

**Indian Society: Sociological Perspectives**

**Dr. Santhosh R**

**Department of Humanities and Social Sciences**

**Indian Institute of Technology, Madras**

**Week-11**

**Lecture-53**

The Cracked Mirror: How Egalitarian are the Social Sciences in India? II

Welcome back to the class. We are continuing our discussion of this essay titled, Egalitarianism and the Social Sciences in India. This essay, written by Professor Gopal Guru, first appeared in EPW and later was made a part of the very popular book titled The Cracked Mirror, you know jointly authored by Professor Guru and Professor Sundar Sarukkai. So in the previous class, we looked into the very first section of this essay, where he foregrounds the necessity of egalitarianism as a principle in Indian social sciences and then argues that the visible lack of theory or following standards also needs to be looked into from this particular practice of very highly unequal or non-egalitarian structure of Indian social sciences. So, we are continuing with this essay. Now, the next section, the social context of influential hierarchies, has very important and very insightful arguments.

Any discourse, including social sciences, emerges within a specific material and social context. In other words, it is a material context in which appropriate conditions shape reflective abilities among individuals or groups. What material context would have prompted Dalits to go for experimentation, innovation and imagination? So now, he is looking into this argument that some groups have an innate endowment to reflect. So, they can understand, for example, they can understand mathematics better, or they have been in the field of theory making or the field of education for generations, for over a period of a century and hence, they are better endowed to continue that legacy.

So, this is a very problematic argument, but it is a very popular argument among various

things and various groups. So, Guru is arguing that every such endowment, every such innate ability must have a social context unless you, say, believe in the biological superiority of certain caste groups or certain race groups which have absolutely no scientific basis. So, what material context would have prompted Dalits to go for experimentation, innovation and imagination? Skilled occupations do facilitate a certain degree of innovation among their members. So, he is talking about how different skills, people who are involved in different skilled occupations, for example, carpentry or blacksmithy or masonry or other work where they have to use their skills and tools more imaginatively, may have a social context that might further improve their imaginative skills. So, that is the argument here.

The progressively transforming labour processes unfold umpteen opportunities for reflexive capabilities. The intellectual history of the West is proof enough in this regard. In India, social groups, particularly the artisan caste, who are forced, if not privileged, to handle the labour process with innovation could produce an innovative knowledge system. But certain groups like Dalits who did not form part of the organic labour process, were ultimately fated to develop an intellectual capacity to reflect. So, this is a very important argument that if you look into the traditional occupations of Dalits, for centuries, they worked as agricultural labourers, landless labourers who did only physical work, and in many places, they were the slave caste who were sold and bought, en massed and then disposed of.

They were forced to do menial jobs, menial jobs including scavenging, removing the carcasses of dead animals, or doing other extremely menial jobs. So, these jobs, according to Guru, do not provide them the context to improvise, improve their abilities to reflect, theorise, and then create better knowledge systems. Generations after generations, they were pushed into occupations completely devoid of any possibility of innovation and imagination. And for example, in a caste-like Bhangis in the northern part of Rajasthan and in Haryana and in other places, their only job for the past several centuries has been to carry human excreta on their head, collected from the upper caste households, carry it and then dispose of it. Now, this particular job involves no

imagination and it is such a disgusting job in their everyday life.

So, social context is central in preventing somebody's imaginative abilities from flourishing and fruitify. Until the arrival of modernity in India, particularly with independence, Dalits were not included in the differentiated spheres of production that offer the context of imagination. In other words, ghettoisation into inferiorised manual spheres reflecting the cross character of society resulted in the loss of the confidence that is so important in developing the theoretical potential of Social Sciences. A very important aspect.

How historically, maybe till some say 50 or 100 years back, for several centuries, this large section of the population was tied to some of the most routine dehumanizing jobs. In the Indian context, these occupations were alienating and humiliating and stalled any possibility of imagination or innovation within Dalit communities. Thus, before independence, the Dalits lacked the context and condition, differentiated spheres of production, both intellectual and material and destigmatised occupations are necessary for acquiring intellectual caliber and confidence. After independence, the labour process did offer differentiated spheres for Dalits.

After independence, the rigidity in terms of traditional occupations became more relaxed. Castes could move beyond their traditional occupations and then venture into other opportunities. However, they did not create sufficient conditions that made reflectivity possible. That is another observation that he makes. We shall discuss this point in greater detail later.

Suffice it to say that the lack of conditions stalled the growth of any reflective faculty among Dalits. Dalits may have had reflective capacities, but could not develop them. They were denied conditions that are necessary for the development of reflective faculties. They were denied the conditions that are necessary for the development of reflective faculties. He highlights the notion of freedom as a very important condition that requires you to develop the ability to reflect.

So, this freedom is not only the notion of individual freedom but freedom from fear, hunger, physical insecurities, and anxieties about tomorrow. Now, if a person or a community or a group of people are constantly haunted by the insecurities of tomorrow, the whole question of how do you fill the stomachs of your family, or you are constantly afraid of the physical security about your shelter, clothing, your food, then that that very, basic life would prevent you from developing more fine features, fine characteristics, reflective abilities, and your scholarly pursuits. You will be more bogged down by the vagaries of nature and of your life. So, in this section, he is talking about how freedom of various senses is important. Ultimately, it is those with economic security who can pursue philosophy and theory in the formal sense of the terms, which is something very important.

So, he gives an example of Ambedkar's example, how he had to move beyond his immediate context and then make sure that he had some free time and then freedom to reflect, think, and then come up. Scholarship programs are insufficient to provide material security for Dalits for two reasons. First, they are meagre, and second, they do not guarantee jobs that are crucial for reflectivity. Along with these conditions, the community resources and historically accumulated intellectual resources assure a congenial cultural context, making one's choice of theoretical research look natural. So, if you look, if you compare this with another group of people coming from more privileged backgrounds, from families of learned people, families of education, families of highly cultured people, then for them investing say 4 or 5 years in researching certain things is not a burden at all, because they are not expected to earn money and then support their family.

On the contrary, the family would be supporting them. The family would assure them that they do not have to worry about the family and, in turn, the family can support them sufficiently. So, you have the free time, all the freedom and facilities to think, work, and then create some academically or intellectually rigorous materials. So, members of the twice-born caste are fortunate to enjoy these conditions both in India and abroad, the

Dalits lack these community resources, which is very true. Then the hierarchical past survives in the cultural present.

These historical reasons gave a structural advantage to the top of the twice-born TTB, a section of the upper layer of the social hierarchy in India. In consolidating its privileged position in doing theory, historically accumulated cultural inequalities seemed to have reinforced Dalit epistemological closure. This, in effect, left the realm of reflectivity and entirely free for the TTB. Such closure has its sanction in Manu's thinking. The Sudras, according to Manu, are born from the leg and hence are deficient in terms of the capacity to think. Manu's court denied Dalits and women access to formal education, which is necessary to achieve the capacity to speak in an abstract universal language. This division with religious sanction behind it was conveniently naturalised within folk consciousness as evident in this Marathi Ditti. The privileged location of TTB, the top twice-born was further legitimised through the writing of both Indian and foreign scholars. He talked about P V Kani and maybe slightly more with reservation of Louis Dumont, who privileged the Brahmin the impression that the Brahmin are the founding heads of knowledge production in India. So, Louis Dumont mentions with reservation that Brahmins, as the renouncers, were the creators of value and different branches of knowledge.

It is generally believed by some scholars that Brahmins have always pursued theoretical or pure reason with the help of intricate arguments while Buddha always followed practical reason. That is a commonsensical argument, a commonsensical sense that is prevalent. Members of the TTB have consolidated cumulative advantage over Dalits or Bahujans for the following reasons. First, the TTBs were fortunate enough to receive modern education from the imperialists. Again, it is a historical fact that it was the top twice-born, especially the Brahmins who were the first to make use of the scientific education or the secular education from the colonialists.

No other aspects of pollution, meat-eating or alcoholism of the colonialists were influenced by upper caste, especially the Brahmins, but the Brahmins were the first to accept and then adapt to these new opportunities. Many of them did not mind migrating

the western countries, even though that went against the spirit of the religion. They were also the recipient of different kinds of fellowships that were showered upon them both by several princely states and colonial states. These are all historical facts. Even after independence, they received attention and appreciation for those in power.

For example, he talks about how the hegemony of Brahmins or the upper caste people who occupied the most important position during the colonial and post-colonial periods really worked as a social capital and form of resources that enabled these people to come up and make use of the opportunities. And this is an extremely important argument. Many new studies are emerging on how caste works as a capital. Caste works as a form of capital. This capital helps in bringing up members of the same caste.

It works as a network of highly influential people in the form of social capital. Of course, the caste as cultural capital is well understood. So, it worked in concrete terms, both in the colonial and post-colonial scenario. Yeah. So, he is talking about how, in recent times, there have been some initiatives to provide scholarships and other things to people from disadvantaged groups, but otherwise, it was mostly monopolised by the already privileged groups.

There is no doubt that these institutions, including the Indian ones, have promoted quality research. But these institutions' obsession with modernity as a governing condition seems to have seriously undermined egalitarian principles that, as seen earlier, require equal access to intellectual resources. Many scholars who have managed to become part of a globally operating academic network have a strong attachment to every new opportunity. So, he says, now these are all important observations. I am not going through them in detail, but about how, in terms of concrete policies, Indian institutions were not much concerned about ensuring an egalitarian level playing field in its substance.

For a long time, institutions like IITs and IIMs were outside the purview of reservation. And this OBC reservation came much, much later. Till the late 70s, these IITs and almost every educational institution were supposedly free supposedly open, which in turn

resulted in most of the students who were able to enroll in them being from the already privileged upper class and upper caste positions. So, these institutions, while they were preoccupied with the question of merit, preoccupied with the questions of academic excellence, were completely oblivious to the question of inclusivity, completely oblivious to the question of social justice, completely oblivious to the question of egalitarianism. So this section is completely about that, how even the UGC and the ICSSR have had had a very limited role in doing that.

In any case, Dalits are the latecomers of such opportunities. They were excluded from the benefits. So, it is an institutional analysis of the higher education system in India. In the absence of such opportunities, the only alternative available to Dalits, Adivasis and OBCs is to approach central bodies such as the University Grants Commission and the ICSSR for help. It would be interesting to know how many tribals and Dalits have been beneficiaries of various national and international fellowship programs.

So, he is looking into that, which again presents a very dismal picture that despite state initiatives, the number of students who are enrolled on some of these important places is highly insufficient. On the other hand, there is a constant flow of opportunities for the TTBs. The Sudras have been, as remarked earlier, left with the earthen pot full of empirical detail that is thoroughly despised by the TTB as inferior. The pot overflows in seminars magazines and government offices as and when it requires to overflow. Apart from the monopolisation of institutions to maintain the historical lead in epistemological status, the TTBs deploy different strategies such as canonising the discourse with the help of well-defined ground rules, procedures and protocols and compartmentalisation of institutions and chosen teams.

For example, the high prison theory seeks to canonise Social Science discourse around ground rules that are often inhibiting protocols that are discouraging, language that is definitely frightening and procedures that cause those who want to move away from empirical to the theoretical. So, as I mentioned earlier, these are all heavily influenced by Gopal Guru's personal experience as a teacher who witnessed how a university works and also his experience may be in a whole lot of seminars and conferences where these

protocols are ensured, where this very intimidating atmosphere is made, where you see this frightening language that obscures the content, all these things. This TTB professionalism strikes fear among the Dalits and Bahujans who then do not dare to enter theoretical agrahara. The failure to elevate the discourse to higher levels of complexity and the formulation and approximation of experience result in displeasure displayed by the gatekeepers of Social Science towards Dalit, Tribals and OBCs. The creation of language becomes another effective weapon to restrict the entry of Dalits into academic circles based on a particular syntax, mostly Anglo-American.

Some of the more nasty guards of these circles would point out the grammatical mistakes of the Dalit publicly, not just to crush the intellectual confidence of the Dalits through humiliation but also to hide behind the language game. This restricted exchange ultimately leads to the creation of mutual admiration societies. Delhi is full of such societies. Such societies certainly achieve a certain height, but hardly any depth in Social Sciences. So, read this section; it is such a scathing attack on the snowberry in Social Sciences, perpetuated by the so-called high priests of Social Sciences.

It is so sharp language and metaphors that Guru uses in this thing. So, read that. He is invoking, , Gramsci about how these are all, as I told you, inspired by his own experience of having to witness such drama in many academic spaces.

Now, moral conditions of reflective capabilities. Doing theory demands enduring moral stamina for successfully restricting the temptation of temporal gains that have the capacity to demotivate a person from pursuing intellectual projects.

He is talking about the need, the requirement for freedom and the requirement for a fair and level playing field; here, he is talking about the moral conditions for reflective capabilities. Doing serious theory also demands that one should overcome the sense of anxiety that involves an element of compulsion to perform, Very pertinent point. Performance, whether on stage or in seminar room, is aimed at getting immediate recognition from the audience. In such performances, what becomes important are body language, speech, sound and speed of words, and not so much of the careful arrangements of the content.



Doing theory requires discipline, patience, and endurance to make a carefully made theoretical statement, not superficially or polemically. Doing theory does not, therefore, bring you immediate recognition. Ambedkar's sociological, economic and jurisprudential work took a long time, and Rawls invested nearly 20 years in his theory of justice. Against this, the temporal fetches immediate here-and-now recognition. Most Dalits are vulnerable to the attraction of the temporal power that does not flow from the theoretical practices but from what is considered easy, if not more glamorous, spheres of mobility. This might include formal politics and networking with the institution that demand the intellectuals always be ready with data. So, in this section, he is talking about why that there are Dalits often find it difficult, or Dalits are often reluctant to move into the realm of theory building or reflective research than they find it easier to go into places where it is much easier for them for this higher social mobility. And maybe to an extent, this can also be compared with the question of Dalits or Adivasis being forced to take up jobs immediately after their graduation or masters rather than spending another 4 or 5 years for research by getting some meagre fellowship. So all these factors are something very important. So, in such an intellectual atmosphere, promoting theory requires the transcendence of emotions to reach rationality, and anybody offering theory looks strange to this band of Dalits who have a stake in maintaining the collective theoretical inability.

The logic of the temporal dominates the academic agenda of the Dalits. Thus, many of them go in for soft options rather than tough courses such as philosophy and theory that do not promise temporal power. It is this professionalisation of Dalit interest that, on one hand, makes them more individualistic in their attitude and, on the other, is responsible for their casualness, if not callousness, towards theory. So, Guru acknowledges that there is an issue, but this issue has a sociological and historical explanation. Then, he talks about how Dalits try to compensate for the theoretical deficiency by substituting it with brilliant poetry.

However, he argues poetry cannot be a substitute for theory. Again very interesting points. Poetry cannot be a substitute for theory. Most poetry, including the poetry, is

based on aesthetics and metaphors, and this no doubt makes things interesting. It is true that Dalits have deployed a good sense of aesthetics, but it, by definition, belongs to the particular.

Though it is based on rich experience and therefore has the potential to become the guiding standard for universal. Besides, it is also generates inwardness and tends to keep some things hidden from the public imagination. But poetry has no considerable capacity to universalise the particular and particularise the universal. So, he is saying that even though poetry is quite powerful because you are able to express through aesthetics and through creativity and imagination, theory is the one which actually provides you the the tool to universalise the particular and then particularise the universe. So, the theory has the ability to make sense of your immediate context in the larger scenario and also the larger scenario through your immediate context.

By contrast, theory demands clarity of concept, principles and the open examination of one's actions to see whether they are justified. Poetry helps the Dalits in making connections through metaphor. So, it is a comparison between poetry and theory and Guru, which strongly suggests that the theory requires its own relevance or has its own relevance. It is not entirely true that Dalits turn towards either poetry or empirical research out of compulsion. On closer observation, it is found that they also make very conscious choice to undertake empirical research for the following reason.

First, they would argue that their lived experience is rich enough and can stand on its own authentic terms and that it does not require any theoretical representation. This is another trend that your experience is very true, especially your experience of discrimination and humiliation is very true and that needs to be recorded and needs to be studied. Experience from them is a sufficient condition for organizing their thought and action and igniting everyday experience into resistance. Second, Dalits argue that since they have privileged access to their reality, they can capture it in a full view without any theoretical representation. .

This claim is obviously based on ontological blindness. Now, so these are the third in

defense of empiricism. Some Dalits still argue that doing theory is undesirable because it makes a person intellectually arrogant, egoistic and socially alienated if not error. So, these are some of the responses that Guru must have gleaned from the Dalit scholars who argue have a very negative position towards theory building. But Gopal Guru's position is very clear: Dalits need theory, and Dalits need to invest in theory.

Now, this is the point that he argues. Dalits need theory as a social necessity. It is argued here that moving away from the empirical mode to the theoretical one has become a social necessity for Dalits, Adivasis and OBCs. It has become a social necessity for the following reasons. First, theory is a social necessity for them to confront the reverse orientalism that treats Dalit tribals and OBC's as inferior empirical self and TTB as the superior theoretical self. As we mentioned, just like the white Europeans going to remote places, coming to India, going to tribal areas, going to Africa, going to the West Indies, going to the Caribbeans and then studying the tribals and the present, this is how they think, this is how they look.

So, a similar trend, as Guru has pointed out, is a trend among Hindu upper caste social scientists to go to Dalit or to take up some tribals or go to some tribal hamlet or Dalit hamlet and then do a study in haste and then come up with a caricature. Very, very floppy, very slippery theorisation, very rudimentary theorisation, very problematic assumptions and then arguments. So, first theory is a social necessity, yeah. So, this, the description of the body language of the Dalits and the OBC becomes need for the cultural and political satisfaction of TTB. Because they are objectified, they are seen as objects, and so they are described, and the Dalit way of dressing is described.

There are studies which, for example, look at how Dalit youth use Jeans and other things as a symbol of modernity. And these observations were made on a very, very peripheral level, very superficial level, with a very, very high stand of moral standard and then taking, you are passing comments on those groups. So, this is due to the reason that the TTB did not find it necessary to offer theoretical treatment to the theatrical language of the OBC chief minister of Bihar. He must be, or the Dalit chief minister of

Uttar Pradesh he is referring to Lalu Prasad Yadav and then Mayawati. The theory of theatrical language offers a unique opportunity for Dalit Bahujan scholars to escape derisive descriptions of their cultural symbols. It is in this sense that doing theory becomes a social necessity in order to fight inverted Orientalism,.

So, he says Dalits have been objectified, commented on, described, explained, interpreted by the non-Dalits or the upper castes. And it is just like how, Indians felt, or the people in the Orient felt how they were theorised, explained, described by the Western scholar. So, he argues that that is not sufficient or a good scenario. To put it more crudely, the asymmetrical relationship that characterises inverse Orientalism seeks to caricature Dalit tribals and OBCs as amusing objects. Again, as I told you, the fundamental aim of Gopal Guru's essay is to provoke, so that is why it is so polemical, it does not have the usual finesse or the modesty that you see in it. Its basic aim is to create a controversy, create a dialogue, and elicit a response. So, that is the major aim of Gopal Guru: to elicit a response, to create a debate, to make people talk about this scenario, which is so far hushed under or swept under the carpet. Dalits have been portrayed as amusing objects in several studies initiated by UGC and ICSR around Dalits and tribals.

Now, women are doing separate studies in this. These studies of Dalits and tribal communities seek to museumise the latter as amusing objects. In view of the complete lack of theoretical interventions from Dalit and Bahujans scholars, some non-Dalit messiah have offered to represent Dalits or Bahujans theoretically. So, this is another point that he brings in. They claim to fight the reverse Orientalism on behalf of Dalits look attractive.

It is argued by T.T.B. that they need to intervene in Dalit situations at the theoretical level only to restore voice and visibility to Dalits and ultimately advance Dalit epistemological course. ok. However, this also ends up producing reverse Orientalism very subtly. So, he is even critical of non-Dalit scholars who openly declare commitment to the Dalit course.

So, even that seems not completely free of problems for Guru. For example, a scholar like Sharmala Rege, who identified herself with Dalit feminism, would appear more suspect in Gopal Guru's argument. The claim to offer epistemological empowerment to Dalits involved a charity element, which is condescending. The epistemological charity has several implications for Dalits. First, speaking of Dalits or anybody constitutes a Jajmani relationship structurally involving a patron and client. In the present case, the Muknayak or the translator as the leader of the dump mass, becomes the patron, and the dump becomes the client to define the patron.

The patron in very ironical sense tend to reproduce the Brahminical mechanism of first controlling knowledge resources and then pouring them into the empty cupped palms of Dalits. It happens in the same humiliating way. The TTB still pours water into the hands of the thirsty Dalits. This relationship makes the Muknayak intellectually indispensable, and the dump almost crawls before such messiahs for rhetorical appreciation and designated empowerment rather than real theoretical elevation. So, he is talking about how even the people who have sympathy with the Dalit cause must be seen with more caution.

The Jajmani relationship also has another implication for the Dalits. The representation tends to undervalue or underplay the discursive capacity of such groups who, in favourable hermeneutic conditions, can develop an epistemic stamina. So, the very prevalence of these people from within the community also prevents others from developing more organically rich perspectives and ideas. But the Muknayaks make a very smart move prompting the dump to throw up more interesting details so that the former can use these details for either grand formulations of a liberal mode or the postmodernist deconstruction. This, by implication, restricts the Dalits to empirical and pushes them into a frozen essentialist trap. The postmodernist construction of Dalits remains blind to the hegemonic politics that would feel happy to celebrate such a construction.

It replaces the need to connect several local experiences belonging to the same logical

class of collective suffering and exploitation. So this mere celebration of differences, as we have been saying, is what is being fulfilled by this group of intellectuals and not a genuine interest to help the Dalits to question the systems and structures of operation and inequality radically. Thirdly, from the epistemological enthusiasm of the known Dalits also suffer from another and rather serious malady.

This intellectual representation remains epistemologically posterior. This is again a very, very interesting thing which Sarukkai will take up in the coming class. That is to say, the discovery of the Dalit epistemological standpoint fails to explain who has arrived, whether the object is Dalit or the subject is the Muknayaks. This question becomes absolutely important because such claims have been sustained on the basis of throwing up completely new conceptual landscape from the Dalit experience. This inability to either recover or throw up alternative concepts happens because these scholars choose to theorise about the Dalit experience while standing outside the Dalit experience.

This representation thus remains epistemologically posterior. So, his argument again is a very contentious debatable argument that somebody who does not actually experience the Dalit life will always have a posterior position with respect to the Dalit experience. They will always be outside and beyond that, not a part of that. They will always have a posterior position. In the use of the posterior epistemology, its standpoint remains a mere assertion that feeds on the critique of the mainstream, Marxist or feminist framework. This externality hardly enables the Dalits to secure theoretical advances in their revolutionary understanding of politics.

To put it more crudely, such epistemological enthusiasm may turn Dalit epistemology into the exegetical horizon of differences that may radically undermine any possibility of the fusion of egalitarian epistemologies. So, again, the same point is that such celebrations would radically curtail the possibility of forging a larger alliance with with similar scenarios. So, this is about how Dalits and then Marxist theory has this tension. Now, Dalits need theory as inner necessity.

That is a concluding section which he talks about. There seem to be different factors that

become the preconditions for the realisation of this inner necessity. There are moral conditions. For Dalits to realise doing theory as an inner moral necessity, they must make a conscious moral choice to use their sense of freedom for understanding and reflecting on the Dalit experience. They should treat this freedom to walk out on the Dalit experience as the initial condition for achieving the theoretical heights of their reflection. They may go to Oxford and Cambridge to achieve heights in their experience, but they should also make the moral choice to walk back into the Dalit experience in order to accord depth to their reflections.

These are all suggestions, advices, politically motivated advices, not mere moral advices, but heavily politically charged advices. This becomes an essential condition for doing theory. Thus, the modernist theorists who are driven by the individualised intellectual triumphalism of conquering newer epistemological territories become a morally undesirable position for Dalits. This epistemological imperialism is one-sided as it shows commitment to scholarship and not to the course. So, he is calling out the Dalit scholars, the emerging Dalit scholars, to actively participate in this very conscious act of theory building, not to not to build their own empires in isolation.

For Dalits, theory comes as a double commitment to scholarship and the social cause. As part of the moral commitment, the Dalits should avoid walking into pure empiricism or experientialism, which come as alternatives in the competitive forms of tokenism in the realm of both academics and politics. For Dalits, theory should not begin and end with Oxford or Cambridge or some institutions in India that promote theoretical work. Their theory should not be taught in the self-serving professionalism and stupefaction adopted by the TTB in the country. They should test the tenacity of the theory, not with the certification of jurists of Social Sciences, whosoever attractive they might be.

So, it is a Gramscian project that demands impeccable commitment on the part of the theorist to translate technical content into an ordinary idiom and common speech so that it becomes accessible to the common people and does not remain confined to seminar rooms only. Very important when he talks about organic intellectuals and other things, it is very important. In fact, it should be practised from the Red Fort in Delhi, which is very

interesting.

He is saying that, in fact, it should be practised from the Red Fort in Delhi. And what Red Fort signifies. That would, by the way, re-signify the fort by dispelling the deceitful rhetoric of interested parties, ritually on every August 15th. Dalits are expected to take the initiative of giving moral lead to doing theory in the country. This orientation would thus remove the cultural hierarchies that divide Social Science practices into theoretical, Brahmins and empirical sudras. Ultimately, Social Science in India would fulfil the fondest hopes by expanding the social base of its conceptual landscape.

Beautifully he has written. So, as I mentioned, this was a very, provocative essay. Essay that created a lot of ripples, if not immediately, but of later. And it was a very decisive intervention by Gopal Guru; so we will go for the next essay in the coming class, Experience and Theory from Habermas to Gopal Guru by Sundar Sarukkai. Again, this is an excellent piece, which responds to Gopal Guru's article.

But, of course, it takes it into a more philosophical dimension, which is very important. So, again, we will go a bit slow. I will devote two sessions to reading and then understanding this essay. So, see you in the coming class. Thank you.