

...not just the future, the present too

(Speech at Virasam Foundation Day Conference - July 2025. Edited for better clarity.)

Comrades, I thank the organisers of this conference, the comrades of Virasam, for giving me this opportunity to come and be with you and talk about this topic. Essentially, it relates to the tremendous repression being faced by the revolutionary movement today. The huge losses it has sustained and whether that calls for any review or change in the path it has followed till now. Or the tactics it has adopted.

Before I get into that, I would like to speak a little about some old memories. When we came into the movement in our student days, in the early 70s, the only thing we had was disgust for the revisionism of the CPM and a desire to link up with the revolutionary movement so that we would be of some use to the people and the country. We had no ideological or political guidance. No contact with any organisation. We just had this desire and some crazy ideas that Naxalites are supposed to be in the jungles. So, some of us, we were studying a college towards the eastern part of Kerala, we would set off on early morning walks, walk miles and miles together, go to the hill areas, jungle areas and then roam around there. The expectation was that someday, somehow we will come across a Naxalite or a squad or something and then we can join them. It took us one year to finally get in touch with the existing party in Kerala. Then we got involved in activities.

Most of us got arrested during Emergency. And when we came out of jail after the Emergency was withdrawn and we were acquitted, I remember I was walking along the road one day and one of my classmates was coming from the opposite direction on a scooter. The moment he saw me, he stopped the scooter, turned it around and fled in the opposite direction. So, that was the condition in the 70s. That is not the condition today. Despite this huge repression, despite the heavy losses we are suffering, despite a very organised enemy - quite unlike the Congress then, now we have a very organised enemy in the fascist RSS and its offshoots - despite all that, we are not isolated. The revolutionary movement is not isolated. And more and more youth are getting attracted to it.

I recently met a comrade from Tamil Nadu. And he was telling me how over the past one month, all over Tamil Nadu, even where the revolutionary movement does not have a presence or active presence, the CPM, CPI and various left parties and the VCK, all of them are very actively campaigning against Operation Kagar and demanding that the government should stop it and agree for ceasefire talks.

That's what he told me. Something similar is seen in Keralam also. Usually whenever our people try to organise something, most of the other parties would keep away from it. But this time, when they organised a Convention on Operation Kagar, demanding that a ceasefire should be implemented and talks should be started, in which Bela Bhatia had come from Chhattisgarh to talk about the conditions there, we saw that a many parties came, participated, declared their support and said that they would be fully engaged in it in future if we take it forward. So, that is why I am saying that the conditions are vastly different from what it was in the 70s when we suffered heavy repression.

Half the Central Committee of the CPI(M-L), all those who stood firm for revolution were murdered, including the Secretary, comrade Charu Majumdar. Something similar happened

in the case of MCC also and all organisations that stuck to the revolutionary path. And those who surrendered like Kanu Sanyal, Satyanarayan Singh, etc. were heralded by the enemy. They went all over the country trying to convince those who were in jail to surrender, to leave the path of armed struggle. While we were in jail, the Gandhi Peace Foundation people had come and informed us that the moment we signed a pledge agreeing to leave the path of armed struggle, we will be released. Those of us who refused continued to be in jail and those who signed were let off.

That is not the condition today. That's what I am saying. So, we must keep that broad context, the historical perspective when we discuss the present condition, the present situation that we are facing. No matter how hard and torturous and distressing it is, how heavy the losses we suffered, the conditions are quite favourable for the path of revolution. Not only in our country but throughout the world. Now, having said that, that does not mean that there is nothing to think about.

We cannot just continue as if nothing new needs to be done and everything will be fine. What I said was not blind optimism but a realistic evaluation of the potential that is existing in the present situation. We know very well that every revolutionary movement that has stood true to its principles, to its aims, has suffered severe repression. Again and again. All over the world, everywhere you see that. Not only in our country. And whenever such a heavy repression takes place, the question of the tactics that we have to adopt to overcome this comes up. Now, in our country, especially in this part of our country, that is Telangana and Andhra Pradesh, there is the direct experience of two instances of tactics that were used. One was the withdrawal of the Telangana armed struggle in 1951 and the other was a suspension of armed struggle in the 1970s.

The first led to a total surrender. It led to the imprisonment of thousands of comrades and who knows how many were killed. There is no exact account. 50 were put on trial and sentenced to death by the Nehru government despite all the 'gentleman's' agreements between it and the revisionists. And it was only because of a mass movement that they finally were able to escape the gallows. So, that was one experience. At that time also, when the armed struggle was withdrawn in 1951, the undivided Communist Party leadership had informed its cadres that this is just a tactic to overcome the present repression. Once things are organised again, the armed struggle would be resumed. But we know that did not happen. Step by step by step the leadership sunk into the parliamentary morass and finally abandoned armed struggle altogether.

Not only that. I personally knew a person who was in the Air Force during the Second World War. He was a member of a communist cell. These communist cells had been organised all over. In the Air Force, in the Navy, as well as in the Army. And in some places where mutinies took place against the British they were the leaders actually. That whole lot of comrades were betrayed by the revisionist leadership to the Congress government. All of them got arrested. They were all imprisoned in the barracks behind the Teenmurti Bhavan where Nehru, as the new Prime Minister of India, was living. It was earlier the residence of the commander-in-chief of the British Indian Armed Forces. So that was one experience of so-called tactics to overcome repression.

We have the other experience of the 1970s. Where, though there may be differences about how exactly that should have been formulated, that did not lead to surrender. Rather it paved

the way for building the movement in a totally new manner. In a totally new, broadly organised manner, with the strengthening of organisations like the RSU and the youth organisation, the peasant organisation, the massive 'Go to the Villages' movements, all of which led to the formation of squads. Finally leading up to the present struggle that is going on in the Dandakaranya. A similar thing happened in Bengal and Bihar also where MCC and the Party Unity took initiative, building broad movements that ultimately led to the development of a new phase of armed struggle in those regions too.

We have both these examples before us. One, where tactics leads to surrender. The other, where it leads to a resurgence of the movement. So this is very crucial. What exactly should this tactics be about? The lesson is this. Tactics can serve the cause of overcoming repression and rebuilding the movement in a broader, better manner only if it sticks to the path that is necessary for carrying out the revolution in a country.

Now as far as our country is concerned it is a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country. It is a clear thing that the path that has to be followed is that of a protracted people's war. I do not think that there is any reason, any objective situation or condition, that demands a re-examination of that path. As far as the basic aspects of the semi-colonial, semi-feudal characteristics of our country are concerned, they are very much evident even today. Especially the semi-colonial part, the part of subjugation to imperialism. It is becoming more and more glaring, day by day. In the coming days we are going to see that in an even more glaring manner with the Modi government preparing to sign away our whole agriculture sector to his US masters. Does that mean that there is no need for a re-examination of tactics, on how exactly we go about this? When we speak about an agrarian revolution, that becomes central, given the semi-feudal, semi-colonial character of the country, how exactly is this agrarian revolution going to proceed? Because while it is clear that semi-feudalism is there, it is also the case that a lot of changes have also taken place in that, over the years.

It has taken place because of various reasons. When compared with the British period, there are considerable changes in semi-feudalism. Government reforms and various revolutionary democratic struggles have brought about a change in feudal exploitation, forms of exploitation and the rural class composition. New forces have become part of the feudal forces. Party - cooperative - panchayat - police networks have taken form. A new form of feudalism, a new form of exploitation and of control have emerged.

This is a new condition that has emerged in many parts of the country. It is partly because of the deepening of bureaucrat capitalism, the spread of bureaucrat capitalism. It is also partly the result of the struggles waged under the leaderships of revolutionary organisations or democratic and progressive organisations. There is another aspect also. The more and more bureaucrat capitalism deepens its control, its grip, its penetration in the country, the more and more the demand for monetary returns increases because everything now demands cash.

Monetary income becomes very important for every family. For every family generally, but also, most importantly, for the peasant family. Cash returns from agriculture becomes very important. And if you look at the conditions over the past many years, you can see that generally this has been on the decline. It has not kept up with the demands of the present world. As a result, a large section of youth are turning away from agriculture or from traditional occupations. It is not just agriculture. For example, you can see the same thing along the coastal regions of our country, among the fisher folk. The returns from fishing are

going down, while the expense incurred to carry out fishing is going up. The surplus that they are getting is simply not enough to meet their daily demands, cash demands.

Now, it is true that after the COVID pandemic, where lakhs and lakhs of people were forced to migrate back to the villages, the number of people engaged in agriculture has increased according to the latest data. But that is because of compulsion. The industrial sector has not revived in any significant manner. Therefore, rural folk stick on to agriculture because they have no other way. But the trend of moving away from agriculture, of seeing agriculture as a no profit zone, a loss making zone, something that is not worthy in future, that is seen in all aspects. Like, for example, the marriage market. Whereas earlier, a landlord's son commanding hundreds of acres would immediately find a bride in the marriage market, that is not the case today. No matter how many acres you have, you are not going to get a bride, easily. That condition has now come up. Because people don't see agriculture as a profitable, a promising sector.

What is its implication in the practise of agrarian revolution? In some studies that have been carried out about the anti-displacement struggles in our country, it has been noted that the response to the displacement measures of the government are quite varied. In some very backward regions of the country, specifically in the Adivasi areas, the struggle against displacement is directly focused on retaining the land. They don't want to leave the land. They want to keep the land. And that is related to their own occupation, as well as to their religious beliefs. But in other areas, it has been noted that the struggle against displacement is often focused on getting a higher return for the land, a higher compensation. The concern is not so much about losing land but about getting as much compensation as possible. Because they see that once this land is handed over to the corporate sector, once they grab that land, they are able to make a huge profit by increasing the value of the land through making some additions and all that. So, keeping that opportunity cost in mind, the peasants there are demanding a higher compensation.

What is the significance of these two types of responses? If you make the land question the central slogan for mobilisation, in the former area that would definitely have an immediate response. Because land is very much vital to their existence. But in the other type of areas, that sort of slogan might not attract so much of support, mass support, as an immediate tactical slogan. On the contrary, in such areas, the struggle might have to be more directly focused on this nexus that I spoke about. This party - cooperative - panchayat - police nexus controlled by the local landlords of the dominant caste.

So, this sort of variation in tactics, this is definitely required. Though the path remains the same and the overall strategy would also remain the same, one would have to make these sort of adjustments in tactics when one gets actually into the practise in the present period. Because obviously, the necessity of building up powerful mass movements continues as it was in the earlier period. But one has to take care to formulate the proper tactics for that given these various conditions in mind. There is another aspect that we have to consider also, which is the question of how exactly do we understand semi-feudalism. Quite often, the issue is simply reduced to whether the classical forms of feudal exploitation are seen or not.

If that is not seen, if wage labour is more common than tenancy, or if the traditional forms of domination are not seen, then it is immediately said that that this is proof of growth of capitalism. The problem there is the failure to properly understand what is meant by

bureaucratic capitalism. Mao Zedong had defined bureaucratic capitalism as a capitalism that is engendered by imperialism in the countries it has subjugated. A capitalism which is tied up with both imperialism and feudalism, serving the interests of both of them. A capitalism which is directly tied up with the state. These are the specific features of this type of capitalism.

Which means that it never leads to an elimination, a total wiping out of feudalism, as in the case of the classical capitalism that we saw in the Western countries. Rather, this form of capitalism would always keep on generating new forms of feudalism. It would transform it as well as prop up some new forms. Therefore, one cannot expect to see typical types of feudal exploitation, typical types of feudal domination, in our conditions. I will just give you some examples. Some 20 years back when I had done a study of agrarian relations in Keralam, I pointed out that all three types of tenancy exist there. Labour tenancy, crop tenancy, as well as cash tenancy. These three forms continue to exist.

In labour tenancy the person who is taking the land on rent is paying it by doing labour on that land. By planting coconut palms or something or the other, which has to be handed over to the owner of the property after a specific period of time. Even in the case of cash tenancy, where the rent has to be paid in money and where the crop is a cash crop, there too one could see the characteristic of semi-feudalism. It was subsistence tenancy. One knows that Marx differentiated between ground rent and differential rent. Differential rent is the rent, the extra rent so to say, that comes from a land that is more fertile than other lands. Since the produce is better than the other areas, the landlord demands a higher rent. And that rent is what Marx characterised as differential. But in my study of Keralam, I found that even in areas where the fertility is high and the productivity of the land is higher, the rent was lower than other areas. The only reason for this was the lesser demand. There were less people demanding land for tenant cultivation in this area compared to other areas because people in this area had other occupations. They were mainly involved in, I mean speaking of the basic masses, they were mainly involved in construction and various other activities. So they did not so much need income from tenant farming as a supplement. Whereas in the other areas, the people had to rely on this supplemental income coming from tenancy to get on with their lives because they had very few opportunities. One sees here a typical case where the laws of tenancy do not operate according to the logic of capital. They rather operate according to the logic of the demand of the people, which again is decided not by the laws of capitalism but by the backwardness of the whole economy.

Coming to the present, nowadays in Keralam, mechanisation of agriculture has gone up to a great degree compared to some 20 years back. I recently interviewed a person who had taken 50 acres of land on rent. He was mostly doing it in a mechanised manner. Manual labour was very little. On discussing with him about the returns, he said that he is able to maintain a middle class lifestyle with the income from this agriculture. By middle class lifestyle he meant of course an upper middle class lifestyle. But note that he was speaking about maintaining a lifestyle. He was not speaking about the accumulation of capital that is possible from the 50 acres he has taken on rent. He was not talking about the amount of money he was able to accumulate, the amount he turned into capital and invested in agriculture or some other field. He is not accumulating. He is earning enough or extracting enough to maintain a lifestyle.

This I think is a very good example of how semi-feudalism operates. Though he is doing tenant farming on a broad scale, though he is using wage labour, machinery and all that, he is still not operating according to the logic of a capitalist economy. The reason I am speaking about this in detail is that when we try to understand what semi-feudalism is, when we try to work out the tactics appropriate to a certain situation of struggle, one must surely keep particularities in mind. But we must also understand, go deeper into it and understand, whether what we see before us represents the capitalist logic or the logic of bureaucrat capitalism. This type of capitalism that transforms but sustains feudalism. Because that determines the overall path, the overall direction.

This is one aspect of the present situation. The other aspect that we have to take note of today I think is the increased casualisation of labour. Now, it is true that in our country the major chunk of the workers even in the modern sector, that is the industrial sector, have been casual workers since long. We know that employment in the big factories has been very little when compared to that in the informal sector. But this casualisation is now no longer restricted to the working class. Look at the faculty of our academic institutions. Throughout the country the larger section of the faculty, especially those who have been newly appointed over the past 10-15 years, are all casual workers, day workers. They are paid according to the number of days they work or the number of hours they take lectures. In other words, casualisation has now spread very much into the petty bourgeoisie too. They are appointed as assistant professors and all that. But they are basically casual workers working on a daily wage basis. They can be sent out of employment anytime and they get paid only for the days that they work, days of employment.

This casualisation is creating a new condition. Precarity is now spreading out. This of course creates a shady condition for these people but also prepares the ground for a larger section to get conscious of the conditions they work in. We can see that happening where this precarity, this casualisation, first took hold of, in the Western countries. In countries like America and Canada. You might have heard that last year there was a series of struggles in Canadian and American universities, organised by associations of these type of teachers. They are known as tenured faculty there because they work according to a specific tenure. It was a big struggle. People who consider themselves as middle class, who thought they are secure in their lives, are being forced to struggle. They are being shaken out of their complacency. They are being forced to come to the realisation that they are in an equally precarious situation like the person working in a petrol pump or any other place or in an informal industry. So this actually broadens the scope of struggle and organisation.

And there are so many new opportunities of organisation also coming up, like gig workers for example. Swiggy, Zomato, delivery agents etc. A whole new field is opening up. We can see that now gradually they have also started organising and getting into struggle. For example, Uber workers have recently organised and formed an association to take up struggle. Gig workers like Swiggy and Zomato people are coming to struggle. All sorts of new sections of people are being forced to come into the path of struggle, which is opening up an opportunity which was not existing earlier. It is actually brightening the prospects for mass activity and mass mobilisation.

Then there is also the spread of communications. And the possibility it offers to produce and popularise counter-narratives. Look at what's happening in Palestine today. And look at the

Western media like say for example BBC, CNN etc. They are not reporting about it, like Al Jazeera. Where do the people today get information about Palestine? It is from the social media. From Instagram, from Facebook, from WhatsApp and all sorts of things. And it is a very vibrant space where the youngsters are coming up with all sorts of ideas to expose the Zionists, to expose the imperialists who are supporting them and to rally support for the people of Palestine, for the people of Gaza. I mean it is indescribable. The sort of crazy ideas that they come up with, creative ideas to push this idea that genocide is going on and we have to protest, we have to come out on the streets, we have to do something about this. You cannot keep silent. It is a powerful counter-narrative. So powerful that even the Zionists and the imperialists have now advised, I mean instructed, their think tanks to come up with methods to counter this. Because the narrative is no longer in their hands.

Earlier they were able to control the narrative. What they said was considered as true. Because there were no other counter-voices. If at all there were some, it was of very few people, not broadly heard or understood. That is not the situation today. There is a powerful counter-narrative exposing at each and every instance the truth of what is happening. Look at the agitations that have come up in America against the forced deportation of people. It was spontaneous but at the same time organised. And the youngsters have come up with so many new methods of communication, of evading surveillance, of evading face recognition technology, of evading cell phone surveillance of the state, that the state is simply finding it difficult to keep its control over this. So this is a new situation again.

That's the whole possibility, potential that is coming up for a counter-narrative through the social media. Even when that is blocked. As we know, once you get past a certain viewership in the social media on Palestine or some such issue, immediately your account is suspended or blocked. You are simply cut off from communication. But all these things are being evaded. They are being broken through. New forms are coming up. New forms of decentralised social media networks have come up like Mastodon, Diaspora and all that. The state is finding it impossible or difficult to control. Even in a country like China, which has got a sort of 360 degree surveillance, total surveillance, new Maoist groups are coming up. They are doing active propaganda on a day to day basis about what is happening in China, what happened in China during the Cultural Revolution. They are bringing out accounts of the present reality, spreading the word of Mao Zedong and Maoism all over the country through the net. They are getting suppressed. Yet they keep coming up in one or the other manner. It is going on repeatedly.

This potential again is something that was totally absent earlier. It is a very powerful factor aiding any revolutionary organisation to meet up to the challenges it faces and push forward again. Not only that, we have to note that these technologies are now far more easily accessible. You have the smartphone. Consider the example of the Moolvasi Bachao Andolan in Chattisgarh. This movement was led by Adivasi youth. Perhaps educated till the 10th or 12th. They had their own YouTube channels. They were doing interviews on YouTube. They were putting out propaganda through YouTube. They were mobilising people through their smartphones. All of this was going on in a most backward region of the country. Just imagine the huge potential this has if it is consciously taken up in regions that have far more facilities. This is again pointing out how technology has now become far more accessible than it was earlier. In the 1970s, cyclostyling was itself a very dangerous and challenging task. To get a cyclostyling machine was a practical impossibility. And if you got one also, it

was not at all an easy task to get the ink etc. But today Xerox machines are spread all over the country. All sorts of reproducing methods are available all over the country. And you don't even have to go for printing. You have your smartphone, which is both useful for the enemy to track us and for us to track the enemy also.

All of this is pointing to the new factors that are there. We must keep them in mind. I am not getting into spelling out tactics and all that because it is not my task. I don't think I should do that or anybody of us should do it. It is the people who are in the field who have to work these things out, given the conflict conditions they face.

Overall, if you look at the world situation, you can see a particular situation today, where, on the one hand, the imperialist forces have not been able to succeed in their plans. Yes, it is true that a horrific genocide is taking place in Palestine. They have been able to attack and smash the Hezbollah. They have been able to attack Iran and overall carry out many such things. But if you look at the position of imperialism in the early 1990s or even the early 2000s, what was their attitude at that time, the opinion makers of imperialism? We know that Fukuyama statement of 'end of history' and all that. Their whole attitude was that now there is nothing to block us, no bar before us. We will do whatever we want to do. And they carried it out by imposing the Dunkel Draft on the whole world, especially the Third world, forming the WTO, by attacking Iraq and so many such things. But the crisis of 2007-08, the financial crisis, upset this whole thing. And from there on we can see that they have been forced to step back. Though aggressiveness is continuing, though they are on the offensive in many places, they have been forced to step back. So much so that instead of globalisation, now all the leading imperialist countries and their think tanks are talking about protectionism, how to protect their own economy. And we see that what Trump is trying to do now and the contradictions that he is creating among the imperialists themselves. By his unilateral imposition of tariffs.

So that is one thing, that imperialism has not been able to push ahead and carry out its plans as it wanted. It has been forced to step back. That is one thing. The second thing is, if you look at the revolutionary forces, there also you can see that the promise they held in the 2000s of a huge advance forward, that has not been realised. You saw that in our country, you saw that in other countries also. And we have suffered some serious setbacks. The setback in Peru, in Nepal and our own condition also. More or less similar conditions are there in the Philippines also. Though they have done better at holding on, still they are facing serious repression. The potential or the possibility they saw of going forward to a new stage in their people's war has not been actualised. So the revolutionary forces too have not been able to push ahead as they wished to, or in the way they thought was possible. Now these two things are happening. On the one hand for the enemy and on the other hand for the revolutionary movements.

But as far as the broad masses are concerned, they have never been quiescent. Country after country after country, we have seen upsurges. Huge upsurges, even leading to regime change, like for example in Sri Lanka or in Bangladesh. Every country, one after the other, whether it is in Europe or in Asia, Africa, Latin America, wherever, the masses have never kept quiet. They have always been on the path of struggle. Spontaneous alright, not led by any organisation. As a result of that, after the struggle, the enemy recoups and forms some sort of

a balance there again. They come back to power through one means or the other. But despite all that, the struggle, and that is the most important thing, that has never stopped.

And that actually shows that the real potential, that the masses, are there. They are on the path of struggle. They have never stopped. And that is true of our country also. Despite the repression that we are facing, struggles are taking place on specific issues, local issues that affect the people, in various parts of the country. Despite all the betrayals and all the repression that we have faced, the masses have not left the path of struggle. So this I think we should keep in mind when we talk about the repression today and the problems we face and the way we have to go forward.

In conclusion, to give some examples, you might have heard of the struggles going on in Myanmar. There, after the fascist army again took over power, new resistance fronts came forward. They started linking up with the existing national liberation struggles. And out of all this, there has been a revival of the Communist Party of Burma and its People's Liberation Army, which was suppressed for a long time. That is a new development that has taken place in Myanmar. We don't know much about this Communist Party of Burma, its ideology, its politics and all that. But that has happened. Take the case of Kenya. A revolutionary section within a revisionist party in Kenya has broken away from it and adopted Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. That is a recent development. These sort of things are taking place. New communist forces are coming up.

Now we look at the other end. There is an example that I cite of a rap singer in Kerala. Some of you might have heard about him. His name is Vedan. Vedan actually is a caste name. They are supposed to be hunter-gatherers. And that word has the meaning of hunter. He is a rap singer. He is attracting crowds of some 20,000-30,000 youngsters wherever he goes for some performance. The RSS is extremely annoyed with him. They are trying their best to attack and corner him. That has made him even more popular. The CPM initially tried to suppress him. When they saw that it is going to turn against them they are trying to co-opt him now. The interesting thing about this youngster is the politics of his songs. Each and every one of his songs, his rap songs, is extremely political. Dealing with contemporary issues, worldwide issues. Like what's happening in Palestine, what's happening in Syria and all sorts of things in our country. And very clearly with an anti-caste standpoint. And whenever he starts singing, he first spells out the lines that he is going to sing. Sort of recites the lines. And then asks the audience, the youngsters, do you understand what I am speaking about? And the interesting thing is that a huge roar of yes comes out immediately. What I am saying is this. He is connecting the audience with politics. Not one or two, 20,000, 30,000, so much so that in some instances the barricades were broken down by these youngsters in their rush to get in. Again an example of the condition of the masses today.

Then look at the example of Greta Thunberg. We know she started out as a campaigner against climate change and the ecological disaster that is happening in the world. Where has she progressed to? She has progressed to the realisation that climate change cannot be separated from the genocides and the oppression that is taking place all over the world. If you want to fight and end climate change, you have to fight and end all these sorts of oppression also. Interestingly, once she arrived at that position, when she started talking about that, she became a person non-grata for the imperialist media. You don't hear about Greta Thunberg in

BBC or CNN or anything else. She is no longer invited to the talk shows by these media people. But, on the contrary, she is getting more and more popular on sites like Instagram and Facebook. Precisely because of the new stance that she has taken. That is an example of the radicalisation that is taking place in our present world. So these are the indications that we see all around us, in our country, all over the world.

Thoroughgoing optimists that communists are, the future, for us, has always been bright. You know that famous saying, 'the road is tortuous but the future is bright'. Well not just the future, the present too is bright. There is deep rage, seething rage among the masses, all over the world. Clarity in ideology will allow one to shake off despair caused by savage repression and pierce the fog of pessimism to see this wonderful potential, link up with it, grasp its manifold possibilities and promote its realisation, in order to continue the ongoing task of changing the world.

So with those words I will conclude. Lal Salam to all of you!
