

## Transcript of Zoom Meeting at 5.00 pm on February 18, 2026

The transcript is full but is mostly uncorrected and has machine-made errors. For example, the Hindi words लोकविद्या (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 2026-02-18 in the shared folder [Lokavidya Debates](#). You will also find a shorter Summary of this transcript there. – Girish

---

### **Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Shall we begin? Suresh is not here, but Suresh wrote that he may be a few minutes late. And, Naresh is not going to be there. So... the rest of us are, I think, here, except Avinash. And Vijay also... Vijay has not been joining, I don't know why. So... All right, I suppose we can begin.

I hope you have seen... I had sent that a slightly longish kind of Summary. I was supposed to send that on the 11<sup>th</sup> itself, but took a lot of time and became quite long also. But then I thought that maybe it was alright to break it up into different parts of the discussion. And, that file combines, things from different days also. There are 3 meetings... I mean, classified under different heads. Many of them relating directly to the program. In fact, all of them, although I may not have written that on top of all of them... all the subheads. But they essentially relate to the... to a possible program, because that is what we have been discussing anyway, all through. And, So, what the... I mean, the request is to please look at that, and if there is any marked difference between what you said and what is written there, then maybe, you can just point it out. Mostly it, should be correct, but there is a... because many times the transcript is quite bad, and I might have actually lost the original meaning. So if you look at your own parts under different heads, and in case you find something which is... amiss, then please point it out. So we can begin with that. Sunil had also sent a draft program I don't know whether it has been shared with all, but I can put it up here. It is in Hindi, and English, combined. So I can put that up just now also, or we can begin with any comments which one might have on... Whatever that file contains, On the discussion, if anybody wants to add to... the discussions we have had... Is that okay, or should I put up the file straight away? The draft program which has been shared? Maybe, GSR, have you seen that file? That was sent quite late, but... GSR?

### **Sivaramakrishnan G:**

Not in that detail, but then...

### **Krishna Gandhi:**

I have not seen any file.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

It's a slightly longish, 4-5 pages. But, so it is the discussion we have had, anyway. So, maybe I can put up the file which has been shared by... This is a PDF, I'll just put that up. That is, in the nature of a draft program. Around what has already been suggested in these discussions. So I'll put that up so that it'll... Just one minute, let me share that. Huh? H. content better. Where do the shit. Yes. Is this, visible? Okay, can you see this PDF file? Hello?

**Krishna Gandhi:**

Yes, I can see it. Okay.

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

I can see it. Yes.

**Krishna Gandhi:**

Pop.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Yeah, this is a draft program which was sent from, Vidya Ashram. And, this is written around what is already contained in the discussions which we have had. Except that it has been... Oh... These are specific, thanks, so... Maybe I can say something for GSR. This, first one says... But... A dialogue may be started in different languages, in different regions. Hindi, it's already there, but we might start a dialogue around relation between knowledge and politics in Bangla, Marathi, Telugu, Kannad, Malayalam. Because we have people Speaking these languages. Then, second one is on समाज सृजन का कला-मार्ग, so... the path of Art... for Re-creation of the Society. So, this is basically a Sur Sadhana publication. And contacts with artists, art journalists. So, establish contacts with them... and... to bring out publications in different languages around this theme of समाज सृजन का कला-मार्ग. The third is...

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

Girish...

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Huh, yeah?

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

अगर ऐसा करें .... This quickly going over may not entirely help. What you have sent today, I have seen part of that, That, and this... (draft program). Let people go through both... What you have sent and what this ... Maybe an English translation, can be done of this. This is a short statement, what I have sent. Let people read both that, that summary of the discussions, as well as this. And... Let people read that. It's not a question of how accurate the reporting is, the question is, it is a reporting of the three meetings. Right? So, even if something left out, it has the broad outline of

what we have been discussing. Okay. Right. So that, combined with this draft program that I have sent you. If both these are read, and then we... we have a discussion specifically for a program for the next 2-3 (meetings)... based on our reading of these two texts... And then people may have something to suggest, and... what is possible and what is not possible, let us take a view, more accurate view of the whole thing. But that is possible only after everybody has read these two documents.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

That is true, but then...

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

premiere... So, I suggest, and there is, like, we want to finalize all this before the Trust meeting in March, March 17<sup>th</sup>, or sometime it is... right?

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

That we have already finalized, 18<sup>th</sup> March.

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

...18<sup>th</sup> March, so let us... let us do this. And meet next Wednesday again. Take one week. We may have to meet more often during this one month from today to 18th March. So that, yeah, so that the meeting is fruitful. So, let us meet the next Wednesday again on the program.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Alright, but then what do we do today?

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

Now, today, I suggest... you see, I think most of us are familiar with the global debate that is going on. There are two important things that are happening globally. One is the artificial intelligence, a large meeting that has taken place in India. Right?

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Yes.

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

Maybe some of us have, kept a trace of that, in the sense, have been seeing what is happening. So, either we can be told about that by some people, and there is another thing other than artificial intelligence, there is a debate going on between, on the possibility of a multipolar world and a world entirely dominated by America. That is unipolar, dominated by America.

This time in Munich that Secretary of State has given a longish, interesting speech. It had given the impression earlier that America also stands for a multipolar kind of arrangement. But this time, he has given an entirely Western speech, that West has ruled the world for the last 500 years,

expanded and ruled, and we must do it again. It... we... we let it go away from our hands. And we must do it again, and he has given a call. It is interesting that he has given a call for Europe to be led by Germany. Now, this is very interesting. He has... and Germany is re-equipping itself in a very large scale, militarily. A large amount of money has been sanctioned for military expenditure in Germany. So, there is something... maybe some of us are familiar with some of these developments. If those... among these two, any one of this we can discuss today, if someone expanded on the... expands on that. And this parallel thread, because... How we are going to figure out our program. For next 2-3 years, depends on our understanding. Of both the new technology, artificial intelligence, as well as the new global political situation. It's not directly relevant, but that constitutes the context of our... otherwise, we'll become absolutely irrelevant at every stage. Toh agar kuch logo ni iska jalrakai, either Krishna Lou, or GSRK, or Gandhi, or anybody. Suresh is also there. So, on one of this, we can have the discussion today. Either on artificial intelligence, or the global... artificial intelligence discussion may be slightly had in the context of, if possible, Bauddik Satyagrah, that is, ज्ञान क्षेत्र में बहुजनों का दखल, from how the Bahujan can intervene in the world of knowledge, from that angle, and and the rise of artificial intelligence as a... whatever... like, the steam engine replaced the working population, workers, in the sense, created new workers, but the essential thing when Gandhi opposed the machine, he talked about machine replacing the man. So far as the work is to be done. This is the concept of organized work, this, that, and whatever there is, right? Now, this is talking about replacing human thinking itself. So, can someone... someone... there are people here in the group who can offhand also educate the rest of us on the idea, what is going on? Where lies the essential idea in all this? So that we can have a more fruitful discussion about the program, with... equipped with this, with both the politics as well as the technology of, At the global level. Can we do that?

#### **Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Yeah, I suppose, yes. I... I don't know whether we are in a position really to discuss developments in artificial intelligence today, because very few people might have... last time we had this discussion was, I think, almost a year back. This was pre-Shimoga... that we were... we discussed artificial intelligence for quite some time. There has been a gap of one year after that, And, I mean, I have at least not followed it closely after that. If someone has, then maybe we can have something on that, but we have been more in touch with this other thing, probably. So we can discuss, the world situation may be better. I don't know. This is just a suggestion. Let people... Suresh, what do you think?

#### **డా. జ క సురేశ్:**

I'm okay with any... any decision on this. I'm just now traveling, I mean, not traveling in the sense of... I'm going close to home. I have to just check out, and I will join in, I'll continue to listen, but I can't say much for the next 5-10 minutes. I will hope that, you know, somebody else is able to initiate the discussion on either of the two Areas that you speak about. And, I would certainly think, that, you know, what Girish says, we could take it up. I mean, we could take up the current international situation, and what it implies, or might imply, in terms of the way forward in the larger

international scope of things. About the new colonialism, which seems to be, you know, getting shaped up as we speak. And, it seems to be a result of multiple factors that we must analyze, and from what angles, and how, let us say what are the implications of science, what are the implications of society, et cetera, in this? I'm sorry, somebody has... I reached home and somebody is there. I'll get back to the discussion a bit later. Okay.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Okay, okay, yeah. Alright. Yeah.

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

Because when we came, we just... when you just opened the meeting, Krishnarajulu was saying something about a clash between Iran and United States, that United States unilaterally... This, but United States has not been able to act at various places. For example, in Ukraine. It has had zero success in Ukraine so far. And it has... it doesn't have the option of, going to war, in Ukraine. I mean, directly against Russia. That option has not surfaced at all. No one has talked about a possibility that United States will have a direct engagement with Russia. That has... that means bipolarity has been accepted, with Russia and China on one side, and America on the other. This has been accepted, and that is a deterrent in case of Iran also. In case of Iran, and also in case of North Korea, this is the deterrent, because America is not in a position to engage with... to have a war engagement with either Russia or China. That... that, alters the situation substantially. And, once again, America talking about taking Europe along with, to lead Europe, but European leadership being in the hands of, this, Germany. This means that America is not able to see how it can contend with China and Russia on its own. And if it cannot do that, whether it will be able to engage Iran on the battlefield long enough to defeat it completely, the way it has done with others, whether the Palestinians now or the Iraqis earlier out, even the Afghan. That... the question mark has come on that. because of this move towards friendliness with Europe in Munich, Munich Security Conference. That has been... is being seen as a turning point, as some kind of America turning back Trump's policies so far. Trump's... Trump was talking about C5. The civilizational state, this, that, and the other, was coming from several corners, but they had subscribed to this also, to the idea of civilization being the only meter of sovereignty and this and that. And therefore, only 5-6 states are possible, sovereign states are possible with their command areas and all that, that made for multipolarity fundamentally, and all that, the discussion that went on. But America has backtracked. it has very clearly... it's a longish speech, maybe some of you have read that speech by the Secretary of State, what is his name, in Munich. He has made a long speech about how we are the same people, how we are culturally the same people, how we have been the same people, and so on. Now, this is no new discovery that they are the same people that, even before, when they were talking about Europe, not being equal in any sense, and Europe as a dead entity, even then they were all the same people. So it's a question of... there is a clear turning back on... on the policy that Trump was propagating just about, maybe some time back. So what is, whether, I mean, on one side, this. whether if Krishnarajulu has been tracing, keeping track of this, we would like to hear him on this. Because just now he had said about America are not listening to anybody

and doing literally whatever they wanted to do. whether they will be able to open a front in Taiwan, or somewhere in Indochina. Is a question that cannot be answered through simply.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Actually, one has to, I think, It is not quite clear. I... what the impression I got after reading what Suresh had posted, that speech... and also, I think a Substack article, which commented on that. The feeling I developed was actually... I mean, see, I think there are various things happening, but I don't know whether it is retracing of, or backtracking on what they were saying. Like, if you look at the, there, that, much of that policy which they had announced. That security ...it was called some... security policy, which they announce every year, and this year, the one which was announced was very different, making the big break with the old, and it was talked about, ... a complete... this thing from European, etc, etc. And that was interpreted by the... this Russian, this philosopher as saying that they will... we will rule the... Americas. And we will not interfere in that region. That was the interpretation. And... but the same policy talked about the rightist forces, or the extreme rightists, I mean, calling them not that, but neoconservatives or conservatives in Europe, in various countries in Europe, and explicitly said that we will keep backing those. And this, Germany is, I think, only coincidental. Germany, they, every year they hold this ... there is this conference called Security Conference. I think it is held in Germany every year. Last year, also, it was held. So, how much it has to do with Germany, I really don't know. But whatever was said there about civilization ... Remember, I mean, a big eulogy for the European civilization, the... including not the Renaissance ideas, but the older ones, the whatever... with a lot of stress on (Orthodox) Church etc. This was very much in line with that policy. That's what I thought. I mean, they were saying even then that we will keep backing (these). So, how much of it is, really related to... bringing Europe under their security control again... I am not very sure. Because basically, Europe... the condition which Europe finds itself in is that its security has been essentially outsourced. And they have not been spending anything on (it), and in the intervening period, I think all of them have started now... thinking in that direction and building their military, bringing up their military capabilities and so on. And even... this Marco Rubio was forced to sort of, say things like every nation-state is sovereign, and that it has to... even on China, they said that we have to keep talking, we cannot ignore China, etc, etc. So, I don't know how much of backtracking it is. It is a... it has been interpreted like that by Dugin. But one has to really see, I think, because the other reactions which came to that, we're not so sure about this. That, that it is again going to... into, sort of, complete American domination. It looks going toward bipolar, I mean, America on one side, with Europe, etc, but there are so many other centers now. So, I really don't know whether it is going back completely in that sense. What Suresh had sent was talking about new forms of imperialism, American imperialism. Now, it may be new forms of imperialism, but I really don't know how dominated by America it is going to be. Because there is no doubt that America, as far as manufacturing goes, America is in bad state. And every evaluation which came at that time said that to recover their original position, although they are... they're continuously now talking about it... that is not going to take less than a decade for any reasonable, you know, come back to position on manufacturing, which they had earlier. So, I... and the same decade is available to others also, so... One doesn't really know. It still looks much more like (it is) going to be multipolar.

But one has to, I mean... keep looking at it, that is certain, because there is a... there is a comeback to... on the... the strict... this thing against Europe, which... the position which they had taken. There is a contrast with the... what the vice president said, for example. Last year, just a year back, and so this... That much is, of course, true...

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

It is not a question for us whether the multipolar position is going to win, or the American position of single... single pole is going to win. This is not an issue that we should be discussing. You see, who is going to be more powerful in this global contention? This is not the issue we are going to discuss. What we want to discuss is, can we change the multipolar versus unipolar, Discourse into a multipolar, unipolar, and local.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

No, true, true, true.

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

So, let us focus more on where are those spaces. Where we can enter this debate by taking the local question, matter of self-governance, matter of localities, matter of face-to-face societies, or whatever, there are various expressions to the same. How this matters. This is what is meant when we say whether how Bilby takes the idea of Swiraj to the global debate. If Mandal can be recovered into the global debate by some mechanism, by some people writing about it. Why can't Saraj be recovered into... and again, there is no discussion on the Latin American positions of plurinational state. Which is also talking about local. in a different language altogether, because their politics is different. But can we formulate... the issue is this. Can we start a global discourse on multipolar... And unipolar, and the local. that they be treated as equally important in the global debate. Abhi debate, you have, okay, well, unipolar or multipolar ke beech.

Russian philosophers are arguing for a multipolar thing, and that fellow with a German name who lives in America, New Orleans, or somewhere, Hofmeister. who is writing again and again, and who controls, perhaps, this multipolar press, is perhaps started by people led by Hochmeister. And who is in fair agreement with Dugan's position? And Dugin is absolutely Russian position. Russia is correct. That is the... that is his position. And, therefore, talking about multipolarity in various ways. So, Hofmeister and, and Dugin are relatively in agreement. Where the American political elite has not laid its cards bare on this question. They are playing all... Playing along with all positions. They are playing along with multipolar, they are playing along with unipolar. The only thing they are not playing along is local. And the Latin American situation with the threat to Cuba, the question is of being local. there was an open threat to Cuba. And it is very unlikely that if they go to war with Cuba, may the war may last longer than they may imagine, but it's not easy to see how Russia or China can intervene there, actually, physically. They are not able to intervene in American intervention on the movement of ships containing oil. Again and again, it is happening, and russia or China are not saying a word about this.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Enforcing sanctions that they say.

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

Whatever that is. Our issue is whether locality can make Can be discussed in this context of an open debate between multipolarity and unipolarity. A contentious debate is taking place between these two positions. It surely opens up space for locality. Can we... can we do that? with Mandal, with Swaraj, with local alliances in African Union, with plurinational state in Latin America, there are innumerable. Maybe we will find more cases if we get down to it. Can we start a global debate on that? I mean, we'll take a little longer to decide on this, but the importance of a discussion on the global level, what is happening, is whether And the moment locality is introduced into multipolarity and unipolarity. Moment locality becomes a serious Point in the discussion in this, globally, A new politics, starts taking shape in, in India, in Latin America, in Africa, in various different ways, in their own ways. Locality doesn't mean a universal formulation anyway. So, can... is that with some people who are more familiar with the global Suresh, GSRK, Kishra, you know, Gandhi, and Sabilo? Who, who, who can, who can kind of capture this debate. From their personal angles, doesn't matter, let us come to... Come to a dialogue which is substantial on the global question. Yeah, and we were able to do one thing. Just imagine, when there was a debate in... on the knowledge question. When knowledge was the term around which the whole debate was unfolding. We were able to talk about Lokvidya, and a very large part is talking about Lokvidya now. We were the first to start that discussion, that here is an opportunity, that there is a clash between the computer world and the older world of science, natural science, and that gives us space And it did give us space, and we did utilize that space. To whatever extent we did.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Yes.

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

politically, can we... can we come up with a new political imagination? The idea of a new political imagination based in Based in locality, based in the ideas of lokavidya and ordinary life.

Is there a space for this? I mean, we must return to that. That is our forte. That is our strength. Anywhere else, we will not be able to hold waters so easily. And that's a meaningful discussion. Our draft program will depend upon that. Whether we... we are... how do we look at this? The whole thing. Maybe we discuss the global situation next time. Maybe we meet every Wednesday from today to, to the trust meeting on 18<sup>th</sup>. That is 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday after today's. Four weeks from now. 18th March. then if we meet every Wednesday, is it possible? Let others tell. Then we discuss the global situation, we discuss the Bogdan-centered program, and come to, finally, in the third meeting at least, come to a conclusion, which can be taken to the trust meeting.... Yes, GSRK wants to say something.

**Sivaramakrishnan G:**

We can certainly meet, every Wednesday from now on. That is, till at least the first meeting, everyone. And about this global situation, etc, I am not too sure whether we are not reading too much into all these speeches. Because we must also remember, that, the Secretary of State, And this vice president making not the same kind of speeches in just about a year or so. And Trump himself. keeps saying all kinds of things, you know, you don't know whether he is for this, he's a peace, I mean, Nobel Prize contender, and he's also, at the same time, aggressive. I mean, these are very difficult to judge, and I don't know whether we are reading too much into every... Word that is uttered by some of these people. Because some of them may even be not their own words. These are written by some speech writer, and these people go and mouth them. And maybe he was trying to humor the audience in Europe, having brands and others going and giving him a trash last year. This man may be trying to humor them, or placard them, or try to tell them that we are not abandoning you altogether, etc, kind of thing. And, you see, this is very difficult to... I don't know, I would not be able to make that kind of easy generalizations. I mean, for instance, Russia and America. America may have succeeded, in a way, by pinning down Putin in Ukraine for such a long time. Even if they are not able to take him on, they don't want to really take him on. They just want to pin him down. And if they can do that with, I mean, the kind of trade and the communication that China has with the African level. countries now, with a lot of their contacts and so on, if they can create disruptions everywhere, so that the supply chain or, you know, whatever that China has with some of these countries is disrupted for quite some time. To that extent, they have succeeded in, you know. keeping China at some distance, and so on. So, this may be... I don't know, one can read all these kinds of things that one wants to in these kind of situations. But I'm myself not very... one can make a very meticulous analysis of what Rubio says as some attempted recolonization, or repeating the old colonial kind of domination, etc, etc. But will it work? You know, they can... they can keep Changing this position very often. And Europe is not all that dead, you know? They are not going to receive all kinds of comedies from some of these American leaders. I mean, they may keep quiet for some time, but they may also have their own intellectuals and their own thinking on this, because they have been in this game for more number of years than Americans. So, you see, we have to, I think, be a little more flexible in understanding this than trying to put it in terms of, what we, you know, think as the unipolar, or the multipolar, and this, that, etc. Because this is what I have immediate reaction to this.

**Sunil Sahasrabudhey:**

Yes, GSRK. One second, let me repeat. No, no, this position should be clear. I am not... making any statement other than this, that there is a global debate. That's all. Whether somebody's lying or telling the truth, or somebody will be able to stick with his position or not is not the issue for us. There is a global debate on the question of the nature of the state. That's hard.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Like, is there a way to, deepen, the formulation of knowledge question. I mean, if... are we... if we directly address that, then maybe we are... I mean, we have been doing it in some ways. See, the

things were very clear. When this globalization was happening, with the coming up of, I mean, not very, very clear. They became very clear to us with the formulation of Lokavidya thought, and you see, the... because there was a direct sort of link between what we were saying about Lokavidya and the exploitation of Lokavidya, and on a much, much deeper and larger scale, as globalization developed. Now, globalization is dying, basically. So that context is, I mean, the apparent context is at least lost. And we have been talking about, knowledge-politics relation, and to explore that relation. Now, what is the way to, go ahead in that direction? I mean, of course, one way is to talk about Swaraj and Mandal and things like that. Local, initiative, local governance, local needs, responsiveness to local needs, then, mutual dialogue, continuous dialogue, mutual respect. So one is that, of course. What else do we have to say about the knowledge question as such? In what way is it to be deepened, I mean, reformulated in a deeper fashion. Can we pose the question in some way like that? Because, of course, I mean, see, the multipolarity and unipolarity discussion, as it seems to me, if it becomes a multipolar world truly then it is a much better... I mean, the space is much broader for us to talk about Swaraj, and to talk about Mandal, and to talk about newer, you see, formations. It may not be so if it goes back to unipolarity. That is... that is also true. Not that it is going to go back. So, we are discussing unipolarity, multipolarity, only to that extent, not more than that. And, what I was trying to say is that things are not very clear, as far as that is concerned. But is there a way to pose the knowledge question in a way which takes it for... takes the formulation forward, in... given the current political, and, you see, international situation as it is developing? That is probably... What we are... we have been looking at, rather. Krish? Yeah. Krish.

**Krishnarajulu:**

Yeah, I have nothing. Immediately, I, I mean, hmm. You see, this, you see, it all starts with this, I mean, the debate becomes more intense, the international thing of multipolarity and... Unipolar, and this and that. the Trump... the move that Trump... Made, initially. On the trade front. He said, tariffs. That means he's interfering with The so-called free capitalist market mechanism. He's, that word free became very blurred. The second thing what you did was, Control of resources. I mean, this business of acquiring Canada or Greenland, Just to name these two. Was all about control over resources. Resources, so that the market system. Becomes a little more, playable. He doesn't want local control over resources to dominate the market, the free market economy, let's put it that way. Now, Maduro was not willing to Engage his oil trade in a free market way. Basically, that... by refusing to trade in the dollar, or whatever it is. So... He thinks that the solution is to... get hold of. Somebody who is more amenable to playing in the thing. That is, control the market conditions. And then now, the attempt at Iran is also to do that. That is what it appears to me. The other thing, the tariffs that he did, was also tried to skew the market to make it more controllable by America. He hasn't succeeded. Because... For long, no. the Chinese have played their cards very well, and they have a very good Control over the market, global market situation. All the supply chains till fairly recently were all entirely controlled by Or dominated by China, let's put it that way. And the recent announcement by China that they are going to take from 53 African nations, Tariff-free. inputs. No tariffs. They will import. Which means... That they are capturing the market? the export market of the African states. The African states can... freely export whatever

they produce to... of course, China has largely invested in agriculture in the African continent. Now, you see, it's all about keeping the capitalist market system You know, thriving, even in this modern era, where there is a lot of, local, nationalist, or whatever, aspirations. To controlling the markets in the local regions. Seen in this context, it appears to me that The... the global market situation and controls by the outside, Not in the favor of Bahujan Samaj. See, the import... the U.S. import policy, whatever trade, whatever the agreement they're saying, the biggest loser is Bowjan Samarj. As far as we are concerned. You don't need to see the US trade deal in any other context. The biggest loser is Bahujan Samaj. Those whose lives are based on locomithya. What do you do? I mean, I would say that if you're looking at the international context and how to react to it from our point of view, mobilize local Lopidya Samaj. using this US trade deal as a focal point, and say, this is out to destroy your lives and livelihoods. Some very directly. As all the agricultural, the farmers' unions have clearly pointed out. But it is also everything else. They may say textiles will flourish, but... then if you have to import Cotton. And then the textile industry has to thrive on imported cotton. It's almost, you know, putting a dagger to the throat and saying, okay, you carry on with life. The moment I push the dagger, you're finished. Because they can stop the... Cotton flow at any point of time. You see, so, the... in this context, I mean. I mean, you could use such points, I'm saying. to mobilize Lupidya Samaj. And, therefore, Bring to the light. that, politics based in Lokvidyam in Bahujan. is the important thing that we should concentrate about. And the same thing would apply to the countries in Latin America and Africa. These, the Bahuja and Samadju of these countries are Are all set to lose by, due to the machinations of this capital market system by all the big players, America, Russia, or China, or anybody else. Europe to some... Europe is now beginning to see that it should intervene so that it also has some say. So... Control over resources so that the market... the capitalist market system survives. Indeed. Intense competition for market control in different areas of the world. Bye. the dominant players, the USA, Russia, China. And, there is the Baoj and Samaj of Latin America, Africa, and India. And part, of course, Southeast Asia also. They're the ones that... Who are in the receiving and front end of this? And the politics, or whatever campaigns we have. can be used, I mean, in this context, for some kind of mobilization, and then defining Positions, with respect to everything. Vis-a-vis this struggle. I mean, what kind of alliances should you make, political and other alliances? What kind of social cohesion do you need to emphasize upon in order to achieve this end? It's a... Because if you are going to import, I can say that, if you're importing all kinds of agriculture products, including dairy and et cetera thing from America. It's an thing trying to change your, let's say, food habits. In the long run. And that'll impact on your health, and so on and so forth. I mean, a lot of things can follow. you know, the... the global situation and what's going on there, if you just look at that, what is actually observable... you see, they tried to control resources and talked about Greenland, I think, and there was a lot of opposition from Europe. You see, then, he switched to oil. And then he did something in Venezuela, And then, Now he's trying to do Iran, try to control the oil control of Iran's stockpile of oil. Nope. There is a... amended. They could... I mean, there would... if there is a war or some kind of conflict, it's going to be a very massive one. And, all are set to lose, and most importantly, the Bajan Samaj of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. India, that is. The greatest losers. So, we can't, really talk about the politics of war, or... Aggression. In the public domain, there's not much to say. But we can certainly talk about the impact of these kinds

of moves, say, by America, or even signing a trade deal with the European Union. Because one of the things that all of... both of them want to export to India are agricultural produce. Whatever types there. And the agriculture is the domain of Lokvitya Samach. Bo did so much. And those kinds... I mean, the... Yeah, those will survive because it's... they're not going to face the brunt. Of these trade deals. So... Maybe this is the opportunity to formulate programs where we can mobilize. Talk about! these kinds of trade deals, the big ones, the European one, and the... American one. As being ones which are definitely inimical to the interests of Bahogen Samaj. And Lokvidya as a whole, because, see, what AI will do will replace the whole knowledge debate. They said that AI will solve all problems. Why do you need to worry about any local knowledge? Localized knowledge initiatives. whether it's Lepidya, or the knowledge that people in China live by, or... people in Latin America, they'll say AI will take care of everything. So, there, that kind of dominance, I mean, the whole air is to just, Aid the capitalist market expansion and exploitation. I can't see that it's there for the benefit of humanity per se. It could be there, I mean, it could be used, maybe AI has many uses, but I don't know. The current trust seems to be how to help the capitalist market system to, you know, develop further and have more control over supply chains, Consumption patterns, this, that, the other. So, it's an attack on Bajan Samayajan in Lokavidya. as far as the Indian context is concerned, and maybe we should use these instances of what is happening outside, outside of Baoj and Samarj, to mobilize Baoj and Samaj, to say that their interests are directly being threatened. Ern? there should be more panchids to see how they can resist this in their own way. See, we started long ago, Just when this globalization started, we started talking about local markets. Because we knew that it was local markets. That would, be a counter. to... One important aspect of globalization. Globalization really meant globalization of the market. And then, different control centers have developed. So, when Greece says the globalization is a gone question, it only means that there have been more local controls. I mean, China has control over certain spheres, and America has tried to gather control over certain spheres, and so on and so forth. But, the local markets are still Still a point of strength for Mojin Sumach. And, I mean, maybe it has to be rephrased and all that, but the moment that we have has to Talk about these. questions, Given the international context and what has happened. That people are aware of these trade deals, people have become aware of what is going to be imported, and so on and so forth. And, they directly understand how those kinds of imports would affect their lives and livelihoods. In fact, they are even talking openly. Their lives and livelihoods are going to be destroyed. So, fine, this is a good point for Wes to start, that the whole of Loko Vidya itself is under attack. And when these people also talk gribly about AI, It's not to solve the problems of Bahuj and Samarj that AI is going to be used, rather to continue the domination Overweight Boge in so much. Some things like this can be... thought about, this is about it. Okay.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Well, fair. Yeah. Gandhi? Yes.

**Krishna Gandhi:**

Hello, am I audible?

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Yeah, yeah.

**Krishna Gandhi:**

So, I... I... I... regarding this, multipolarity, I think that, For the last, 10, 20 years, it has been obvious that, I think I would say everybody would agree among us also, that America has been weakened. And, basic reason is the rise of China. So... and I don't think that even... Today, Americans threatened even by the technology skill advances of China. So... the globalization... thrust. Has not benefited the American middle class, working class, etc. So, Trump has, sort of, become the... symbol of the aspiration of the American, working class, etc, or the farming community in America, etc. Somehow, he has promised them that he will make America great again, kind of thing. So... So, there is, definitely we will have to accept, and, the fact that America is on the decline, and, the fact that many countries are thinking of the BRICS, for example, thinking of dealing in A different currency other than... dollar for their transactions. That is their direct threat to America, and So, it is only a matter of time before America, becomes weaker. That is what I feel. And, therefore, multipolar world is more or less, as far as I'm concerned, a reality in 10-15 years. Even though America may intervene physically. war, etc, but that is another sign of weakness, I would say. They have to... Resort to violence to... keep their domination. That is a sign of weakness for any country, I would say. So, what happened in Venezuela. or if they go and grab Greenland. Those things are going to weaken only America. So Europe will... come out of America's, this thing. So... this, these, changes, I think, they are a conducive atmosphere for discussion. of a civilizational state to Swaraj. local... Organizations, etc. Local knowledge. And one thing that America, I think, is betting on is artificial intelligence as a means to control. The world. So, is, imperialism through knowledge, and knowledge of The artificial intelligence is, being... sort of propagated, even though very few successes have been reported. But, clerical jobs, etc, they can be replaced by artificial intelligence. That has become very obvious. But, true intelligence is not... I... he's not in sight. But despite it, doesn't matter. America is pouring a lot of money, American companies are pouring a lot of money, because they are sure that through artificial intelligence, they can, sort of control the world, even if they are losing the manufacturing, etc. They are... Keen to keep artificial intelligence under their control. So, as far as Lokvidya is concerned, or ordinary people is concerned, artificial intelligence is going to be A great threat to their lives. That is how I see it. And, therefore, American domination. is being... tried to be perpetuated through AI, and it may not succeed, because China is already keeping pace with it. So, whether it is China or whether it is America, it doesn't matter, but artificial intelligence is going to enslave people. There is one, aspect of the... Debate that we have to... Keep in the front. And, as far as this local is concerned, I feel that... this, One thing that we have to clearly take a position is that we Opposed to civilization and states. Because they are more larger entities than national states. Many nations together will become a civilizational state. So... That kind of a... this thing is losing one's sovereignty. So, I think that the idea of a sovereignty is also being discussed these days. What is national sovereignty? And in the Trump era, many countries are Losing their sovereignty, and it has become very, public spectacle, shabby. Sure. on the part of many politicians, that they are

not able to deal with America, except China. And, to some extent, the ratio. So, when there... Question number, sovereignty is being discussed. I think that... Is an opportunity for... Imagining sovereignty at the local level. At the Suraj, and at the local governance, so these... Idea of sovereignty, why can't it be? brought down to the local level, that is the question I think we should be raising. And therefore, Suraj and whatever that Mandel, etc. They can be discussed, they should be discussed. When sovereignty is being discussed. So, another thing is that markets, local markets, we have been talking about it for a long time, but I think we should be doing something about it also. So... It is an expression of sovereignty at the local level. So, I would say that, the situation in the world, is undergoing is... favorable for a... Discussion of, local and, suraj, and, knowledge, local withdhya. Versus artificial intelligence. So, I think we should be doing... Hmm, some... program on these lines, that's what I feel. Thank you.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Okay. Yeah, Suresh?

**ಡಾ. ಜ ಕ ಸುರೇಶ:**

Yeah, I am, here. I thought, you know, given that it is, Fairly, already 6.15. I'll just limit myself to a few... few minutes of, Expressing my thoughts. My feeling is that we must be very careful about, understanding what has been happening in the last, about, year, although one might actually put it in the context of the last 10, 15, 20, 30 years, perhaps, if we want to. I think we must be very careful about coming to quick conclusions about this. as an attack against free trade through the mechanisms of tariffs or sanctions and so on, or as an attack against rule-based frameworks that Western nations are so fond of speaking about, including Kearney in the WEF, and many of the Europeans who are Beating their breasts about how this rules-based system is actually, being, sort of deprecated because of the actions of USA. This is not even to be understood as an attack against freedom of expression, democracy, and the various things that these people seem to hold dear whenever it is convenient. And it is also not to be understood as an attack against the hegemony of the dollar. It is not even to be understood as an attack against multilateralism. And, please, we should understand, when we speak about the great steps taken by China and the so-called BRICS and so on, we must understand that the BRICS bank, for example, or the new system of electronics exchange. of foreign exchange and so on that is created specifically several years ago by China, it handles 0.01% of the entire world's trade. So, one should not, sort of, one should have a sense of proportion when we think that, you know, the dollar denomination is going to be defeated by the BRICS and so on. One must also... Try to take into consideration the fact that some of the biggest, trade relationships of all the BRICS countries is with Israel, in spite of the genocidal death of, I mean, 700 to 800,000 people, which they have been engaged in since just two years, two, two and a half years, since the Gaza came into the genocidal this thing of the Israelis. So, my personal feeling is, if we are really trying to sort of understand this, outside of it being framed as an attack against either free trade, or rules-based systems, or dollar hegemony. or an attack against multilateralism and so on. How are we going to understand this? I think we must, I mean, get back into the fundamentals what seems to have been happening in the last

about 30, 40, 50 years, in order to really get to understand where... why the Western world has come to a point where it has today. And, only subsequently must we really try to understand what is the stance of India where is India in all this? And more particularly, where are we in all this, in trying to understand, as well as create some little kind of possibilities of both understanding as well as perhaps action, although it sounds a little too far-fetched to me at this point. The first thing I think we must bear in mind is that societies have ups and downs, merely because America, at this point in time, is actually undergoing certain kinds of difficulties, both at the social, cultural, and civilizational level, if one could call it a civilization, as well as economic, which is, of course, most important. I do not think, I mean, you know, there is any reason to suspect that it is going down in a certain way, and as has been interpreted in many circles. that this is the last failing attempt of a dying civilization to take up arms. There are several kinds of people who have, looked at history, looked at Rome, looked at all kinds of major civilizations to say that in the last phase of civilization, they tend to irrational violence in order to subjugate the periphery and so on. I think we must take all of this with a pinch of salt, especially because, to me, it doesn't appear that history can be a very great kind of feature of lessons. for what is to come in this society. There's a problem there. There's a conceptual problem in understanding history itself as being a harbinger of the tomorrow, and so on. So that's... I mean, for the moment, without debating that, I think we must not give overdue importance to the assumption that this is a failing society, which is actually going to... going through throes of change, and therefore is trying to be violent in preserving its control over the world, and so on. It is not the sign of a dying society that a .001% of it controls about 40% of the wealth of these people, and is able to continue to do that for the last at least 30-40 years. one might be able to sort of really look at the roots of this certain weakening. There is a certain weakening, definitely, that we must acknowledge, but that weakening is what we see. That is not something which is felt in a wide enough sense among the operas, even within the Americas. or within Europe and so on, in the terms in which we understand it, nor is it felt by the people who actually rule these societies. The top 0.1%, or 1%, or 3%, as you wish, might be the reason. So, I think we must understand this in terms of the phases of capitalism. The larger organization of society, when I say capitalism, I only mean the larger organization of society, and the kinds of relationships that With production that people have, and the kinds of forces of production, in the conventional sense of the term. How are these changing, and why is that actually, you know, suddenly coming to a crisis point? If we can understand the crisis here, we can perhaps understand the possibilities that is open to societies, while not foreclosing it theoretically from our own side. It is not the... for example, Europe is, weak, that it is actually getting into a vassal state with that of America. What are those forces which have actually happened, which have actually, you know, taken shape in the last 30 years, 40 years? to create this kind of a relative advantage, because we are only talking about relative advantage between USA and Europe, between the Western world and China, between Western world and, let's say, India and Africa. It is only the sense of relative advantage which brings in the possibilities in politics in the world politics of today. And I think we'll be better served by actually looking at these relative differences in terms of the various phases of capitalism and what it's doing to society. So, it is possible, without getting into too much elaboration, I personally believe that this is a phase of capitalism where I think the desire for value, in other words, the desire for profit, the desire for extraction,

even after sucking out just about everything through the most efficient forms of exploitation in the last 40, 50, 60, 70, 80 years, and I keep repeating this, I think after 1947, India has extracted, possibly, 150 times or 1,000 times more natural resources from Mother Earth and the people of India than was the case in the last 200 years, even by the British. And that must be very true of the Western world, what it has done to Europe and Africa and India and so on, and so with America with its own resources and so on. So, given that the greatest kind of exploitation has possibly happened of Mother Earth and its people in the last hundred years. Even after this is sucked out, there is something which is innate to the nature of capital to search for returns, search for value. With every process that has actually led to previous value being seen as a baseline for creating greater value. So, because you're moving with the changing baseline, which is different from what it was in 2000, what it was in 2005 and 2010, to something else, which creates this constant hunger for either resources or people and so on. Now, if there are structural limits. to this, because you have done this so efficiently in the last 100 years, it appears to me that some of the solutions which were discussed in the last 20 years are coming to fruition. For example, Bill Gates, for example, the... what do you call that, this, this function? There is this function for viruses, which is called a transfer function, or some amplification function, which actually is likely, as it has been actually experimented with across the world. with a lot of money from people like Bill Gates, and not just him, but most governments are in cohorts with that. There could be a possibility of elimination of very large fractions of people, and there are conditions, in my opinion, social, cultural, philosophical conditions, which have laid the basis for a lot of this. One of them being Universal Basic Income, for example, which has been accepted to a level where, after 15 years. even that becomes unacceptable to a large number of people, leading to possibilities of elimination. I'm just giving that as an example, there are 100 other possibilities which lie behind that. And it is possible that we can look at a world which is converging through AI, through virus research, through the theories which are finding greater acceptance among the elite themselves. Who are unwilling in 40 years ago to eliminate large numbers of people, and to be able to convert the technologies, the tools. And more importantly, the cultural and philosophical and the emotional aspects of humanity, to be able to eliminate large numbers of people, and also directly enslave the rest in manners which are Much more innovative, different, and deeper than the ones before. And that is where the roots of the recolonization of the West of the rest of the world, by the West, is being imagined today. And I do wish that someone amongst us, or maybe a younger person who could be given this as a project, would actually look at Project 25, which is one of the cardinal stones of the conservative movement of the last 15 to 20 years, perhaps 25 years, ever since the time of Bush. This is the holy document, the holy set of, I mean, you know, thoughts of, the institutions which serve the Republican conservatives and so on, which lays out the nature of the world. culturally, civilizationally, economically, and in terms of the society that they want to establish, you know, and so on. I wish, you know, I had the ability to actually go through that and try to form some kind of summary, but even that apart, even by looking at the graphs. kinds of statements, as well as the activities in the last about 25 years. More especially in the last 3 to 5 years. or perhaps starting from when it came to fruition in 2016, in the form of Trump I. I think we must be able to get an imagination of what the new capital's requirements are, and why there seems to be a crisis of confidence within the West itself, and how that has been used by the U.S.

In order to reshape the response to this crisis in a manner which has changed international relations very fundamentally. where it is possible for Europe to no longer pretend to be, you know, something which is the guiding light of equality, or equity of certain sorts, and so on and so forth. For a moment, I think we must also look at the fact that the reality of what free trade is, that it was always unequal. Always there were tariffs, always there was exploitation, or that there is this rule-based framework, but it allowed for the starvation extension of 500 million people, or, sorry, I mean, you know, 30, 40 million people in the last 10, 12 years in Afghanistan, Syria, and so on, must also be recognized. And therefore, some of these terminologies themselves are under very serious threat, and that is an observation that I'm making only so that we don't very clearly get bogged down with the terminologies which actually characterize the current intra-nessing fight between elements of the Western so-called, I mean, you know, free world, and so on and so forth. Having said that, I would like to almost immediately move to the point that, There is this theory of elite exhaustion, which seems to underlie many of our own ideas that USA is coming to some kind of a grind, some kind of a problem, this last stretch of capitalism. No such evidence is available for any of these assertions, because It appears to me that Societies which have power, the power to do extraordinary damage to other societies in a manner which is unequaled by anybody else, is going to use not only its power, but also the knowledge Knowledge is driven. It is not a driver. Knowledge is driven, and knowledge has a compact with power, which is extraordinary. And maybe we will arrive at an understanding of knowledge and power. Us! maybe a hyphenated thing which Krishna keeps speaking about, knowledge, power, as a dyad of some kind, which can actually explain the... both the crisis of capitalism at this point of time, and the way American capitalism is going to actually get out of this, and any hopes that we have that it is the last dying throes of it, which will actually fall down with a big thud, and so on, is difficult. I'll just point out one exact rebutting of this particular point. Please remember, China exists because of the West. There is a yin-yang between China and the rest. We have to understand that, in spite of all the tall kinds of statements that is made about China becoming the beacon for the next development, nothing could be further from truth than that, because China exists because it can extract value from the West. And it gets the best value, not from Africa, not from India, from America and Europe, which are the ones which pay far better returns on equity, far better returns on the labor employed, than any of these countries can. There is not going to be a tomorrow, very soon, where China is going to pivot from USA and Europe, and actually de-risk itself by producing all the world's stuff for these, I mean, you know, countries, and therefore become a dominant power. Number two, even if it becomes a dominant power, given the fact that it is being provoked in such a fashion in everything it does. It creates something in Africa, America bombs it. It helps Venezuela, America bombs Venezuela. It helps Iran, America bombs Iran. So, given this, it is not a day too soon in the next 20 years when China will become as imperialist, as militarist, and so on. You might say it is in response to what the America and Europe does. Whatever be the explanation, they are not going to be unaffected by this. That is essentially the dialectics of modern imperialism, and it will be... what I'm painting is a very dark picture, but that, I suspect, is strongly how things are going. And given this, possibly our, Greatest mission would be to understand this. Through terms which do not fall for certain kinds of doomsday stories about, you know, the capitalism having come to an extreme end, or some kind of a doldrums, and so on. If there are doldrums, there is a certain

kind of a, you know, creative, interactive kind of a level of the will of that capital represents, which will help it go to the next phase. It is very likely. I'd be most happy if, I mean, you know, things happened such that it collapsed. Unlikely. So, while we wish for that, our hope must be to understand this better from various perspectives, which both question all the assumptions, I mean, of the analysis which is prevalent today, and try to also look at the negation of that in order to obtain a better picture of this. Only then, and only then. should we dare actually look at our own concepts of Bhavujan, our own concepts of for Raj, our own concepts of decentralization, and make a connection between a very tentative and possible connection between these ideas, which are dear to our heart, and those larger kinds of realities, and try to see how it is that we can actually Try to paint a picture of approaching one with the other. So that's it from my side. I'm really sorry I took 15 minutes, wanted to finish in 5. Thank you, that's it from my side.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Okay, I think... we will meet again next Wednesday. And, with the... talk with the background of the... Summary, which I have sent, and the draft program... I will share that also... the one, which I had shown earlier. But, I mean, I would like to say to Suresh before leaving that, I... see, in everything you have said, I don't really find, any hints to in what way we are going to, you know, look at spaces for... action for the... for us. So... I may have actually taken it more darkly than... you, were saying. But that seems to be the obvious kind of... you know, limitation that whatever you have said puts... puts on ways in which we can, you know, think about our program. Because, it appears that... To even understand what kind of spaces we have to move in a whole lot of analysis is necessary, which is not... you know, very familiar kind of analysis for our... for us... I mean, people like us. So, I don't know, let us take it ahead from there, I mean, in the context of these two things which I was saying...

**ಡಾ. ಜ ಕ ಸುರೇಶ:**

You're right. You're absolutely right. You're absolutely right. And that's a task for me... For example, you know, I can't imagine anything at this point, but I think we must.

**Girish Sahasrabudhe:**

Okay. Okay, so let us stop with that. We will come back next Wednesday, then. That is, today is 18th, so 25th. Alright, let's meet on 25th. Oh my god.