

Transcript of Zoom Meeting at 5.00 pm on February 04, 2026

The video recording was started a bit late. However the saved transcript is full but is mostly uncorrected and has machine-made errors. For example, the Hindi words लौकविद्या (lokavidya), बहुजन (Bahujan), Swaraj (स्वराज) ... are rendered variously! But much of it is understandable. Request all to go through their own parts and send me corrections. The docx file is available in the shared Google Drive sub-folder 2026-02-04 in the shared folder [Lokavidya Debates](#).
– Girish

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Hello, am I audible? Hello. Uh, we... can start... today we are short, actually. Um, Gandhi is not there. Then Suresh is not likely to be there ... And Avinash sent the message just now... that his mother and sister are sick, both of them. So, he is not going to be able to join. So I think only... Whoever is here already, except Naresh ... I think only this is going to be the meeting today. I don't know if Naresh is joining at all... Ah, Naresh is there, okay. So that is it, uh...

So, nothing is fixed, I just wanted to start with the saying... that, uh... today is 4th February. We will have a meeting on 18th, which is the one fortnight from now... and since this is a 28-day month, we will have 4th and 18th again falling on Wednesdays in March. So, if we decide to hold our (Trust) Meeting, I mean, if it is online, and if we decide to hold it on Wednesday, then maybe we can hold it on 25th. Instead of breaking this sequence, because... together with today's meeting, we will have only 4 ... I think we will need all of them to sort of come to some kind of a... of program outline that we wanted to... Two meetings back, I think it was elaborated sort of... by Sunil, that we would like to have an outline of a program,, we may keep discussing it for a while... but we would like to have an outline for the next 3 years or so. And then, guided by that, we may... look at who can be the office bearers, etc., etc. So the rest of it uh... is uh... And then other things like, uh, how to organize the... whether there can be a CA outside Varanasi, and things like that. But the main thing of concern is... arriving at the program, and we have been discussing it for the... last, uh, two meetings, including the one in which it was started, uh, this 21st meeting and 7th in January. So this is the next one after that. Uh, one of them we had some discussion on, Bahujan Darshan also... uh... because Gandhi came up with some response to that (Note). But that is, again, an ongoing discussion, which may be a part of the program we decide. So, we need to talk... more about it, more explicitly, actually, and uh... I mean, what I'm saying is that... We may have to talk in terms of what exactly we are going to do. I mean, apart from the general ideas... which we have been sharing.

So, I would like to put it to you ... whether we can arrive at some kind of a consensus on... uh, the core program which has been suggested, I mean from various angles, that program maybe worked, and that is still... quite open. For example, like Swaraj, there was this question of uh... trying to look at... some of the, uh... I mean, some historical kind of uh... literature on that, not exactly literature, but practices... to search weather... uh, such practices existed... uh, and then...

but then, on that, there were different opinions which came up, including... how to read these instances which we find in history... uh, whether they can be regarded as... instances of self-governance, or whether they were... contingent upon, for example, ... that was something new, which, uh... No, I think GSRK talked about last time very specifically... where many of these things may have been... uh, things which were triggered by general loss of central power after the Mughals ... Mughal power declined. And, of course, in many places in India, several regional, sort of, uh... kingdoms, or whatever you call them, came up. where, in fact, that is where... many people from what we call OBCs today came to power, etc., etc. Many things happened... and in fact, many historians say that that is the period when ... over the later half of that period... Brahmin-like caste system started dominating. I mean, it's only that much old ... some 200 years, or whatever... whatever it is, the... Now, whether to read Swaraj in that was really not... I thought the... attempt we are making, but uh... I mean, we should try to see that as the general... task of, uh... Bahujan... developing a Bahujan narrative around that... with their Ordinary Life, Swaraj, Panchayat... Uh, etc., that we have been talking about. Whether we can use these instances to build that narrative, uh... in any, you know, substantial (way), whether they are helpful toward that, ... that is really the question. Not really the question of whether... they were genuine Swaraj or not genuine Swaraj. For example, even the fiscal system which we were talking about... uh, that fiscal system, ... of course, we are... nobody to talk about, you know, an imagination of fiscal system... I don't know whether we can do that... we don't have... that type of expertise... but the point was whether that kind of fiscal system can be used to trigger current imagination... among the Bahujan... Samaj members and activists. That was... Uh, so really, one has to look at it from that point of view. That is how I at least interpret the meaning of saying that all these tasks have to have a political edge. And this language of narrative, of course, already has that edge. That's what I thought.

Also in the same way, we have been talking about knowledge – power relation also for quite a while. In fact, Naresh talked... for a while about the... uh, looking at the organization of Lokavidya. And something which stuck me is... uh... something which... I would like to place here, right in... right now, I mean, nothing that is thought out in any detail... but I thought that the way we are looking at this knowledge - power relation in talking in terms of organization, this terminology, may not be very proper if you... anyone... may not be appropriate, rather... to, uh... to look for what we are trying to. And what strikes me is, you see, two terms which are... often used in studies of linguistics, even mathematics, uh... societies and so on... One of them is called 'morphology'. And the other is called 'topology'. Now, morphology basically relates to, you know, forms, structures, etc., organizations, et cetera, et cetera, whereas topology actually relates to the nature of spaces themselves... their connectivities, neighborhoods, proximities, etc., etc. So, it just occurred to me that maybe when we are trying to talk about the relation between knowledge and power, or knowledge and politics, then, what we are trying to say is that the topology of knowledge sort of determines or, uh, affects the topology of power. Not really the morphology. I mean, it's not in terms of the detailed organization, it's in terms of the spaces which... Now, for example, Lokavidya... has a different topology in this terminology compared to modern science. Entirely different. Otherwise, it is not possible to understand. Lokavidya, as we have been talking

about it, it lives in Ordinary Life, et cetera, et cetera. Whatever knowledge comes back to Ordinary Life is Lokavidya, etc. These things are not understandable unless you understand them. In terms of, you see, the nature of the Bahujan Samaj... uh, as a topological space, I mean, it may be a very, uh, I mean, odd kind of terminology to use, but I think it appropriately expresses the idea I am trying to sort of express that it is the nature of spaces that one is talking about. For example, to look at it another way, you see, US and China... they have... uh... are politically very different when you talk in terms... morphological terms. Their forms of politics are different, their organizations are different, the languages are different. Uh, their interrelations are different. But topologically, they are similar... and maybe identical. In terms of, uh... the proximities within politics in terms of connectivity is within those, etc., etc. So, uh, and I thought that Lokavidya has a completely different topology compared to science. So, when we talk of relation of knowledge with power, I think we have to keep this in mind, that we are... We have... we don't want to match them morphologically alone. Something which is topologically different cannot have identical morphologies. That is a given thing. Although, same topologies may also have different morphologies. That's a different thing, but... So, I don't know whether it catches the idea... If I am trying to... For example, if you ... earlier, sometime back, I was... there is one person called... VN Rao or something... Velacheru Narayan Rao... uh, he is in the... a U.S. University. He has written extensively... on Telugu, uh... you see narratives about history... uh, from 1600 to 1800, the medieval period, later medieval, or whatever it is. And he talks, uh, in terms of... he says that one has to talk about textures and not histories. Something like that. It's a different sense of history altogether. Uh, it relates it to memory, there's that, everything. So, I mean, there's something I just wanted to put in. Uh, in our discussion of the knowledge and politics, etc. So, when we want to understand this relation naturally, like I think Sunil mentioned in one of these (meetings)... like, for example, to most people, the relation between knowledge and quality or something, I think... It looks... uh, a proximate relation. But, knowledge and politics doesn't look... proximate. Uh, so to catch a sense of such things, I thought this may be helpful, and may be helpful even in understanding, knowledge, power, uh... I mean, different organization of Lokavidya, etc., etc.

So, okay, I mean, I wanted to just put this at this point. The discussion, as I said, is all open still. And we would like to sort of arrive at some kind of a... outline of program, I mean... We must aim that by 18th of March... the next four meetings... roughly. So, that is all I want to say. ... Okay. So, it's open, we can take off from anywhere where the last two meetings left. GSRK?

Sivaramakrishnan G:

I don't know, because your idea of this topology-morphological distinction is... quite interesting. One has to... maybe proceed further on that, and then see how one can comprehend this. But I don't know, I mean, this is quite interesting. First time I'm hearing something like this. Topological and morphological way of looking at this question. I wish you elaborate further, or maybe explore further in this direction. That is one thing that occurs to me immediately.

But about this, I mean, what I said last time about, our problem of, the... Pre, let us say, colonial times. when, I mean, let us say, after the Mughal... the fall of the Mughal, central rule. The

atmosphere that provides air, and so on. which can be mistaken for some kind of a, urge towards the assertion of the spirit of Swaraj and so on. That is how Dharampalji would like to look at it. Because he used to always say. That there is one way of looking at it. There is another way of looking at it. There are people who have always said that the Mughal rule, the fall of the Mughal rule, created quite a bit of chaos and confusion in India. they were all varying principalities and small kingdoms and so on. It was this atmosphere that, let us say, favored the entry of foreign rulers, the British and others, etc. But then it can also be considered as some kind of an assertion of the spirit of, independence that, the Mughal... the fall of the Mughal Empire provided. By which, you know, you find that small kingdoms, small rulers, etc, start asserting their independence, their autonomy. I mean, to that extent, I agree. It can be seen as some assertion of the lost autonomy, or independence. But then, does it also tell us that there was this idea of, Swaraj being, you know, central to this. I don't know. I'm not saying no, completely... I mean, empathetically, no. But it is difficult to see it as some kind of assertion of the spirit of Swaraj. Because Swaraj presupposes a certain positive kind of an attitude, not merely that there is a certain positive in the sense that people should feel that any rule other than their own is some kind of a burden, some kind of a... some kind of a fetter, some kind of... something which they have to resist, or they should, I mean, express themselves more in terms of their own autonomy, etc. If this was the spirit, that, characterizes Swaraj Let us say, after independence, and when we find that Gandhiji and others were talking of Swaraj, and there was this kind of urge, even within the Congress Party, that we must have for an independent, kind of village, communities, and this... because one of the ideas of, Congress, and Gandhiji was that we must have a constitution where... or we must have a structure where it will be a republic of so many villages, and they will send their representatives and that sort of thing. It's not the kind of parliamentary democracy that we had. But that did not happen anyway. The constitution that we had drafted was almost like a central... I mean, a union... unitary kind of a constitution, with some... some kind of concessions to federalism of sorts. Because the urge was to keep India united, strong, centralized, because there was always a fear of further partition, and then quarrels, and some territory going away, and so on. So the urge during the constitution making was that we must have a strong center. And that is why you see you, I mean, paid only lip service to federalism, of sort, and... but then retained all the central power. And even today, we have that kind of a problem. So, we had made compromises of that sort. But my question is something else, you know, the question is, if we think that people still have the urge towards Saraj in our villages, and that is what we think is still workable. where is the evidence of that? You know, because they have become so dependent on the state and the agencies to give them various benefits and concessions, and the urge in all villages and small areas is That we must have the development of a certain sort. We must have the... the, let's say, super highways, or this, or that. So... and they keep building more and more on things from outside to be delivered to them. Then, they're asserting that we, we will do it on our own. Except for some small stories here and there of people trying to do something on their own to mitigate their problems of water, or some other, you know, tank irrigation, or cleaning up of certain things that have not been done for ages. There are no evidences of people trying to say that we will do it on our own. We don't want outside interviews. It means more and more of total different. Everyone wants their development package to be given to them in more, let us say,

quantity, in terms of... and the complaint is always... we have been neglected. We are not receiving the kind of attention that others are receiving. We... I mean, it's the complaint of the states. It is the complaint of the districts, it is a complaint of Talks, so each... within each state, you have the same problem now. I mean, certain part of the state feels that it is neglected. For instance, Karnataka, North Karnataka thinks that it is not being given the kind of attention that Bangalore is getting, or South, you know, Karnataka is getting. This may be the story everywhere. Which means, you see, I mean, instead of a certain urge towards Faraj, and that we will do it on our own. There seems to be more and more argument in favor of our having to get it from the center, or the state, or... some other, you know, centralized system in terms of development grant, or in terms of other facilities, and so on. Now, if this is how it is. I don't know how do we build a Suraj narrative in a situation like this. This is all the questions that I have in mind. I don't know, we can keep talking about it further. I mean, in terms of how one perceives it. But this is the problem that I face, at least in terms of how do we build a narrative? That narrative is required, but then how do we build it? Because in a context like this. Where everyone is feeling that something should be delivered from somewhere, you know? They will not, assert their... So, this is... this is all that I have to immediately say. Let us see how it goes.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay.

Abhijit Mitra:

I have... first, I wanted to say something to Girish. See, when you are talking about morphology, topology, etc. can you come up with proper Hindi or regional language translations of these concepts, so these are totally related to how topology and morphology, these concepts are there, and... In the Western sense. Science, scientific sense. Morphology, is there in the study of... most biology and other things, you talk about morphology. Topology... is there a topology more in the mathematics domain? People talk about topologies and try to talk about it. At least, that is how I have come across these terms. But I can't think of... related Bangla terms, or Hindi terms. So that is something I would, like us to talk about. And the other is an immediate, response. To what, GSRK just now... spoke about... But I think, In a situation which is currently there. Because of the current dominant, Economic, scenario, the situation of the command, Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Yes, yes, yes.

Abhijit Mitra:

So, so, so basically, there are communities, and within communities, there are communities which are deprived of all sorts of resources. At the same time, the center makes accession or enrutes into whatever they think is their own birthright, they are in their position, they are being taken away, so these also have to be considered. It is not a one-way.

If you are living in a scenario. Then from within that scenario, there are... The fact that people, or life is going on in various places. In spite of the command economics and the... all those things, so that is the... where the specter... and that is done. That living, that life that goes on is on the basis of their own knowledge. I mean, there we have to see it. We can obviously see that if people, if the government is taking away, through taxation, anything you buy, you are paying taxes. Everywhere, then they come and take over land. They do so many things. and then they give it back specifically to certain places. Now, obviously, what JSRK is observing, that demand will keep on coming But... Is it the central thesis of how ordinary life is going on? So that is something that I think we have to definitely... because if we get into that thing that people want, we'll come to the conclusion people want development, because everybody is talking about development, and that is the narrative that is being built up. Including most of the so-called revolutionary political parties, or left political parties, liberal political parties, or those who are trying to provide leadership. Everybody, nobody can... nobody seems to be out of this. So, within that, these things will come. But the fact that people do come up and assert from a sense of position, or their right, and so on and so forth, that is there. How can we miss it? So, Swaraj, sparkles, I think have to be looked at, in, in, in those spaces. I... there's one more thing I remember. At one point of time, about... organization. political, economic, and other organizations, or organizations within communities, a lot of discussions had gone on. I don't remember very clearly all the things. But, for example, there was some discussion about rhizome. So, rhizome, when you talk about the rhizome and the way the rhizome, evolves, so that topology and the way modern science evolves, or, the way, certain, other types of organizations which are related to, that are there, that we can see in different places. So what Girish has been talking about, in terms of topology and morphology, there are many interesting things to be found there. It needs to be looked into. Apart from the fact that, of course, when we say that This decentralized versus centralized versus democratic centralism, these are all different types of topologies that we are talking about. So this is... these are the... some of the maybe slightly scattered comments that I wanted to put in. That's up.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay, thank you. Naresh? Naresh? Can you hear me?

Naresh Kumar Sharma:

Yes, yes, I can hear you.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay.

Naresh Kumar Sharma:

Actually, I... I have not got clearly what is the agenda of discussions. some ideas I have been hearing, so... Adhere, and... Somehow, I have not got clarity about the agenda, what he's talking about. I am assuming it is in context of the, the forthcoming... Trust meeting. But Exactly is... is

this some of the ideas that need to be discussed, or is it... How we related to society? What is? the agenda, so maybe, Others can continue. Krish or Sunil, and if I get some clarity on Agenda, I'll come back.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay. No, no, I... the ideas yes, but they are being discussed with the... with the... I mean, the attempt is to arrive at... a program which one can take up for 3 years... So, basically, we are talking about ideas which may aid that. I mean, that's what I thought.

Naresh Kumar Sharma:

Oh, okay, okay. Maybe, maybe the initial sentence I missed here. Maybe the first one minute I missed, maybe. Yeah, you're not just be it.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay. Krish! Kriesh, would you... huh? Yes...

Krishnarajulu:

Yeah, I... I just want to... add one thing, I mean, when you talked about topology and morphology and all that stuff. I see, and the example that you gave was... I think appropriate and relevant to think that is... The topology of Lokvidya, the space in which it operates. I mean, largely, defined by ordinary life. It's quite different from the discourse of modern political economy or politics. Or modern science, the space, it's quite different from... What we know... what we'd like to talk about is... that experiential people science, I mean, the kind of beach. Which people, I mean, scientists term as empirical knowledge. But, so, see, the knowledge, so, in the knowledge domain, it's... you can see the distinction. You can't actually get into this space of, Where, you know, modern science operates, and modern scientific theories, political science, social science, etc, etc. And use that space to discuss what we are saying, locality. And vice versa. Okay, if you try to do that, then you get into certain problems which are intractable. From this point of view, one more example I'll add, and then I'll just go on to something else. You see, the... The space in which We talk about... Say, local market. We called it look with your bazaar. Is not the space in which modern economic theory has been formulated. It doesn't operate. You can't. You can't understand Lokvitya Bazaar in the... In the space of... Modern political economic theory. It doesn't... it just won't work vice versa. So, if you try to... Put forth this idea. of a Logwidya Bazaar in... The current prevailing context, which is general... all over the place, I mean, it's not merely within the kind of circles in which we operate, but even within Bahujan Samaj. You'll see, there will be a problem in trying to understand. What we are saying about local market. Now, so... This is the thing, we are trying to... Make formulations in a space that is quite different from the common Commonly. acknowledged space. People understand it. So, which brings me to the other question, which is... what, we were talking about, I think, the last few meetings. See, it's important to see that when we talk about Swaraj. And whatever we are saying is Swaraj. We've been talking about Swaraj for about... almost 2 years now. And, we've come up with different,

ideas about what we mean by Swaraj. And, I think, what is important? Is to see, or at least build upon, D... consciousness of Swaraj that exists in Bhujan Darshan. That is, within Bahujan Samaj, What is the consciousness? Whatever small level it might... Be retained as, etc. About Swaraj. And Swaraj, in every sense, you know, D. self-governance. The way decisions are taken, and so on, so discussions are conducted, etc. One must examine And this can be done in various local contexts. What is the consciousness about this for us that exists? You see, I'm saying this, for example. I mean, we know about this, we heard about this. See, this... Jatkarpanchay seems to be fairly powerful, even today. That is... Within that local context, there is a consciousness that Dispute resolution is best done through the Kap and Chait. Nope. You can't evaluate that consciousness in modern, legal, jurisprudence, or whatever it is called, whatever modern terms that we have about, what is, what is the method of conflict resolution? You see, this consciousness... I mean, similar kind of thing that exists. You see, some people are talking about the mandala system. of self-governance. That is the harking back to something that existed, maybe, Many, many years ago. Does the consciousness of the mandala system still remain, to whatever extent, within Bahujan Samarj. If it does, then one can try to build up on that. And then tried to see Formulate ideas of... Swaraj, Bahujan Swaraj, in a modern context. Now, all these, things, the examples that... which have been coming up, and recently Girish's post on the group about, somebody talking about, the mandala system, etc. You see, they were... remember that the... Global context has completely changed. Today, we have a capitalist market economy. And all discussions, social, political, economic. Cultural, anything is only in that space. you can't talk about... there's no point... it's all right. Historical reminiscing about the glory of the mandala, or some such thing. I mean, it might give you some, emotional, satisfaction or something, or you can pat yourself on the back that you are, The descendant of such a tradition. But that's about all. it does not... I mean. If you're going to say that we want to build on this to counter the current, debate, you know, whatever's going on, international debate about governance and rule-based interactions, etc, etc. You see, that'll happen only if... This consciousness Of having whatever kind of rule-based or system of governance or whatever decision-making. If that consciousness, to whatever extent, exists in Bhujan so much, Jane could build on that. If it does not exist, Then... It's alright. You see. We've been talking about social, socio-political change. For the past 50 years, Which is supposed to be brought about by the people. Okay, I remember long years ago, that fellow CPP Sing. I don't have any great respect for him, but he did say something which is relevant. He says. At one of those meetings, early meetings, he says, don't think that we have become little, little linens. Oh, Shay Govarez, over to it. We are not... we are not... that Vanguard group. We're not trying to formulate a theory, political change, for a Vanguard group. It is immaterial what our personal beliefs are. What the people believe in. I mean, what is part of, let me call it, their belief system? About even things like Swaraj, self-governance, decision-making, this, that, the other, economic organizations, exchange, local market, this, that, the other. If... if you can... Because, based on that, if you can... Create a situation, or rather, a moment, that brings about some kind of social change. That is what we aim to do. So, if you're talking about Shwaraj, fine, because that is an idea that has been prevalent for a very long time. In India, at least. And... We have to identify, in the local context, what are those elements of Swaraj that still exist or persist There could be various elements, but to different extents. within Bahujan so much, and then try to understand it.

And maybe through the Bahujan Gyanpanchajits, these things get talked about, elaborated upon. then you can build a version, Darshan on Suraj. Abhojan Swaraj. Right, yes Other ways. We'll get caught, like... all of Indian polity in the past 70 years. Or even earlier than that. Except, Gandhiji's... Efforts at trying to change the context of the discussion. From the realm of modern political theory, economic political theory, to something else. to the realm of, let me call it, the Lokvidya space. Maybe he tried it. And a few others did. But other than that. All the debate, everything people think is... then they revert to this kind of... You know, this kind of politics that we have today. everything. I mean, there is no patience to listen to anybody. I mean, at all. In every sense. Okay, so we've all got our heroes here and there, but what I'm saying is we need to... I think make an effort. If you're going to do some program for the next 3 years or something, if you want to formulate something like that, then it's important for us to, at whatever level, whatever way we can, wherever we are. And the age group that we belong to. We should shed them. Our old ideas of What we have acquired about social change, historically, and other things. And try to see what is that that the people the consciousness that still exists, towards building something like Swaraj. Because... It's now, this multipolar world. you know, plurry national world, or whatever it is. I mean, this consciousness is now creeping in in the other space. That modern political theory is saying that, oh, this way of doing... but it's all about controlling the capitalist market economy. That has been the... Task for the past 200 years. Even what Mark suggested was also how to control the capitalist market economy. Who would control it, how to do it, etc, etc. And... It's a matter of things have been going on and on. And finally, what we have. We've landed a width. A whole series of, essentially, dictatorships, fascist dictatorships, all over the world. Nobody seems to think that anything else is different. You replace one fascist dictator by another one. And hope that solutions... it'll never happen. It can't happen. Because modern capitalist economy is based on very severe, intense competition. Intense centralization. Intense resource mobilization, and Like the old days, go to war. to capture resources. I mean, there is no element of Swaraj in that sense that we're thinking about in all of this. There's nothing. What is Varaj? For them, nothing. See, so, you can't keep talking about this in that space, and so I think that if we can conduct, more Bhojan Gyanpachites, within Bahujan so much, within Bhujan so much. We can meet every two weeks here within ourselves, as we meet doing. That's a different matter. But we should try to do, where we can, go and talk to those people. Find out what is it that the local communities, the local Whatever they are. Whether they're village committees, or caste communities, or communities here and there, all language committees. See, what is it that they... What are the elements of Swaraj that still persist or exist in Bhujan consciousness? And then try to build on that. Try to talk about it within them, and see whether some real ideas which will... cause of mobilization of... within Bahujan so much, Towards some kind of change. And the change will be in all levels, like Gandhiji said. Not only between the community, but in the personal level also, there will be change. And if that happens, then people will... will then move to God, to the change. So we should make a consciousness of that. And the discussions that we have within ourselves. The topology that... the space is just modern space. We've been trained in that space. See, you can't escape that. And maybe, if you want to dialogue with other similar people like us, then we need to talk in that space, because... but if you're going to talk in... in Bahujang Panchar, there's no point in talking about this space. Absolutely not. We'd rather get... try to make a transition, as far as we

can, into that space, and then talk in the space in which the Lokvidya space, Bohojin consciousness space, and see what is it that we can... ideas that we can get about Bohojin Sumaraj. This is it. Thank you.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay. Chitra ji... you are muted...

Chitra Sahasrabudhey:

गिरीश ने जो बातें रखी है वह मैं... तो नए शब्दों को चर्चा में लाया है। सब। हम को लगता है ये अलग अलग क्षेत्रों से जितना इस तरह के की शब्दावली आ रही है पहले हम लोग इसको कहते थे कि क्रिस्टलाइज हो रहा है समाज अ: गांधीजी के इसमें अ:कला की दृष्टि से हमने देखा कि जब बिखराव हुआ तो अलग अलग समाज अ बेसुरे हो गए एक दूसरे से सहयोग करना ये तो समाज को देखने के अलग अलग तरीके हैं और यह देखने और यह शब्द जितने आए वह शायद स्वागत योग्य होने चाहिए अपने इसमें क्योंकि वह अलग अलग आयाम सामने के आते हैं, जिसे स्पेसज का यह आया या फिर रचना के कुछ नए एंटीबायोटिक एयरफोर्स उसमें से निकल आते हैं। तो इसका तो स्वागत है। और दूसरी बात, यह हम कहना चाहते थे कि अ: जो हम लोग अ: नया एक आख्यान बहुजन समाज का लिखना चाह रहे हैं या लिखने का आह्वान किया है उसमें एक प्रयोग यहां अभी चंडीगढ़ में कल परसों कुछ एक कार्यक्रम हुआ जिसमें हिंदी साहित्य के पांच कथाकारों का कि पांच कहानियां चुनी गईं विभाजन पर और अ: उनके कैरेक्टर्स के मार्फत इतिहास का दरवाजा करते हैं। तो क्या प्रमुख जो कैरेक्टर्स थे, उनके स्वभाव पर इतिहास का दरवाजा खोला गया है? मतलब कुल मिलाकर, उन्होंने यह कहा कि कई तरह के एक कैरेक्टर्स हैं जिन्होंने विभाजन को देखा है। एक ने कहा, एक कैरेक्टर को ये था जिसमें अमृता प्रीतम, मोहन, राकेश और अगेय की दो कहानियां और कृष्णा सोक्ति के कप्तान इस तरह से पांच छह कहानियां अ: उसमें से कुछ कैरेक्टर्स में बदला लेने की भावना को प्रमुख कहानी का विषय बनाया। किसी ने प्रेम का और फिर से वापस भाईचारे का अ: किसी ने फिर से जिंदगी को कई लोगों के बीच में सही ढंग से के साथ बिताने की बात रखी तो कुल मिलाकर यह अलग अलग एककर के कार्यक्रम का उद्देश्य था कि ये जो अलग अलग भाव उभर कर आए, वो आज की दुनिया में हमें बताते हैं। कि केवल बदला लेने का ही भाव एकमात्र भाव नहीं है जो आज के राज, सत्ता और इसमें प्रोत्साहन दिया जा रहा है। समाज में उसके लिए अ: और भी कई भाव हैं। और हम लोग चुनने के लिए स्वतंत्र है। क्या तो बदले का मार्ग चुने या तो भाईचारे का चुने या लोगों के साथ एकत्र होकर कुछ बातों को नहीं खड़ा करने की यह सोचे। तो यह एक अ: बता रहा है कि नए आख्यान किन किन किशोरों से लिखे जा सकते हैं? जितने कैरेक्टर्स थे उनके मार्फत एक नए आख्यान लोगों के लिखा जा सकता है। यह बात उस कार्यक्रम का मुख्य विषय थी। अ तो ये एक नया प्रयोग था। तो हमें ये लगता है कि बहुजन समाज को समझने के लिए इन सारे मतलब विविध आया तरह के अ: दृष्टिकोण हो सकते हैं, लेकिन उन सारे दृष्टिकोणों को हमें एक साथ कैसे अ: ले सकते हैं जो मानवीय संवेदनाओं को जो उत्तेजित करके एक स्वराज की चेतना को आकार आज की परिस्थितियों। तो ये केवल बात हम रख रहे थे।

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Ok. सुनील जी आप बोलेंगे?

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

हाँ, थोड़ा ... दो बात ..., ये जो टोपोलॉजी वाली बात गिरीश ने कही as distinct from morphology or structure or paradigm type की बातें... We have used a different term to understand this... हम लोगों ने ... जैसे हम लोगों ने गांधी के context में कहा we said that, he tried to build a different public domain... when you... Build... build a different location of... Discourse. A different location of dialogue, Using terms and references. That were not very meaningful in the dominant domain. So, he was trying to build a... we tried to do that, if you recollect. We had created an idea of Lokaidya Tana Bana. This is before

the... at the time of, that is, in preparation to the... to our Bombay meeting. Bombay meeting must be 2013. दो हजार तेरा ... We, लोकविद्या ताना-बाना... whether, in the name of Lokavidya Tana-Bana, some writings were done, we could erect a different kind of public domain and this is precisely what one is saying when apparently. When one is talking about the topology. Where you are located, what is that space? And how that space is... Not the same as the received space, where most of the dialogue like, talk about knowledge and polity goes on, that's a different space. That is an... this... this has been addressed in various ways earlier. Like, we used to say that, that the Brahmins of... Maharashtra, West Bengal, and Tamil Nadu. Take precedence. And have a higher status. Even among the Brahmins, Across this country, Because they came from metropolises. And they knew how to conduct our how to talk in the imperial domain. those coming from Mumbai and Pune, or coming from Calcutta, or from Chennai knew how to talk, how to communicate, how to express themselves. In the public domain which was emerging, namely the imperial domain under the British Rule. And that placed them ahead of others in very different... very definite ways. For example, one of my friends here from Tamil Nad, although he was born and brought up in India, in Paranas. He said. that the Tamil Brahmins think that the Brahmins of Benares do not know... their pronunciation of the Vedodhar is wrong. that they don't know how to pronounce the Veda... when Vedod chart takes place, when Vedas are narrated. Or, spoken out aloud. The Tamil Brahmin says that the Brahmins of North India do not know how to do that. This thing, pronunciation is wrong. Now, this is rather strange. It is like us telling a man from Wales or London that your English pronunciation is not good. It's something like this. Now, it's a question of power. Because he knows how to talk to the dominant system, or how to talk in the dominant system, so his word carries to some extent, to whatever extent. So the... we have encountered this. All I am underlining is that the idea of a different public domain A need for an idea of a different... a need for a different public domain. for ideas like Swaraj to be discussed and to be popular. It is in the process of building a different... for example, you see what Gandhi is... Gandhi is talking about a self-sufficient village. There exists no self-sufficient villages In 1900, there exist no subs... they have been broken down more than 100 years ago. There are no self... and yet he's talking about self. There is... There is a face-to-face society in the name of a village. But there is no self-sufficiency of any kind. And yet he is talking about that, and making sense. People are not talking about self-sufficiency. And yet he's talking about self-sufficiency and making sense. I mean, I am partly answering what GSRK said about there being no discourse or discussion among the people, from the people, or by the people. on the idea of Swiraj. you see transformative ideas. I don't know whether Saraj is a transformative idea or not. That will be decided only on the... in the battlefield, as it is called. but you look at Karl Marx, he wrote Communist Manifesto in 19... 1848. And one of the sentences, characteristic sentences I remember when I read that, long back. He wrote that he alone is a communist who belongs to a communist party. And I said, there are no Communist parties in 1848. the first German Communist Party, I mean, the critique of Gotha, the Gotha program comes somewhere around 1880 or so. There is Working Men's Association, International Working Men's Association, without there being any Communist Parties as such. The ideas are there. He's talking about a revolution based on worker majority. And even England doesn't have a worker majority at that point of time. It develops a worker majority only at a later time, sometime around 1890 or so. when the Paris commune is taking place, the discussion is that most of France

lives in rural areas. And they are fighting a battle to uproot bourgeoisie from the saddle. I mean, what are we doing? what are... I mean, what will you be doing once people are already talking about Faraj, then you are not needed. Then you have no role to play. If at all you have a role to play, you have a role to play before it has actually happened. And facilitate the process of happening by foresight. If you can't do that. You don't belong to a political prop... a change-oriented political space. You're not there at all. You are a scientist of some kind, social science, you read social science. It says explicitly that it talks about what has already transpired. It don't talk about the future, but the politics talk about... talks about the future. A new imagination talks about the future. But the social science only talks about what has already transpired, what has already happened, post facto. And even the very... Welcome! critics from that area, Carl Mannheim, Sociology of Knowledge. Says, let us talk about thought. Let us talk about metropole thought, for where else can thinking exist other than in metropolises? You see, these are the ideas. If we take them very seriously, then there is no program for change can be evolved. A program for change always looks into the future, future, looks into spaces which have not taken shape. And by using a certain terminology and certain types of discourse and dialogue and narratives, it tries to create that space Which, when takes shape, a change becomes imminent. Change cannot become... unless the change becomes imminent. Large numbers are not for change. They can be only for change when change becomes imminent. All this discussion has taken place in the 20th century and before. Why do we go back to that again and again? what I'm saying is... that... Our job, just as we created... I said this last time also. The... the... from... from the knowledge space, what we observed in the knowledge space at the turn of the century, around 2000, little before, little after that. laws... that, there is a conflict. of paradigm. And conflict also to the space in which they belong. If there could be a software engineer. who could carry a name in Kenya, With confidence and with respect. Without knowing any physics. or chemistry. There were no engineers before that who knew no physics or chemistry. Don't go to the 18th century. After the respect of science has been established, institutionalization of science, that is, after early and mid-19th century, there could not have been an engineer without knowing any science. But you had software engineer without knowing any science at all. The idea of software has got nothing to do with science as such. It's a language paradigm. which you must be able to handle. Formal languages is what you must be able to handle. The logic of formal language is that you must be able to handle, and not physics and chemistry. So the topology had changed. The computer discourse belonged to a different space altogether. And also, because the topology has changed, as Girish said, I think, that if topologies are different, then morphologies cannot be the same. A same topology can have different morphologies, but if topologies are different, you can't have the same morphology. You can't have the same paradigm of understanding, of doing whatever is called science, if the two sciences belong to different topologies, have different topologies, belong to different spaces. So, if computer and computer-related activity, mainly the soft activity. Belong to a space which is different from the space of hard sciences. There was a conflict in the knowledge domain of the kind in which you could come up with ideas or knowledge which were not given any respect earlier. Lokvitya was called Kwakkari earlier. Traditional knowledge, whatever that meant, was called quackery. There were no concept of knowledge traditions at all. You could talk about traditions of knowledge, you could talk about living traditions, you could talk about local vidya in

the space which was... which was created because of this conflict. That new topology had emerged. From within the older one. And yet, the conflict was so strong that spaces were created. We said that explicitly, and Vidya Ashram came into existence in that space only. And now, Now look at what is happening. It's not just multipolarity that... multipolar world that one is talking about. Neoconservatives have come up. In half of the world. neoconservatives have come up, which are different from the secular, progressive lot. Completely different from the desirable or undesirable, I'm not talking about that. They have come up in a different... they have created a different political space. multipolar world, a conceptual apparatus have come on the horizon, and the discussion has... there is a serious discussion on the idea of a multipolar world. Now, just today, there was a news that yuan... yuan is the... is the currency from China. What is that? Yuan, right? Is, is about to challenge the dollar. And dollar is the biggest secret of their power. All this is coming now. In an open dialogue. Many people are talking about these things, more from Russia, maybe, to start with. But from many places, it is coming. So, there is a multipolar world. the politics, there is a multipolar world which challenges the earlier concept of imperialism, comes with a new idea of imperialism, maybe. Challenges the old concept of sovereignty that took shape. starting after the French Revolution, after the early 19th century, finally taking shape in a big way, when national independence movement succeeded through the Second World War. And sovereignty, the idea of national sovereignty took shape on a global scale. They are talking about sovereignty in a different sense. They are saying that the multipolar world conception is promoting an idea that only civilizational states can have sovereignty. There is no concept of a national state having a sovereignty. Only civilizational states have sovereignty. So, multipolar world, civilizational state, sovereignty, etc, are new ideas which have created the space for what was put on the look with their dialogues, look with their list in WhatsApp group, namely the mandalas. We were talking about... we had already talked about, in the context of Bhawjan Swaraj Panchayat, whether this global context We can take the idea of Swaraj to a global discourse. And let us not imagine, we had said that, that first, let us be clear about the national discourse on Swaraja and a local discourse on Saraj, then only we can go for a global discourse on Swaraj. I don't think it is linearly ordered like this. what will happen first, and what will happen after that? The priorities will be defined, will be, It will depend upon the politics of the times. They are not theoretically determined. So, maybe you will start first. What is it? Multipolar world? The idea is starting with the global scale. Why can't the idea of Faraj first crystallize on the global scale, and then, become popular in more... just as the concept of Mandal, which has come up, come back in this, in this, context? new global discourse. Why can't Sharag be taken there? Why do we have to wait for our people to say that we want Saraj, for Saraj to be taken there? This would be hawkish. This would be a backbencher attitude. I mean, we are... we are not backbenchers. I mean, we may have been backbenchers in the classes we sat, for various reasons. But we have not been backbenchers in any kind of dialogue, political knowledge, or any other space for that matter. Why should we be backbenchers in the context of politics? I don't see any reason. A political imagination. No reason at all. We are frontliners. I'm not saying that we are a Vanguard group. There is a difference. We are not a vanguard group, maybe. That's a different kind of question that we need to answer. But that the idea of Swaraj can be taken to the global level. And there can be a national discourse Suppose we say, now, let me suggest, there is, in this UGC committee thing, there is a huge

conflict going on on the campuses. And maybe somewhat outside the campuses also. about implementation of the UGC, the law, or the intended law which was state by the Supreme Court. Government is all gaga. Keep fighting. They are very happy. But... The point for us is. Whether we can formulate the idea That better educated you are, Better placed you are. for creating a new Saraj. Can we speak to the Baghdadian leadership? Can we speak to the Baudyan Samaj? formulating the idea that, yes, you must be better educated, you are right, you must have an equal space there, and once you do that, you see, I recollect this, I just want to show you this, there is a popular way of saying nowadays, quoting Ambedkar, I don't know whether Dr. Ambedkar said this. But they say, struggle... to be educated. And educate yourself to change society. There is this. I remember reading Lenin, about... Workers being educated properly. He says that if workers are educated. They will wage the class struggle better. So, his position was, seek education. To struggle better for a new society. And now, what is being popular? what is popularly coming in the discourses I read on Facebook and other places is that struggle for education, and educate yourself for change. The other one has been shelved. It should not be shell. That is... that is a competing idea. They are both actually equal ideas. I think if you mix the two together. The dialectics of these two ideas will constitute the new space. Where you need to carry out the discourse. The relationship between Between education, struggle, and a change on the larger scale. On the social scale. How these three, kind of create... how they become sometimes a sufficient condition and sometimes a necessary condition for the other. Sometimes a consequence, and sometimes an antecedent. we can... we can sit with these three ideas and very easily see that, that it... the... the relationships remain in flux. You can't pin them down to one kind of relationship. So, why can't Saraj be discussed in this context? Why can't we say that when... if Bahudan is better educated. He can build a new society, which is his. We... we... of his leadership. A society of his leadership. can be built when he is better educated, and that society will be called Saraj. Why should we get bogged down by an idea of Swaraj that was there at the Maratha period, or in some, earlier, what Dharampal talked about in 18th century? It has got nothing to do with Swaraj. They talked about one idea of Swaraki. If different concept of sovereignty has already taken shape. What holds us back from creating a new idea of Saraj? Obviously, there is space in the global debate If the global debate is talking about sovereignty of a new kind, or sovereignty that is rooted somewhere else, say, in a civilization. then why can't Saraj be talked about and... At... also at the national scale. Why can't we say that a civilizational state is... can be built only by the Belgian Samaj in the name of Saraj? There is no other path to civilizational state in India? Or maybe elsewhere, also at other places. Why can't we say that? We can say that Where is it that you go to get your ideas ratified? The ideas are not... we are not deciding on what is correct and what is not. What may take us forward and what may not take us forward at this point of time. Whether it is correct or not is going to be decided in the battlefield. When the struggles take place, when the change is impending, when the change is imminent, only then is decided what may be correct and what may not be correct. We are not deciding. We are only looking at ideas which may take us forward. Which may take us closer to the people, which may enable us To listen to the people, which may enable us to talk to the people, which may enable us to construct new organizational apparatus. See, look at the... look at the Kisan Andulan from Uttar Pradesh. It brought back the idea of Panchak. In a very big way. Dr. Lohia talked about Panchayat, but all his

Panchayats were nothing other than unions. And now what has... it has inverted itself. The Kisan Andolan in UP Calls itself a union, but talks about only Panchayat. It's very interesting. Dr. Loya talked about panchats, which were unions. And now this Kisan Andolan talks about unions which are panchats. Why do... why do we want to prejudge issues? We know so many committees here, the left formations, which talk about the committee process. They don't take a single decision in the presence of the people. The Panchayat takes all decisions in the presence of the people. This is a huge difference between the two. It's a question of choice. It's not a question of correctness. Both will deliver, but they will deliver different things. or they may not deliver at all, that is a different story. But if they deliver, they will deliver different things. We are familiar with this Hajamgarh movement, a long enough movement and a good movement against the land grab for, for expanding the airport or something. A huge movement that has continued for a long time. controlled by the left. Not a single decision has been taken in the presence of the people. They always withdraw to a room, a committee sits and takes a decision. And this is what happened. These left people have come to work among the... among the artisans, among the weavers in Benares. Manatkash.in is their reference. I mean, where they exist, they say. We have had long discussions with them. And when one of our meetings in the Bunkar Samaj, in a locality. was not allowed by the administration. We said some 50 people had gathered already, that we'll sit down informally and decide where we will meet. They said, no, we will not sit here informally to decide on that. They went back to their committee meeting, where they decided what to happen. So, it's a matter of choice. It's not... it's not... it's not a given thing that you have to follow this path or that path. It's a matter of choice. That the people have this choice. The people followed the Panchayat process in a big way. Bahujan, whom we are calling Bahujan, followed the Panchayat process in a big way, We are always... Always suspected the committee process. This is the reality. You may invert it if you like, depending upon the kind of work you want to do and you're able to do. So, what I'm saying is that we have, at the moment, 3 layers of... in the context of our program, developing our program, three layers. One, an actual program among the people, or among the activists, which is... which is being given shape to... from Varanasi. Until Lokavidya Janandolan was... like, first about 7-8 years of Lokavidya Janandolan. Many regions, Maharashtra, Telugul land, with their paper and so on, Prapanch. and, some other places, Singeroli and other places, they all had, a Lukvidya Janandolan unit, and it worked, among the people, with the people. That possibility has become... apparently, that possibility has become weaker now. with the... with this time of another. For example, the Shadkari Sangatna base may not be as good to start a new kind of thing now than it was some 10 years ago for Luk Vidyajanandula. This only, Girish or Javan Diya can assess. But certain kind of work is already going on. in the name of Bhawjan, in the name of Lokvidya, in the name of Saraj, in the name of Panchayat, and so on, in Varanasi. So, there will be a level of program... an aspect of program at this level. There will be another... At the level at which we carry out these discourses. Whether we can create those ideas, which can be taken to practice. Through a larger discussion, global and national, in a group like the one we are sitting, some 10 people or 12 people, whoever we are. So, at this level, some different conceptualization will have to take place. And with this, I think the cardinal ideas are Bahujan, Swaraj, Panchayat, Lokvidya, Ordinary Life, Kalamarg, and so on. or the moral aspect of these things, and so on. This is what we have listed in Bhagan Darshan. But that is talking about it, whether a program which is

well-knit with it. in reasonable correspondence with it, can be developed, and shall we need, then. Not just a change of guard, not just a change of... office bearers is imminent. It has to be done, because we will not be able to function anymore. All... I mean, this is one reason, and we function for long enough, so... A change must take place in the guard, in the office bearers, At another. A change... a bigger change can take place in the organization of the ashram itself. If we are prepared to do that, that will involve handling finances differently, handling communications differently, making committees of a different kind. It will depend upon whether we are ready to take up that job. Now, again, it... we will have to write the memorandum again in a... in a reasonably big way. transform the memorandum, Into something new. If we think we are, prepared to do that, we can attempt to do that. But that may be a very large task. So, this... all this may be, kept in mind. And additionally, I may inform this group. that, I had started talking to Various people about a commitment for next 3 years. financial contribution. And, at the moment, the commitments that I have, Are to... of the tune of 15 plus. every year for 3 years. 15 lakh or little more than 15 lakh for 3 years. I mean, this is the base amount that this will come, because this is... people have given the commitment, so... This much will come. So, a new... whoever takes the charge up fresh, and everybody here must think about it carefully. We can go through, first, a change of guard, a change of... into new, say, office bearers. And then think about the larger change, if desired. The... the change of structure itself. If we want to locate ourselves, you know, if we want to do... we want to change our topology, let's be very clear. Then, a morphological change would be desired. That means, if we want, Vidya Ashram wishes to locate itself. In a new world of a different kind than we were located in so far. Then we will need to change the memorandum reasonably to suit that. Some deep thought is required for all this, but I think, well, we should go through an exercise. We may do that or not do that. But we should go through an exercise. And, see whether it is. Like, like, finance has to be handled differently, like, organization to be worked in a different manner. Like, it could be a different kind of, setting. 3 or 4 major centers, say, Nagpur, Bangalore, Calcutta, and Banaras. Where different centers have different strengths. It is not as if the program is same for all the centers. Different centers would have different strengths. Would take the lead in different kind of Actual activity, dialoguing as well as action, both. depending upon... maybe ni... maybe not both, only one. So, it all depends upon how we want to go about it. But Bonaris can continue as a substantial, concrete location of activity. that the people are there, and it's going on also. It can be continued with an expanded idea also. This... this others may feel confident about. So maybe... maybe someone needs to put some of these things in a more ordered fashion, in a more organized fashion by listening to, what is the... listening to the record. AP, a statement can be read in maybe 2A, 4 pages or something. All that has transpired today on the question of... on all these questions, whatever we have talked about. Maybe a paragraph each, some 4, 5, 6 paragraphs like that. If someone can do that, We will have a good enough focus. To go further from here, and not, kind of, keep expanding in an unlimited, indefinite way. wo base banjayaga aaphir. If one of us can do that, This thing. A compact statement of... Just about 1,000 words, maybe, less. Hmm. nikki. To start thinking from there on, then, and not go back again and again. Because we need to conclude this discussion on organization and program. by, let us say, the first week of March. What was Girish suggesting?

Maybe... We... next meeting will be on 14 days from now. 18th. And then in March 14... 4th and 18th. 4th is... maybe holi, so we can have 3rd, or 5th or whatever...

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

No, I was suggesting we can have Trust meeting on 25th. So, we have clear four meetings before that, including this. Because it was anyway going to go to end of March, so...

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Let us work it out along that line. We will have to have... I think we will have to have the meeting online only, the Trust meeting, this time.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Yes, yes, that's why for 25th. That's why 25th, Wednesday.

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Even, it won't be workable here, it cannot be easy. Hmm. Or... Or other possibility to have 3 clear meetings. And the fourth one be the trust meeting.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

But the fourth one then falls on 18th... no ... which... the fourth one... three after this, then the fourth one will fall on... in April, if we... but we don't want to go to April. In March, it is 25th. See, 3 more clear...

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Okay.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

18th February, 4th March, and 18th March. These are 3 clear meetings. From today. I mean, after today

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

So, is... is two meetings not enough after this? Once we get that statement. About a thousand words. After that, two meetings.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Then after 2 meetings, then it... then we skip 18th and go to 25th, because that meeting has to be end of March, right? Because of... Because Chitra ji's chemo will probably interfere with it.

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

It will be on 14th, right? It will be on 14th March.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

14th, or earlier, or whatever. So, 25th, at least, is 10 days or something.

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

We will decide that a little later.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Yeah, we can decide whether we want 18th, or 25th. Because if... because if that chemo goes to 14th, then 18th may be better than 25th

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Yeah, possibly. That is why I'm saying.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Alright, so that we can decide. So... So, two clear meetings before, that is 18th of February and 4th of March ...

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Yeah, that's right. Are you just control. And who will prepare that statement? If Girish is going to prepare that statement. Oh. Then, let that be in one week from now.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

What statement?

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

This, all the discussions we have had.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Yes, yes. Yeah, yeah, that can... maybe that can come by... by 11. of February. So, 7 days from now. It can be... we can... we can try that. I can start off with that... some kind of summary. And then maybe it can be refined. I'll send it to...

Sunil Sahasrabudhey:

Right yeah, okay.

Girish Sahasrabudhe:

Okay, so we can stop for today.