

Transcript of Zoom Meeting at 5.00 pm on November 12, 2025

Except for my part and Sunil's, this transcript is mostly uncorrected and has machine-made errors. Request all to go through their own parts and send me corrections. The docx file is available in the shared Google Drive sub-folder 2025-11-12 in the shared folder [Lokavidya Debates](#). - Girish

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

We won't wait for Krish, because Krish said that he may be late, and may not join at all, so... Okay, I think we can start. So I hope you have all seen either the recording, or gone through the transcript. At least glanced through it. We are actually continuing the same discussion. And last time this question was put whether... so we had discussed this question, whether we... can take Swaraj to the global debate ... whether it is possible for us, whether it is meaningful for us, Uh... this is a question which we... actually began to discuss before the Swaraj Panchayat, and... last time we discussed it as a possible lead to carrying these discussions forward. We have already decided to ... hold this every fortnight, rather than every week, so we'll be meeting once in 15 days ... there was agreement on that. Then this question was discussed, Gandhi was essentially in... agreement on this, so was Krish. Gandhi, of course, also talked about many other specific things. And uh... also said, uh... that maybe we should try to lift the discussion to a national level first, maybe we should, uh... pay more attention to that. Krish also said something similar. Uh, in fact, he had also welcomed this idea of... holding this, uh... similar meeting in Hindi, as a part of Bahujan Gyan Vimarsh, to be conducted by somebody else, maybe. I mean, they have already discussed it in Varanasi. So, Parmita apparently has taken the lead to uh... organize that. Uh, some of us may be part of that. That meeting will be once a month. That suggestion was already on cards last time, so... But Krish had said that maybe we should think about starting these meetings in other languages also, in other states also. Then, Sunil had talked about, I mean, before that, Naresh raised some question about what is the meaning of taking the debate to the global level, that that is not clear. That's what he said. So Sunil tried to answer that by naming one of these online platforms, called WSM Discuss. World Social Movements Discuss. It was an offshoot, apparently, of WSF Discuss. The one led by Jai Sen, so that is one possibility ... this thing. What was said was that there we have some, uh, uh... entry, and it may be possible to bring other people into a larger discussion there. So, as an outlet, to start with, to try, uh... that was one of the... things which was said. But there were some other observations which he made, in the sequel. Um, I mean, he also talked about various other things, and... I think he said that, uh, we may discuss this question of, uh, different, uh... forms

of the nation-state which are being discussed. But maybe internally first, uh, the civilizational state or the cultural nationalism kind of phenomena, and come to some kind of an agreement on that before we go out to discuss these things with other people. When there was some other... fairly general suggestion made by him. Which was that, uh, to, um... to focus... on a cluster of 5 ideas, 5 concepts, Lokvidya, Ordinary Life, Bahujan, Swaraj and Panchayat. And... not insist on primacy of any of these. And, uh, try to work out the interrelations between them. Uh... Keep any one of them at the center, sort of, as a starting concept, and try to relate to the other four, but not... accord any primacy to any one of them. Maybe ... this maybe a way of going... taking this discussion forward. Uh, that, of course, needs to be understood by uh... I don't know exactly what is meant by that, but one thing which struck me after that was is it possible to look at Bahujan Swaraj Panchayat as a constructive program? Sunil talked about it as a replacement for a party. Uh... it, uh... I have not worked out anything about that, but... look, something which, uh... probably can be treated as a concern. That is, If we are talking of... holding Bahujan Swaraj Panchayats in various places, Maybe we can think of it as a constructive program which takes us towards Swaraj, something like that, a very... a rough idea, uh, but maybe I can try to work that out a little better, but uh... Something like that struck me when we were talking about these interrelations.

So, we did not have Suresh, uh, last time. And GSRK did not uh... speak last name, so... Uh, can we expect both of them to say something? Uh, not necessarily about just this question, maybe in the context of this question, But also... speak about whatever they think would be a way of going forward, taking these discussions forward. Uh, what is the kind of thing we should be discussing? What is the kind of questions, which should... we should be posing, et cetera, et cetera. Um, so let me, uh... request, uh... either Suresh or GSRK, could you... say something in this regard to initiate discussions today ...

ಡಾ. ಜ ಕ ಸುರೇಶ (Suresh):

Okay, okay. I will... I can start, I can start.

Girish Sahasrabudhe

Yeah. Ok.

ಡಾ. ಜ ಕ ಸುರೇಶ (Suresh):

And, uh, say a few things that came to my mind. When I... just today, I could not do this before. Today, after mail from Girish, I was able to look at the... proceedings, uh, they... the textual... the PDF which, uh, captured all the discussions of last time. And since he has already summarized everything... I... I

thought that, maybe we could spend a couple of minutes on... While most seem to agree on Budhey's proposal to this WSM debate, the possibility of erecting a debate using WSM and so on, of course, after clarifying many issues within, perhaps, I mean, within our group itself, and so on and so forth. And, not really focus too much on plurinational or civilizational kinds of aspects till that is done, or maybe do that internally before you get into a larger debate outside, in the process of, perhaps, I mean, talking about this on the global stage. And, So, for the moment, I would think that, you know, avoiding any questions of implementation immediately. Here are some of my observations. And I'm keeping in mind sharply, the idea that, you know, we really aren't looking at implementation of the idea of Swaraj, but to give it a certain traction in the world of ideas. If that is indeed the case, and possibly to create a debate on Swaraj with either WSM or even a larger body outside of our own group. It may be necessary to create a cogent set of ideas of alternatives to the current ones, be it socialism, be it whatever, enlightenment kind of, I mean, you know, capitalism, and this and that, various flavors of which arise and are prevalent across the world, not merely within India, but also outside. Could be various flavors of Gandhism, various other flavors of... You know, liberation, and so on and so forth. But I think it's a very critical thing for us to project these ideas in the background And this provides an opportunity, because we are thinking thus that we want to actually do this on a global stage, even if we do not yet get into a discussion with WSM or entities outside India, larger groups, and so on. I think one point which needs to be very clearly sort of understood is that this provides an opportunity for a larger geopolitical, strategic, economic kind of an expanse of the world to be understood, and in a certain sense, I mean, you know, we need to place the idea of, I mean, Sarajya, or of you know, the Bahujan and so on, more especially. In this matrix of our understanding of the geopolitics, the economic realities of this world, given that, you know, the kind of connections between the rest of the world and India has actually fundamentally transformed from the time of India of the 80s or even early 90s. And one can see the kind of realities which shape world politics, and therefore the impact on countries, and therefore the impact on politics within the countries, and therefore the impact on societies within these countries themselves, and the policies of the government, and the relationship between the oligarchies which rule the world, and so on and so forth. We'll come to that in a moment. But I think these complex kinds of interrelationships need to be looked at. When we think about explicating, or even understanding better the idea of Swaraja or Bahujal. before we actually get into engagements with many of these kinds of people who are talking about liberation, talking broadly about the possibility of working for a pro-people kind of alternative in this world, and so on. And in the process, we may need to really critically explore The different categories that, in my opinion, are very important in describing the world today, or even in terms of explaining the alternatives which exist today. For example, we

may need to understand capital in its most recent and most kind of virulent form which it has taken in the last 20, 30, 40 years. We need to perhaps, I mean, look at the returns on capital, which seem to be driving the violence and wars, forever wars of the West on the East, in so many different ways that we are seeing, which are very different from that of what used to be the case, let us say, before the new millennium began. And, simultaneously, we need to therefore explore the relationship between power, capital, knowledge. classes, for example, we may need to understand, in the specific case of India. you know, sort of give up our old, or perhaps, I mean, you know, sort of, what would you say, liberate our ideas of classes and castes and so on. in a manner which enables us to understand whether India is a class-born society, or whether it is a caste-bound society, or whether these categories are useful or useless, for example, or is there some alternative to this, for example? What is the nature of imperialism in the 21st century? What does colonization mean? Does it mean that, you know, we physically go and take over some place? Or is it, I mean, done in different mechanisms today? And just as we speak about extractive capitalism and productive, I mean, you know, the kind of rentier capitalism of 21st century, I think we need to understand colonization imperialism as well, in a somewhat different sense. because of the geostrategic implications of this, which seem to touch the world, the moment a perturbation arises in China, USA, Brazil. Venezuela, or Russia, and Europe, and so on and so forth. So, coming back to what I have been saying in the past as well, we also need to understand propaganda, the nature of propaganda in the world of virtual reality, and how the real has been substituted by virtuality, to the extent that there is no need for a real to exist. when, I mean, you know, the virtual world on its own, creates, I mean, certain kinds of endless loops within, where you don't even need reality to support it. I would like to just, I mean, you know, quote the kind of, I mean, stories, narratives, and so on, which are being spun around Ukraine, around India, around China, around USA, around just about everything that we see. where both the MSN, it is very well known that the mainstream media is an extremely great, corrupted lackey of, I mean, the powers that be. But even the narratives in the alternate medias are also approaching something similar. So, we have to understand the effect of this virtual reality On the meaning of truth, and so on. And... I think, you know, we also need to understand the idea of truth today. Do we therefore say that in the era, era of post-truth, there is no such thing as reality and truth? Or do we actually say, like Gandhi did, that there is something real, there is something truthful, and that happens to be the fundamental distinction for people who think, which is humans and so on? So, I mean, in addition to that, we need to look at awareness. What does awareness mean? What does consciousness mean? What is the relationship between the material reality and the social reality of a society, and the consciousness that it has? And especially about science and technology, and the relations that it has. I think it is possible to argue that much of our

understanding of science and technology, both from PPSD and subsequently, are possibly very naive. If one were to look at it today, and one may find stronger bonds between science, technology, and the way it is guided and it is structured, and it helps the power of imperialism to actually stretch itself, and so on and so forth. So... It also appears to me that, these explanation of these and other categories is likely to throw light and also provide insights into the existing social and economic realities of the world, not merely in India, but also in relation to what seems to be happening elsewhere. For example, we... occasionally, we even get into very split arguments. For example, I would say, for example, that, you know, look at China, look at what they have done in 30 years. Somebody else would say, look at USA and how it has gone down in the whole so many years. Yet others would say something about Europe and this and that, and so on and so forth. But the point is, when you integrate all this, what do you understand about the social and economic realities, not in an abstract sense of the word, but as we understand from the situations that obtain. in the mechanisms of, I mean, capital's working, and its relationship with the culture, the civilization, and the people of that society, how it manifests itself in different societies, and is there something that we can actually understand in order to be able to push this idea of Swaraj, or about, I mean, let's say, the Bahujal, which may actually be An alternate set of categories, perhaps a set of crutches. which serve the people better than the ones, I mean, through which they explore alternatives. And perhaps impose a challenge To the... to understand the nature of subjugation or exploitation, or the ruling ideas of the present. So, I'm merely saying that an examination of these categories might help us really understand subjugation and exploitation differently, and also throw light on the ruling ideas of the present. And lastly, I think these insights may actually help us make a better case for the central idea of Bahujan Swaraj. As has been sort of, sort of proposed and so on by everyone the last time around. And, this may actually, this kind of an outside-in perspective, in addition to the inside-out that we are actually looking at, either at the world outside or at India, from within our vantage points. that maybe it will help us better understand the Indian socio, political, and economic dynamics better under the influence of the international, under the understanding of the international setup, for example. For example, in economics, one can think of many, many, many questions to ask, and see how we have been misled by all of the neoclassical economics in a way which actually makes us... makes the servitude to international, you know, the oligarchs which rule the world. Seem both natural and unavoidable. from the economic theories. So, when you look at monetary theory, when you look at the idea of inflation, when you look at just about everything, the rivers through which nations actually control their economies in the centralized economy, which have actually crushed and pushed them into insolvency and deep debt and so on, we will also possibly be able to hopefully understand the economics better, the society better, the kind of

fractures in society better, and perhaps, I mean, you know, also understand, insert the ideas of Bahujan Samaj, or Bahu, Bahujan Swaraj, into the larger global or international debate. And while doing that, I also must emphasize, and that, you know, I always have this kind of a feeling that we should not forget, that all we can hope for is to perhaps refrain our arguments and perhaps bring these ideas to a more mature or central... a place of influence in such forums. And as for influencing more sections of people and so on. while I believe that, you know, ideas will inspire people and perhaps can create some action in them, the consciousness of people, in a larger sense, is another matter altogether. And, because I think, you know, the social and economic reality is what sustains the present order. It also creates the consciousness in a certain sense, but I still believe that the power of ideas could move people, and When we wonder that, you know, why are people not conscious of that, we must also recognize the fact that, you know, much of this is a result of the current socio-economic kind of arrangements. And one doesn't know, really, where ideas starts taking root, and where ideas actually start snowballing into something with the momentum enough to perhaps affect larger numbers of people. So, in a certain sense, all of what I say is merely in the world of ideas. But then perhaps these are ideas for tomorrow, and I'm open to, sort of, delving into this a little deeper to understand how this could be done, and how we need to understand this in the larger matrix of the world altogether, and in that, what India is, and what India can be. So that's it from my side.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay, thank you. Yeah, I'm ... okay, GSR?

Sivaramakrishnan G:

After what Suresh said, I think one can spend... a whole lot of time trying to talk about the things that he mentioned. I more or less share many of the things. But I shall be very... I mean, I shall not attempt anything of that kind, because one is... he has been... very articulate in what he said, and I think he has captured certain things that we have been talking amongst ourselves, both of us, for quite some time now. Leaving that aside, I think there is something very interesting that Girish said While making a concluding kind of a statement. That the entire process of this Bahujan Panchayat, etc, can be, conceived, more in a constructive manner, in the sense that, how do we... let us say, bring together people at a very small level, maybe even... because this panchayat cannot be organized. I suppose at very large cities and big places. It may have to start with some small places with the population which is manageable and so on. So if we are thinking of holding panchayats and organizing them at various levels. that itself is a very... I mean, instead of trying to put forth any demand, or asking for this or that, or mobilizing them for... towards a certain, let's say, agitation, or whatever, instead merely

bringing them together, is it possible for us to even gather people from various I mean, let us say, people who are engaged in various activities in a community. I mean, who are largely Bahujan, maybe even a few others who are not members of the Bahujan community, let us say the intellectuals or others. I mean, can we make attempts at even bringing them together? Because in the process of trying to bring people together to address any question, or even discuss anything. we might feel, I mean, we might understand the problems and also the consequences of this bringing together people, you know, how it helps in our own understanding, and how it helps in, maybe, resolving certain basic problems that our own people have. in, let's say, castes and communities coming together, are the Hindu and Muslim coming together in certain sense, you know? I mean, if they are two religions and groups, etc. How do they face each other? How do they... what do they talk? I mean, that... that process seems to be very interesting to me. I think we should try and... I attempt that. That would all be, you know, important, according to me, in the coming days, and if we can do that, I suppose. We would, make the first few steps towards understanding Saura, anything else? I have nothing more to say immediately. Maybe I will say something if, the discussion proceeds.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay, thank you. Yeah. Sunil?

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

You want me to respond?

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Yes...

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Mmm. See, I followed very closely what, Suresh said, and also what GSRK said. We need a... To define a window for us. From the point... from our strength position. We... we are not economists. We are not political scientists. We are none of these. Some of us are. For example, GSRK is a proper sociologist. Most of us are not. Our expertise as a group... or our... understanding, depths of our understanding as a group are on the... Knowledge-Politics Interface, where knowledge and politics meet in variety of ways. And, and this is not a... It is like, even if you go back to Plato, or Raja Janak, or Ashok here. You will find it is the knowledge and politics which constitutes the primary diad in some sense. You see, Plato's famous books, the most famous books which are taught first in the MA classes are Republic and Timaeus. Timaeus is about what is knowledge, and Republic is about the... about statecraft, or how governance should take place.

So, politics and knowledge. Are, in some sense... A primary, this thing places whose relationship between... the relationship between the two kind of provides a window to view the world. to look at technology, to look at the changes that are happening all around, to kind of look at the cultural changes, to look at philosophical changes. I am not saying that this is the only window. But our strength lies on an interface which constitutes a reasonably good window, historically also... see ... that knowledge science... knowledge-politics interface to look at the world. To understand the world better and better. One way to do it is... In practice, I think... we may not directly talk about, or we may not be interested, as Suresh says, in directly talking about a discourse, or constructing a discourse around, Pluri-enational state, Civilizational state. and other forms of state, that nation-state, the liberal one, the democratic one, the dictatorial, bourgeois dictatorship, this, that, proletarian dictatorship, all have been there in last 200 years. All kinds of debate have been there. There's a new interest. in this. the neoconservative sweep across the world has definitely created, and the Latin American tribal phenomenon. The two have very distinctly left an impression on the dialogues going on across the world on the question of new politics. On the question of what kind of state is... it is taking shape, and what kind of state needs to be built from different standpoints as if. I think... our discussion of this ... we are not entering that debate. But we need a context. for Saraj to be formulated in the larger framework. We need to use that language. We need to use the language which is kind of ... which is able to talk to both the secular nationalists and the cultural nationalists. We... we need to talk in a language which is able to dialogue with both these, the major these are the two major focuses, major foci around which the debate is constructed, not only in India, but also globally. the secular progressive on one side, and the neoconservatives on the other side. Rahul and Modi here, Biden and Trump there. And whatever else, at other places, maybe it's not easily so easily identifiable, the poles, but idea-wise, these are the poles, apparently the two main poles. They are not the only poles. If we have to grow out of this, if... If Mamdanis must cease to hold so much interest for us ... Mamdani is the name, right, who won in New York ... if they need not... if they are not going to be so attractive for us, it is necessary that we grow out of this this, bipolar... bipolar thought world. Secular progressive on one side, and neoconservatives on the other. They both may mean same things in various spheres, and yet may mean very different things in some other spheres. We know about this because it's happening in our own nation also. But we need the context. We need not discuss that, but we need the context to shape our language.

If we are going to talk about Bahujan Swaraj we are not... we cannot, in a sweeping manner, say that democracy doesn't work, and socialism doesn't work, and liberal democracy doesn't work, and nation doesn't work. We have to engage at some level. And this is the engagement which takes Swaraj to the global, debate.

It is... it is a... it is a... it is important to... to understand whether we should first clarify further amongst ourselves, or the level of clarity we have is enough, in the sense that there cannot be more clarity in a group of intellectuals like us. This is a group of ... I called it long back in 1984 in peasant seminar in Gandhian Institute ... I called our own group thinker-activists. Well, I don't know whether we are knowledge activists, or thinker activists, or activist thinkers, or whatever, but we occupy that space. So, and... and I don't think an agreement... greater than what we have with serious engagement with each other, with one another in this group, serious contentions with one another in this group, remaining open. I doubt whether a greater kind of cohesion can be obtained. I'm not sure. Others can say something about it, but I think we have enough cohesion to move forward. To take the ideas ... well to the national and to the global level ... in that it doesn't have to be one or the other, both can happen simultaneously, or it will depend upon our strength.

But I think the window is... the... our... our thing is... where I gave these 5 - Lokavidya, Ordinary Life, Bahujan, Swaraj, and Panchayat... and I think when I was working on this, and I have written some statements ... (to) these five ... I added art or morality as one more ... from abstract norms ... art or morality as the sixth one So, you get a total of, what is it? If you take relationship between any two of them. And if ARB is not same as BRA, Then you get 30 statements. P2, permutation of 6 taken 2 at a time. ARB and BRA are different. So, I have written out these 30 statements in Hindi. I will send it to, maybe Girish, so that a proper English rendering is done. And just for others to have a look at it. This is not to make an assertion of any kind. Just to lay bare, to lay the canvas, just to write on the blackboard, as if we are all sitting in a room where there is a blackboard, write on the blackboard for discussion to proceed further.

So this is a kind of our way, kind of where we come from. This is where we come from. And we want to discuss the various ideas of state prevalent today in the... at the global level, coming from Latin America, from Europe, from places like New Zealand, and wherever else it is ... India, and so on, and the Islamic states, and so on. So, the ideas of state will give us an opportunity And will force us to discuss everything, practically everything that was mentioned by Suresh. Nature of capital today. You see, it is... We can't take an economist's standpoint, and the economist's standpoint would always be less realistic than a political standpoint. In an economic ... class standpoint is always less realistic ... whether it goes up to welfare or whatever else it goes to in doing some good to the people of that country ... when the ideas of race, ideas of culture, ideas about gender, ideas about Bahujan and elite, whatever different ideas one may have about the oppressed classes, or suppressed classes, or the Bahishkrit samaj of the world, or in different countries ... An idea of economic class is certainly a weaker idea ...

(it) has been used by many to enter the big world. I personally feel, to enter the big world, the knowledge politics diad is a better... is a better entry point which... which... which kind of presupposes the minimum. I mean, has a smallest number of hidden premises. It has hidden premises, and they are expressed through this set of ideas, Lokavidya, Ordinary Life, and some six, seven that I mentioned. They relate to some kind of a ... not hidden agenda ... hidden premises through which we are going to approach. Not so hidden ... we have talked about them for the last 20 years, so they can't be called the hidden ideas anymore, anyway. So, I think if we... talk about Swaraj on par with various other ideas of the state. Start talking about it. I mean, different people amongst us will approach it very differently. But we should try that, and try to locate the discussion in the context of ... in the context of the ideas of states that there have been ... in which there is also the idea of Swaraj in Indian tradition. That is also, like the nation-state, we also had the idea of Swaraj. We also had a Mughal state. So, we can refer to any and every idea of state that there has been. To discuss and kind of try to focus on the idea of a contemporary idea of Swaraj. We may succeed, we may not, but then that is that. And there is no, there is no measure of success in this, I think. There is... there is... whether one is able to construct a, construct a substantial or substantive, discourse for it to make sense, both nationally and globally. I think the politics-knowledge interface is... this is our strong point. Let us... let us not be carried away. By the fact that so many falsehoods are being uttered, definitely the virtual world has taken the entire debate to a new level. But so was ... the debate on nationalism in the colonies took the debate to a different level altogether. So did Islamic resurgence during... not the early one, but starting with Iran, let us say. Not go back too much, but start with... go back to 1975, 78, like, when Fidayeen started in ... in Iran. Around that time, against the Shah, and against America, and against USSR, and against the entire West, and so on. When they started the dialogue. That... there must be a way from whatever we have been talking about to enter the global dialogue With a knowledge-politics interface. We are not discussing what universities are doing. We are not discussing what OpenAI or that Chinese AI, what is its name, is doing. We don't discuss that directly, but it is there in the context. What Suresh is saying has to be there as the context while we are talking about ourselves, our ideas, and some new ideas around Swaraj. That has to be the context. We can't focus our discussion on that. It will take nowhere ... take us nowhere. This is my view. that we can't focus our discussion anywhere other than a knowledge-politics interface in the global situation and in the national situation. That is where we are, and we can't be anywhere else by wishing to be so. That's all.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Yeah. Gandhi? Naresh ... Abhijit?

Naresh Kumar Sharma:

I, I don't have anything... all there to say ... I look forward to the 30 statement that Sunil mentioned ... 30 formulations ... Hmm... To add to what has been already spoken very clearly.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay. Gandhi? You want to say anything?

Krishna Gandhi:

Hello? Can you hear me? Yeah.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Krishna Gandhi:

Yeah, actually... Regarding this, last time also, I had, supported the idea that we should take our discussions to a wider level, nationally and globally. Second thing is that, these, ideas, actually, depends on the state of the society at any time. And I think, currently ... nationally and, worldwide ... there is a lot of ... that is ... questioning about established, systems of thinking. So, that's why we said that there is a lot of turmoil in people's minds, and people are puzzled by the turn of events. And, they are not able to digest many things. So, this is a very opportune time for us to participate in all kinds of debates. So... definitely, I... I think that the economic society ... starting from economics, is not a very sound position for us. So, I also support that point. We should start from either... the state, or politics and knowledge the interface kind of thing. Other than these, points, One thing is that you create... Of course, instead of merely, sort of, trying to generate ideas on the basis of our this thing, what we have been going through, you know...

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Your voice keeps going down.

Krishna Gandhi:

That may not be sufficient, although we have parts. Hello?

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Oh, God.

Krishna Gandhi:

Yeah. Are you able to hear me?

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay.

Krishna Gandhi:

Okay, so... So, although we have our strengths of having participated in various movements, etc. But, when Girish said that, some constructive kind of thing. I think, we can also think about those things, not necessarily some kind of a movement of... a political movement kind of thing. Because, for example, the idea of... local markets, for example. And, Sanjeev also has been, Saying something about local markets being the center of, that is, interaction of the lokavidyadhar etc. So, what I want to say is that, perhaps we can... think of, at least, connecting with those people who are, acting, or trying to do something like local markets and other things. So that can also be one way of, We have, this thing sort of advancing our ideas in other areas, other... with other people, activists, etc. So... What I want to say is that there are many openings, and let us explore them. And, try to, let us say, generate... interest in, ideas of Swaraj, and, Lokavidya, etc. And how to organize those, events, or how to... carry out the discussions, whether it is digitally or face-to-face, that also we can explore. I think we should be trying to, meet face-to-face wherever possible, and we should... focus on that instead of... doing merely, let us say, digital kind of over zoom, etc. So, these are some of my reactions. Thank you.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay, thank you.

Abhijit Mitra:

I don't know whether I'll be able to, say anything substantive, except that I, think that the bill has... I identified, the... the context, the bipolar nature of today's politics, essentially bipolar, not essentially ... only bipolar, essentially bipolar context. In that context, an attempt, to raise, the idea.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Your voice is very low. I bet you have.

Abhijit Mitra:

That is because I am rambling in my own mind while speaking out. Am I clear now?

Krishna Gandhi:

Yeah, you're not clear now?

Abhijit Mitra:

So I was...

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Yeah, yeah. Huh.

Abhijit Mitra:

What I, what I, what I said is that, I mean, Budhey has very nicely identified ... and I, you know, it is ... I found it very, very exciting. The way, he has identified, the current, political, status. Or situation, in terms of, the two essential two poles. And with that as a context to raise Swaraj, the idea of Swaraj, that is the way to go. That is all that I can say, that I agree it should be done. How it can be done, I have nothing to add to whatever is going on in the current discussion. That's not...

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

That's fine. Okay. Yes. Can't hear you. Have you finished?

Abhijit Mitra:

Yeah, yeah, I said yes, that's, that's all, yeah, yeah.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay. Alright, so... Let us meet next time with some definite agenda which we can pick out based on today's discussion. Sunil would be sending that, which I'll translate and send to all of you as soon as possible. Send the transcript also. There is just one (other) thing, 14 days from today comes to 26th. Actually, I have to go to Mumbai. And that may very well be on 26th ... or even 25th actually. So, I don't know, 26th may not be possible. Can we meet on 24th? Because I'll be back only... oh... after 30th ... or on 1st of December, or something like that. So, we may have to meet a couple of days earlier. 24th, maybe. That's Monday, or 1st or 2nd December. So... we'll work that out, but 25th or 26th may not be possible for me. So ...

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

It's okay for us.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

24th would be Monday, so... we can make it on 24th. Also, the Hindi meeting, they are supposed to be meeting on 15th ...

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

And I think they are working out something, so...

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

And they are going to talk about microfinance, as far as I know. I would, I'll talk to Jawandhia. He can definitely contribute to that. If any of us want to attend that, I suppose we can. I'll see how that invitation is going to come, etc. I mean, most probably, I'm not conducting it from here. So, let me talk to Parmita, and let's see how it works out.

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Ram Jannam and Parmita.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

That's all.

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Ram Janam will be running the dialogue, and Parmita will be looking after the technical side, as some such thing has been decided.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay.

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Talk to both of them, you may talk to both of them and find out.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Aha, I'll do that. I will do that. So, when are you likely to send whatever... Right up your head. Today.

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

I will say tonight.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay.

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Either tonight or tomorrow morning.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay, so I'll take a look at that, try to translate it, quickly. And send this, send the transcript, maybe in 3-4 days, but I don't know. So, let's decide to meet on 24th next. And I'll let you know about this 15th November meeting as soon as I learn about it. All right. Okay, so let's stop for today. Thanks.