

EDITORIAL

IIC's Association with the University Department of Sociology, Mumbai

The Year 2019 is very special for the Department of Sociology, University of Mumbai. It is celebrating its Centenary. The Department traces its origin to 1919 when the British sociologist and town planner Sir Patrick Geddes was appointed as its first Professor and Head. It has the distinction of being the oldest centre of teaching and research in Sociology and Anthropology in India. In addition, it is the oldest Department in the University of Mumbai. Over the last hundred years the department has made pioneering and significant contributions to teaching and research in Sociology.

In a small way, the Institute of Indian Culture (IIC) has been associated with the Department of Sociology and the promotion of teaching and research on Indian Culture, Society and Religion.

Dr. Stephen Fuchs, the Founder-Director of the Institute of Indian Culture began the Department of Anthropology at St. Xavier's College in Mumbai, (then Bombay). Later with a few other German scholars, the Indian branch of *Anthropos Institut* was found in Bandra, Mumbai in 1950. The Institute shifted its operations to the present premises on Mahakali Caves Road, Andheri East in the year 1976 as a research centre with a new name Institute of Indian Culture. Dr. Fuchs spent sixty years of his life studying and researching the tribals and Dalits of India. He has published several monographs on them - he has done extensive field work among the Balahis, Gonds, Bhumias and Bhilalas of Madhya Pradesh; among the sweeper caste of the Nimar district;

among the Korkus of the Nimar district and in Melghat, Maharashtra. His twenty-two books and about hundred and fifty articles are a significant contribution by the founding scholar of the Institute.

Mathias Hermanns, who was one of the first Faculty members of the Institute, was a renowned scholar. He has done extensive studies on the Indo-Tibetans and the Mongoloid Problem in the Southern Himalaya and North-Northeast India. His other works include *'The Origin and Development of the Chinese Culture'* and *'The Nomads of Tibet'*. His works have been recognized as a major contribution to the studies of Nomadism. Dr. Wilhelm Koppers, a renowned anthropologist and co-scholar with Dr. Wilhelm Schmidt, the founder of the German School of Diffusionism in Anthropology, was closely associated with the Institute. Dr. Koppers and Leonard Jungblut did a detailed study on the Bhils of Jhabua, Madhya Pradesh and the adjoining territories. Leonard Jungblut lived among the Bhils for an extensive period of time and was the first scholar to compile a dictionary on the Bhili dialect.

Prof. J.V. Ferreira, who was the Head of the Department of Sociology, University of Mumbai between 1976-82, was a close associate of Dr. Fuchs and Faculty at the Institute of Indian Culture. While Dr. Ferreira was a lecturer at St. Xavier's College, Dr. Stephen Fuchs encouraged him to take up studies in anthropology. Dr. Ferreira had his scholarly orientation from the Vienna School of Diffusionism and did his doctorate under Dr. Wilhelm Koppers on Totemism in India. He joined the Department of Sociology at the University of Mumbai in 1976. He contributed to anthropological theory and methodology through his well-known work, 'Totemism in India'. He was the founder-member of the Indian Sociological Society. He joined hands with

Dr. Fuchs and Dr. Klaus Klostermaier to bring out the contributions of a large number of German-speaking scholars in a book entitled 'Essays in Ethnology'.

Dr. Clement Godwin, an associate-member of the Institute, did his doctoral studies under Prof. J.V.Ferreira on *'Change and Continuity: A Study of two Christian Village Communities in Suburban Bandra'*. Dr. Othmar Gaechter, who was one of the Editors of Anthropos Journal from Germany, was also a Faculty Member of the Institute of Indian Culture before he took up his new assignment at *Anthropos*. He did his doctoral studies in Indian Philosophy from Banaras Hindu University and has also done extensive studies in Sanskrit. His works included a critical investigation into hermeneutics and language in Purvamimamsa, a study in SabaraBhasya. Dr. Traude Pillai-Vetschera who recently retired as a Professor at the Department of Anthropology, University of Vienna, has been a very long associate of the Institute of Indian Culture. She has carried out extensive research on the Mahars of Maharashtra, on the 'Hijras' or 'eunuchs' of India and on the Devdasi system in India. Dr. Bernd Pflug, formerly with Kodaikanal International School and Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam is another Associate member of the Institute. He is a scholar with interests in philosophy of education, history of ideas and philosophical anthropology. He and Dr. Michael have published two volumes on the work of Prof. J.V. Ferreira.

Dr. Stephen Fuchs mentored several young scholars to pursue anthropological studies. A few of them went on to teach at Fu Jen University in Taiwan and Melanesian Institute in Papua New Guinea.

Dr. S.M. Michael did his doctoral studies at the Department of

Sociology, University of Mumbai, and later joined the Department as its regular faculty. His field of research has been the reciprocal relationship between Ecology and Culture. He concentrated his work in the field of “culture” and its intricacies with power, values and religion. Culture, nationalism and social movements are his areas of research. Among his several contributions, the edited volume “*Dalits in Modern India: Vision and Values*” was the best seller of Sage Publications for the year 2000 and has been translated in different languages. He collaborated with his colleague Dr. P.G. Jogdand for the publication of “*Globalization and Social Movements: Struggle for a Humane Society*”. He served at the Department for eighteen years and now after his superannuation as Professor of Cultural Anthropology, he continues to be an Adjunct Faculty of the Department. Fourteen scholars have completed their Ph.D. under his guidance.

Another young scholar of the Institute of Indian Culture, Dr. M.T. Joseph, after his completion of Ph.D. in Sociology has joined as the faculty member of the University Department of Sociology. In collaboration with Dr. Gita Chadha, Joseph has edited the volume “*Re-Imagining Sociology in India – Feminist Perspectives*” recently published by Routledge India. Dr. Joseph specialises in researching critical perspectives on religion and subaltern religiosity; particularly probing the ways in which marginalised communities interpret and imagine religion as a resource for emancipation; and has initiated research on shades of masculinity from a feminist lens.

In order to facilitate research activities of IIC, a new Academic Block was inaugurated by the Hon'ble Pro-Vice Chancellor of the University of Mumbai, Dr. Naresh Chandra in the year 2000. In

addition to a spacious library; a reading room, a seminar hall, a reference section and a conference hall were added. At present the well-equipped library has about sixty thousand volumes, a comprehensive collection of books in the areas of Culture, Society and Religion, with special reference to India. The Institute also has a large number of Indian and foreign journals. The library continues to grow with carefully selected contemporary books.

The Institute has been recognized as a Post-Graduate Research Centre in Sociology and Anthropology by the University of Mumbai from 2004. Several senior scholars collaborated with the Institute guiding Ph.D. scholars. Dr. A. Bopegamage, after his superannuation as Professor of Sociology at Gokhale Institute, Pune, joined the Institute as a Ph.D. guide. Similarly Dr. Augustine Kanjamala, Dr. Myrtle Barse and Dr. Leela D'Souza have been guiding research scholars at the Institute. There are twenty six scholars who have completed their Ph.D. and M.A. (by research) programmes at the Institute of Indian Culture.

Dr. Augustine Kanjamala with a doctorate in Sociology from Lancaster University, U.K took keen interest in the growth of the Institute of Indian Culture. His research focused on sociological forays into the cultural profile of the diverse Christian communities in India. His doctoral thesis grew out of extensive field work among the adivasis of Chotanagpur. A committed scholar and a keen analyst of Indian society and culture, Dr. Kanjamala has authored ten books and many articles with sharp analysis of the contemporary dynamics of Indian society. As a recognised supervisor of PhD research scholars, he mentored five students who have made a mark with significant contributions in their areas of research.

Dr. Vasundhara Mohan joined the Institute of Indian Culture as its Programme Director after her superannuation from the Centre of Soviet Studies, University of Mumbai. With her vast experience in working with the University and with her research credentials, she is pursuing her academic work at IIC. She has been instrumental in enhancing the research profile of IIC with outstanding contribution towards designing workshops, courses and conferences on academically engaging topics and in mobilizing resources for upgrading infrastructure.

The Institute of Indian Culture has been organizing Research Methodology courses, Seminars, workshops and Conferences with assistance from Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) and other academic institutions of Government of India. Concerted efforts are being made to preserve the valuable and rare collection of books by getting them digitized. The library is now fitted with air-conditioners and IIC is going in for industry standard library software to ensure that the books and journals are catalogued and made available to the public. IIC is moving ahead to contribute its share in the academic field through its research, publications and courses in the area of social sciences with its vision to build a just and humane society in India. The collaboration of IIC with the Department of Sociology, University of Mumbai has been in the form of faculty members teaching at the University, collaborative ventures in organising conferences and publishing books and articles as well as supervision of Ph.D. and M.A. (by research) scholars.

The IIC shares the joy of the Centenary of the Department of Sociology and wishes it a bright future ahead.

S.M. Michael
Director

IIC News

Institute of Indian Culture has been collaborating with College of Social Work: Nirmala Niketan and St. Andrew's College, both in Mumbai to promote “the efforts of the United Nations for Sustainable Development”. The three academic institutions are jointly conducting a Post-graduate Diploma Course on “Interreligious Collaboration for a Sustainable Development for a Humane Society”. Apart from its regular academic activities of seminars, workshop and animation programmes, the IIC has taken effort to preserve its very rare books by digitalizing them and make them available to a wider research scholars through internet facilities. By taking financial help from a few corporate bodies in Mumbai, the IIC has partially air-conditioned its library.

Information:

Infrastructure and Library

- The IIC is located in the Gyan Ashram Complex on the Mahakali Caves road of Andheri-East in Mumbai. The Institute has its own building, with spacious Seminar Hall, library and hostel for visiting scholars.
- The Institute's library has over 40,000 books in the areas of culture, Philosophy, Sociology, and religion, with special reference to India. A number of these rare and specialized ancient books are out of print and may not be found in other libraries.
- The library and reading room are used by students from the poor families who have no place/facility to study, at a nominal fee of Rs.500 per month.

- The IIC subscribes to a number of Indian and foreign journals and has accumulated over sixty thousand volumes over the years.
- The IIC's library has many rare and specialized ancient books that may not be found in other libraries.

Important events

- As a large number of valuable books and journals in the Institute's library are more than 100 years old, it was proposed to digitise the library books in stages and upgrade the library to protect the ancient books and journals.

The Consulate of the Federal Republic of Germany in Mumbai, whose support was sought for upgrading the status of the library by installing air conditioners and providing Desk Top computers for the students using the library, has been pleased to sanction a sum of Rs. 3, 68,472. The work was completed in December 2018. The IIC is grateful to the German Consulate for its grant.

The IIC is also happy to record that the Mahindra Educational Trust of Mahindra and Mahindra Ltd/., Mumbai has also been pleased to sanction a sum of Rs.16.50 lakh for digitising the library books. The work has since been awarded to Noetic Technologies Ltd., an expert in digitising.

Coming Events

IIC Day

- The IIC Day will be celebrated in March 2019.

Research Projects

- Dr. S. M. Michael is pursuing his research project on the relationship between “Culture-Politics-Religion in Indian Nationalism”.
- He is also pursuing a research on “Ecology & Culture” as a UNESCO Study project.

IIC Publications/Seminar Participation

Dr. S. M. Michael SVD

Resource Person for workshops

S.M. Michael was one of the resource persons for the International Interculturality Workshop organized by Centro Ad Gentes, Nemi in January 2018. He also gave a workshop on the same theme for the Intercultural Volunteers of the Maris Brothers in June 2018 at Florence in Italy.

He was also a resource person on the International workshop on “*Facing the Future in Religious Life*” organized by the Union of International Superior Generals, in Rome from January 21- 1 February 2019.

Gave a Valedictory Address during the 6th Annual National Seminar on “*Women among the Marginalised Communities of India: Issues and Challenges*”, organized by Sanskruti – Institute of Dravidian Culture and Research, Hyderabad, February 1 &2, 2019.

Publications:

“Post-Modern and Post-Truth Society”, *Missionary Discipleship in Global Contexts*, Lazar T. Stanislaus and vanThanh NGUYEN

(eds.) Sankt Augustin: Steyler Missions wissenschaftliches Institut at Sankt Augustin. *Studia Instituti Missiologici SVD* # 112, 2018, pp. 73-90.

“Christianity, Culture and Formation in the Globalized World”, *Asian Journal of Vocation and Formation*, Vol. XXXXIII, No. 1, 2018, pp.3-20.

Presentation of Papers:

The following papers were presented at various seminars and conferences: “Christianity and the Indigenous People in India”, paper presented at a National Consultation on “*Indian Christianity: Public Theological Explorations*”, at the Department of Christianity, University of Madras, February 27 & 28, 2018;

“Culture, Religion and Politics in Contemporary India: An Outpouring of Dalit Angst” Paper presented at the National Seminar on “*Religious Tolerance, Culture and Civil Society in India*”, at the Institute of Indian Culture, Mumbai, March 6 & 7, 2018;

“Contemporary Challenges and Prospects in Christian Mission” Keynote Address at 3rd National Conference of Mission, Education & Research (MER – India) on *A Critical Appraisal of SVD Mission in India: Contemporary Challenges and Prospects*, 3rd to 5th September 2018 at AtmaDarshan, Mumbai;

“Culture, Identity & Hegemony: Challenges to Tribals in India”, paper presented at the National Conference on “*Indigenous Epistemology: Perspectives from Within*” at the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, September 10 & 11, 2018;

“Sustainable Ecology and Sustainability of Culture”, Paper presented at the National Conference on “*Sustainable Development through Research and Intervention Programmes*”, organized by College of Social Work – Nirmala Niketan, 20-21 December 2018.

Dr. M.T. Joseph

Publications:

Book:

Chadha, Gita & Joseph, M.T. (Eds.). (2018). *Re-imagining Sociology in India: Feminist Perspectives*. London & New York: Routledge. ISBN 978-1-138-29424-0

Joseph, M.T. (2018). “Subalternity, Language and Projects of Emancipation: An Analysis of Dalit Literature”. In *Language, Identity and Symbolic Culture*. David Evans (Ed.). London: Bloomsbury Academic. pp. 161 – 182. ISBN 978-1350023017

Lectures and papers presentation at conferences:

- a. 16 November 2018. *Masculinity and Religion: A Feminist Perspective*. ICSSR Sponsored Two Days National Seminar on “Vision for an Inclusive Society: A Feminist Perspective” On 15th & 16th November 2018 conducted by UGC Centre for Women's Studies, University of Bangalore at Venkatgiri Gowda Auditorium, Jnana Bharathi Campus, Mysore Road, Bangalore.
- b. 28 December 2018. *Prof. N.R. Sheth and Industrial Sociology in India*. 44th All India Sociological Conference (Reconstructing Sociological Discourse in India: Perspectives from the Margins). St. Philomena's College (Autonomous), Mysuru.

Workshops, Sessions and Lectures

- 01 June 2018. *Perspectives on Gender and Patriarchy*. Session for the orientation programme at Human Resource Development Centre, University of Mumbai. 10.00 to 11.30 a.m.
- 13 July 2018. *Liberalization and Agrarian Distress*. Session for students of Xaviers – Berkeley Summer Programme 2018 at St. Xaviers College, Mumbai. 03.30 to 05.30 p.m.
- 11 August 2018. Workshop on *Sociology of Religion* for M.Phil and PhD students of Krantijyoti Savitribai Phule Womens Studies Centre, University of Pune. 10.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m.
- 18 August 2018. *Perspectives on Gender and Patriarchy*. Session for the orientation programme at Human Resource Development Centre, University of Mumbai. 03.40 to 05.10 p.m.
- 24 August 2018. *Qualitative Research Methods*. Workshop on Research Methodology in Social Sciences, organized by ICSSR Western Regional Centre at ICSSR Conference Room, J.P. Naik Bhavan, University of Mumbai, Vidyanagari, Mumbai 400098. 11.30 a.m. to 01.00 p.m.
- 11 September 2018. *Use of Qualitative Data*. Workshop on Research Methodology in Social Sciences for the research scholars and faculty members. Indian Council of Social Science Research, North Eastern Regional Centre, Shillong, Meghalaya. 3.15 to 4.45 p.m.
- 12 September 2018. *Critique and Revision*. Workshop on Research Methodology in Social Sciences for the research

scholars and faculty members. Indian Council of Social Science Research, North Eastern Regional Centre, Shillong, Meghalaya. 11.15 a.m. to 12.45 p.m.

- 12 September 2018. *Introduction, Conclusion and Abstract*. Workshop on Research Methodology in Social Sciences for the research scholars and faculty members. Indian Council of Social Science Research, North Eastern Regional Centre, Shillong, Meghalaya. 3.15 to 4.45 p.m.
- 25 September 2018. *Qualitative Research Methods: Ethnomethodology*. Session for the students at Sophia Centre for Women's Studies and Development, Sophia College, Mumbai. 1.30 to 03.30 p.m.
- 11 October 2018. *Qualitative Research Methods. Workshop on Research Methodology in Social Sciences*, organized by ICSSR Western Regional Centre at ICSSR Conference Room, J.P. Naik Bhavan, University of Mumbai, Vidyanagari, Mumbai 400098. 3.30 p.m. to 5.00 pm.
- 17 November 2018. Session on *Gender, Patriarchy and Religion*. Short Term Course. Encapsulating Gender: An Interdisciplinary Perspective” from 14 to 20 November 2018 conducted by Sophia Centre for Women's Studies, Sophia College, Bhulabahi Desai Road, Mumbai 400025 under the aegis of UGC HRDC, University of Mumbai. 11.30 a.m. to 1.00 p.m.
- 23 November 2018. Workshop on *Frameworks to analyse social movements* for M.Phil and PhD students of Krantijyoti Savitribai Phule Women's Studies Centre, University of Pune. 10.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m.

- 23 November 2018. Session on *Sociology of Religion*. Short Term Course titled *Gender Sensitization*, under the aegis of UGC Human Resource Development Centre, conducted by Krantijyoti Savitribai Phule Women's Studies Centre, University of Pune. 2.00 to 4.00 p.m.

Dr. (Mrs. Vasundhara Mohan

Book

Good Governance in India (Eds.) Vasundhara Mohan and ScariaPannackal, New Delhi (2018), Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.

Participation in Conferences

- Presented a paper on "Indian Diaspora in Malaysia" at the April 27-29, 2018 National Seminar on ***"Act East Policy of NDA II and Primary Goals"***, organised by the VidyaPrasarak Mandal's Centre for International Studies, Mulund East, Mumbai.
- In August 2018, delivered a lecture on ***International Organizations*** at the Political Science Department of the SNDT University, Mumbai.
- Presented a Paper on ***"Educating Tribal Children: Issues"*** at the National Seminar on ***Status of Tribal Ashram Schools in India: Issues, Challenges and Prospects***, organised by the Department of Social Work, Faculty of Social Sciences, Jamia Millia Islamia (A Central University), New Delhi and Yashwantrao Chavan Institute of Social sciences and Research, Bharati Vidyapeeth, Pune on 28-29 December 2018.

Relevance of Gandhi Today*

Dr. G. Ramachandram

On Mahatma Gandhi's death, the renowned scientist Albert Einstein said: "No country other than India, no religion other than Hinduism, would have produced a Gandhi. The generations to come will wonder whether such a man in blood and flesh ever walked on this earth." To the Philosopher- Statesman S Radhakrishnan, Gandhiji was the greatest Indian after Buddha.

After returning to India from South Africa in 1915, Gandhi had organized three major campaigns against the colonial British rule- the non-cooperation movement in 1920s, the civil disobedience movement in 1930s- the highlight being the Dandi March On March 1930 from Sabarmati Ashram- and the Quit India movement of 1940s. Though these movements were part of the struggle for Indian independence, equally important were his programmes for social reform, particularly ceaseless efforts to abolish the practice of untouchability, the promotion of the Hindu-Muslim unity and inter-faith dialogue, the upliftment of women and the revival of the village and artisanal economy. As the historian Ramachandra Guha says the 1920s and 1930s were the Age of Gandhi, just as the 1940s and 1950s were the Age of Nehru- his political heir.

Gandhi believed in equality of all religions. To him truth is God and God is truth, emphasizing on truth and non-violence as the two cardinal principles of Hinduism. His objective was to create an ethical Indian State founded on *ahimsa* and *satya-non-violence* and truth. The national motto of independent India- *Satyameva Jayate*- truth alone triumphs- taken from the *Mundaka*

Upanishad, was chosen by Gandhi as his guiding credo. He often expressed the view that the truth is many-sided and relative and that the spirit of synthesis is the essential hallmark of Indian civilization. Gandhi was essentially a man of religion, a Hindu to the inner-most depths of his being, and yet his conception of religion had nothing to do with any dogma or custom or ritual. To him, Truth and non-violence were the two sides of the same coin. He told the Federation of International Fellowships in January 1928: “all religions are true; all religions are almost as dear to me as my own Hinduism.”

At a time when India was reduced to an economic and political appendage of an imperial power, and the people were enslaved, Gandhi entered the political scene and galvanised the people. Pundit Nehru in his book *The Discovery of India* wrote about the Gandhiji's impact:

“And then Gandhi came. He was like a powerful current of fresh air that made us stretch ourselves and take deep breaths; like a beam of light that pierced the darkens and removed the scales from our eyes. He did not descend from the top; he seemed to emerge from the millions of India, speaking their language and incessantly drawing attention to them and their appalling condition. Political freedom took new shape then and acquired a new content. The essence of his teaching was fearlessness and truth, and action allied to these, always keeping the welfare of the masses in view, the absence of fear from the mind. So suddenly that pall of fear was lifted from the people's shoulders... It was a psychological change, almost as if some expert in psycho-analytical methods had probed deep into the patient's past, found out the origins of his complexes, exposed them to his view, and thus rid him of that burden.”

Gandhi had transformed the Indian National Congress, limited to the upper classes, into a democratic and mass organization. A new technique of action was evolved, of not submitting to what was considered wrong and as a consequence, a willing acceptance of pain and suffering. There was no submission in him to fate or anything that he considered evil. However, the means were as important as the end.

What was Gandhi's idea of India? He said:

“I shall work for an India in which the poorest shall feel that it is their country, in whose making they have an effective voice, and India in which there shall be no high class and low class of people, an India in which all communities shall live in perfect harmony... Women will enjoy the same rights as men. This is the India of my dreams.” He refused to narrow his cultural inheritance. To him “Indian culture is neither Hindu, Islamic, nor any other, wholly. It is a fusion of all. I want all the culture of all lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any.” His ambition was to wipe every tear from every eye.

In a broadcast to the Nation, following his assassination on January 30, 1948, Pandit Nehru said:

“The light has gone out of our lives and there is darkness everywhere. Our beloved leader, Bapu as we called him, the Father of the Nation, is no more. For the light that shone in this country was no ordinary light. The light that has illumined this country for these many many years will illumine this country for many more years, and a thousand years later, that light will still be seen in this country and the world will see it. For that light represented something more than the immediate present; it represented the living, the eternal truths, reminding us of the right

path.....the greatest prayer that we can offer is to take a pledge to dedicate ourselves to the truth, and to the cause for which this great countryman of ours lived and for which he has died.”

Gandhi was a man of God. He believed the path of violence is perilous, and freedom seldom exists for long where there is violence. Democracy demands discipline, tolerance and mutual regard. Freedom demands respect for the freedom of others. Throughout his life, he thought in terms of the poor and the oppressed and the downtrodden. To raise them and free them was his life's mission. He gave a new method of struggle and political warfare, demonstrating the efficacy of truth and good-will and non-violence in politics. He was the great unifier in India, who taught Indians not only to bare tolerance of others, but a willing acceptance of them as friends and comrades in building of the nation, to rise above petty things and prejudices. His death symbolized the message of larger hearted tolerance and unity. He held the view that out of hatred and violence nothing but hatred and violence and destruction would follow. And to make India a secular State, “where every religion and belief has full freedom and equal honour, where every citizen has equal liberty and equal opportunity.”

He was a staunch believer in non-violence. Those that wield the sword shall perish by the sword. To him passive resistance is a method of securing rights by personal suffering, refusing to do something that is repugnant to one's conscience, to disobey laws that are unjust, accepting the consequences thereof. Passive resistance is a soul-force or truth-force. And “Passive resistance cannot proceed a step without fearlessness. Those alone can follow the path of passive resistance who are free from fear, whether as to their possessions, false honour, their relatives, the government, bodily injuries, death.” It is a non- cooperation with unjust government.

He fought for the abolition of untouchability. He considered untouchability as a crime against God. According to him, “Hinduism has sinned in giving sanction to untouchability, as the mass of Hindus consider it a sin to touch a section of their own co-religionists, and treat them worse than dogs. For dogs are not untouchables. This had results in social and religious atrocities against 20 % of fellow Indians- considered Depressed classes- whom he called 'Harijans'—children of God.. These so called untouchables had no access “to eating-houses, saloons, restaurants, schools, wells, tanks, water-taps, not to speak of temples...” They were prevented from using public latrines, built out of public funds. They were humiliated, insulted and treaded worse than animals by the Caste-Hindus.

Gandhi had promoted Hindu-Muslim unity and inter-faith dialogue. He had gone to South Africa at the invitation of a Muslim merchant. And surprisingly his main clients in that country and at times his main supports were Muslims. He successfully fought against the racial discrimination- the policy of apartheid. He started the Satyagraha movement against the white rule to secure justice to the Indian settlers- mainly merchant class and indentured labourers. In South Africa he had drafted a “vow of Hindu-Muslim Unity” and got it administered that read:

“With God as witness we Hindus and Mohomedans declare that we shall behave towards one another as children of the same parents, that we shall have no differences, that the sorrows of each shall be the sorrows of the other and that each shall help the other in removing them., We shall respect each other's religion and religious feelings and shall not stand in the way of our respective religious practices. We shall always refrain from violence to each other in the name of religion.”

His concern with inter-religious harmony went beyond Hindus and Muslims. He found himself in the midst of a large Christian Indian community in South Africa. He had many friends and followers among the Christians.

Similarly, he had very progressive and enlightened views about women. He believed in equality of women. For the first time, he brought the women into the social and political movements during the freedom struggle. He said:

“I am uncompromising in the matter of woman's rights. In my opinion she should labour under no legal disability not suffered by man. I should treat the daughters and sons on a footing of perfect equality. Parents should seek to make their sons and daughters self-reliant.”

He was opposed to the women wearing purdah. Recounting his experience of addressing a gathering of women he said:

“I was called upon to address the ladies behind the purdah. The sight of the screen behind which my audience, whose number I did not know, was seated made me sad. It pained and humiliated me deeply. I thought of the wrong being done by men to the women of India by clinging to a barbarous custom which, whatever use it might have had when it was first introduced, had now become totally useless and was doing incalculable harm to the country. The purdah is being retained even in educated households not because the educated men believe in it themselves but because they will not manfully resist the brutal custom and sweep it away at a stroke. Why do not our women enjoy the same freedom that men do? Why should they not be able to walk out and have fresh air? It must be a very poor thing that cannot stand the gaze of men. Men, to be men, must be able to trust their womenfolk, even as the latter are compelled to trust them. Let us not live with one limb

completely or partially paralysed. What we are doing to our women and what we are doing to the 'untouchables' recoils upon our heads with a force thousand times multiplied. It partly accounts for our own weakness, indecision, narrowness and helplessness. Let us then tear down the purdah with one mighty effort”

Today, all these ideals of and values of Gandhi are turned on their head. India of his dreams- a secular and pluralistic society in harmony- is shattered. Cow vigilantism, love-jihad, lynching mob culture, polarization of people on caste and religious lines, majoritarianism and feeling of insecurity among the minorities –all are in direct conflict with all that he stood for. The loyalty of the Muslims who opted to stay in India, after the partition, is still questioned by certain section of the society, leading to communal tension and riots. The weak and the marginalized, particularly the poor and the dalits are ill-treated, insulted and humiliated, gripped a fear-psychosis, as if they are not the lawful citizens of India. The majority community, with a misconceived notion of being threatened by minorities, have become intolerant and mute spectators to the atrocities and violence and crime committed against the vulnerable and the oppressed. The minor girls and women are subjected to barbaric and brutal heinous crimes; untold misery and violence, making Indians hang their head in shame. Any political disagreement is dubbed as anti-national and anti-patriotic by the extreme right wing elements, becoming a law unto themselves. The dissent- “a symbol of vibrant democracy”- is sought to be crushed. The freedom has become a license. And democracy has degenerated into mobocracy and India becoming 'lynchistan'. Political discourse is at all time low, with every election becoming an end itself- capturing power by hook or crook- with money and muscle power, subverting the rule of law.

This is not India of Mahatma Gandhi. Nationalism, Patriotism, Indianness and Hinduism are much abused. The Hindutva ideology that is sought to be imposed by the SanghParivar is neither the Hinduism that Gandhi believed and practiced; nor does it represent the Indian nationalism. A befitting tribute that we the people can pay to the Father of Nation ,on the eve of his 150th birth day, is to pledge ourselves to follow his footsteps, to uphold truth and non-violence , as the guiding principles in our public life, and shun hatred, violence and bloodshed.

Gandhi was a great social, spiritual and political leader-a saint among politicians. He infused ethics in politics on a big scale. To him means are as important as the end. In today's turbulent world, torn by hatred and violence and war mongering, his message of peace, tolerance and communal harmony is as relevant as ever. The world observes his birthday- October 2- as the International Day of Non-violence. And it is important to preserve his legacy and the nations across the globe must cherish and celebrate their ethnic and religious diversity.

*A presentation made by him on the Gandhi Jayanti Day - October 2, 2018.

He is a Professor of Political Science and retired Principal, who published his magnum opus *The Trial by Fire: Memoirs of a College Principal*. He is also the author of the book *Nehru and World Peace*.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY IN BOMBAY/ MUMBAI

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE INSTITUTE OF INDIAN CULTURE

Bernd Pflug

In the history of anthropology in India, the Department of Sociology of the University of Bombay has played a prominent role in the promotion and development of sociology and anthropology as academic disciplines especially in its first five decades. Its founding hundred years ago in 1919 - with Patrick Geddes as its first head, who was followed in 1924 by G.S. Ghurye - was a milestone in anthropological teaching and research in the country. The rest, as they say, is history – with Ghurye dominating sociology and anthropology (I use these two interchangeably) in Bombay and beyond. Quite a few of his 80 research students subsequently developed sociology and anthropology in many parts of the country where they followed in the main his line of thought by absorbing anthropology into sociology and open the subject(s) to a wide range of topics and methodologies, from indological sociology to ethnographic fieldwork, from questions of gender to problems of political economy, from ecological to urban sociology.

Ghurye's dominance in Bombay was so overwhelming that his colleague, N.A. Thoothi, who had joined the Department a year after Ghurye, was left to play a secondary role in the twenty-five years they worked together. We can only speculate on the development of sociology and anthropology in India, if Thoothi's conception of sociology and Geddes-oriented research style,

beautifully documented in his forgotten classic on the Vaishnavas of Gujarat had flourished into a 'school' or a distinct epistemic community. Whilst Ghurye supported a host of (later well-known) research students who have become household-names in the history of sociology in India, Thoothi's most notable research student was P.H. Valavalkar (also known by the name of Pandhari-NathPrabhu) whose doctoral dissertation on Hindu social institutions, is still in print today and used as a popular reference. Yet Thoothi had never a great influence in the development of sociology and anthropology as a discipline beyond Bombay, and even within the University his work was far less recognised than Ghurye's.

On the other hand, the Institute of Indian Culture (IIC) - founded as 'Anthropos' in 1950 in Bombay by the svd-congregation of the Catholic Church, and changed into the Institute of Indian Culture in 1967 - is but a footnote in the history of anthropology in India, with Stephen Fuchs as a strong and committed founder over nearly half a century, but with virtually no 'students' to come thereafter who could have transferred his work and ideas into a 'school' across the country. Besides reasons of finance, resources and size, the main cause for this was (and is) the religious brief of the IIC in the development of its academic work. This brief was from the very beginning to produce reliable anthropological knowledge of peoples for the task of missionary work. If the agenda of research work, noble as it may be, is limited to the sole objective of anthropology for the mission, then the 'output' of an institute is consequently limited. Staff members usually do not question the agenda and line up their work accordingly. That's why the contributions of Fuchs's early colleagues, e.g. Mathias Hermanns and Leonard Jungblut, fall into the same category of descriptive ethnographic studies as the major works of Fuchs. On the other hand, the non-Government character of the ICC put it from the

outset in a favourable position of deciding on its priorities without or with considerably less bureaucratic constraints than a government institution – a condition a researcher might value more than the support of a rather big but tightly organised and regimented university department. While the secular status of the University's Department of Sociology allowed for more multifaceted research, members of the IIC were able to refine their ethnographic expertise for the sake of mission.

It was Kamala Ganesh, a former Head of the university department, who, to my knowledge for the first time, pointed out, albeit in an aside, that there could be more in the relationship between the university department and the IIC than what has met the eye so far. She remarks that “The work of the anthropologist Stephen Fuchs in Bombay and his association with the Bombay School is yet another thread in this tangled history [of the Department and of anthropology in Bombay].” She also makes the valid point that a third pillar of the development of anthropology in Bombay, the Anthropological Society of Bombay (ASB), deserves to be studied more closely in this 'tangled history'.

Fuchs not only lectured occasionally in the university, but was also cognizant of the research work which was being pursued at the Department. He regularly referenced the work of Bombay scholars in his studies and was well aware what was done next door in the south of Bombay. The IIC library is a treasure trove of publications in sociology and anthropology produced in Bombay over the decades. I am not so sure whether this was and is reciprocal. The works of Fuchs and other IIC-associated academics were hardly cited by Bombay scholars in sociology and anthropology. Though half a century and more ago the religious tolerance and acceptance in India appeared to be much higher than in today's India, the minority stigma attached to the IIC – being a

Christian institution and, moreover, openly in the service of missionary work – may have been never far away from the minds of scholars like Ghurye. They considered their efforts to be excavating knowledge for the purpose of promoting a national Hindu culture as their prime objective. Before colonialism and present-day communalism people in India wore their religious beliefs and identities with more ease and interacted with a natural lack of self-consciousness. A wealth of cross-cultural exchanges established the heterogeneity of her culture which became a hallmark of the country's strength. It would be supportive of the openness of Indian culture if both, the Department and the IIC, could consider their sociological and anthropological research as a contribution to India's vigorous cultural pluralism.

A pivotal role in bridging the academic work of the Department and the IIC was played by J.V. Ferreira who early on was teaching at St. Xavier's College, Bombay, whose department of anthropology was incidentally founded by Stephen Fuchs. After his Ph.D. research in the University of Vienna in Austria under Wilhelm Koppers, Ferreira joined the University's Department and retired as its fifth Head in 1982. His efforts in philosophising anthropology and in reflecting critically on its methodology was in marked difference to the dominant works produced by Ghurye and many others in the first decades of the history of the Department – but it was also in marked contrast to Fuchs' work in anthropology. Besides his indological streak, Fuchs' major academic interest was to produce reliable ethnographic knowledge of tribes and small-scale societies. In an article on applied anthropology he categorically states: “The problems arising from the attempts to integrate the tribal and other backward communities in the national culture can only be solved after an impartial and scientific study. It requires the knowledge of an

expert to assess the capabilities of a backward community correctly and to give the right directives for its smooth and peaceful process.” Not many today would agree with Fuchs. His position as an ethnographer comes across as a top-bottom one which puts trust in instrumental knowledge and not so much in participation and discourse. Due to the structure of the Church and his towering role in the IIC Fuchs was never really challenged in his ways of doing and promoting research.

Particularly after his retirement, Ferreira kept a close relationship with Fuchs and the IIC and supported the Institute on many levels, including the religious-missionary one, which can be clearly gleaned from his article on anthropology and the svd-congregation where he concludes that the tradition of the IIC with its focus on the anthropological disciplines “must never be allowed to wither away, especially as its invigoration is likely to generate many advantages to the [svd-]Society and the Church, both in India and abroad.” On the other hand, it is difficult to trace much of Ferreira's thinking on the theory of anthropology in the practice and understanding of ethnography by Fuchs. Fuchs' great ethnographic monographs on the NimarBalahi, Gond and Bhumia, and Korku of central India are, to put it bluntly, devoid of any contemplative, interpretive, or philosophical finesse – they are, instead, mines of information and comprehensive records of the life-world of small-scale societies. Both Fuchs and Ferreira agreed, however, on distancing themselves from the rigid culture circle theory of the Vienna School of Ethnology represented by Wilhelm Schmidt in the first half of the 20th century and with that also from the rather rigid understanding of cultural diffusion of which their conversation in the Fuchs festschrift gives ample evidence. Scholars at the Department were never much involved in the Vienna type and understanding of anthropology but felt

more akin to what the British called social anthropology.

Some years ago, the personal library of J.V. Ferreira was handed over to the IIC and incorporated into the already impressive library of the IIC with c. 48.000 volumes. At the same time the IIC agreed to set up the 'Prof. J.V. Ferreira Research Centre' paving the way for discourse and research in the theoretical and philosophical aspects of anthropology and sociology. If more personnel and financial resources were available, this Centre could become in future the place where a closer working relationship between IIC and the Department of the University could be practised, especially in tackling problems and questions of theoretical anthropology and the philosophy of anthropology.

I would like to mention in this context two research students of J.V. Ferreira who straddled, with their personal knowledge of Fuchs and the IIC, both institutions, C.J. Godwin and A.R. Momin. A.R. Momin, who later became Head of the University's Department, wrote his Ph.D. dissertation on a topic which was very much related to the thought of Ferreira in philosophical anthropology (the only one who did so amongst the research students of Ferreira); he also holds the anthropological work of Fuchs in high esteem, and is of the opinion that the Institute's (historical) resources could be more creatively used for the benefit of the anthropological knowledge of India – again, provided means and personnel were available.

Besides being a research student of Ferreira, C.J. Godwin was also a member of the svd-congregation and an associate of the IIC. His dissertation of 1970 on two village communities in suburban Bombay was in the new ethnographic style of description and reflection, of change and comparison, and of observations of a limited but clearly defined target population. In this it was in

marked contrast to Fuchs' understanding of macro-ethnographic research and much more related to developments in the University's Department. However, we can without doubt assume that Godwin was, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, a strong advocate of the work of both the University's Department of Sociology and the IIC.

In the recent past, two IIC staff members who were and are on the staff of the Department have formed a strong connection between the two institutions. They are S.M. Michael, the present director of the IIC, who worked for 18 years in the Department, and at present M.T. Joseph, a former director of the IIC. In my understanding, their main contribution to the Department is twofold. First, there is S.M. Michael's strong advocacy for, and consequent exposure of, cultural anthropology to and within the Department; and second, M.T. Joseph's support of the role of social theory and its critical engagements within the sociology of religion and minorities. And reciprocally, the many influences of professional discussion and development within a large and established university department do surely flow back through these two teachers into the academic work of the IIC. I can well imagine that the roles of S.M. Michael and M.T. Joseph, viz. being both priest and academic in a secular department, are not always easy to reconcile. On the other hand, their intellectual presence can also be a constant reminder to the Department that there is more to sociology and anthropology than what is represented in the rather dominant positions by well-known scholars and institutes in Mumbai, Delhi, Lucknow, or Kolkata. Academic progress in the social sciences and humanities is not only achieved by more and more fieldwork or/and (rather playful post-modern) discourses but also, and by necessity, in rigorous discourses on the conceptual foundations of the subject of which its epistemological predicament is of prime importance

for the validity and reliability of knowledge. The Department and the IIC have a great opportunity to complement each other in historical-empirical research but more so in theoretical-philosophical discussions. Their respective histories have produced a wealth of material and expertise for this ongoing task, and their present-day activities in research – within the spectre of the numerous branches and themes of sociology and anthropology – promise a steady flow of new ideas, initiatives, and visions. In these efforts, they might want to avoid what Andre Beteille some time ago criticised in the practice of sociology in Indian classrooms and conferences, viz. its tendency “to oscillate between a commentary on current affairs and a vague philosophising about man, society and culture.”

The collaboration between the IIC and the Department has been supported by the fact that the IIC is recognised by the University of Mumbai as a post graduate research centre for sociology and anthropology, but it would be more beneficial for their future relationship to clarify what this actually means, not in terms of administrative procedure, but in terms of outlook and research. A beginning could be made by the IIC as the much smaller institution to invite the parent institution to discuss which kind of research the IIC could and should pursue. The ambience, the facilities, and the history of the IIC would allow it, for example, to concentrate on areas of research which are underpinned by the problems of religion in Indian societies, by the difficulties faced by the vast number of marginalised people in Indian societies, as well as by the methodological and philosophical trials and tribulations of sociology and anthropology. Ghurye labelled, already in the 1930s, the discipline as 'anthropo-sociology', a name – as awkward as it sounds – that makes sense even more so today when disciplinary boundaries turn more and more porous

and when knowledge does not only get more specific but also more foundational and is in constant reflection on its results and how they have been obtained.

What would be helpful for the discussion of a closer future collaboration between Department and IIC is a comprehensive historical and conceptual study of the parallel development and the intersections of both institutions. Some years ago, T.N. Madan published an excellent volume on the first fifty years of sociology at the University of Lucknow in the series 'Oxford in India Readings in Sociology and Social Anthropology'. To me, this is what Bombay would need, covering both the University's Department of Sociology from about 1930 to 1980 with the IIC joining as a strong contender in anthropological research in 1950 with Stephen Fuchs and his colleagues straddling the decades before and after this mid-century point. Madan's volume on Lucknow is outstanding for three reasons. The author reflects on his personal involvement in Lucknow sociology; he documents his critical knowledge of the works of the four major protagonists of the Department of Sociology at that time (Radhakamal Mukherjee, D.P. Mukerji, D.N. Majumdar, and A.K. Saran); and he reveals an acute sense of the possibilities and constraints of the subject. And not least of all, the volume is written in an old-world charm of calm but concise observations together with a responsibility to academic detail.

The greatest challenge to a closer collaboration between the IIC and the Department in the centenary year of the latter is, however, the basic assumption that there are different outlooks and agendas. What may have to be overcome is the attitude of exclusion, viz. that the Christian foundation of the IIC is not in tune with the secular character of the Department, and vice versa. A more generous look into the past of India's cultures and societies could

easily dispel this notion and thus remove the main obstacle to the road of a fruitful working together.

References

¹ N.A. Thoothi: *The Vaishnavas of Gujarat. Being a Study in Methods of Investigation of Social Phenomena*, Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co., 1935. Thoothi describes his study as follows: “The present study is primarily an attempt at applying and testing the Geddesian theory and method of the investigation and interpretation of social phenomena. The subject-matter of the study, also, is of peculiar importance; for the Vaishnavas of Gujarat seem to me to be a typical example of communities having thoroughly adapted themselves to a definite mode of life, and being then called upon, or forced, to readjust radically their habits and ideas to meet new conditions and circumstances arising from contact with strange peoples and strange civilizations and cultures.” (x-xi) One of the few contemporary sociologists who has recognised the significance of Thoothi's study is T.N. Madan: 'For a Sociology of India', *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (N.S.), Vol. 15, Nos. 1-2, January-December 1981, 405-418, where he calls it an “early classic, now hardly remembered or read”, yet “a splendidly holistic effort.” (408)

² Pandharinath H. Valavalkar: *Hindi Social Institutions. With Reference to their Psychological Implications*. Bombay: Green and Co., 1939. The publishing history of this book is astonishing as is its longevity. A new revised edition of the book was published as Pandhari-Nath Prabhu: *Hindu Social Organization. A Study in Social-Psychological and Ideological Foundations*. Bombay: Popular Book Depot, 1954. A third edition was issued in 1958, and recently, a fourth edition has come out in 2016 by Sage Publishing. In its first and second editions the book carries a programmatic

Note on studies of Hindu social thought by N.A. Thoothi which he wrote as the General Editor of the Series entitled 'Regional and Sociological Studies (Mainly Indian)' and in which his Vaishnava study appeared. As of date, I have not found out whether other titles (apart from Thoothi's and Prabhu's) have been published in this series.

³ The intellectual self-promotion of Ghurye is well-documented, most strikingly in his autobiography *I and Other Explorations*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1973. It seems that he transferred his critical views of his one-time teacher and predecessor, Patrick Geddes, onto his colleague in the Department, N.A. Thoothi who considered Geddes his 'guru' and to whom he dedicated his Vaishnava study. How Ghurye dealt with Thoothi, he reveals, consciously or not, in one of the two sentences he wrote about Thoothi in his survey of teaching sociology in India: “Mr. N.A. Thoothi, who received the degree of D.Phil. from Oxford University in 1923 for his thesis on the Vaishnavas of Gujarat published his work under the same title in 1936 after revising it and incorporating in it his *riper view* on methodology.” See G.S. Ghurye: *The Teaching of Sociology, Social Psychology and Social Anthropology*. In Humayun Kabir et al: *The Teaching of Social Sciences in India (1947-67)* (152-164). Delhi: Universal Book and Stationery & Co., 1968, 155 (emphasis mine). First, Thoothi received his degree in 1924 (and not in 1923); second, his book was published in 1935 (and not in 1936); and third his views on method (an extraordinary chapter in his book) were already part of his dissertation and didn't *ripen* in Bombay as Ghurye may have wanted to imply. Thoothi's dissertation (kept and accessible in the Bodleian “Weston Library” of the University of Oxford, Shelf mark “MS. D.Phil. d.40) has a title which shows that the methodological was in the

forefront of this work from the very beginning: “*Discussion and determination of the most adequate method to be employed in the study of the interrelation and interaction of the economic, ethical, and religious factors in the life of organised communities, as illustrated in the Vaishnava communities of Gujarat, or, The correlation of economic and social life with religious beliefs and general culture, so far as illustrated by the Vaishnavas of Gujarat*”. A comparison with the book confirms that part II 'On Method' in his book is apart from a few revisions and reorganisations the same as in his dissertation. That means when he joined the Department, Thoothi had already developed a complete theory of method for sociology and anthropology. What Thoothi, however, added to his book was a “fairly comprehensive section on [Vaishnavite] Art.” (See Thoothi 1935, op. cit., p. iv) Since this was a novel field of research it took him quite some time to finish it; that's why the book was published eleven years after the dissertation. In his own words, Thoothi confirms that “the work remains substantially – in method, treatment and conclusion – the same as it was originally written.” (Ibid., p. x) Ghurye's critical views of Geddes are referred to in S. Devadas Pillai: *Indian Sociology through Ghurye. A Dictionary*. Mumbai: Popular Prakashan, 1997, 119-123, and were mainly directed at the fact that Geddes was less interested in the day-to-day operations of the Department but more in spreading his vision of the symbiotic relation between man and his habitat all over India.

⁴ Kamala Ganesh: 'New Wine in Old Bottles? Family and Kinship Studies in the Bombay School', *Sociological Bulletin*, 62 (2), May-August 2013, 288-316; 307.

⁵ Ibid., 290. See to this the noteworthy article by A.M. Shah: 'Anthropology in Bombay, 1886-1936', *Sociological Bulletin*, 63 (3), September-December 2014, 355-367, which outlines the

history of the Anthropological Society of Bombay in its first fifty years.

⁶ Stephen Fuchs: Applied Anthropology in India. In M.C. Pradhan/R.D. Singh/P.K. Misra/D/B/ Sastry (eds.): *Anthropology and Archaeology. Essays in Commemoration of Verrier Elwin, 1902-64* (258-271). Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1969, 270.

⁷ J.V. Ferreira: Anthropology for the Mission. The SVD Tradition and Contributions in India. In J.V. Ferreira: *The Humanistic Relevance of Anthropology. Further Writings on Anthropology by J.V. Ferreira* (168-183). Edited by Bernd Pflug and S.M. Michael. Ajmer/Mumbai: NavVishnu Publications, 2017, 182 (Originally published in *Indian Missiological Review*, Vol. 10, No. 2, May 1988, 167-177).

⁸ See to this Mahipal Bhuriya and S.M. Michael (eds.): *Anthropology as a Historical Science. Essays in Honour of Stephen Fuchs*. Indore: Sat Prakashan Sanchar Kendra, 1984, v-xiv. This interview of Ferreira with Fuchs is reprinted in J.V. Ferreira: *The Humanistic Relevance of Anthropology*, op. cit., 151-167.

⁹ A.R. Momin: *Towards a Unified Science of Man. A Critical Appraisal of the Work of Ernest Becker*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Bombay, 1988, a copy of which is kept and accessible in the IIC.

¹⁰ The dissertation was published as C.J. Godwin: *Change and Continuity. A Study of Two Christian Village Communities in Suburban Bombay*. Bombay: Tata McGraw-Hill, 1972. The difference in the prevailing methods of sociological and anthropological research at that time can be assuaged from the two dissertations on the people of the same community when we

compare Godwin's thesis with the one of Elsie W. Baptista under the guidance of K.M. Kapadia which was published as Elsie W. Baptista: *The East Indians. Catholic Community of Bombay, Salsette and Bassein*. Bombay: The Bombay East Indian Association, 1967, which contains a warm Foreword by Fuchs. In Godwin's study reflection complements description, in Baptista's study description reigns supreme.

¹¹ Of special historical and social interest is S.M. Michael: *Culture and Urbanization*. New Delhi: Inter-India Publications, 1989, a study of the migration of Tamils and Malayalis to Bombay. S.M. Michael's numerous publications, many of which are written for the popularisation of ideas, revolve mainly around the problems involved in the anthropological bases of culture and Christianity with a strong interest in the dialogue of religions and cultures.

¹² Here I would like to refer to the (unfortunately yet unpublished) doctoral thesis of M.T. Joseph: *A Sociological Inquiry into the Theory and Practice of Buddhism: Ambedkarites in Maharashtra*, University of Delhi, 2009, which, based on solid fieldwork, embarks on a skilful and imaginative analysis of Ambedkarite Buddhism. A summary of some of the conclusions of this thesis ("Identity Religion" or "Religion for Engagement in Civil Society": A Study of the Ambedkarite Buddhists in Maharashtra) has been published by M.T. Joseph in the *IIC Newsletter*. No. 1, January 2010, 3-12.

¹³ Andre Beteille: 'Sociology and anthropology: Their relationship in one person's career', *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (N.S.), Vol. 27, No. 2, July-December 1993, 291-304, 300.

¹⁴ See S. Devadas Pillai: *Indian Sociology through Ghurye*, op. cit., 10, where he paraphrases Ghurye's early views on the discipline from his article in *Man in India*, Vol. xv, Nos. 2, 3, April, September 1935. In this article, Ghurye also emphasises the "liberalizing influence of a comparative study of culture" (Ibid., 10); more than eight decades later, this kind of research is still urgently needed in order to counteract today's spread of heightened and political cultural nationalism and populism in India and many other parts of the world.

¹⁵ T.N. Madan (ed.): *Sociology at the University of Lucknow. The First Half Century (1921-1975)*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2013.