Thus they went for Indian nationalism in 1947 under Shyama Prasad Mukherjee, MLA from the Calcutta University. He was president, by the way, of Hindhu Mahashabha. The Bengal leadership of the Indian National Congress, went along. In India, by 1947, communal identities overwhelmed national identities.

India was never a nation, but a collection of nations or 'nationalities' if you prefer. So one may call it a 'civilization', it is not a nation, at any rate not yet. But before the idea of nation matures the British fostered the idea that the two great religious communities are two nations in India. What about other communities? For truth's sake, there should have been as many nations as there were communities.

Ostensibly, it was the Muslims of India, especially the aristocrats, who put forward this demand. But the truth was that the Muslims put forward their demands in reaction to the developments in late 19th century, especially after the exclusion of Muslims in the Governor-General's Legislative Council in 1892. So the organic crisis that led to the usurpation by foreigners of India's administration in the 18th century continued throughout the 19th century by a different path to mutation. The sense of nationality was converted to a religious communal sense. And this was not without its repercussions. Today's India is a multinational state. So is today's Pakistan and Bangladesh. Even Bangladesh is also a multinational state. But the ruling classes would not admit that honestly. They are trying to suppress the word 'Advasi', for instance. In other words, they are trying to suppress national minorities.

In order to understand origins of the communal problem in Bangladesh well one must refer to India. This may sound not well advised. But it is true. Our borders, especially cultural ones, are porous. And what we see in Bangladesh as communalism is more often reverse communalism. It is most often the flip side of communalism in India. Communalists of all nations are united in one thing, they are oppressors. Therefore communalists in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh they are part of a South Asian communalist international, so to speak. In order to resist them you should form a people's international, there is no exit outside. Exactly as the case was in the 18th century, so it is going on today. The 20th century, its second half especially saw the worst. Alas, it is not yet over, not in the 21st either. The Indian state (officially secular) in this regard is a failed state, so is the (officially communal) state of Pakistan, (officially semi-communal) Bangladesh proves not exception. None of these states could put it the legacy of communalism behind. Communal conflicts do flourish, with official and sometimes civil social support, everywhere. That means the organic crisis with the British inherited and passed on continues to this day.

It has not been solved. Why, on earth? For a fundamental social revolution has not been carried out. 1947 is not a fundamental social revolution and I'm very sorry to observe it despite my great commitment to 1971 warfare I must admit that we are a failure sate. The revolution has become "passive", to use again a Gramscian signifier, which in Bangla we sometimes translate it as "Behat". Even 1971, our liberation war, could not put an end to the legacy of 1947. So it remains as a half-baked revolution. Our struggle continues. Bangladesh must accomplish a social revolution, which alone can make the communal question perhaps completely superfluous. Why do we need to continue? For it is a continuation of the unfinished struggle against British colonialism.

> "Rumours spread the truth in a fictional way. So what is fiction here? That the Indian Army came to Bangladesh to repress political dissidents is the fiction. What is the truth, then? It is that there is a fear in the mind of the people. That India might come is the truth."

Why do you think people believe in rumours?

Why people buy, you ask, rumours? It is a very metaphysical question. Our minds are hungry, or thirsty if you prefer. If you are not going to feed them with the right stuff they are going to purchase the wrong. Getting them the right thing, I mean politically right thing, is your business. A Bengali daily, namely Inqilab (what an irony) recently published in its columns a rumor that the Indian army came into the terrain of Bangladesh, intervening in Satkhira. Why was it that they alone were the ones to find it out? Or take the instance of the group named Hefajate Islam. I refer to the incidents on the day and night of May 5-6 in Dhaka. Some human rights organisations claimed first and then at least 61 people being killed. Whatever happened to those claims? These are classical examples of rumors. The point is why whould you lend your ears to this tales, if you too don't have a felt gap?

Rumours spread the truth in a fictional way. So what is fiction here? That the Indian Army came to Bangladesh to repress political dissidents is the