

Discussion (11Jan – 13Feb 2023)

[On Whatsapp Lokavidya Group and Email]

[Sunil Sahasrabudhey \(12/01/2023\):](#)

I recollect that I said in the meeting day before that we should revisit the idea of lokavidya in the present context. The state of present context for this purpose may be understood as the state of social/people's movements today, in particular those that may have a flavor of 'transition'. These may be listed as

1. Farmers' movement
2. Climate Justice
3. Social Justice
4. Swaraj
5. Jal, Jangal, Zamin
6. Lokavidya Jan Andolan

The concept of lokavidya needs to be located in the inter-connections between these. The philosophical and political considerations may both follow and precede this exercise. May be we can start with pairwise discussions. This would mean 15 such discussions.

Should we discuss this approach next Tuesday?

May be we should also pay attention to Bharat Jodo Yatra as providing the larger political canvas.

[\(14/01/2023\):](#)

In sequel to our Zoom discussion on Tuesday, 10th Jan., I had suggested by a WhatsApp post on Thursday, 12th Jan. that we locate our *lokavidya* understanding in the web of contemporary social/peoples movements. Further to that I wish to add that a larger canvas be laid to substantially re-address the idea of lokavidya. Let this canvas be constituted of

- i.** Global advances in Science and Technology – Smart connectivity and Artificial Intelligence. Whereas the smart connectivity appears to provide space for lokavidya and its larger claim, AI seems to close this space. It seems there is a (paradigmatic) conflict between smart connectivity and AI. This may provide the space and the opportunity for the claims of *lokavidya*.
- ii.** Global politics – Generally bipolar, in popular parlance Conservative (religious) Vs. Progressive (secular) and/or Authoritarian Vs. Democratic. There is apparently a third stream also in many countries. It is generally based on indigenous people’s movements. I wonder whether Farmer’s movement in India opens a third option. May be it can do this if informed by the idea of *lokavidya*.
- iii.** Social/peoples/political movements – Movement of/for farmers, climate justice, social justice, Hindutva, swaraj, jal-jangal-zameen, lokavidya, rights of mother earth/nature, indigenous peoples,. Lokavidya seems to provide the thread that links these movements.
- iv.** Lokavidya Darshan as at present. Please see the Standpoint page in our website vidyaashram.org
- v.** Vidya Ashram Activities - They are composed of two streams, one *darshan* and the other *andolan*. They may be listed as follows:
 - a. Lokavidya Satsang: Twice a week on Ghats of Ganga ji.
 - b. Varanasi Gyan Panchayat: A public forum for Knowledge Dialogue, often specifically on events and issues in Varanasi.
 - c. Samajon ki Kahani Samajon ki Zubani: Generally interviews of leaders in the samaj (communities).

- d. Sur Sadhna: A broadsheet (4 pages) published (not regular) by *Varanasi Gyan Panchayat*. The idea derives from an art-view of society.
- e. Samaj Srijan ka Kala-Marg: Investigation and construction in the world of art seeking philosophical (epistemological, logical, ontological and ethical) guidance in general and particularly for lokavidya-movement.
- f. Karigar Nazariya: A broadsheet (4 pages) about artisans and general issues, published intermittently keeping the karigar lokavidya point of view at the center.
- g. Loka-Niti Samvaad: A concrete dialogue on local self-governance at the sites of *lokavidya-satsang*.
- h. Swaraj Gyan Panchayat: Dialogue centered on *swaraj*.
- i. Farmer's Movement: Participation with focus on **Swaraj vs. Corporate Raj** and **Strength of the Samaj vs. Political Power**. **Nyay, Tyag and Bhaaichara** constitute the frame of values which ought to be in the lead.
- j. Darshan Akhada: A place in Rajghat focused on activities and debate that build a darshan-dialogue between samaj and the social-political leadership. Also focusing on the requirement and reality of fraternal relationship between various philosophical streams and traditions.
- k. Publication: Booklets
- l. Social Media: Presence and participation on Facebook and various WhatsApp groups.

These activities are informed by *lokavidya-darshan* which is constantly in debate within these activities as well as independent of them. Generally speaking *Gyan-darshan, Sant-darshan, Kala-darshan and Swaraj-darshan* are the subjects of dialogues which are very broadly conceived as Dialogues on Knowledge in Society. Further, many of these activities are guided by the ideas of *Gyan-Panchayat and Bauddhik Satyagraha*, which are themselves seen as forms of direct epistemic intervention in the public sphere to move towards a new political imagination.

The activities and dialogues find their expression and representation in the publication from Vidya Ashram and through our presence in the social media.

[Girish Sahasrabudhe \(16/01/2023\):](#)

I think Sunil's Whatsapp posts of 12Jan2023 and 14Jan2023 provide an appropriate opening for our future online debates. We can discuss this approach to our future debates on Tuesday 17Jan2023.

In this context, I am recalling the suggestions made on 07July2021 to context our debates and the following progress:

The "present" as contained in 1) Farmers' Movement, India, 2) Centre – State Relations, India, 3) Corona Condition worldwide, 4) Movement of Indigenous Peoples, South and Central America and new developments and 5) Democracy versus Autocracy, Formulated and announced by G7 in June 2021;

and

The ideas and VA initiatives i) न्याय, त्याग, भाईचारा ii) autonomy, iii) distribution, iv) lokavidyaa darshan, v) lokavidya knowledge intervention, vi) equal returns for lokavidya work, vii) LJA programs and activities, viii) global fraternity of peoples' movements, and ix) Shaping new initiatives in the world of knowledge, in particular

focussed in the domains of Art, Language, Philosophy, Media and Design. Main strategy would relate to equal and friendly relations between Lokavidya and University Knowledge (in the formulation stage and is yet to be circulated for ideas and response).

It seems to me that our debates following these suggestions did broadly follow these lines. Emphases on the various directions set by them did, of course, vary – may be also substantially. The same may be said of the Hindi book, which contained essentially substance of these debates with a strong focus on farmers' movement.

New activities (वाराणसी ज्ञान पंचायत, समाजों की कहानी समाजों की जुबानी, समाज सृजन का कला मार्ग, लोकनीति संवाद, स्वराज ज्ञान पंचायत, participation in farmers movement with stress on Swaraj vs Corporate Raj, power in society vs political power and values of न्याय, त्याग, भाईचारा') in Varanasi have reshaped as suggested in iv), v) and ix) above. Much more needs to be done with regard to language, lokavidya darshan, philosophy and media. It appears appropriate to view the fresh proposal as servicing this need in renewed context.

Climate justice is something we have not addressed directly though we have always treated it as a self-evidently natural concern for those – the lokavidya samaj – whose knowledge systems regard nature as part of human societies. We need to directly engage with the climate justice question and movement. There appear to be two aspects to this: Global events and elaboration of Lokavidya position on climate justice. COP26 officially and finally debunked the principle of “strong sustainability”. On the other side, the 21st century global extractivism is being seen as giving rise to “environmentalization of the agrarian question and the agrarianization of the climate justice movement” There is also questioning of the labour theory of value for regarding nature as something “external to society” and its consequent “epistemic failure to understand that capital transforms the man-nature relation qualitatively”. There is the attendant idea of “nature as value”. It seems to me (i) that this kind of theorizing does belong the knowledge

dialogue and knowledge politics in which our interest lies, and that (ii) our understanding of lokavidya as ‘knowledge originating in and returning to samaj’ and ‘lokavidya samaj as societies living by lokavidya’ has something directly to say about this.

We have earlier related social justice to prestige of lokavidya vis-à-vis university and organized knowledge. Therefore we have seen “equal return for lokavidya work” as the contemporary programme of social justice. The farmers’ movement has seen demand for prices for agricultural produce as demand of justice for villages. The movement has shown inclination to take farm labour along. Is localism / distributed power / autonomous communities / Swaraj the lokavidya route to social justice?

Some of us have talked earlier too of the recent trends in artificial intelligence and likely consequences. Much of it was in the context of unemployment and income loss. There seem to be at least two aspects to the impact of spread of AI – one, the increasingly larger numbers of livelihood skills devoured by AI systems, and two, far larger potential for social control, violence and destruction through AI systems accessible to very few. We really have no detailed lokavidya view on all this. This is true even as lokavidya view took shape as ICTs provided a criterion / referral of true knowledge that sidelined science. There may be many reasons for this, which will probably show up if we address the question of how lokavidya thought looks at it seen as a knowledge creation paradigm. Whatever may be true of the AI methods – basically mathematics and statistical inferencing – working AI systems cannot be disengaged from massive amounts of data on which they train. So, as Suresh said in his post, what they throw up is not bound by any axiomatic logic as such. But my feeling is that for the same reason AI systems cannot probably be separated from their place and context at least not in the same sense in which physics can – a essential aspect of western knowledge systems, which Suresh and GSR had talked about. But, even if data is local and contexed, it is still digital. So this may not be important. Still one cannot deny the reality of creation of software

machines – the many local and task-specific apps – that the youth keep creating for the mobile phones.

[Krishna Gandhi \(04/02/2023\)](#):

In his first post Buddhe had suggested the following 6 topics and their interconnections for further exploration.

1. Farmer's movement
2. Climate Justice
3. Social Justice
4. Swaraj
5. Jal, Jangal, Zamin
6. Lokavidya Jan Andolan

I feel that our explorations must start from first principles. To facilitate this we can imagine any human being as located within a space whose dimensions are -

1. Human - Nature relationship
2. Human - Human relationship
3. Knowledge
4. Dharma (Moral Order)

We need to explore each of our topics within this framework. Maybe we can have a discussion on this framework itself to begin with, so that our approaches will be mutually consistent. This will be helpful in undertaking collaborative work.

Another starting point could be an exploration of the idea of "Development". Because the one thing that both the rulers and the ruled today agree upon is the need for "Development". Political, Social, Cultural, and Economic Development is the apparent goal of everyone who is part of modernity.

Only some indigenous tribes in some inaccessible corners of the world seem to be exceptions.

Similarly, "Civilization" is another catchword, that is often bandied about in any discussion on international conflicts. Although within the Social Justice movements in India, too, the civilisational aspects are also brought in - The Ambedkarite "Mool-niwasi" and the Periyarist "Dravidian" narratives are examples. Going beyond the explicit manifestations of "civilisation" like magnificent monuments, technological and artistic achievements, what is civilisation vis a vis human-nature and human-human relationships? In the framework mentioned above what is civilisation with reference to Knowledge and Dharma? This is important because we have stated in the Hindi book, "There is No Civilisation Without Village". Anthropologists argue that agricultural revolution brought about a huge destruction of biodiversity on earth. Moreover, extraction of surplus from peasants formed the basis for the flowering of "civilisations" (think of the Egyptian pyramids) and in that sense, can we imagine civilisation minus capital accumulation and exploitation?

Yet another approach could be to have discussions on the relevance of Ambedkar, Gandhi, and such public figures to current events and movements. In particular, any discussion on Social Justice movements going on in India today cannot be undertaken without bringing in Ambedkar and to a lesser extent, Jyotiba Phule, Periyar, Sri Narayana Guru etc... who are part of the modern era. Here it must be noted that the Ambedkarite movement has crossed India's borders and is getting connected to social justice movements in other parts of the world like the US.

I am sending this note in response to our discussions on what next. In addition to what I have written in the note, I want to stress that we must also keep up our efforts to bring in more people into our discussions and communications.

Recently I came across a number of Malayalam Youtube channels where eminent writers and thinkers of non-Hindutava spectrum give talks on specific topics concerning history/society/personalities which are quite informative and illuminating. If we can a channel devoted the topics suggested above, it will be very.wonderful. We may invite knowledgeable persons outside our Lok Vidya group too to give such talks. These talks can be occasionally in the form of a symposium or seminar once every three months, may be, where a number of eminent personalities are invited to talk.

This will be in addition to the Facebook and Vidyashram website work.

[Suresh and GSRK \(06/02/2023\):](#)

The task ahead for Lokavidya Group

Looking back to twenty five years ago, the idea of Lokavidya may be understood to have emerged from a combination of thoughts from three different sources. Whether it indeed came about from a combination of these very ideas is not important; however, whether it can adequately explain the circumstances of its origins is:

- A preoccupation with some questions: How comes it that, time and again, the farmers' movements - that appear to be large expressions of protest against the modern state and its anti-people nature - are unable to negotiate with power? And, every time they attempt to, they fail?

Must we understand it only in terms of power relationships, or are there other incommensurable aspects of a civilizational dimension involved in this that contribute to their lack of success? Such as an incomprehension of how profits become more important than *Daya* or *Karuna* towards fellow beings, how insensitivity towards people promotes wide destruction of natural resources

and degradation of the environment, how complex protocols have made conversation and negotiation between the rulers and the ruled impossible, etc.

In other words, is this a dialogue between people from the 18th century (the farmers) and those who command power in the 20th century? And therefore destined to fail?

- How do we explain the continued (apparent) resistance amongst a large fraction of India's people to various influences of modernity in education, ethics/ morality, lifestyle, belief systems, etc.? Is it capable of being understood as a characteristic of that fraction of society which provides strength to its resistance?
- Across the dominant centers of power in the world, there is an apparent increase in questioning long established methods and content of Science that seems to be driven by enormous technological changes in the 20th century. This has changed the meta-language of Science and Technology, enough to accept previously unacceptable methods, results, and bodies of knowledge. Can this provide spaces for indigenous practices, beliefs, sciences and technologies to rebuild lifestyles destroyed by modernity and help the majority reassert itself?

In the intervening years, the group has made attempts to engage with the ordinary people and thinkers to promote self-awareness, perhaps a sense of identity and thereby a sense of unity centered on the idea of Lokavidya.

- However, in this period, fundamental changes have overtaken the society as a primary consequence of efforts to restructure international trade and commerce in line with the new needs of finance capital that came into existence together with globalization. Obviously this is not an endogenous development because it is a result of the endless search of capitalist markets for profits, new

markets and achievement of greater efficiencies in exploiting the existing. As a consequence, deep inroads have been made into the basic structure of Indian society that had thus far resisted atomization, in two ways:

- the reduction of inter-dependency in the village through a recasting of the capitalization and value-extraction processes (e.g., no taxes are imposed on agriculture and yet input costs and market sales are levers through which inter-dependency in society is unalterably changed).
- An opportunistic development of a new class that provides services to a global clientele from within India. This in turn has created hope, opportunity and paths (howsoever self-defeating) for a large section of rural India to become dependent on urban centers for life, livelihood and education. Migration is only part of the story, though.

In this background,

- Caste is not the system as we understood a mere 50 years ago, in spite of what the dominant discourse leads us to believe
- Community is not the community that we knew of, or imagined them to be, decades ago
- The village society for those who stay in it is not an integrated whole. We don't know how they think or what they think. Or how they live.
- We do not know how around 50 crore Indians who reside in urban centers live, think and work.

The search for profit is a central tendency of capitalism. All that we know of the course of civilization over the last couple of centuries bears out the consequences of this single minded pursuit of profit. The search for and transformation of resources, efficiency, progress, development, good life or

social and philosophical structures all bear the imprint of this tendency in one form or the other. These are emergent outcomes of the tendency, not results of nefarious designs.

There is little that the collective will of people can achieve today so long as it does not translate into collective action. Especially if we do not acknowledge that there are forces that have unleashed changes on a vast scale in society; that traditional knowledge has been perverted beyond recognition; that indigenous knowledge has become a captive of the big corporation; that farmers have become more dependent on market as part of the great transformation of India in the last 75 years; that IT has helped enslave people to a greater extent and not liberate them (remember the great promises for improving farmer incomes by timely dissemination of SMS'es about weather, crops, etc, or Indira's promise of rural agricultural support through TV, etc.?).

To provide us a semblance of balance in our thoughts, we ought to recognize the effects of the forces of production on all societies, during these centuries. In response to the wave of changes that has enveloped us since, it may be possible to grieve about the changes in our thinking of the world that is brought about by reification, the sense of unhappiness created by alienation of the self from the fruits of man's own labor, etc. But it is towards commodification that we must turn to understand the changes that have swept us off our feet in this time. From the Tirupati Laddu made by machine to the destruction of the family, from the character of a Sringeri or Siddaganga Mutt and Swamijis to the recruitment into TCS, Wipro and Infosys, the centralization that commands distribution of resources or consumption of labor in whatever way it determines is right, it is commodification that underlies them. It underlies the essence of the modern State as well. The relevance of Gandhi, farmers' struggles, traditional knowledge, indigenous knowledge, etc. ought to be understood only in the context of how they can help the reduction of its evil. Else, they have no significance other than the inspirational or historical.

What is Lokavidya in today's parlance? Can it, and if yes, how can it provide strength to the poor to form the basis of cognitive, and therefore in the future, physical resistance to domination, exploitation and dehumanization?

This possibly may form questions that some of our efforts may address in the coming years.

[Krishnarajulu \(12/02/2023\):](#)

Thoughts on the current discussion

I'll begin with an extract from Suresh-GSRK's note

“The search for profit is a central tendency of capitalism. All that we know of the course of civilization over the last couple of centuries bears out the consequences of this single minded pursuit of profit. The search for and transformation of resources, efficiency, progress, development, good life or social and philosophical structures all bear the imprint of this tendency in one form or the other. These are emergent outcomes of the tendency, not results of nefarious designs.”

We need to take note of the various opinions and 'solutions' being put forth across the world , by the establishments(which are firmly grounded in the capitalist market system and who try to adhere , come-what-may, to the Norms/Dictates as set out in the extract above), vis-a-vis

1. Climate Justice
2. Social Justice
3. Swaraj

and formulate (what we may call) a Lokavidya Perspective/Manifesto, which is firmly grounded in an totally different alternate way (a Dharmic way perhaps) of looking at and working toward a solution for these issues. That

is we try to answer the question: what is the Collective WILL (as embodied in this Perspective) of Lokavidya Samaj and how will that translate into collective SOCIAL & POLITICAL ACTION to achieve the goals as outlined in the solutions as per the Perspective?

But firstly a look at the Lokavidya formulation. When we started looking for an 'ideological basis', for meaningful social change, about 45 years ago (MKN collective, 1977) we chose to denote the exploited, poor and marginalised people of the country as Bahishkrit Samaj. Thereafter, after about 10 years around 1984, we chose a relatively more 'positive' denotation- Swadeshi Samaj. Both these denotations highlight (focus upon) the 'weaknesses' of this Samaj; in recognizing that they were continuously at the receiving end of the capitalist system. There followed a period when, recognising that the strength of the Capitalist Market System (CMS) lay in its dependence on and adherence to 'modern' Science and Technology, we interacted extensively with PPST movement (to understand the strength of the Samaj vis-a-vis 'traditional' S&T thought and practices). It was also a period when the Farmers' movement had taken a great visible shape all over the country and we once again got extensively involved with this movement (to understand the dharmic strength behind their being able to mobilize people at the grass-root level and taking on the CMS, the WTO and multinational seed, fertilizer and insecticide producers/marketeters).

It appears to me, that by the middle of the 90s we became fully aware of the real strength of the Samaj and consciously chose a strength-based denotation- Lokavidya Samaj. Because the real strength (and unity perhaps) of the Samaj lies in Lokavidya. It is also significant that a Global Knowledge Movement (largely representing the interests and will of the exploited peoples of the World) took centre stage around this time. We were able to become a significant part of this Movement through the Knowledge (Lokavidya) formulation of the real strength of such peoples' movements.

The Lokavidya formulation is built on the real strength of the exploited, disinherited, poor and marginalized peoples of India. It incorporates the 'Dharmic Principles' that is part of the (living) ethos of the people which unites them (real unity in an accepted diversity) in a way that is NOT captured in any (popular) Vedic, Dravidian, Dalit perception of our society. These Principles have all but withered away under the continued onslaught of the domineering Norm/Dictates of the CSM. A reformulation of the Lokavidya Perspective (based on these Principles, which we have tried to build on the concepts of Nyaya, Tyaga and Bhaichara) vis-a-vis the three movements listed above will hopefully show the way forward.

I have repeatedly argued that centralization of Economic and Political control follows from the Norm/Dictates of the CMS (which is based on centralised control of planning, production and distribution); paraphrased in the extract as 'these are emergent outcomes of the tendency, not results of nefarious designs'. There are visible emerging dictatorships in ALL countries-developed, developing and under-developed, who have adopted or are pursuing the prevalent 'development' model, albeit the differences in professed 'ideological' bases (needed to bolster the dictatorship and garner support for their development model among the most exploited sections of society) such as religious bigotry, racial hegemony, pseudo-Marxism and the like. There is a growing move to deprive local government bodies any sort of (political or economic) autonomy. Those societies are being driven to social homogenisation too.

The way forward in tackling the issues of Climate Justice, Social Justice and Swaraj is to be found by local people in their local environment (social milieu) based on their re-interpretations of Nyaya, Tyaga and Bhaichara (what I have referred to as the Dharmic context). We have referred to this as Swaraj Chetana. The context for achieving Climate Justice and Social Justice thus lies in achieving Swaraj based on Swaraj Chetana; which will become possible ONLY if the people repose belief in and accept a

system based on distributed control of planning, production and distribution.

Our thinking, our interpretations and formulations of peoples' movements should be recast in this perspective for us to be able to effectively contribute to resolving the problems that beset humankind today.

[Chitra Sahasrabudhey \(13/02/2023\):](#)

विद्या आश्रम के भविष्य के कार्यक्रमों के बारे में मेरे सुझाव

पिछले लगभग 25 वर्षों के लोकविद्या आन्दोलन के विचार और दर्शन की सहायता से बनी समझ और कार्य को नीचे लिखे बिन्दुओं से व्यक्त कर रही हूँ.

समझ के प्रमुख बिंदु:

- पर-पीड़ा की अनुभूति ज्ञान का अनिवार्य अंग है.
- सत्य, न्याय, त्याग, सहजीवन, भाईचारा के जीवन-मूल्यों की प्रतिष्ठा से ही मनुष्यता आकार लेती है.
- स्वायत्त व्यक्ति, स्वायत्त समाज, सहजीवन, वितरित सत्ता और विविध ज्ञान-धाराओं को बराबर की प्रतिष्ठा, मिलकर न्यायपूर्ण और सृजनशील समाज की बुनियाद बनाते हैं.
- संत परंपरा से प्राप्त प्रकाश व्यक्तिगत आचरण, सामाजिक पहल और समाज संगठन के आदर्श मार्ग उजागर करता है.

सामाजिक पहल के लिए वैचारिक मुद्दे:

- प्रकृति की लय में जीवन-संगठन के प्रकारों को गढ़ना ज्ञान-मार्ग है.
- खेती, कारीगरी और कलाकारी में मनुष्यता, संस्कृति और सभ्यता के बुनियादी आधार हैं.
- ज्ञान और व्यवस्थाओं के सामाजिकरण के लिए कदम उठाना सहजीवन के प्रारंभिक कदम हैं.
- 'सबकी पक्की, बराबर और नियमित आय हो' यह ज्ञान-धाराओं के बीच बराबरी और भाईचारा लाने और सामाजिक न्याय की दिशा में बढ़ने के पहले कदम हैं.
- 'छोटे पैमाने' पर उत्पादन, संग्रह और विनिमय (*गति, मात्रा, आकार, संख्या, दूरी, क्षेत्र, ताप, मुद्रा, पूँजी, संगठन और सञ्चालन की इकाइयाँ आदि का लोकहितकारी पैमाना*) यह न्यायपूर्ण समाज के निर्माण और लोकनीति (आर्थिक, सामाजिक और सत्तागत) के ठोस आधार हैं.
- आज की परिस्थितियों के मायने और सत्ता के चरित्र की समझ को हासिल करने का मार्ग आज के जन-आन्दोलनों के सन्दर्भों में देखा जाना चाहिए.

सामाजिक संवाद के तरीके/मार्ग:

- बृहत् लोकविद्या-समाज के आन्दोलनों में भागीदारी
- लोकविद्या सत्संग
- दर्शन अखाड़ा
- सोशल मिडिया फेसबुक, व्हाट्सएप समूह पर वार्ता
- किसान कारीगर पंचायत

रचनात्मक अभियान:

- स्थानीय उद्योग और स्थानीय बाज़ार
- लोकविद्या भाईचारा मीडिया विद्यालय
- स्थानीय प्रशासन : वार्ड ज्ञान पंचायत
- लोक चिकित्सा प्रणालियों की प्रतिष्ठा
- समाज सृजन के कला-मार्ग

अभियानों के लिए मार्ग/तरीकें:

- बौद्धिक सत्याग्रह
- ज्ञान पंचायतें
- लोकविद्या सत्संग
- प्रकाशन

मेरा सुझाव

आज की राजनीतिक सत्ताओं के अमानवीय चरित्र से मोर्चा लेने का तरीका सामान्य लोगों और समाजों की अपनी शक्ति को हासिल करने के ज़रिये होना है और इसे हासिल करने के लिए वितरित सत्ता के विचारों पर विमर्श आवश्यक लगता है. अब तक लोकविद्या समूह द्वारा किये गए कार्य हमें इस विषय पर संवाद करने के पर्याप्त आधार देते हैं. राष्ट्रीय और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थितियां भी हमें इस दिशा में पहल लेने की आवश्यकता को दर्शाती हैं.

मेरा सुझाव है कि लोकविद्या आन्दोलन को इस दिशा में कम से कम अगले दो वर्ष का एक कार्यक्रम बनाना चाहिए. कम से कम 12-15 विषय क्षेत्र चुन कर उन पर जूम के मार्फत वार्ताओं की श्रृंखला चलाई जानी चाहिए जो साल भर चले. समूह के लोग जहाँ-जहाँ हैं उन स्थानों से तैयारी के साथ लोगों को इस संवाद/विमर्श में शामिल करना चाहिए.