

## Transcript of Zoom Meeting at 5.00 pm on August 20, 2025

This transcript still has some machine-made mistakes. I have added devanagari parts and corrected most of it except the parts containing Naresh's submission. Will amend that part as soon as I receive corrected versions from him.

- Girish

---

### Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Uh... Today, I have heard only from Avinash. He is with his sister in Canada. And he has written that he will be away for about 3 months. And, uh... you know, place where he is... it is 4.30 in the morning there just now. So, what he has written is that he may not be able to join these meetings. For some time. He will be looking at the transcripts. So, GSRK did Suresh say anything? Because he sent a message, and then... deleted it, or something.

### Sivaramakrishnan G

Uh, no. No, no. I think he will join, I mean... He is now free, relatively free from his... daughter and grandson and all the... yeah, yeah.

### Girish Sahasrabudhe:

They were visiting for some time.

### Sivaramakrishnan G

Yeah, they have gone back.

### Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Ok. Gandhi is also... not here just now. I thought that we will today start with, uh... Uh, the... Stapan Diwas ... function that was held. Maybe, uh... Chitra ji, you can talk about it for... 15 minutes or so. Because we would like to know what were the discussions, and the... that, uh, since it was directed to the Swaraj Panchayat to take place in October. So we can start with the ... Suresh is also here. Uh, Abhijit is also here. उस पर बात करेंगे।

### Chitra Sahasrabudhey

हाँ कुछ ... शुरू कर रहे हैं। हाँ स्थापना दिवस इस बार एक अगस्त को नहीं हो पाया कि इस तरह के लोगों के था।

### Girish Sahasrabudhe:

ठीक है।

### Chitra Sahasrabudhey

तो सत्रह तारीख को रखा गया था और इसकी तैयारी में हम लोगों ने से से सालों में सुर साधना का अंक भी निकाला था जिसमें स्थापना दिवस के लिए भी लोगों को बुलाया था। साथ में स्वराज पंचायत के बारे में भी उसमें लिखा हुआ था। उस पर बात करने के लिए कहा था। तो जो ज्ञान पंचायत हुई स्थापना दिवस के अवसर पर उसका विश्लेषण मुख्य रूप से बहुजन समाज की पहचान उसकी विरासत, उसकी ज्ञान परंपराएँ, उसकी दर्शन परम्पराएँ हैं और उसमें निहित शक्तियों की पहचान, ये यह है कि वह इस बात पर गया था, जो लोग आए थे वो ग्रुप से इंग्लैंड की ओर से इमरान खान ने लक्ष्मण प्रसाद के बुलाने से रहमान

के बुलाने से और कामकाज की वजह से हुए थे और काफी नए लोग भी थे। हमेशा जो आते हैं उनके अलावा कई लोग आए थे। और बहुजन शब्द पर काफी बात हुई। कि बहुजन शब्द क्यों चुना गया है और बहुजन शब्द चुनने से क्या फर्क है इस तरह की बात कर रहे हैं अगर हम लोग जो लोकविद्या समाज कर रहे थे उसमें और इसमें क्या तो बातचीत काफी अच्छी हुई, कई लोगों ने यह भी कहा कि बहुजन शब्द सीमित कर पाए और यह नहीं इस्तेमाल किया जाना चाहिए लोक ज्यादा अच्छा है लोक ज्यादा अच्छा है, लोक काफी व्यापक भी है तो अलग अलग विचार साझा। लेकिन इस पर सहमति रही कि बहुजन समाज पार्टी ने कहा है कि बहुजन समाज पार्टी, परंपराओं को देखने की एक दृष्टिकोण बनती है, ना तो कि केवल केवल यह अलग अलग है, जातियों में बटे हुए हैं या इस तरह की पहचान के से अतिरिक्त एक दूसरी पहचान निकाली है, जिसमें उनके ज्ञान के और एक दूसरे के साथ किस सहयोग धारा को देख पाने की क्षमता बनती है। तो ये एक उस से निकलकर आया और यह बात अच्छी रही। इतिहास पर भी बात हुई। बहुत अः इससे नहीं हुई। विस्तार से नहीं हो पाई लेकिन यह कहा गया कि बहुजन समाज के ज्यादातर लोगों का राज रहा। और यह कैसा इस पर कोई बहुत स्पष्ट विचार नहीं आया कि यह कैसा बदल गया। सारा जिसमें बहुजन समाज पिछड़ा तो इसकी समझ बहुत ये नहीं हो पाई और ना आर्थिक व्यवस्थाओं के बारे में जाने, विस्तार से चर्चा हो पाई अ could get जानकारी नहीं थे लेकिन एक बात खुल गई कि बहुजन समाज मैं ऐसी कुछ बातें तो हैं जो स्वराज की उस स्वराज की ओर पढ़ने का एक रास्ता बना सकते हैं किसान आंदोलन का जिक्र किया। सबसे बड़ा और सामाजिक न्यायमूर्ति ने कहा कि ये दोनों ही बहुजन समाज के अःातुबंध हैं और यह दोनों ही बहुजन समाज पार्टी रास्ता बना दिया है जिसके मारफत इक्कीसवीं सदी में स्वराज के एक सौ इक्कीसवीं सदी में स्वराज के रूप स्वरूप को बनाने पहचानने के इंतजार के लिए शुरूआत की जा सकती है। ये बातें मुख्य रूप से हुई अः और स्वराज पंचायत के बारे में थोड़ी बात हुई कि उसके भोजन के बाद कुछ लोग हो गए। उन्होंने आपस में चर्चा की कि स्वराज पंचायत को लोग कैसे संगठित करेंगे। अ उन्होंने आपस में कि हम मुझे मालूम नहीं, मुख्य रूप से मुझे मालूम नहीं मुख्य रूप से लक्ष्मण, रामजनम, हरिशंकर, कमलेश ये लोग सब बैठे थे पात्रता थीं जिन लोगों ने फिर बाद में कहा इन लोगों से बात करके अभी आज ये दोनों आये हुए हैं। लक्ष्मण और रामदेव और इसके क्रियान्वयन लिख रहे हैं। नीचे बैठकर तो ये पूरी हो जाएगी। फिर हम आपको भेज भेज देंगे। लोगविद्या ग्रुप पर, ... जिसको बाद में वेबसाइट पर डाला जा सकता है, यह जरूर रहा कि जो वीडियो बने उसमें आवाज साफ नहीं हो पाई। हरिशंकर से पूछा तो उन्होंने कहा कि शायद करने ये नहीं है। नेट का प्रॉब्लम है।

#### **Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

नहीं नहीं।

#### **Chitra Sahasrabudhey**

पर नहीं होगा।

#### **Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

मुझे लगता नहीं है। नेट का प्रॉब्लम है। कहने के मैंने कहा कि उसको एक्चुअली उसमें से पता है, लेकिन अधिकतर में ऐसा होता है कि वो एक एक मिनट के अंदर वो पूरा स्क्रीन जो है वह रंग बिरंगा हो जाता है और आवाज़ गायब हो जाती है और मैंने तीन चार चेक किए और ऐसा लगता है कि अधिकतर में वैसा है। जिसमें कम है वो मैंने एक्चुअली इसमें डाल दिए हैं। वो कुछ इंटरफेयरेंस है। वो माइक पे खड़े हो के जो बोल रहे हैं... जो बोल रहे हैं कि उनका ज्यादा इस तरीके से हो रहा है। ऐसा मुझे लगा। हरिशंकर को यह भी पूछा है कि क्या प्रॉब्लम है?

#### **Chitra Sahasrabudhey**

अच्छा।

#### **Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

उसके फोन पर हैं क्या वीडियो कि सिर्फ वो फेसबुक से हो रहा है प्रॉब्लम? अगर हैं तो वह भेज दें मुझे मतलब वो मेल से भेजना पड़ेगा। क्योंकि व्हाट्सएप से भी भेज सकता है। लेकिन अः बेटर है कि मेल से भेजे। क्योंकि वो मैंने सब चेक किये। अच्छा उसमें कुछ रिकॉर्डिंग की प्रॉब्लम ही लग रही है। मुझे वो ... जो केबल से होते हैं कुछ ... अगर बीच में ही वो कनेक्शन थोड़ा फॉल्टी हो जाता है। केबल के कारण हो रहा है जरूर क्योंकि पहले भी वीडियोस हैं उसमें ऐसा ध्यान में नहीं आया था। हां, इस बार इस कार्यक्रम में ऐसा लग रहा है।

**Chitra Sahasrabudhey**

हाँ ऐसा नहीं हुआ।

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

उसको देखेंगे।

**Abhijit Mitra**

आप अच्छा व्हाट इज ... आई थिंक ...

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

अभिजीत आपकी आवाज बहुत धीरे आ रही है।

**Abhijit Mitra:**

So what, what Chitra, just now, the synopsis of the summary that Chitra talked about, I think, Girish, it would be nice if you can, give that translation in English. Can you hear me now?

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

हाँ ... हाँ।

**Abhijit Mitra:**

I'm saying that whatever Chitra said just now, it would be nice if you can make, English, send it in English, especially for GSRK, because... I think the summary and synopsis, the way things have come out, some of those are important in the light of whatever discussions are going to happen after this. Because everything Chitra said is in Hindi. So that is why I think it would be good that if a brief synopsis can be made again.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

If you can, but I can do it, I mean, briefly, if you... See, ... Basically, the... what Chitraji is saying is that the program was attended by... quite a few new people who had come... invited, essentially, by Ram Janam... Lakshman Prasad, Fazalurrahman and Harishchandra, and people like that. And there were many people who come, normally too, even otherwise. And there were, discussions about this, word Bahujan. The... quite a few of them like that word. And, ... said some things in support, like it brings out the cooperation aspect within different sections of Lokavidia Samaj better, some things like that. But some of them feel that it may not be a good word to use. So there were some differences, but most people seemed to like that word. ... there was some discussion about the history of... Bahujan history also, in some sense. And, ... Some discussion on... kings from middle castes, lower castes, and so on and so forth, but not very systematic. But there was some such discussion also. What else? .... और कुछ? चित्रा जी कुछ छूट गया हो तो ...

**Chitra Sahasrabudhey:**

नहीं मतलब अब रपट लिख कर तैयार हो जायेगी ये लोग बना रहे हैं .... मूल रूप से ये कि इनके आन्दोलन जो हैं ... बहुजन समाज के ... उनमें बहुत सी कुछ समानताएं डिमांड की आजकल दिखाई देती हैं वो डिस्कस हुईं वहाँ

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

हाँ हाँ ... ठीक है ... even मतलब ... सामाजिक न्याय के आन्दोलन ...

**Chitra Sahasrabudhey:**

हाँ हाँ ... सामाजिक न्याय के आन्दोलन भी

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

मतलब किसान आन्दोलन, सामाजिक न्याय के आन्दोलन इसमें कुछ similarities दिखाई देती हैं ऐसा कह रहे हैं ...

**Chitra Sahasrabudhey:**

नहीं मतलब .... (साफ नहीं है)

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Okay, I suppose the report will come, right? Is the report being written? कुछ रपट बन रही है न?

**Chitra Sahasrabudhey:**

हाँ बना रहे हैं ....

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

ठीक है ... Okay, so that'll be translated fully. And... Is that enough, Abhijit, or do you have anything to add to that? Abhijit?

**Abhijit Mitra:**

Oh, sorry, I forgot to unmute myself. No, it is, it is fine, but then, when Chitra was describing it, so fluently, I mean, I, I had, I had a far better perception of some of the things, especially in the context of, you know, that, the Bahujan word, seems to be limiting, the, the, the, the... the, the, the breadth, to some extent. But, generally, what was, what, what did come out is that the commonalities, And, other things, they have a greater meaning. And in the context of history was also very nicely worded by her. But anyway, if the report comes in that report and the translation, I think things should come out, yeah.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Any comments on this? All right, so you will get the report anyway, and that will be also put up. There is already something on the website, which I sent ... about it, but, that is basically only videos and, ... Yes. I'm going to add transcripts, and I mean, once I am able to do that, those transcripts are available in Hindi. Once they are available, they can be translated also, so I'm going to link that to those videos, the transcripts and their translations, at least in English, also. So... so that, that will add to what was said, I mean, understanding what... what was said by everyone.

Alright, so let us, now come to the, come back to the Swaraj Panchayat. Discussion on that. ... there... we have already had about 3 sessions on this. And, in response to the second session, I think, on 7<sup>th</sup> August GSRK wrote a note about contentions which were... which were made by Sunil. And Sunil has written a short mail regarding that. I hope people have seen both of these things. The mail was there. That mail is available also in the... as a doc in the same directory as the other files. So... Gandhi? आपने देखा है कुछ ये ... गांधी?

**Krishna Gandhi:**

मैं तो थोड़ा बिड़ी था इस बीच में ... So, I'm sorry, I couldn't read any of those things.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Okay. Alright. Naresh?

**Naresh Kumar Sharma:**

Hello?

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Have you, have you seen this ...?

**Naresh Kumar Sharma:**

Yes, yes, I have gone through. Mostly, I agree with GSRK. ... I just realized, ... One thing I will clarify is that he did not speak so much about spirituality. Are you... To me, it appears that GSRK was talking about spirituality, not because Budzesh talked about that. He started talking about his... Or digging out anything after... Briefly, Referring to what Budjay said. So, broadly, I... Agree with that. then maybe... nuances may be different. In particular, about class. Possibly, there may be need to, ... rethink that how much useful is class assets? As a category of analysis, because I think that... At one time, it may have been seen to be a very, very important category. But we do find that not many people, see themselves as belonging to one particular class or the other, except in the statistical sense, which is not what we mean here, so... So that is the only comment I've had, but broadly. I agree, and I think what they also said that there's a need for elaboration, That, GSRG talked about. Apart from clarifying that he did not talk about, spirituality as such, it's all. Landlessness, I think it is a bit of a tricky question. Because if... Land ownership is not clear. If it is the, rights to the produce, basically. Then, ... Who gets to till the land? Is important, but not the most important. Director of the ownership. So I think this is why it becomes a bit... Tricky question, that how do we... perceive of landlessness, because I think there's a long, ... long historical understanding. that before British the ownership concept as in Britain. doesn't seem to be very much true for Indian context. Although, ... There is a association of land parcels with the individuals. Not collected in the sense that you take collective decisions about carrying out agricultural operations, or... And he says, do you... They were indeed mostly individual. But that did not confer that you can... do as you wish. With the land that you can... you can transfer... You can leave the oath, or whatever. Boop. If you look at the... It creates it on the land. I did, ... so it is only from memory I'm talking. Some, 35 years ago or so. I was looking at, quite a bit early, sir. Most of them start by saying that in the earlier time. The people talked about land as savvi Gopalking. So that it belongs to the Gopal. All the land. So you cannot, think of land as you, say, own utensils, or you own house. Or some testing, which is different. ... If it is a... you can see that... Allotment of land from time to time. Or even in a longer term. But it is not ownership sense. And then you have that, the one who is cultivating land, A certain right to produce. The Dobi has certainly right to produce, the watchman has certainly right to produce. The idea is ready to produce. the money system that, that GSR can refer to it. In that sense, then the landlessness as a category becomes irrelevant. Right? So, different people perform different tasks. And they have, slain tooth? Both produce for agriculture and their claims for the services of various component society. So I think we... we... We try to fit today's categories onto that. there'll be a problem. That is how I look at it. So, broadly on that question that we got, I see. But I think the broader point GSRP is referring to is. It does not mean that everything was hungry. Very good. So everything was harmonious and all

that. I think that broad point, I didn't go along with that. There have been times that ... more prosperous. There are times which are not prosperous. All people are not equal. Some people have Less prosperity in the same society. All the accounts that we have, whether we have from Jingle for two, or from his money. They are telling about, mostly about the way rules Or supposed to operate. Nope. How do they translate into the individuals? Prosperity basically has prosperity. Cannot be deciphered from any of these records. Okay, so do you say that so much shared goes to that, so much shared goes to that? But how much actual, ... happens, that, there were some sense, I remember that when we were reading, Especially articles that were... the published in the Hindu. series, Bajaj, and these people publish articles under the broad name of Leaves from Tundai, Mangala. Tundai, ... Mandelan, yeah. Okay, so broad sense they gave was that Depending on how remote The place to which you contribute. The smaller will be the contribution. So there is some kind of equitability in the claim to the... Produce, and everybody's needs are taken care of. Now, ... this... Is an idea which may have something to it. But I think it is not fully established. That is, ... I will be feeling. To that extent, I'll go with JSRK, that things have gone rough and smooth from time to time. One needs to have a more, I think more, nuanced understanding, more detailed understanding. If we want to see that how different systems work, And... I believe both of them are saying that, let us look at those elements which can go towards building Elements of the future, thinking. Or, new imagination. ... what can work, what cannot work? I think that on that. They may be addressing differently. But there must be some sort of... That is a seeking, as... That when you look at the past, this must be the view that What can work for future? And what has not worked, why it has not worked, that component is not very prominent in your discussions. So, maybe that also may need to be looked at. So, I'll stop here. This is what I gathered from reading both the border, GSRK as well as About this, new....

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Okay.

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

Unless somebody else has to say something. If there are others who want to speak, they may, but I want to say something which I can say now or later, as you desire.

**Naresh Kumar Sharma:**

I think you... it'll be good if you say now, we'll continue later ...

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

You see, there are no... I start my position by stating that there are no universal categories. There is no search for truth. There are different narratives. All about our past. In the name of history and social scientific inquiry. An idea has germinated among the... among the educated. That they constitute a search for history, for truth in our past. I don't think there is any search for truth at all. It is a question of constructing a narrative A narrative of the past. Well, narratives can be useful ... narratives can be good ... narratives can be enlightening ... narratives, but truthfulness is not what you ask about a narrative. A narrative is like a story. They say, as he insisted, that Dharampal said that we need to write a story of India. Yes. Dharampal was not talking about what was the truth. He was talking about writing a story of India. You don't ask about a story whether it is truthful. A story is a story, it's a good story, it says something, it means something to some people, maybe

something else to some other people. So it's like... I mean, you don't ask the question whether the story is true. If Prem Chanda or any other author of the present times who has written about, for example, the peasant world, the farmer's world, Godan, the great novel that we have read, the Hindi-speaking ones... you don't ask whether Huri actually existed, whether... whether what Prem Chand described in Godan about rural life ... whether it actually happened. It's a story. It constructs a narrative. We are interested in different narratives of the past. Because different narratives serve different purposes. The history has done the damage of telling us that among the given narratives, there is one which is a true narrative. I think this is a patently false position. It's a position arising from... it's a... well, we can forget about that, but that it is a patently incorrect position To ask the question about which narrative is true. Ambedkar has a narrative, Gandhi has a narrative, Subhashj Bose would have had another narrative, Jawaharlal has a narrative in Discovery of India. They are sometimes similar, sometimes different. But we don't ask the question about who was speaking the truth. So, the question is not about what was really the case. The question is about a good narrative. And why it is a good narrative? There could be different criteria for a narrative to be good and otherwise. So I don't... I am... what I am saying is that there are no universal categories.

For example, I will take a very hard question, land. The concept of land in England is different from concept of land in India. The concept of ownership in England is different from concept of ownership in India. The concept of debt, the concept of loan is different in India from that in England. The concept of overlordship is different in India than in England. Every concept is different, to the extent... I will take an example, just to illustrate why... I mean, what is the problem with seeing some of these concepts as universal... Take a very simple and, ... a very, very easy to understand, say, the word 'father'. It is easy to say that, an immediate response would be the father means the same thing in England as it does in India, or in America, or somewhere. A father means whatever he does, we know all that. But... When my father dies, in India, if a friend asks me, were you very close to your father? It would be... it would be a very strange question, considered a stupid thing to ask. But maybe in America, it is a legitimate question to ask, were you very close to your father? When somebody dies, his son, his friend of his son, asked his son: Were you very close to your father? It's a genuine question. It's a proper question. It's a legitimate question to ask in England or in America. But it is an absolutely illegitimate question. People will get angry, get mad at the person who asked the question. What nonsense are you talking? Because father means different in India than in England or America. These are not terms... we are not talking about biology, we are talking about society. We are not talking about physics. We are talking about society. We are not talking about genes and DNAs. We are talking about society. We are talking about people. We are talking about people and their practices. We are talking about people and their ideas, people and their relationship with other people. And there are no universal concepts there. We are not talking about biology. We are not talking about this. Social science apparently wants to become something like a science. I think Krishnan knows better than all of us do ... the Merton-Parson exercise sometime in 1940s or 50s. What they wanted sociology to become. A science of some kind. I was in IIT Kanpur, First three lectures. in a sociology course, Introduction to Sociology course, the first three lectures used to be to explain to the students of first-year and second year BTech why sociology is a science. I mean, I don't know from where these ideas are coming. It's so stupid to talk like this in the Indian context. Absolutely meaningless. It is absolutely

meaningless to talk in these terms anywhere other than in a university. You go to the society and use these terms to talk about the society, people say, 'God knows what he was talking about'. You make good sense in the university, not because they are knowledgeable people. Because they use the same language as you do, and they have the same Western perspective of thought that you are using. Let us...

I mean, the Lokavidya movement cannot be a trap to such Western way of thinking. We cannot be a trap to a social-scientific way of thinking. We can't be even a trap to a scientific way of thinking. We want a humanist temper. We want a cultured temper. We don't want a scientific temper. We want a lokavidya temper... to develop in society. We want a proper epistemic temper to develop in society, and not a scientific temper. This is not to say that we think Newton was wrong or right, or Kepler was wrong or right, or what was Leonardo's position in this... in the world of science. We are not talking about that.

See, the point is, what is it that we are doing? The fundamental question is about what kind of narrative are we trying to construct? I have read myself parts of Tapan Roychowdhury and, who is that other... Irphan Habib's Cambridge History of India. They say that although... and their claim to the entire two fat books is that it has been written on documentary evidence. And they are right, they are not fools. They are great scholars, absolutely, and I admit that, and I acknowledge their scholarship. But when it comes to... when it comes to talking about medieval India, they say that... Although there... there we have found no documentary evidence for this, we must assume that there existed a large army of landless labor, or agricultural labor, or some such word they use. I don't remember the specific wording. They must find labor. We have known Trotsky's in our own In, in, in, what was... in the, in the 80s, in the early 80s. We met several Trotsky's who said there is nothing like a small peasant, he is a worker. They counted small peasant as a worker. Which would slowly transcend into or move into the worker being a proletarian. Because Trotsky has no space in his permanent revolution for anybody other than the workers. It has to be a majority worker state for a socialist state. It's clear. We have read Trotsky also. It has to be a majority worker state, and therefore, the revolution must keep expanding into the Western Europe to become a majority worker state. Otherwise, the Russian Revolution does not lead to socialism of any kind at all, according to Trotsky, because it is not a majority worker state.

And what happens in places like India? You start treating the marginal farmer as a worker, because he also functions as an agricultural worker. So you have a choice, and you call him a worker, because you want to increase the number of workers in this country for Trotskyism to be applicable to this country. This is absolutely fantastic. This is... I mean, this is being trapped into a... into a paradigm of thinking, which has got nothing to do with the reality of India. We are not interested in these narratives. We are not interested in these. We have come through all this. We have debated with all these people long enough. For long years, we have debated with all these people in our universities and elsewhere. Lokavidya movement, also debates with these people, but wants to devote majority of its time, most of its time, not to this debate, but to construction of another narrative. A lokavidya narrative. If we start talking about reality as the social scientists did, we will only construct a variant of a scientific, call it scientific narrative, or variant of a historical narrative, or variant of a bourgeois narrative. We are not interested in bourgeois narratives of India. We want to construct a lokavidya narrative. You see, I mean, I read carefully GSRK has gone back

to saying that there have... changes have occurred in last... I mentioned this last time, I think here, or somewhere, I don't remember. Woodworth in 1880, Anand Kumar Swami later, and till very late, I don't know even whether today .... The language is, everything is finished. the language that GSRK is prone to use is that everything is finished. Whether in last 20 years, or 50 years, in the days when we are talking about it, that is today, everything stands finished. Everything that we could talk about, about this great civilization stands finished. Anand Kumar says... Kumar Swami says that in 1900-1910, Woodworth says that about the handicrafted industries in India in sometime around 1880 or sometime. Every time they take the pen in their hand, they say that everything is finished. And yet, for 100 years, they keep saying that everything is finished. Why do they have to say that everything is finished? It is creating a narrative. It's not telling the truth about India. It's creating a narrative. It is placing in the minds of the young that everything is finished. Don't look towards that. Look towards your past. Not as tradition, but as past. If the Aryabhata knew about the... about the convergence of an infinite series, or about differentiation it is surely not our tradition. A tradition is always a living tradition, a living thing. It is our past. But we want to call it tradition. This is confusing matters. Because, people, what happened in PPST? PPST took on a large scale the ancient Indian mathematics, ancient Indian logic, even as late as the Navyanyaya logic from Bengal in 15th century. It is our past. We... if we have anything left of this logic. It is in the Bahujan consciousness. This is what the way I'm using the word consciousness. If the past is somewhere captured in the present. Not explicitly at all. It is there in the Bahujan consciousness. It is not in the university minds. Those who are doing research on Aryabhata to prove that he knew, Aryabhata knew about the convergence of an infinite series have no consciousness of that kind at all. They are modern scientists, 100%. Just, no, no, no, no, nothing minus. Completely cent-percent modern scientists who are looking at Indian past. And trying to see elements in Indian past which are similar to modern science. We don't want that narrative. We are not interested in that narrative. I am not saying that those who are interested in that narrative are not, don't think in the interest of this country. I'm not saying that at all. We come from the lokavidya movement. And we want to build a different kind of narrative. Our ideas are different, our conceptual categories are different, our concept of history is different, our concept of our memory is different, our concept of consciousness is different. Our concept of future is different. Our concept of political imagination is different. And there is a basis of all these. That different ideas we have, they have their basis in Lokavidya ... Lokavidya conceived liberally as the science and arts that subsists among the people. Contemporary. It's not a question of what is finished and what is not. It's always contemporary. Lokvidya is always contemporary. Somewhere he writes that Lokvidya is different. Lokvidya of 100 years ago was different from Lokvitya. This is 100... we have been saying this all along. that Lokavidya is contemporary. Lokavidya is nita-naveen is the term we have used. It's renewed every day. This is what we have said. I mean, who is telling whom that Lokavidya is not the same today, or people's thought changes? People's thoughts changes much more quickly and much more so than science does, or formal thought does, or formal language does. The spoken language changes far more quickly than the formal language does, or the grammatical language of the literature man does. The spoken language changes far more quickly, Lokavidya changes far more quickly. Along with the times. It is always the contemporary knowledge. Where is the question of saying that it is no more there, and it is... it was there, and for... We have never referred to Lokiya as traditional knowledge. From where does this idea come about, traditional knowledge,

which has disappeared, and which needs to be preserved, and all these bogus ideas? We have never talked about them. Go back to the literature produced in the last 20 years in the name of Lokavidya, even from before that. Go back to what we have written, and see what has been written all along. We have never talked about traditional knowledge. We have said Lok Vidya is a window for traditional knowledge. Traditional knowledge is not a window for Lok Vidya. Lokavidya is a window for traditional knowledge. It is through Lokavidya that you can find out what our traditional knowledge may or may not have been. It is not the other way, it is not the converse. I mean, what are we discussing? I don't understand. For 20 years, we have been talking just about this, that Lokavidya is contemporary knowledge among the people. What are we talking about? I just can't understand what the debate is about now. what questions GSRK has, I fail to understand. I do understand that part, that if you go on talking about the political imagination, you must have certain... something measurable, something that you can talk about more costensitive, more palpable, and so on. I agree with that. It need not be measurable, but something observable, something that you can talk about in more concrete terms, and so on. I entirely agree with this. We must make this transition. It is good that it has been pointed out by GSRK. It is most welcome that we must move now from talking just about the political imagination to something more concrete than just that. And towards that, a step has been taken here, at the ashram, in terms of talking about Swaraj in the language of 21st century Swaraj. We don't want people to talk about Swaraj in reference to Gandhi. We don't want that. Some people may do that, but we are not interested. There is so much literature about Swaraj in reference to Gandhi. We want people to talk about Farage without Gandhi. Saraal doesn't belong to God. Swaraj is an Indian civilizational term. It... it... the Indian civilization gives the idea of Surat. Let us go back. Let us go to the future. Wherever we wish we can go and try to formulate an idea of Swaraj for the contemporary times. And we are insisting now, with the people with whom we work. That, let us try to formulate an idea of Swaraj without reference to Gandhi. Maybe something new we are able to come to. I don't know. That's all. Thank you.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Okay, thank you. Gandhi? You want to react to that?

**Krishna Gandhi:**

GSRK और बुद्धे का जो भी नोट्स है हमने पढ़ा नहीं है ... लेकिन अभी जो कुछ मेरे मन में है मैं बता देता हूँ ...The first thing is, I am not very comfortable with the statement that, there is no truth, only narratives are there. So it is very difficult for me. to accept this, that, narratives only exist and only narratives matter. Okay, so I think, we have to think, we have to discuss this, more, because, it means that ... the majority opinion, that is what counts. Or... , we have to, make our opinion the majority opinion, that kind of a problem is there. So, whether it... our, statements. Correspond to facts or not, it doesn't matter? What matters is our narrative and whether we are successful in projecting a narrative. That's all matters. So, this itself is sort of very difficult for me to digest. at present. Okay, so because... As I see it, it is true that the whole discussion of history It's only from certain perspectives, and those perspectives are... let's say... governed by certain interests, so everything... Any discussion of the past, or... or the future, or the history of human beings ... everything is from... point of, interest, of self-interest. So, therefore, narratives are there. But... When we are talking about Justice, for example. Okay, so, न्याय त्याग ... We are standing with the

justice. So... When we are talking about the justice, do we have some understanding of what was, justice in the past, pre-British period. And, ... In the British period, and now... Or is justice, something quantifiable? Or, ... or not. If it is not quantifiable... quantifiable, then, what is... is justice also a matter of narrative only? For example, in the... pre... this thing, industrial, the old days, at least in Europe, even, I think, in... in... in our country, duels were very common. So, if somebody had a heart to somebody else. The only way to justice established was to make those two people who feel that they have been wronged by each other, make them fight, and the result of the fight you will decide. What is justice? Okay, so Justice was, like that, and... An eye for an eye, or tooth for a tooth kind of adjusted was also there. So, that was the concept of justice then? So... Justice itself is a matter of narrative only. Now, when we come to the... sharing of the produce in the agriculture, in the pre-British times. The last time when the discussion was there, I was only raising what was the share of the produce received by different sections of the population. In fact, I was talking about Puleya, because in Tamil Nadu and Kerala they are the people who didn't have any other occupation other than... agriculture. And, ... It was also said in the British period that, when land was sold, the ... this, serfs... these Puleyas were also sold with the land. Okay. It is some kind of a serfdom. Now, let us forget about what happened to the British, but even before, if our narrative is so that It was, just a distribution of the produce among the people who were in the rural areas. The pullas, or the... those who, without any other occupation other than Cultivating the land. And, ... the... Maybe the owners, you may say that the ownership was a different kind of concern, doesn't matter. But the judgments And the other, cast weavers and other, blacksmiths, all those Occupational costs. So, was there a... just a distribution of the produce among the population of that time? That was the only point that I was trying to understand, and... Raise at that point of, in that discussion? I was not... I'm not at all... A particular about landless labor, or any particular ownership kind of thing. It is about the distribution of the share of produce among different populations. And if we are going to talk about Suraj today. Are we talking about a just distribution of the produce? Or, the output of the society among different sections of the population today? Are we talking... going to talk about that? If we are not, and we don't think that it is, ... this issue worth discussing? We talk only about Swaraj without, going into who gets how much out of the cake, let us say. So, that is, secondary. We only talk about that every will get... everybody will get a share. Everybody will subsist. But this justice a subsistence thing. Justice? That is the question. So... The question of hierarchy is also there. So, are we going to totally neglect the hierarchical aspect of society when we are talking about Swaraj? That within the village Swaraj, it doesn't matter who is upper or who is lower, and, hierarchies don't count. What matters is that the village, as a unit, it flourishes. Some people may get more, some people may get less, it doesn't matter. Are we going to say that is... is that our narrative of... Swaraj, our political imagination of the future. That is the point I want to raise. That's all.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Krish? ... Yup.

**Krishnarajulu**

Buddhey has talked about Narratives of society (similar to what Dharampalji referred to as 'Stories of India'). Some of you might already be aware that Yuval Harari, in his latest book, called 'Networks', refers to these Narratives as Mythologies, as the bases of the Human Social

Networks that have evolved through Human history, and he puts them in chronological order. Each Network is/was based on a Mythology. And this Mythology or what you might call 'belief system', formed the basis of each (Human-Social) Network that evolved. The section of population that gets to be networked was provided with a Mythology, that served to connect them. It was their belief system. So you had a Network built on a Narrative, a Mythology, that became/was a belief system. And the entire interaction within that population, that Network, was through (in terms/parameters) of that Mythology. And, contemporary local society did everything to strengthen the Mythology. All the concepts 'associated' with that Mythology were elaborated upon, talked about, etc, etc. People believe it and then communicate according to parameters set out in that Mythology. Because they want to be part of that Network. One of the modern Networks is the so-called 'Scientific Network' and this Scientific Community is based on a Mythology called 'Scientific Temper'. I found this to be a novel commentary on human history. In his entire book, he's not saying anything about 'Truth'. I'm just mentioning this so that all of you who might be interested, might want to read that book. Because he's a person I find who has provided a lot of insights into the evolution of Human society, And also clearly stated that there are no universal 'truths'.

Gandhi, in his presentation just now, referred to 'justice'. In this context, I want to point out that, in the beginning, when I joined up with the *Raitha Sangha* movement( around early 1981) - I made my first contact with Prof Nanjundaswamy then, and in my conversations with him (which went on during that entire period ) and in a number of their meetings; their main Demand - The price they received for their produce- was referred to as a 'Just price'. They did not use the term 'remunerative' price. That was used later, once they began to interact with other farmers' movements in different parts of the country; because all the then movements referred to this expected/demanded price as a 'remunerative' price. [*Vijay jawandhia: He (Nanjundaswamy) used to call it 'scientific' price.*]

The word 'remunerative' is what he said is 'Scientific', which is correct, in the sense that it's 'quantifiable/measurable'. And when do we talk about remunerative price ? You talk about it when you have End-use of that money received, in mind. And End-use for the past say, a few hundred years, has mostly been estimated in terms of amount of money and what it could buy in the market. But End-use is not only related to amount of money but something more.

I want to concentrate on what the word 'just price' means and implies to the people, in the movement, who were listening to/supporting this demand? The ordinary people in the *Raitha Sangha* movement, seemed to understand the meaning of 'justice' (in this context). It didn't mean only remuneration in a monetary sense. To my mind, it was based in a conscious recognition of the contributions of the various people involved in agricultural activities and of what Social justice meant. Justice to all producers- the owner/manager of the land, the agriculture worker and everyone else involved in life around that productive activity. So the price being demanded for the produce was supposed to be a 'just price' in this sense. The people seemed to understand that. Whereas people like me, and many others, could easily

understand what 'remunerative' price (in terms of money) meant. What *Raitha Sangha* did subsequently was to produce a book tabulating in detail the 'cost of production', of different crops that were grown in Karnataka etc. [I too contributed one such estimation : that to do with cotton- the cost of production of a certain amount of cotton, its processing cost etc; essentially how the costing went right through from the cotton (basic raw material) to the cloth that was produced and marketed- all the stages; I got a lot of information about how these things were 'costed', how prices set for different stages of production from cotton to yarn to thread, and then weaving when it is converted to cloth, etc, etc and thus to an estimate of final cost of production of a piece of cloth]. That book was for people who wanted to see this price demand quantified in a Scientific/ measurable manner. The calculation that was done by the then Cost/Price Commission set up by the Karnataka government completely neglected the knowledge input into the farming activity( this was pointed out very vehemently by Nanjundaswamy and all the leaders in their meetings). In their argument they didn't use the word knowledge input and all that, they never did - but they compared it to a factory ( an industrial production unit) where the managers were paid a lot compared to the workers because of their 'knowledge input' etc. On the other hand, the landowner or whoever is in charge of the agricultural production process, who plans and manages inventory, production, marketing, etc gets nothing in particular for that input. *Raitha Sangha*, in its 'costing' exercise, had included all family labor, management, planning and so on while also postulating that men and women workers should get the same wages etc. So, it struck me that when they said 'just' price, they were referring to some consciousness about justice. Which apparently was commonly prevalent/understood by the entire society of people involved in agricultural operations. I'm saying this because, I think this is an element of *Bahujan* Consciousness that, apparently, even now, still exists. People might go to great depths to make this 'just price' concept, commensurate with remunerative price, such as with Swaminathan's formula. He was a renowned agricultural economist, and he's done the right thing. But does it reflect any concept of the consciousness of justice? I don't think it does. And what Buddey referred to and GSRK talked about in his recent response, is about this element ( of *Bahujan* Consciousness) which seems to exist in the farming community. As far as the *Raitha Sangha* movement is concerned, to my mind, they seemed to understand what this 'justice' meant. To me, 'justice' was synonymous with remunerative because that's the way I've been trained to think that is, you need to incorporate justice by quantify things logically (and scientifically) in a market perspective.

And then, a few years later, I remember very clearly, that Professor Boraskar, of Nagpur University, explained to us how the market mechanism transfers surplus 'preferentially'(larger sums) to the capitalist. What is the concept of justice, in the market mechanism? We hold that this is injustice. The whole of Marxist revolt is based on that kind of 'injustice'. So, the *Bahujan*, it appears have a different understanding of the concept of 'justice' a Consciousness, a belief in a Narrative, that incorporates a concept of justice that is quite different. Maybe in the *Sant*

*Parampara* were trying to quantify that element of justice, in a way eg Guru Gobind Singh's *Dasvand Dena*. Coming to this land rotation thing. To my mind, what that means, is that you are effectively providing a means for every individual in that Collective, to practice his knowledge- to sustain his life and livelihood, not only for his own benefit but for the entire community. If an agriculturist, a person who has knowledge of farming activity, has a 'bad' piece of land (whether he owns it or it's allocated to him) he may not be able to produce anything meaningful in spite of his knowledge and hard work( as for example all those farmers in Telangana and Marathwada who, in spite of their untiring efforts could not produce enough and didn't receive a 'just price' committed suicide ). So this land rotation was a means that that society had devised in order to sustain the knowledge and productive ability of all producers. Whereas the distribution of the produce, to the various sections of participating society- not only the so-called owners, or title holders of the land, everyone got share, in a continuous way, to sustain a dignified life for him his family while facilitating the practice of his knowledge. From the data about pre-British India, we can infer that the sustenance of lives and livelihoods, based on *Lokavidya*, seems to have been the paramount consideration in land allocation/rotation, produce distribution etc. That seems to be an important component of the concept of Social justice, in that society. [For example, every parent would want to his/her daughters married. And customarily there was some gold involved that needs to be bought. Which means you must have some surplus to go and buy some gold, so that you can get your daughter married. Produce distribution seems to have been such that everybody could buy that gold]. It's an organization of society based on, what I have chosen to call, a *Dharmic* consciousness( *Bahujan* consciousness). It's not only based in *Lokvidya*. it encompasses concepts of *Nyaya*, *Tyaga* and *Bhaichara*. And I've tried to see how it is elaborated by the *Sant Prampara*, through their commentaries, their (contemporary) narratives, etc.

The 'teachings' of Basaweshwara, Guru Gobind Singh, Kabir, Ravidas, Narayan Guru, etc are based on a certain consciousness that existed in contemporary society. They told people what needed to be done in order to resolve a certain conflict in society, the people understand and followed their 'teachings' in a wide-spread(revolutionary) manner. They did not put forth abstract concepts, I don't think so. Which means they based their teachings, or whatever you want to call it, on this fertile ground of *Bahujan* consciousness; which contains elements of social justice, economic justice, etc and this consciousness seems to have been changing through the ages.

We have labeled the markers (to this consciousness) using terms such as *Lokavidya* Samaj and *Bahujan Samaj*; which incorporate aspects of that consciousness that sustain society, without using an abstract concept of justice. What has happened in the West, during the past 200- 300 years, and the way they've defined justice, is largely based on economic justice, on a quantifiable concept of justice, through remunerative prices etc, all market-related rather than being related in any human relationships.

*Swarajya* has to be achieved based on an inherent concept of justice rooted in *Bahujan* Consciouness.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Here, thank you. Oh... चित्रा जी आपको कुछ कहना है

**Chitra Sahasrabudhey:**

हमको बस ये कहना है कि बहुत सफाई के साथ ये दोनो बातें आई कृष्णराजुलु के बोलने में ... इससे सहमत हैं हम ... और लेकिन कल की मीटिंग की एक बात हमको याद आ गयी इससे कि किसी ने कहा कि रामायण एक से ज्यादा अधिक लिखी गई ... एक एक कैरेक्टर पर इतने सारी रामायणें लिखी गई हैं, और हरेक में कुछ न कुछ अलग है, निश्चित रूप से कुछ इंटरैस्ट और दृष्टिकोण और ये उसके पीछे रहें होंगे किसी समाज के। ... तो हम लोग इस रूप में अगर देखें। यहां तक बात हुई कि भाई कृष्ण पर भी ऐसी बहुत सी कहानियां हरेक ... हरेक इस पर कई कहानियां हैं ... और हमको कृष्ण महाभारत का नहीं चाहिए। हमको ऐसी एक कहानी चाहिए जिसमें महाभारत वाला कृष्ण नहीं चाहिए क्योंकि वह चालाकी का प्रतिनिधित्व करता है और सबसे बड़ी बात यह है वो अपने समाज को छोड़कर गया। तो ये बातें आई हैं। इसको हम लोगों को थोड़ा सोचना चाहती हैं। दिशा दे सकती है।

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

ये तो ... ऐसे तो काफी instances हैं जो हम लोगों को actually देखने चाहिये ... और use करने चाहिए ... जैसे कहते हैं कि महाभारत के ऐसे versions भी हैं जिसमें गीता है हि नहीं ... ऐसे versions हैं जिसमें गीता में दो ही chapter हैं ... तो, इस तरह की चीजें हैं बहुत सी in fact हम लोग अगर ये कुछ अः साहित्य वाले लोगों को पढ़ते हैं तो उसमें ऐसा होता है कि हम लोगों ने उसके बारे में हम लोगों को कुछ सबके सामने लाने की बात करनी चाहिए ... हम् हम् आपका जो तर्क है उसको काफी बल मिलता है लोगों के सामने जब आप देख रहे हैं उसको कि ये ये narrative वाला जो तर्क है यह ठीक है। यूनिवर्सिटी वालों के सामने आप रखने जाएंगे तो बहुत काफी उल्टी सीधी चीजें उसमें निकलेंगी। अः बहुजन समाज के सामने तो यह तकलीफ नहीं होगी, फिर भी इस तरह का बल मिलना जरूरी है इस तर्क को और यूनिवर्सिटी के लोगों के साथ में जब बात करते हैं तब तक जरूरी है ही। अच्छा ये ऐसा नहीं है कि बाहर वाले बात कर रहे हैं। वो उसमें बहुत से लिटरेचर वाले बड़े बड़े इंडस्ट्रियल में पढ़े हुए लोगों को भी यह चीज मालूम है और बात करते हैं। ऐसी चीजें हम लोग ... जैसे हमने यह सुना वह पुरुषोत्तम अग्रवाल से सुना था शायद कि उडिया में जो महाभारत है उसमें गीता है ही नहीं

**Chitra Sahasrabudhey:**

हाँ ... अच्छा ...

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

इस तरह की चीजें तो काफी निकलती हैं ... इसमें बातचीत होनी चाहिए। इसका कुछ तरीका बनाना चाहिए बातचीत करने का। हो सकता है हर मीटिंग में कोई स्टोरी सुना दे एक नई ये भी कर सकते हैं ... जो सबके पास चली जाए।

**Chitra Sahasrabudhey:**

यह होना चाहिए ...

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

जो है ... मतलब हम लोग थोड़ा अवेयर रहे इस बारे में ... ठीक है तो इसके बाद मिलना है सत्ताईस को ... हम एक्जुअली पूना जाएंगे। वो कब जाएंगे अभी तय नहीं है तो सत्ताईस को हम हैं कि नहीं। अब तक most probably तो हैं तो वो बताएंगे उस तरह से ...बीच में clear हो जाएगा।

**Abhijit Mitra:**

वो सत्ताईस अट्टाईस से एक सप्ताह वह यहां पर दुर्गा पूजा के समय है ... उस समय हमारा अटेंडेंस डाउटफुल रहेगा थोड़ा।

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

अब आप कलकत्ता चले गए क्या?

**Abhijit Mitra:**

हाँ मैं कलकत्ता में हूँ। अच्छा sorry ये तो अगस्त है ना sorry... sorry हमारे दिमाग में वो ये आ गया ... वो तो September में है ... कलकत्ता में ही मैं हूँ ... और ठीक है सब ...अगस्त के महीने में मैं पूरा पूरा यहीं पर हूँ।

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

ठीक है। ठीक है।

**Abhijit Mitra:**

एक चीज़ सबको हमको कृष का जो भी जैसे बताया वो काफी अच्छा लगा वो हरारे का मतलब हम कुछ पढ़ रहे थे । will try to discuss something with him कुछ डाउट्स है हमारे मन में but later on न्याय के बारे में मतलब वह एक पॉइंट अगर इस तरह से रखें यह न्यायोचित का मतलब जो जस्ट है ... तो जस्ट का कांसेप्ट जो प्रोज्यूसर है किसान के लिए जस्ट प्राइस और उनके मन में ये विश्वास है कि जो खरीदेंगे उनको भी लगेगा ये न्यायोचित है। न्याय का कांसेप्ट में सैटिस्फैक्शन ऑफ ऑल पार्टिज यह अंतर्निहित है। It is it is not... It is very different from concept ... rules and punishment वाला जो चीज है उससे अलग चीज है ये। That aspect of justice is different ... I thought that ... this is just to add ...

**Vijay jawandhia:**

इसमें इसमें मैं एक चीज और जोड़ता हूँ कि महाराष्ट्र में हम लोग ऐसी मांग करते थे कि 'रास्त भाव, जास्त नाही' तो रास्त माने जस्ट ... और वो हमको ज्यादा नहीं चाहिए।

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

हाँ

**Vijay jawandhia:**

जास्त नाही। नॉट मोर or not exaggerated। इस तरह का अभी हमें घोषणा देते थे। रास्त भाव, जास्त नाही। तो शायद वो उसी तरफ जाता है। वो बिल्कुल सही कहा आपने। क्योंकि देखे एक और चीज में बता दिया आप किसान भी कंज्यूर है, हम यह भूल जाते हैं ... कपास पैदा करने वाला किसान भी शक्कर का कंज्यूर है, कपास पैदा करने वाला किसान की गेहूं का कंज्यूर है, कपास पैदा करने वाला किसान भी चावल का कंज्यूर और चावल वाला कपास और कपड़े का कंज्यूर है। यह सब लोग कंज्यूर है। परंतु यह जो जस्ट प्राइस की बात है, यह पॉलिटिकल लोगों ने इन बहुजनों में स्प्रेड नहीं होने दी। और एक के खिलाफ दूसरे किसानों को भी खड़ा किया। और इसलिए जब कभी भी कोई मार्केट में जाता है जैसा चावल वाला मार्केट में जाएगा तो उसको लगेगा कि कपड़ा सस्ता मिलना चाहिए। और वही भूल जाता है कि कपड़ा सस्ता होगा, तो कपास वाला मर जाएगा और कपास वाला जब चावल खरीदने जाता है तो उसको चावल सस्ता चाहिए। वह चावल के रास्त दाम के बारे में सोचता नहीं है। और यह जो एजुकेशन होना चाहिए था ... barter system collapsed, or was killed and monitoring system came ... that education was not there with bahujan ऐसा मुझे लगता है ... इस पर भी बात हो सकती है ... तो अच्छे लोग इस पर बात कर सकते हैं उसको पढ़ा सकते हैं।

**Naresh Kumar Sharma:**

बार्टर सिस्टम तो बहुत पहले से नहीं है, विजय साहब। जो जिस के रूप में एक्सचेंज, जो बार्टर सिस्टम नहीं था वो ... I have seen in my village अनाज से आप सब कुछ ले रहे हैं उसमें अनाज has become a common commodity ... that was not barter तो I think barter system में आया तो हर चीज में क्या कहते (...?) हो अनाज has become a common denominator वो जो ट्रेडर है वह भी अनाज के साथ में कर रहा वो अनाज (...?) नहीं है तो यह जो बार्टर सिस्टम समझ रहे हैं ... यह हो सकता है कि हज़ार साल पहले रहा दो हज़ार साल पहले रहा ...

**Vijay jawandhia:**

नहीं जब पैसा नहीं आया उसके बहुत पहले साल की बता रहा हूँ कि जब पैसा कम था ...

**Naresh Kumar Sharma:**

पैसा कम कहाँ था उस समय?

**Vijay jawandhia:**

उस समय था।

**Naresh Kumar Sharma:**

Hello आप मुझे ... हाँ पैसा कम था इस लिए circulation कम था ... So, I think we have to, if we are talking about these things. मुझे लगता है कुछ चीजें बहुत डिफ्यूज हो जाती हैं। जस्टिस के बारे में I read long ago in the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences ... that in 15<sup>th</sup> century, 16<sup>th</sup> century, 14<sup>th</sup> century in Europe, this concept was there. And you are right, a scientific prize, or just prize was spoken in the same breath during farmers' movement... वो मजदूर किसान नीति में इसकी बात हुई थी but it is not (...?... ) पर ये समझेंगे कि quantification नहीं है तो आप मुझे बताइये विजय साहब कि प्राइस की बिना quantification आप कैसे बात करेंगे? और किसानों की बात करना चाहते हैं तो ... मुझे समझ में नहीं आता है तो just price, I think the... what I try to understand. It was more about an idea of fairness. That you don't cheat the other person... that you yourself should be... aligned with that. I'm not talking about the farmers' movement just price. Farmers movement just price, I understand, is... that... this is ... not an unjust demand. This is a demand which is very fair for farmers, they are not asking for more than what is their due. That's how you understand that the idea of just price was articulated in the Harvest Movement of 80s. This is the time it was being articulated, right? So, I just thought that... ... If we focus on one or two things, we can have a much better understanding. And you are very right in your saying a farmer of cotton, farmer of grains, or oil seeds ... if a farmer is not growing everything we have to have some idea about that, what will be fair exchange. Among all these things and you have, I think, put on the critical point. Yes, that are we aware of interests of each other, not only our own interests, and that is where the fairness ... just... concept on that, we are aware of that. Interests of not only my own, but of the other also, to whom I am linked intimately. See, a cotton farmer is also linked to the food farmer, and so on and so forth. So, I suppose you are pointing to that. I also thought I'll just add a line. in tune with Randy was, of you know. that about the narratives and truth. I am also, like, very uncomfortable. I have no problem in narratives. But narratives, if they are not anchored in anything, then... Where do they (...?... ) narratives? Anybody who is looking at narratives will have some sense of that this is somewhere relating to some truth about society, or not truth about society. If we are not having that anchoring then I don't see that how we can even exchange. Views and ideas with yourself ... two narratives. So, what narrative we find more plausible? We say plausible, what do you mean plausible? So, ... Or some narrative is Hawa Hawaii. So, ... If you look at truth in Ramayan, or Mana, or Prem Chand, or narrative we don't, I think, look for the realism that these were actual, people of... Flesh and blood or not. We look for, does it have truth of the society of the time? We do think about that. Even somebody says that Prem Chand was a realist. What does it mean? That it was... getting essence of reality. And if that is not relating to truth somewhere. Then, how will you understand that? So, I am sure that one can go on that, but... but without that, I am... I am completely lost. You're not anchoring to truth in some sense. I'm not saying that you can ascertain

truth. But if you don't have, ... a sense of truth that we are... we are trying to... look at truth then, at least I am completely lost.

**Abhijit Mitra:**

I don't think, Naresh, anybody is talking about sense of truth. Truth as you see it. And... which is acceptable ... and in that, with our sins. of, nyaya, tyaga, bhichara, and other things which are there in our inner consciousness, that which is acceptable, that sense, is the... I think one thing, may come more frequently, and that is the context of exploitation. And exploitation, which also comes on the hierarchies that get created in terms of valuation of commodities and services. And exploitation that comes out of it, and how life and living copes with it. This is... this is just a very, you know, Morse code, elaboration of what's going on in my mind. Maybe... Later on, next time or other, I can try to say more about this, yeah.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Okay, ... I think let us stop. It's nearing 6.40. So, uh, next time we'll, uh... hopefully meet on 27<sup>th</sup> ...