense of course is that we have to speak about the fact that how the subaltern school in that sense is to be seen in terms of creating the new history and basically we try to see that the most important thing which comes into the picture in that sense is that we have to speak about that the subalternity in that sense is going to bring about new shift, paradigm shift in that sense towards the understanding of

the reality because when we try to speak about the subaltern I think many aspects in that sense comes into the picture and its canvas is huge, its canvas is wide, it may include the different segments of the society in that sense either it is the present or it is the urban the industrial workers in that sense or it is the transgender for that sake or it is the gender in general in that sense or we try to speak about the Dalits. So many categorization can fall into the broader umbrella of subaltern and that is going to be an important issue and gradually we try to see that it is trying to bring about a very new understanding about the phenomenon. Now, we have another important perspective which of course is related to the understanding of sanitation and that of course is going to be quite appealing is the perspective of modernity and post modernity. I think we are trying to club it together because they were trying to make a shift from classical to contemporary or to the modern in that sense as such and we have the contribution of Anthony Giddens who was trying to speak about the aspect of structuration theory and this structuration theory he was trying to speak about many aspects especially trying to cover up the issue of globalization and we try to see that he was trying to speak about in terms of the runaway world and what is important is that in the new era of capitalism it is basically the commodity, the production, the private ownership of capital or it is the class system in that sense which is going to be important and the most important aspect in that sense of course is that we have to see that surveillance in that sense is going to play a crucial role and this surveillance in that sense is basically seen as the new way of the supervision and it is beyond the human in that sense and that is where we try to see the contribution of the so called modern in that sense is going to be important and within modernity I think when he was trying to speak about the structuration theory.

The whole idea in that sense of course is he was trying to speak about the distanciation, he was trying to speak about the disembeddedness and also he was trying to refer to the reflexivity. So the three important things in that sense he was trying to discuss in that sense when he was trying to argue the structuration theory and the basic idea in that sense of course is that how he was trying to make out certain distinction with regard to the compression of time and space and now I think any reality in that sense either it is at the micro level can be put at the global level and that is how we try to see that the role of modernity in that sense is going to be important and I think modernity in that sense apart from that has been spoken by people like Habermas and he was basically referring to the modernity in terms of an unfinished agenda and the whole idea in that sense is that he was trying to speak about how we can have the newer understanding about the modernity because it is to be seen as that it is trying to bring about a very new understanding about the social world. And then we have Jackis Derrida who was trying to speak about in terms of post structuration and he was trying to speaking about the most important thing that how the writing in that sense has to be decoded and he was basically speaking about the deconstruction of the knowledge, the deconstruction of the text and there I think we try to see that this is how we can build up the new understanding and the basic idea in

that sense of course is that we have to speak about that the local centers which has been prevalent through the classical notions in that sense or the classical theories or the perspective. Now I think this has to be dismantled and now we have to speak about the new world and I think within that framework we have the contribution of Michel Foucault who was trying to speak about post structuralism and he was trying to speak about the structuralism in a very different way and the whole idea in that sense of course is that he was trying to speak about the genealogy of power and this genealogy power in that sense is important because when he was trying to speak about that the whole idea in that sense of course is that knowledge is power in that sense and through that he was trying to create the new understanding. So I think these are certain perspective in that sense which are going to be part and parcel of our understanding about the sanitation moving from the classical to the contemporary in terms of postmodern or in terms of subaltern in that sense will give a very firm meaning to the sanitation and the whole idea in that sense of course is that since sanitation has been taken over of late with regard to its linkage I think now the present government is speaking about the issue of sanitation in terms of the Swachh Bharat.

So the whole idea in that sense of course is that how this understanding of sanitation in that sense has to be put into the academic debate and the basic idea in that sense of course is that how much and to what extent these things are going to be meaningful and how they are going to be more effective. Now I think understanding those perspective now we can come down to the second important component which I was sharing earlier that who are the classical Indian theorist in that sense or the classical sociologist in that sense who had played a crucial role with regard to the understanding of the issue of sanitation directly or indirectly. So this is my way of putting these people in that sense they are hardcore sociologists in that sense but how their work can be related to the issue of sanitation that is going to be important as such and I think for that I think the founding father of sociology in the Indian sociology that is G.S. Ghuraye can be claimed to be the one in that sense whom we can list and G.S. Ghuraye when he was trying to speak about I think he had used the Indological perspective where of course I think one of his famous work that is caste and race in India he was trying to speak about the historical, anthropological and sociological perspectives in a very meaningful way and the whole idea in that sense of course is the notion of caste which he has touched upon. I think he was trying to speak about the segmental division of society, the hierarchy, the pollution and purity, he was trying to speak about the civil and the earliest disabilities and he was speaking about the lack of choices of occupation and the restriction on marriages. I think these are certain things which he was emphasizing upon and especially I think his focus was more on the endogamy as a significant features with regard to the caste system and within that framework he was trying to refer to that how the caste which is related to the, what you can say, the issue of endogamy and it has some bearing with regard to the client system in that sense of the Indian scenario and his focus was on understanding the Indian

culture and Hindu culture. But all these things he was trying to build up were based on the Sanskritik text, the interpretation of the Sanskritic text and that of course is where we try to see that the endological perspective in that sense tries to play a crucial role. And he was also trying to refer to one important aspect that how we can see the issue of caste or the Brahminical understanding about the Indian society and through that he was trying to throw certain lights on the issue of, what you can say, a sensation in his own way.

So we have the contribution of, what you can say, caste in that sense as such in terms of what Ghuraye was trying to speak about and he was basically trying to refer to that how the tension in the process of integration in India can arise and how they can be overcome in that sense. So I think somewhere his understanding in that sense was basically related to the Indian unity in the modern India and how we can understand those things with regard to his contribution. Second important Indologist in that sense whom we can list as an important pillar with regard to the understanding of sanitation is the contribution of Louis Dumountt. And Louis Dumountt in that sense was basically trying to emphasize upon that how the sociology and Indology can play a crucial role in order to understand the whole society. And I think he was relying on Bogle's understanding of the fundamental opposition between the pure and the impure.

And based on that I think he was somewhere trying to speak about that how the caste structure, the structural view of the caste can be maintained. And for that I think his contribution is significant because he was trying to speak about the relationship between or the opposition between the pure and impure. And this pure and impure in that sense he was trying to refer to that how the understanding of hierarchy plays a crucial role because when he tries to speak about the hierarchy the whole idea of course is the superiority of the pure over the impure. And that of course was seen as a building block for the understanding of the caste system by Louis Dumount. So we try to see that caste system which was been projected by Louis Dumount as an ideology in that sense as such it was a values and the ideas which are going to be rational in that sense.

And the holistic understanding in that sense was going to play a crucial role. And the whole idea in that sense is that this understanding of pure and impure in that sense is helpful in maintaining certain amount of degree of purity and how the Indian population in that sense tries to maintain certain amount of purity. And he was trying to speak about the primary sources of defilement which are to be seen with regard to the contact either it is the with the death and the organic waste or it is primarily with the human body or it is also with the different day to day activities of the social life. So, with all these things in that sense he was trying to speak about even the food items that are inhaled or even the cloths that we take all these things in that sense are going to be quite meaningful when we try to speak about the question of pure and impure. Even the issue of jewellery which has to be seen in terms of that how gold is considered to be pure as compared to the copper or the other ornaments which are impure in that sense.

So, we have to see that most of the ideological understanding of the Indian psyche in that sense is based on the pure and impure and which of course is going to be an important aspect of sensation. So, virtually we try to see that Dumount's understanding in that sense has a significant bearing and the whole idea in that sense of course is that we can speak about this element of pure and impure which can play a crucial role. And the most important thing in that sense of course is that we have to speak about that how the element of purity which is considered to be another significant aspect of sensation is going to play a crucial role. And Dumount's ideological understanding in terms of the structural view of caste and the element of pure and impure that distinction between the two can play a crucial role. So, this is how I think we can put the contribution of Dumount as an important aspect in that sense and the third in that Indian framework is the contribution of Radha Kamal Mukherjee.

And Radha Kamal Mukherjee's contribution was based on the value premise. So, he was trying to speak about the structure of values in that sense and I think he was basically been referred to as an important pillar basically from the Lucknow School of sociology in that sense who was trying to speak about the integration of the various disciplines either it is the economics, political science, social philosophy and sociology. And he was basically trying to speak about some of his basic works which was trying to emphasize upon the element of values in that sense. He was trying to speak about within the traditional system in that sense within the modern system how the different aspects in involve certain amount of value system. And on the issue of social ecology he was trying to speak about to that how we can maintain or make a balance or equilibrium with regard to the shifting in that sense of the realities we have to speak about the ecosystem in that sense and how we have to maintain our relationship with the surrounding.

And the adaptation which has to be seen with regard to the environmental factors or with regard to the communities in and around is going to be important as such. So, I think his contribution for social ecology was also directly or indirectly related to the issue of sanitation because he was trying to speak about the human individual adjustment to the environment. And for that I think we have to see that adjustment of men in that sense in the social structure in the function and also in a specific setting in that sense is basically linked to certain aspect of values. So, I think the whole idea in that sense of course, is that the ecological relations in that sense plays a crucial role and the most important thing in that sense is that we have to speak about that what is the position of the ecological space, the status in the social space that matters in terms of locating the person in a society. And the most important aspect in that sense of course, is which was referred to as the social values by Dumount.

He was trying to speak about the social structure of values, the dynamics of the morals in that sense and he was trying to speak about the problem of social values in the core of the social theories. So, that is where we try to see that the contribution of Mukherjee in that

sense is going to be equally important. And quickly we can move down to the contribution of M.N. Srinivas with regard to the structural functional school of thought. And M.N. Srinivas contribution in that sense again was trying to focus more on the Indian social structure especially the caste system and he was trying to emphasize upon certain important aspect like the issue of Sanskritization which is going to be important. And Sanskritization which he was trying to refer to is the process by which the low Hindu caste or the tribal or the other groups they try to change their customs, rituals, ideology and way of life in the direction of the high and the frequently twice born caste. So, the basic understanding in that sense is that he was trying to speak about the Sanskritization in terms of purification of the lower caste or he was trying to speak about the issue of sanitation.

So, Sanskritization has a direct bearing with regard to the understanding of sanitation and how he was trying to speak about it is a gradual process of social mobility in that sense either in terms of food habits or in terms of the lifestyle. And through that he was trying to speak about the relationship between the lower caste and the upper caste in terms of moving or making a shift towards what you can say the purity. So, for Srinivas it was basically the pure which was going to be more meaningful in that sense and he was basically trying to speak about apart from that he was trying to speak about the two other processes like the processes of westernization and also the process of modernization and secularization. And I think when he was referring to secularization he was trying to speak about that how it is going to be related to the Indian value system in that sense even the issue of Hinduism which he was trying to speak about has certain bearing with regard to certain amount of convergence of thoughts with the other categories in that sense. And the most important thing which he was trying to refer to that the element of secularization in that sense has something to do with the Indian social life and the culture.

And also it has a tendency to become stronger with the development of communication and the other aspect in terms of the spread of education. So, secularization that way implies irrespective of the religion it is trying to speak about the process of differentiation and also it is having certain societal, economic and the political aspect. So, we try to see that secularization which Srinivas was trying to refer to also has certain bearing on the issue of rationalism. And then I think we try to see that the contribution of Srinivas was going to be meaningful because he was trying to speak about certain important interface which is there between the Hindu and the non-Hindu segments of the Indian society. So, how we try to see the blending of the two and how the plurality and the complexity of the Indian society can be understood all these things in that sense were been discussed and which are directly or indirectly have a bearing with regard to the understanding of sanitation of the Indian society.

And that is where I think some of the important concept of M.N. Srinivas are going to be crucial. And quickly then we can speak about another important what you can say social

scientist the contribution of R.S. Khare and R.S. Khare's contribution in that sense is going to be important because he was trying to speak about the Hindu heart and the home.

And he was basically trying to point out that how the ideas about the food and the rules of governings the way the things are handled how the exchange of food takes place in the Indian culture especially in the Hindu culture that he was trying to identify. And he was basically referring to the methods of cooking how to make foods and how to make it less polluted in that sense that is where he was trying to speak about the understanding in that sense. And the most important thing in that sense of course was that he was referring to the food in that sense in terms of kitchen and the dining area which is to be seen in terms of maintenance of purity. And that is where I think the Hindu domestic geography is what you can say conferred with the rank to the food and that is where I think the issue of polluted areas in that sense are to be neglected. And we try to speak about the cooked food and the food consumption in that sense in a specific way.

I think the issue of pakka food in that sense was been rated the pakka food which is out of the butter in that sense or the ghee is going to be an important issue. So he was trying to speak about these particular aspects in terms of the role of the fast and also he was trying to speak about the birth and the death related pollutions in that sense and how to overcome that. So I think the contribution of R.S. Khare in that sense is important with regard to its use in the consumption of food in that sense as such that was going to be important with regard to the understanding of the caste ranking. And then I think quickly we can speak about the contribution of Ranjit Guha who was basically in a subalternist and his subaltern understanding in that sense was relied on the fact that Guha was trying to emphasize upon that how we can speak about the people who are been marginalized who are historically been put off and the most important thing in that sense is that we try to speak about the Indian society in which the voices of the so called non-Brahminical categories in that sense have been neglected. So what is required in that sense of course is that we have to speak about the histrographical and cultural perspective, cultural logical perspective in that sense in order to bring about those debates which has been either sideline or which has not been surfaced in that sense.

So that of course is the basic attempt which we have to formulate but the whole idea in that sense of course is that the contribution of these scholars either it is a contribution of Demount or G.S. Khure for that sake or I mean Srinivas or we try to speak about the contribution of people like R.S. Khare and then for that sake Ranjit Guha all of them and their contribution can be linked directly or indirectly with the contribution with regard to the sanitation in that sense.

So I think friends whatsoever we try to speak about in this unit we are basically trying to speak about the fact that how the understanding of specific perspective the various

perspective that we try to use in sociology proper has certain bearings on the issue of sanitation starting from the classical theorization the classical perspective in sociology in terms of its emergence from enlightenment to the postmodern. We try to speak about the different debates and also the key what you can say social scientist in that sense and their contribution in Indian sociology can also be seen as an important way through which we can understand that how the understanding or the relationship of sociology and sanitation can go together. So these perspectives and the key scientist in that sense and their contribution will help us in making things more perfect towards the understanding of the sanitation. So it will give you the subjective as well as it will give you the disciplinary specific understanding about the sanitation because sanitation should not be seen as a layman understanding it has to be put together it has to be clubbed together into disciplinary boundaries and that is basically my attempt to see sanitation in terms of a specific discipline domain in that sense and that is where we have to learn that how we have to understand the day to day activities in a specific framework. So with that I think let us try to conclude this theme in that sense as such on the perspectives which are related to sanitation and we will have in other sessions certain other topics which may be of discussions and related to this issue of sociology and sanitation and introduction. Thank you.