

Sewpaul, V. (2014). Social work and social justice: A global perspective. *International Social Work, 57*(3), 373–385. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872814524960>

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. Basic Books.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO.

Dr Mohammad Hussain is Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, Institute of Social Sciences, Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Agra

Email: husainmsw@gmail.com

Ms Sanchita Agarwal is Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Institute of Social Sciences, Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Agra

Email: sanchitaagarwal2828@gmail.com

Article History

Received: 00 – 00 – 0000

Revised: 00 – 00 – 0000

Accepted: 00 – 00 – 0000

.....*From Our Archives*

Role of Sociologist in India*

D N Majumdar

The sociologist is concerned with the principles that govern social life, common living and common sharing of social heritage and the basic need of co-operation for survival. He studies not only the relationship between various classes of social phenomena, but that between social and non-social phenomena. The study, analysis and interpretation of social phenomena help the sociologist to understand social action, social relationships, functions and processes. He studies the various non-social phenomena, like the geographical environment and its impact upon social life and how it shapes the organization of human relationships. He studies the invisible fact of society, that is, the social structure, having a definite character at every stage; the fabric of associations and institutions, and the forces that keep them and the structure together, as also those responsible for their disruption: both the structure and function of human groups in their interaction and social relationships. He studies the family, which is the most significant and pervasive of the primary groups; the community, which is the most inclusive, spontaneous grouping in the social structure; and also, interest-based associations, temporary groupings of mob and crowd, which are more or less spontaneous configurations. He studies the social process, viewed historically and showing the continuity of the structure. All these and other allied phenomena have been the traditional domain of professional sociologists. Social relations, in order that they may endure and contribute towards social

development, require not only an understanding of nature in relation to man, the two being correlates for proper social development and progress. If social relations at any stage of development hinder or hamper the historical productive relations, that is, the relationship of man to nature, the only way to avert a catastrophic cultural blow-up is to modify the existing social relations. Here comes the real role of a sociologist, for, in this sense, *his discipline represents an instrument of social policy*. With his expert knowledge of social relationships, the sociologist can help predict, control and direct social change, and speed up social progress. His knowledge of social facts is of help in arranging adjustments among social groups, castes and classes, and in destroying the sterile stereotypes that might hamper the smooth working of society's intra and inter-group relations. It is in the field of causation and change that the sociologist in his role of social engineer for community rebuilding is manifest. The academician-sociologist in his role of social engineer has an important contribution to make in solving social problems. And it is here that the competence and ingenuity of the sociologist are put to the test.

Basic Orientation in Sociology

Historically, Sociology and in a sense, social thinking, in India was a monopoly of religious preachers, the saintly order, and later of philosophers. Our lawgivers were men of learning but were inspired by religion; our secular thinking was moored in our scriptures, so that at one time *we preached politics through religion when other countries understood religion through politics*. But later, when philosophers became too preoccupied with their own problems, sociology was adopted by the economists, who have kept their hold on the discipline all this while and still have a finger in the pie. Indian sociology has for the last few decades been developed under the foster-care of economics and, to a lesser extent, of political science, with both of which it has developed a sort of *commensal relationship*, as it were.

The scope of sociology, as it has been heretofore known in India, has been figured out in the context of Indian Economics, which, whatever else might be said for it, has been responsible for its dwindled stature.

After a struggle of nearly half a century, sociology has at last

succeeded in freeing itself from the apron-strings of economics.

Kinship between Sociology and Social Anthropology

Notwithstanding their diverse methodological approaches, the close interrelation and kinship between sociology and social anthropology has made for much overlapping between the two. Morganian studies show some sharp imprints of Comteian sociology, while Spencer has influenced social thinking which led to an active interest in primitive and pre-literate societies. Durkheimian tradition has inspired much of anthropological formulations; the British School, particularly the structure-oriented section, draws heavily from Durkheim and in some American Universities, Durkheim still inspires and sustains anthropological thinking. Sumner, Keller, Pareto and Max Weber have all dominated anthropological thought in America and the Continent. Nadel in Australia showed the deep influence of Weberian Sociology. Anthropological theory has received much critical appraisal at the hands of sociologists, and anthropologists and sociologists have been successfully collaborating in the common task of interpreting social phenomena. Robert Merton has, by his critical evaluation of functionalism, done great service to anthropology. 'Margaret Mead has by her meticulous study of child training and culture-personality inter-relationship given new leads to the field of education'; 'Ruth Benedict's aesthetic model and Spindler's education-anthropology, again, highlight the common ground covered by the two disciplines'. Hobhouse, Mauss, Hubert, Westermarck, Ginsberg and Ogburn, have all been deeply influenced by ethnology and have drawn copious material from field-anthropology. In fact, there is hardly a modern book on sociology today that does not take its cue from anthropological models or concepts. Redfield has differentiated cultural anthropology and sociology in terms of the clientele reached by each: 'people with well-established, centrifugal, exploratory tendencies for the remote, the marginal, going in for anthropology, while those having centripetal tendencies, who want the familiar and the repetitive, with a preference for certain lightness of what they operate with, turning towards sociology'. Linton thinks that in anthropology the attempt is to bring together various disciplines of research for elucidation of one species whereas the other sciences are

interested in particular aspects of phenomena and follow these across the species lines.

Hitherto, what the sociologists have done for urban and complex civilizations, anthropologists were doing for primitive societies, both aiming at a general understanding of the structure and function of society at different levels. Sociologists study at a single level, while the anthropologist's interest in deep-levels studies means, as Margaret Mead points out, 'that it uses methods or analyses from different units and different timescales, cross-cutting all disciplines, relating man to nature, on the one hand, and to history, on the other'. The urban orientation of sociology has so far kept it nailed to industrial complex civilizations, while the anthropologist has been going out with cigarettes and trinkets to study primitive, pre-literate people. The study of simple social institutions has provided a deep insight into the structure and functioning of primitive societies. The holistic approach in anthropology has been possible due to the small tribe the anthropologist studies, and this microcosmic approach has yielded dividends. The exit and gradual extinction of simpler autonomous societies have forced anthropologists to take up the study of complex societies and civilizations, which were outside the domain of classical anthropologists.

Common Focus for Sociology and Social Anthropology – Community Development Programme

The community development programme has been launched for rebuilding rural India, which indeed is the real India. In so far as a large section of the population of India lives in villages, the whole outcome of developmental planning here depends in a way upon the success or failure of the vast, revolutionary programme of rural reconstruction. Aimed at bringing about a transformation in the outlook of the people, so as to make them desire progress and feel needs, and welcome new knowledge by which to achieve it, inculcating in them a spirit of self-reliance and habits of co-operation, this programme involves vital stakes not only for India but for other backward countries of Asia and Africa, who are looking forward with interest towards its progress. This field, like many others of human

relations and social engineering, provides a common focus for collaboration between sociologists and anthropologists. Microcosmic studies of culture-change have been the avowed techniques of the anthropologist, and today we have enough knowledge of change in hand to put it to the aid of the community planners and administrators.

Change in any socio-cultural system implies a correlated resistance, whose nature depends upon the given culture pattern and the type of change. It is, therefore, idle to think of effecting any successful change without a reliable knowledge of the varying effects of and resistances to given change in its relation to different culture patterns. Programmes of reconstruction which are inconsistent with the basic attitudes and cultural values of the people have little chance of adoption or acceptance. Superfluous changes mean not only a waste of resources and money but generate new resistances. Detailed knowledge of the dynamics of culture-change in different communities, based on empirical investigations, can equip us to forestall resistances and solve many of the problems of personality adjustment and inter-group conflicts which follow disequilibrating or induced changes. The anthropologist, interested in the nature and tempo of the process of change, can thus work shoulder to shoulder with sociologist, each helping the other, and both contributing their share in national reconstruction plans and programmes. The association of sociologists and anthropologists with the community development programme, at all levels, advisory, administrative and field execution, can help in safeguarding against possible pitfalls and ensure the successful implementation of the village developmental programme.

Basic Weakness of the Community Development Programme

In the ultimate analysis, the utility and productiveness of the community development programme will be judged by the lasting and permanent changes it succeeds in bringing about in rural India. The Community Development Programme and the National Extension Service are temporary devices aimed at providing the initial generative push in the shape of new ideas and techniques, which may later become self-regenerative in the community. The numerous empirical

studies of culture-change point to one important lesson, that an innovation -whether an idea, a tool or a technique-can be self-regenerative only if it is institutionalized. It has been, and still is, the main weakness of the community development programme that it has not only failed to utilize the existing institutions but has not succeeded in creating any new ones.

For any change in the social attitudes of the backward, rural and tribal groups, it is necessary to start with a change in their cultural environment: that is to say, technical improvement at the material productive level, and institutional change at the inter-group relational level, rather than any piecemeal attempt at converting, reforming or educating individuals. Approach through the individual *foci* is atomistic and in so far as a traditional tribal or rural society is a web of institutional relations, this approach is not likely to yield any lasting results in the shape of community development. In a country deeply moored in traditions and dominated by stereotypes, where individualism has not asserted itself, we cannot ignore institutional matrices and caste structures, whatever the culture-personality studies may hold out for other countries and other cultures. If the **VLW (Village Level Worker)** is kept as the sole feeder in this programme of rural reconstruction, as indeed he is today, then the entire superstructure is in danger of collapsing as soon as he is withdrawn. This eventuality can be safeguarded against only by utilizing the technique of group working, thus helping to lay the 'foundations of institutionalizing the innovations. Working through the individuals, as is the method of **VLW** will not show results of a permanent nature, unless a dent in the system is made through the institutions rather than through the personality system.

If an innovation is sought to be introduced in a particular system, **AI**, through the personality focus, the first step may be a position resembling **AII**, causing some stir in the structure of the system. But since the structure has not been dented at any culturally vital focus, its tendency would be to move towards a more stable position like **AIII**, and, after a time lapse even to the original **AI**, thus not causing any change of a permanent nature in the cultural configuration of the system. On the other hand, an assault at a strategic institutional focus,

as seen in **B1**, may give a push to the entire inter-related web of social relations **B2**, resulting, after the maturity of the innovation, into a configurational change of permanent nature. Here, since the impact of the innovation would percolate all through the cultural matrix, the effect would be lasting.

This is only illustrative, my point being that in the community development programme actually operating in the rural sector one finds institutions like *panchayats*, co-operatives and kinship groups having no place in the channels of communication. Under the new Panchayat Raj legislation, new *panchayats* are a statutory creation, but their form and structure are not very different from the traditional village councils and they exist only in name but not in use. Our field studies in Jaunsar Bawar (Dist. Dehradun) have shown that notwithstanding the new *panchayats* established by law, the villagers continue to use their old caste and village councils, namely *Khumri*, as a forum and arbiter for their disputes and dealings, giving the appearance of a historically mixed but contemporary functioning culture. We find the traditional *Khumri* and the new *panchayats* existing side by side, the former being still supreme in community affairs and functioning as of old, and the new resting more or less in official files.

In any scheme of such vast magnitude as the Indian Community Development Programme, the effective lever of operation is tackling the inter-group relations, whose cultural clogging is responsible for the static appearance that our traditional social structure gives, or for the slowness of change that is manifest here. A thorough reorganising of the inter-group relations is an essential pre-requisite for any scheme of tribal or rural development. Apart from specific educational measures of re-organizing these inter-group relations, they can also be changed through the lever of technical improvement at the material-productive level.

Priorities in Community Planning

Recently, a Conference held in Delhi to consider ways and means for the promotion of environmental hygiene and sanitation among the rural and tribal peoples of India sought to investigate why these folks

had no latrines in their houses, how they could be made 'sanitation conscious', and whether public or private latrines should be introduced in the villages. Such an approach, it appears, does not take into consideration conditions in most parts of rural and tribal India. During my long fieldwork among the *Khasas* of Jaunsar Bawar, I have seen filthy and unkempt village streets in marked contrast with thorough cleanliness inside the house. The relevant point here is that village streets are dirty not because the villagers are any less 'sanitation-conscious', but because the social means to keep them clean are lacking. Water scarcity is so acute in this ragged region that women have often to go miles away, up and down hill, to fetch it for domestic purposes. Carrying a water-load in a mountain region is an extremely hard and hazardous job. But the shining kitchen utensils of the *Khasa* household indicate that they are not unaware of the principles of cleanliness, hygiene and sanitation, though they cannot undertake back-breaking jobs to wash the village streets. This water scarcity has led, in village *Baila*, to the nearest water source being declared as belonging to the Deity on whose behalf the upper-caste people, that is *Rajputs*, look after it, denying the lower castes, *Doms* and *Kohas*, access to it. Here an acute shortage of water has contributed towards perpetuating a particular type of super and subordinate inter-caste relations, invoking religion into the bargain, creating a particular social structure in which the *Doms* and *Koltas* have been 'ordained' inferior, waiting on the mercy of the *Rajputs* for a necessity like water. Introduction of latrines, public or private, would make the *Khasas* more sanitation-minded or hygiene-conscious, but solving their water problem would not only make cleaner villages, but might also improve the inter-group relations, as we have noticed in village *Lakhamandal*. Here with the construction of a reservoir for water storage, assuring its supply to the entire village, a *Rajput* or *Brahmin* now no more minds helping a *Dom* or a *Kolta* carry the water vessel, whereas formerly the latter had to stand at a distance from the slow, simmering water source and wait for mercy of a high-caste man to fetch water. An improvement in the community's productive resources has resulted in a decline in social tensions and an improvement in inter-caste relations. Community planning, like all other planning, is a question of priorities, in whose selection

knowledge of the cultural matrix of the community is very important.

Sociology and National Development Planning

In the wake of planning and national development schemes, anthropologists have had to assume new responsibilities. Especially in the context of rehabilitation of backward tribes and programmes of rural uplift and village development, slum clearance, family planning, problems of human relationship and cultural dynamics, there has been an increased demand for competent practitioners in the social sciences who could size up the new requirements and expectations. The phenomenal dearth of competent personnel in both sociology and anthropology has resulted in its handful of available 'know how's' being requisitioned to do more than is physically possible for them. In recent years it has meant a good deal of confusion: physical anthropologists are becoming sociologists, geographers are lining up for ethnographic research, and so on, making every social scientist at once an expert in theory and practice. The same group of people are to be met at conferences and seminars, and anthropologies must include contributions by the few trusted 'know how's'. Recently, we met at Madras to thrash out complicated theoretical mannerisms in sociology, and earlier at Poona to discuss inter-disciplinary perspectives, and again, the same set met at Delhi to advise public health officers on the type of latrines for the villagers. It is all very well as far as it goes, but the need today is for more sociologists and anthropologists, and it is, I think, the most sacred responsibility of the elders to train up, as quick as possible, the second line of defense so that the void may not prove catastrophic. As in the field of politics and statesmanship, our search for talent has not been adequate, making us rely much on the past. We must break up the school-tie-affiliations that have led to excessive in-breeding in academics, for, in the context of human problems of a dynamic society, we need a shift of moorings and a break-up of stereotypes. We need the youth near and on the rostrum, in all spheres of interest and action.

Tribal Foci

The need for more competent social science personnel has been felt particularly acutely in the context of tribal rehabilitation and welfare.

The time is long past when we could think of people living in isolation, untouched and unspoiled by contacts with civilization and advanced cultures. The history of tribal cultures in all parts of the world shows how, largely due to lack of contacts, they have developed in diversity of language, dress, social institutions, modes and thought patterns. But today the situation is one of contacts and more contacts, intensified by increased and better means of communication, overcrowding of certain areas and consequent shifting of large populations in search of land, wages and means of livelihood. These contacts subject the tribal people to pressure of change, accepting, adapting and assimilating new elements from the higher cultures of their comparatively more advanced neighbours, or often, when coming up against a completely alien culture, disintegration and even extinction. Since contacts are going to be increased, some changes are inevitable. But in the interests of about twenty million tribals of India, it is important that a carefully drawn-out policy of tribal rehabilitation be chalked out.

The main problem here is how these tribal cultures are to be brought into adjustment with these changes without tears. Under British rule the policy was of *laissez-faire*, the main object having been law and order, without any regard for the development of these people. Hutton has pointed out how the British Government failed to appreciate the requirements of the aboriginals who stood outside the orbit Hindu or Muslim cultures, and with whose traditions and needs even their Indian associates felt little sympathy and had but small acquaintance. McCall points out how the weakening of local authorities among the *Lusheis* by Government action in dealing with the authority of the ruling chiefs, have produced adverse effects, and how tampering with the indigenous religion and social structure by conversions to Christianity or Hinduism have disrupted tribal life. That these tribal populations have not to be kept as museum pieces is admitted by all responsible persons today. But the question is of making the culture-change arising out of contact beneficial, forestalling and safeguarding against the possible disruptive influences. Classical theories of change seem to have oversimplified the nature of this complex process. Culture-change needs to be viewed in terms of function so that change can be predicted in advance, and provision made for new ideas,

activities and techniques that fulfil the new needs which were formerly served by traits that the cultures lost in the process. Change must fulfil the new needs of the people and be integrated into the cultural pattern of the community. Change must be such that it has the ability to be absorbed and be in conformity with the social values of the people for whom it is intended. Ignorance of these basic facts or the process of change, and inability to appreciate them, has been responsible for the failure of many a developmental scheme, which otherwise might be of unexceptional value.

The recent tribal upsurge in the North-East Frontier is being viewed with much alarm. This region is of very strategic importance for India, and political expediency demands an early restoration of peace there. Today, the problem is being tackled at the military level, but unless it is cushioned by more stable and sound bases, the military solution would be a temporary solution, if any solution at all. For a lasting and stable solution, a new orientation of tribal policy needs to be worked out, in which social sciences need to be harnessed to diagnose the roots of the trouble, and offer recipes for its solution and cure. It is a pity that our Government has not been able to find any competent Indian personnel to help them advice at the top level. But this region is of a too strategic nature, and no risks should be taken here. The Government may well consider associating a committee of Indian anthropologists with the NEFA administration to help the latter in carrying out a programme of developmental activities for this region.

There are two premises, which, I think, may be helpful in planning our approach here. Positively, there must be recognition of the desires of the people at all levels of cultural development for more freedom than they now possess; freedom from starvation, disease and physical and mental insecurity. Secondly, steps are needed to guard against the ignorance of the members of an alien society with advanced cultures who administer the backward and the less fortunate people; their ignorance of the matrices of the latter's culture as also the incompetence of the agency initiating change to understand the consequences of this initiation. A policy of segregation no longer being a practical proposition, the only valid approach to tribal problem and political upsurge among the tribals, that we face today, is a

acculturation therapy, carefully planned and chalked out. It is, I should think, necessary for the administration to search for talent, and set up a high-power committee of social scientists to advise it on matters of policy with regard to the administration of backward and schedule tribes and backward people, and suggest solutions to the human problem that arise in the context of change and desire for freedom from want. In devising welfare schemes for the backward, rural and tribal people the main criterion should be their acceptability and identification with the people's way of life, and not what we imagine to be good for them. Granting that change is unavoidable and necessary, it can be attuned towards the welfare channels by gearing it to the background of the tribal and rural people, taking note of their special aptitudes and characteristics. There can be no uniformity in this regard, for there are vast differences, particularly among the tribals, in their cultural patterns, the values they hold and cherish, as also the degrees of acculturation to which they have been subjected. Today, the social scientists are increasingly aware of the need for rapid and planned change, especially among the newly resurgent people of Asia and Africa. As Robin Williams points out, the older doctrines stressing the slowness of change in the mores and the ineffectiveness in regulating conflict with customary practices have been under heavy assault. We have to be prepared for an overall change in the context of a total dynamic culture situation, for to quote Robin Williams once again 'piecemeal change is easiest to effect but most difficult to stabilise'.

The Commissioner for the Backward Classes and Scheduled Tribes and his colleagues are doing what they think to be the best for the people in their charge; something has been achieved and more will be, but not enough, and all this is not likely to be of permanent benefit unless we know the configurations of the cultures and their basic human values, if we are aiming to level up. Also, it would be relevant to enquire how far benefits doled out through private philanthropic agencies ensure efficient distribution of such benefits. We do need to evaluate the work done so far.

The Backward Classes Commission did not associate an anthropologists or sociologists with it, and their report indicates what

opportunities have been lost, and how it has created problems rather than solved any. No valid definition of Backward Classes could be figured out, and it has stigmatized one-third of the population of the country as 'backward'. The lacuna, it appears to me, is why it did not include the other two thirds as well. The State Governments are confronted with special provisions to be made for the newly designated backward classes and are anxious to lay the specter of backwardness to rest, which will require ingenuity, skill and political sagacity, which may not be forthcoming. Social scientists view with alarm the distrust and apathy our rulers have developed towards social scientists, anthropologists and sociologists, and this attitude must change if healthy co-operation is desired for the welfare of the people and of the country which we are anxious to serve.

Our Task Ahead

Toynbee has shown that of the thirty known civilizations in world history only one survives today, and even that is now faced with extinction. I am not so pessimistic as that. Civilizations are the physical manifestations of culture. Cultures, as Sorokin shows, do not perish, but only reorient themselves. They live, they grow, they decay, and they reorient themselves. Few civilizations have perished from invasions, conquests and natural death. If they have, it has been caused by internal disruption. Indian culture and civilization have continued under adverse conditions and heavy onslaughts. Even primitive cultures have not perished, due to the operation of occult and vital institutional forces, which are sustained by the ethos or spirit of the cultures.

न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चित्

नायं कुतश्चिन्न बभूव कश्चित् ।

अजो नित्यः शाखतोऽयं पुराणो

न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे ॥

कठोपनिषद् 2.18

The soul of culture (wise) is never born, nor does it die. The essence

(of life) is eternal, everlasting, without any birth, and never dies, even though its physical manifestations may be affected or changed (in time).

The spirit has the power to conquer the flesh, and the spirit is undying. All over India, China, and other Asian and African countries this spirit is wide awake today, and it needs to be rehabilitated. The upsurge that we see all around us is the awakening of the spirit. Now we need to give it a new dress. This is the responsibility of the future, and to carry out this responsibility with determination and competence is our assignment. Here the respective roles of the individuals and groups, of communities and castes, have to be reaffirmed. The philosophers have done their job, having kept the spirit hallowed for us. Historians have recorded the linkage of the past with the present, and pre-historians have pushed the link far backward to remote geological times. The heritage is there, the mistakes of the past, the failures and frustrations that circumscribed progress, are all known. We can build for the future if we know what to avoid and what to lay our hands on. That is what the social scientists are expected to do. They have to answer what they can do and what they must do, and how they can do it and how they should do it. Let us concentrate on this responsibility and assignment and let us plan the future society. Ideas have wings, and knowledge is power. The mistakes of the past are lighthouses for steering new courses; the achievements of the past in the realm of thought are the beacons that keep our paths alight. Social scientists must seize the opportunity with both hands and prepare themselves for service.

Note

* This address has been reproduced from *Sociology, Social Research and Social Problems in India*, edited by R.N. Saksena, 1961. Asia Publishing House, New Delhi. It also appeared in *The Eastern Anthropologist*, 1957, Vol. X, No.2, entitled "What the Sociologist Can Do, What They Must Do, How They Can Do and How They Should Do It".

Professor R.N. Saksena the editor of the book above, omitted certain paragraphs which are printed in his Address in *The Eastern Anthropologist*; these are reproduced here as we consider these very significant and important. The very first paragraph reads as below:

"The election of an anthropologist to preside over the Indian Sociological Conference indicates the linkage and intimate relationship that India has been forging ahead between the two disciplines, a kinship which has not been secured in many countries of Europe, and still remains an ideal even for America, where sociologists and anthropologists share the same roof in most universities and have initiated inter-disciplinary research. This kinship has been fostered by, among other reasons, a feeling that the sociologist can discharge his role better with the collaboration of the anthropologist".

The second paragraph deleted/omitted by the editor lies between 'Basic Orientation in Sociology' and 'Kinship between Sociology and Social Anthropology', which is of great significance reflecting a conflict between Sociology and Social Work. This paragraph is captioned, 'Sociology and Social Work'; it is reproduced below:

"The grave danger to the existence and growth of sociology today is the confusion that has been caused in the minds of our people about the unholy relationship forged between sociology and social work, so that the misconception is growing that a sociologist may be a social worker, and, what is worse, every family planning propagandist, every Panchayat Officer is put in the rank of a sociologist. If the respective fields of sociology and social work are not properly demarcated, and this confusion is permitted to continue, we may soon have a glut of

sociologists, creating a condition when, as Sorokin has put it, every idler is a sociologist. Social work is an action therapy and should not be confused with sociology, which studies and analyses the social phenomena, formulates there from the social objectives, suggesting planned social approaches for their attainment. Its scientific analyses also help in working out a social philosophy to serve as the canvas for social work, the latter providing the mechanics to carry out the recipe. Social work is concerned with the vulnerable sections of our population, with incompetence, disease, sickness, old age, crime, delinquency, poverty and unemployment. and as such cannot disown the emotional plane, which provides for it the jumping platform. It is true also that social work being an applied field can help to correct the theoretical assumptions of the sociologist and even can offer landmarks to his measuring tools but it has much leeway to make to be even a remote substitute for sociology. This should not mean that I decry social work or underrate the role of social work. It has its place, and a very important place in the context of social welfare and must be a handmaid to the Welfare State that we have been envisaging. I can admire social work even if I am not competent to practice or profess it.

It is an ill-omen for the future of sociology if the newly opened institutes of sociology and social research regard their job as done by undertaking city surveys. Communication surveys, family planning projects and refugee surveys and the like, as they hardly contribute anything of fundamental value or towards the growth of the subject. There is certainly scope for *ad hoc* applied research, particularly when the demand is there, and many of us want to cash it at the bargaining counter. But if the social science research-centers end up their assignment by merely starting diploma and degree classes in social work, like the B.S.W and M.S.W., they would cause irreparable damage to sociology. Social science research institutes must concentrate primarily on fundamental research *and* enrich and develop the social science, especially the basic trio, psychology, sociology and social anthropology. In this respect responsibility also devolves on State and Central Governments to give adequate financial help for fundamental research.

Fundamental research is, by nature, of long-term type, unlike the research projects sponsored and financed by the Research Programmes Committee of the Planning Commission and can thus only be financed by the State or by foundational support. This *field deserves particular attention* at the hands of the University Grants Commission, which may well consider making some special provision for financing and starting fundamental research in social science at some selected university centers.

The editor also changed some of the sub-headings, most important being "Social Anthropology and National Developmental Planning" which was changed as "Sociology and National Development Planning" (see p. 21)

*** Presidential Address delivered at the Second Conference of Indian Sociological Conference held on 27 December, 1956 at Patna University, Patna.**