1. The liberation war in 1971

Ans: East Pakistan's long-standing grievances against West Pakistan's political and economic domination set the stage for Bangladesh's Liberation War (Muktijuddho). Key flashpoints – the Language Movement (1952) for Bangla recognition, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's Six-Point Movement (1966) for autonomy, and the 1970 election victory of Mujib's Awami League galvanized Bengali nationalism (Bangalee jatiyatabad). When the Pakistani regime refused to transfer power and launched a brutal military crackdown (Operation Searchlight) on March 25, 1971, committing genocide (gonohotta) in Dhaka, the struggle for Shadhinota (independence) began in earnest [1].

The nine-month Bangladesh Liberation War was essentially a fight for self-determination after decades of cultural and economic subjugation. In early March 1971, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman (Bangabandhu) rallied millions, declaring "this time the struggle is for our freedom, this time the struggle is for our independence" – words that ignited hope for a sovereign Bangladesh [2]. The Pakistani junta's brutal response targeting unarmed civilians, intellectuals, and Hindu minorities confirmed that a peaceful resolution was impossible. On March 26, 1971, Bengali leaders formally proclaimed independence, and an armed people's resistance took shape under the banner of the Mukti Bahini (freedom fighters). The provisional exile government formed in April at Mujibnagar unified political and military efforts, while ordinary Bengalis from students to farmers joined the fight. They viewed the war as an existential battle for national survival against an occupying army that treated them as a colony. International observers quickly recognized the scale of atrocities. American diplomat Archer Blood famously denounced Washington's silence, writing that the U.S. "failed to denounce the suppression of democracy" and evidenced "what many will consider moral bankruptcy" in the face of Pakistan's mass killings [1]. Such eyewitness accounts and foreign media reports likening West Pakistan's exploitation of the East to "an egotistical guest, devouring the best dishes and leaving only scraps" for Bengalis [1] underscored the injustice that had led to war.

On the ground, the conflict rapidly became a people's war of resistance. Volunteers organized into regional units and conducted guerrilla operations across the countryside. Despite immense suffering millions were displaced and around 300,000–3,000,000 killed the resolve of the Bangladeshi people never wavered. By November 1971, the Mukti Bahini with covert Indian assistance had liberated large areas. In December, India openly entered the war, tipping the balance. Facing simultaneous popular guerrilla warfare and conventional Indian military attacks, Pakistan's forces in the East collapsed. The war culminated on December 16, 1971, with the surrender of 93,000 Pakistani troops in Dhaka, sealing Bangladesh's victory and emergence as a new nation.

The Liberation War's background reveals a chronicle of unmet aspirations and brutal repression fueling a rightful rebellion. Bangladesh's independence was born of both the extraordinary sacrifices of its people and the moral clarity that a unified, democratic Bengali nation-state was the only answer to years of injustice. The legacy of 1971 continues to shape Bangladesh's national identity and resolve to uphold self-determination and human dignity.

2.The 1970 Pakistani General Election

The 1970 Pakistani General Election, held on December 7, 1970, stands as the most pivotal and tragic event in Pakistan's early history. It was the first general election based on universal adult franchise since independence and, fatefully, the last election held before the secession of East Pakistan. Conducted under the military regime of President General Yahya Khan, the election was intended to restore civilian rule and frame a new constitution, but it ultimately exacerbated the deep-seated political and ethnic fault lines in the country.

Key Issues and Political Landscape

The electoral contest was defined by two diametrically opposed parties, each dominant in one wing of the country:

Awami League (AL): Led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman in East Pakistan, the AL campaigned on a platform of overwhelming regional autonomy encapsulated in the Six-Point Program. This program demanded a federal system where the central government retained only defense and foreign affairs, effectively ceding all other powers, including fiscal policy, to the provinces [1.2]. The AL's popularity was rooted in years of economic exploitation and perceived political neglect of the majority Bengali population by the West Pakistani-dominated central government. The devastation of the 1970 Bhola cyclone, which the central government responded to poorly, further amplified the AL's narrative of neglect [2.7].

Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP): Led by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in West Pakistan, the PPP appealed to the masses with a populist, nominally socialist agenda, encapsulated by the slogan, "Roti, Kapra aur Makan" (Bread, Clothes, and Shelter) [2.1]. The PPP primarily focused its campaign on the major provinces of West Pakistan, Punjab and Sindh, promising land reforms and nationalization of industries.

The Polarized Mandate

The election results delivered a clear, yet dangerously polarized, outcome:

Awami League's Absolute Majority: The AL achieved a historic and absolute majority in the National Assembly, winning 167 out of 313 total seats (160 out of 162 general seats plus 7 reserved women’s seats) [1.2]. Crucially, the AL won every single seat in East Pakistan, but zero in West Pakistan [2.3].

PPP's West Wing Dominance: The PPP emerged as the second-largest party nationally, winning 86 seats (81 general seats plus 5 women’s seats), becoming the undisputed majority party in West Pakistan, but winning zero seats in East Pakistan [1.1, 1.2].

Aftermath and Disintegration

The results presented an immediate and intractable constitutional crisis. With its absolute majority, the AL was constitutionally mandated to form the government. However, Bhutto and the powerful military establishment refused to allow the AL to implement its Six Points, viewing the program as a prelude to secession [1.4]. Bhutto’s public declaration of "idhar hum, udhar tum" (We rule here, you rule there) cemented the deadlock.

President Yahya Khan’s failure to convene the National Assembly and transfer power, despite the clear democratic verdict, fueled outrage and a mass non-cooperation movement in East Pakistan. In response, the military launched a brutal crackdown on March 25, 1971, known as Operation Searchlight [2.4]. This act ignited the Bangladesh Liberation War, leading to the

intervention of India and, ultimately, the secession of East Pakistan on December 16, 1971, and the creation of Bangladesh [2.1]. The 1970 election is thus a somber historical marker—a democratic process that failed to heal divisions and instead precipitated the violent breakup of a nation.

3. Discuss the role of superpowers in the liberation war including Arab Muslim countries and European countries.

Ans: The international dimensions of Bangladesh's Liberation War were complex, with global and regional powers taking starkly different positions. During the 1971 war, the world's superpowers chiefly the United States, Soviet Union, and China along with the Islamic countries of the Middle East and various European states, all reacted in line with their geopolitical interests and ideological leanings. This created a geopolitical split: some powers actively or tacitly supported Pakistan, viewing the conflict through Cold War or pan-Islamic lenses, while others sided with Bangladesh's cause on humanitarian and strategic grounds.
Superpowers: The two Cold War superpowers were sharply divided over 1971. The United States under President Nixon staunchly supported Pakistan, a long-time ally. Despite reports of mass atrocities, the U.S. government was reluctant to condemn Islamabad – partly because Pakistan was facilitating Nixon's opening to China, and partly due to Cold War logic of containing Soviet-Indian
influence. Nixon and Kissinger provided military aid to Pakistan and even deployed the U.S. Seventh Fleet to the Bay of Bengal as a warning when India intervened in early December 1971. American officials privately acknowledged genocide but maintained public silence, sticking to the view that it was an "internal affair" of Pakistan [4]. This policy led Senator Edward Kennedy to charge that "America's heavy support of Islamabad [was] nothing short of complicity in the...tragedy" of the Bengali people (Dhaka Tribune, 2023). By contrast, the Soviet Union firmly backed Bangladesh (and India). Motivated by both ideological opposition to genocide and strategic rivalry with the U.S.-China-Pakistan trio, Soviet Union provided diplomatic cover and material support. The USSR vetoed three UN Security Council resolutions in December that sought to halt the war without ensuring Bangladesh's rights, thereby buying time for the joint Indo-Bangladesh forces to achieve victory [7]. A Soviet diplomat declared that justice and self-determination must prevail over "internal affairs" arguments. Indeed, Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin had earlier appealed for a ceasefire that acknowledged Bengali demands [8]. China, the other major communist power, took the opposite stand: Beijing saw the Bengali independence movement as a secessionist plot abetted by its rival, India. As a close ally of Pakistan, China used its first-ever UN Security Council veto in 1972 to block Bangladesh's entry into the UN (citing the charter's breach by breaking Pakistan's unity). During the war, China supplied arms to Pakistan and rhetorically condemned India's "aggression." However, fearing Soviet retaliation and U.S. involvement, China stopped short of direct military intervention against India. Thus, the superpower alignment was: USA and China supporting Pakistan diplomatically and materially, while the USSR (and its allies) supported Bangladesh's liberation.
Arab Muslim Countries: The majority of Middle Eastern and Muslim-majority nations stood "on the wrong side of history" by backing Pakistan during the conflict (Saleem Samad, Dhaka Tribune, 2021). Bound by Islamic fraternity and influenced by Pakistan's narrative that India was

dismembering a Muslim country, most Arab states and organizations endorsed Pakistan's stance. The Arab League and OIC not only failed to censure the mass killings but tacitly encouraged Pakistan's efforts to preserve its "Islamic unity" [9]. Saudi Arabia, Iran (under the Shah), Turkey, Jordan, Egypt, and others provided diplomatic support some even military aid to Pakistan. For instance, Jordan and Iran reportedly supplied Pakistan with spare fighter planes and equipment. Many Arab regimes, swayed by the propaganda that "Islam was in danger" in East Pakistan, viewed the Bengali nationalist movement (led by largely secular, socialist-leaning figures) with suspicion [9]. They accepted Pakistan's framing of the Mukti Bahini as Indian-backed "miscreants" threatening Muslim solidarity. As a result, no Arab country recognized Bangladesh during the war. The media in these countries, heavily state-controlled, largely ignored or downplayed the atrocities in East Pakistan. A telling example of this solidarity was during the war's final days: when Pakistan's President Yahya Khan accused India of aggression and appealed for help, several Muslim states echoed his calls. The prevailing sentiment was that Pakistan must not lose – "Islamic nationalism" had to be upheld even at the cost of Bengali lives [9]. However, this stance put Arab countries at odds with global public opinion. As one analyst notes, "Arab leaders unwittingly provided moral, spiritual, political, and diplomatic support to Pakistan, despite knowing the army was committing genocide and ethnic cleansing" [9]. Notably, only Iraq broke ranks to extend early recognition to Bangladesh (in July 1972) after the war, while most others (Saudi Arabia, for example) waited until Pakistan itself recognized Bangladesh in 1974 to normalize relations.

European Countries: Europe's response to 1971 was mixed. Britain, the former colonial power in South Asia, initially toed a cautious line. The Conservative government of Edward Heath valued Pakistan as a Cold War ally and was reluctant to condemn it publicly. British diplomats worked

behind the scenes for a political solution but avoided taking sides openly during the war. However, British public opinion and media were largely sympathetic to Bangladesh. The BBC and newspapers carried graphic reports of the "Bloodbath in Bangladesh," spurring widespread outrage. British charities like Oxfam led relief efforts for Bengali refugees, and Beatle George Harrison's famous Concert for Bangladesh in August 1971 in New York drew Western attention to the humanitarian crisis. In France, President Pompidou's government was similarly muted officially (France abstained on UN resolutions rather than support India outright), but French intellectuals and press condemned Pakistan's repression. Notably, French humanitarian André Malraux even volunteered to fight for Bangladesh's freedom, and Pravda in the USSR (echoed by French papers) reported the massacre of 3 million, galvanizing European sentiment [1]. East European communist countries (Poland, East Germany, Yugoslavia, etc.) followed the Soviet lead – Poland co-sponsored UN proposals to recognize Bangladesh's rights. Many of these countries recognized Bangladesh diplomatically within weeks of its independence. West European governments, while constrained by alliances, gradually leaned toward humanitarian aid: for instance, Sweden (not in any military bloc) provided early assistance and officially recognized Bangladesh in February 1972, as did West Germany and Britain around the same time. One significant European voice during the war was Ireland's UN ambassador, who forcefully highlighted the genocide in UN debates, countering Pakistan's narrative. European popular pressure thus complemented the Mujibnagar Government's diplomacy. By December 1971, as Pakistani atrocities became undeniable, even Pakistan's staunch allies found their

positions awkward. The United Kingdom and France ultimately abstained rather than support a U.S.-backed ceasefire that ignored Bangladeshi representation (implicitly letting India and the USSR shape the war's endgame) [10]. After the war, Europe moved swiftly: the European Community (EEC) sent a delegation to the new Bangladesh to assess needs, and virtually all European nations had recognized Bangladesh by early 1972 (with the notable exception of Spain's Franco regime, which delayed recognition).

In summary, the superpowers and other international actors played pivotal roles in the 1971 Liberation War, often in opposing ways. The U.S. and China diplomatically and materially bolstered Pakistan, aiming to maintain the status quo and their strategic interests. In stark contrast, the USSR (and Eastern bloc), and India, championed Bangladesh's liberation, seeing it as both a moral cause and a means to curb their rivals. The Arab-Muslim world, influenced by religious-political solidarity, largely supported Pakistan's "unity," and their silence on the genocide remains a painful memory in Bangladesh. Meanwhile, the European countries especially their civil societies leaned towards Bangladesh, contributing to the pressure that ultimately isolated Pakistan internationally. This global division meant that Bangladesh's war of independence was not fought in a vacuum, but against the backdrop of a larger Cold War and post-colonial drama, where ideals of human rights and self-determination clashed with political expediency.

The Liberation War's international theater reveals how global powers and regional blocs can profoundly influence the outcome of a national conflict. In 1971, superpower rivalry, pan-Islamic allegiance, and humanitarian conscience all intersected in East Pakistan. Bangladesh emerged victorious not only due to its people's valor but also because it navigated this complex web of foreign interests securing crucial support from some (and learning hard lessons from the indifference of others). The war thus changed South Asia's geopolitical map and taught the world that the "right against might" narrative can prevail when global conscience aligns against genocide, as it eventually did for Bangladesh.

4. Discuss the formation of Mujib Nagar Government and its diplomatic policy

Ans: On April 10, 1971, the elected Bengali leaders formed the Mujibnagar Government in exile (Mujibnagar shorkar) to lead Bangladesh's Liberation War. Sworn in on April 17 at Mujibnagar, this provisional government with Acting President Syed Nazrul Islam and Prime Minister Tajuddin Ahmad provided a political center for the resistance [6]. One of its crucial roles was diplomatic: winning international support for Bangladesh's cause. The new government's foreign policy (Bitarka) focused on exposing Pakistan's atrocities and seeking recognition and aid from major powers and neighbors.

The diplomatic policy of the Mujibnagar Government was proactive and global in scope, driven by the need to transform Bangladesh's fight from an "internal matter" of Pakistan into a legitimate struggle for self-determination. Immediately after its formation, the Mujibnagar leadership established a Foreign Ministry under Minister Khondaker Mostaq Ahmad, which sought to "obtain support of foreign governments and people at large for the cause of Bangladesh" by setting up Bangladesh missions abroad and dispatching emissaries worldwide [6]. By mid-1971, Bangladesh envoys were lobbying in New Delhi, London, Washington, and at the United Nations, while delegations visited capitals from Soviet Union to Cairo. This diplomatic

offensive, combined with global revulsion at the Pakistani army's genocide, influenced superpower attitudes. Notably, India – though not a superpower, the most pivotal regional actor – was persuaded by both moral urgency and strategic interest to support Bangladesh. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's government provided sanctuary to 10 million Bengali refugees and, by late March, expressed "full support" for Bangladesh's freedom struggle [4]. India's diplomatic backing was amplified by its signing of a Friendship Treaty with the Soviet Union on August 9, 1971, which ensured that one superpower firmly aligned with Bangladesh's cause. The USSR's support was influenced by Cold War calculus: backing Bangladesh (and India) countered the U.S.-China-Pakistan axis in South Asia [4]. Soviet Union used its United Nations veto power thrice in December 1971 to block ceasefire resolutions that did not account for Bangladesh's interests, thus buying time for a decisive victory on the ground. On the other hand, the United States and China were initially hostile or indifferent to Bangladesh, viewing the conflict through a Cold War lens. President Nixon and Henry Kissinger saw Pakistan's Gen. Yahya Khan as a key ally (and go-between to China) and thus "considered the crisis as an internal affair of Pakistan," even as reports of mass atrocities mounted [4]. Still, the Mujibnagar Government's diplomacy aided by global public opinion put pressure on these superpowers. Graphic news of the 1971 genocide and appeals by figures like Senator Edward Kennedy gradually turned American public sentiment against Pakistani actions. Kennedy, after visiting refugee camps in India, argued passionately that America's support of Islamabad was "nothing short of complicity in the ... tragedy of East Bengal" and urged the U.S. to "rescue our foreign policy" by backing the Bengali people [6]. Consequently, by December 1971, even the Nixon administration tempered its stance: while it still sent the USS Enterprise to the Bay of Bengal in a show of force, it also pressed Pakistan to accept a ceasefire and political solution. Soviet support, meanwhile, grew even more resolute Soviet Premier Kosygin publicly endorsed Bangladesh's right to self-determination and supplied India with military hardware, confident that supporting Bangladesh aligned with the USSR's anti-colonial values and strategic interests.

Critically, the Mujibnagar Government's diplomatic narrative highlighted the Bengali struggle as a fight for democratic rights and human rights. This framing resonated with many in the West and the

Eastern bloc. For example, France and the United Kingdom (though both governments were cautious due to ties with Pakistan and the U.S.) saw strong public and media empathy for Bangladesh. World opinion was swayed by concerts (George Harrison's "Concert for Bangladesh" in August 1971) and reports of "a reign of terror" in East Bengal. Under this pressure, even some superpower-aligned nations acknowledged Bangladesh's plight. By the end of the war, India and the USSR led the international coalition supporting Bangladesh, while USA and China stood diplomatically isolated for opposing its independence [4]. Indira Gandhi's impassioned advocacy during her world tour in autumn 1971 (visiting Washington, London, Paris) also paid dividends, she exposed the moral imperative to stop Pakistan's campaign. As she defiantly stated, "You can't annihilate people and be allowed to do it." This uncompromising stance helped ensure that India (with Soviet backing) would intervene decisively.

In sum, the Mujibnagar Government's diplomatic policy grounded in justice and pragmatism significantly influenced global powers to favor Bangladesh. It leveraged moral suasion and realpolitik: appealing to the USSR's anti-imperialist stance and India's security concerns, while isolating Pakistan's allies by exposing the humanitarian catastrophe. As a result, the

superpower camp was split: the Soviet Union (and its Eastern European allies) firmly supported Bangladesh, Britain and France leaned sympathetic, and even the American people (if not their government) “recognized” the legitimacy of Bangladesh’s cause (to quote Senator Kennedy: “the people of the world do recognize you”) 1971: In US Senate, Ted Kennedy spoke for the Bengalis, Dhaka Tribune, 2023. Ultimately, it was this combination of high level alliances and grassroots global support that helped Bangladesh triumph against a much stronger oppressor. The formation of the Mujibnagar Government gave Bangladesh a voice on the world stage at its birth. Through astute diplomacy, this government won critical backing from one of the two Cold War superpowers (the USSR) and vital regional support from India. These efforts countered the U.S.-China tilt towards Pakistan and framed the conflict as a just war of liberation. The superpowers’ responses were thus not only influenced by great-power strategy but by the Mujibnagar Government’s skillful advocacy and the undeniable moral force of Bangladesh’s struggle for freedom.

5. Discuss about the Constitution of Bangladesh

Ans: Bangladesh’s 1972 Constitution drafted in the aftermath of the Liberation War is the supreme law that established the country’s identity as a democratic republic. Framed by a Constituent Assembly led by Dr. Kamal Hossain, it was adopted on November 4, 1972, coming into effect on
Victory Day, December 16, 1972 [12]. The Constitution embodied the core ideals of the new nation (nationalism, socialism, democracy, secularism) and set up fundamental state institutions and citizens’ rights. Over the past five decades, this living document has undergone a series of amendments reflecting Bangladesh’s turbulent political history from military coups to the restoration of democracy while retaining its foundational spirit.
Drafting (1972): The Constitution was drafted in record time by a committee of 34 members headed by Dr. Kamal Hossain [12]. It drew inspiration from Bangladesh’s Liberation War mandate and global best practices. The Preamble proudly commences, “We, the people of Bangladesh, having proclaimed our independence on 26th March 1971…pledging that the high ideals of nationalism, socialism, democracy and secularism…shall be the fundamental principles of the Constitution.” (Constitution of Bangladesh, 1972). These four ideals known as Bangladesh’s state principles were directly linked to the aspirations of the liberation struggle [13]. The drafting reflected both idealism and pragmatism: while aiming for a society free of exploitation and based on rule of law and human rights, it also set up workable governing systems. The Constitution established a parliamentary system with a President as head of state and a Prime Minister as head of government, under a unicameral legislature (Jatiya Sangsad). It also created an independent judiciary, a Comptroller and Auditor General, and other institutions to ensure separation of powers[14]. As one Bangladeshi jurist recalls, the framers were deeply aware that “supremacy of the constitution” must be ensured to guard against future authoritarianism – hence Article 7 declares all powers belong to the people and that any law inconsistent with the Constitution is void [13].
Core Principles and Rights: The original 1972 text enshrined secularism (dharma-nirapekkhota), socialism (in the sense of social justice), democracy, and nationalism as Fundamental Principles of State Policy. These principles are not directly enforceable in court but guide governance. The

Constitution also provides a robust catalogue of Fundamental Rights (Part III, Articles 26–47). It guarantees equality before the law, “All citizens are equal before law and are entitled to equal protection of law” (Article 27) and prohibits discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth [13]. Citizens enjoy the freedoms of speech, assembly, movement, conscience and profession (Articles 36–40), and the freedom of religion (Article 41) in a secular framework. Notably, it includes the right to life and personal liberty, and safeguards such as the right to a fair trial. These rights reflected the values for which Bangladeshis fought during 1971, and many are similar to those in modern liberal democracies. The Constitution also created independent institutions like the Public Service Commission and Election Commission to uphold these rights and democratic processes [14]. However, it allowed for emergency provisions (Article 141) under which some rights could be temporarily suspended a clause that would later be misused by military rulers.

Key Amendments: Since coming into force, the Constitution has been amended seventeen times. Some amendments were progressive; others fundamentally altered the state’s character (often under undemocratic regimes), requiring later correction. Among the most significant:

• 1st Amendment (1973): Enabled the trial of 1971 war criminals by exempting such prosecutions from certain fundamental rights challenges. This showed the new state’s commitment to justice for genocide and was invoked decades later to prosecute war criminals[12] [15].

• 4th Amendment (1975): A turning point that “brought major changes”. Passed in January 1975 under Sheikh Mujib’s government facing instability, it replaced parliamentary democracy with a presidential system and one-party rule (BAKSAL) [15]. It curtailed judicial independence and removed the Supreme Court’s power to enforce fundamental rights. Essentially, it concentrated all power in the presidency. This amendment is controversial; though done by an elected government, it is criticized for undermining the Constitution’s democratic fabric.

• 5th Amendment (1979): After a military coup and martial law (1975–79), this ratified all acts of the martial law government of General Ziaur Rahman. It reversed two founding principles: secularism was removed and replaced with “absolute trust and faith in Almighty Allah” as a guiding principle, and the Islamic invocation “Bismillahir Rahmanir Rahim” was prefixed to the Preamble. This marked a move towards political Islam. (Decades later, Bangladesh’s Supreme Court in 2010 struck down the 5th Amendment, calling it illegal and restoring secularism and other original features to the Constitution.) [12].

• 7th Amendment (1986): Similarly indemnified the actions of General Ershad’s 1982–86 martial law regime, securing Ershad’s decrees including making Islam the state religion via the 8th Amendment (1988). The 8th Amendment declared “Islam as the state religion” while still pledging equal status for other religions [15]. It also attempted to decentralize the High Court by setting up regional benches (later invalidated by the Supreme Court for violating the unitary judicial structure). The insertion of a state religion was a profound shift from 1972’s secular vision, and remains in effect (Article 2A) even as secularism was later reinstated as a fundamental state principle a duality reflecting Bangladesh’s cultural synthesis of religiosity and secular governance.

• 12th Amendment (1991): “The most important landmark in the history of constitutional development in Bangladesh” (Banglapedia, 2021), this amendment, passed unanimously by Parliament after a popular uprising ousted Ershad, restored parliamentary democracy [14] [15].

The Prime Minister again became the executive head of government and the President a largely ceremonial figure as in 1972. This amendment reinforced checks and balances and revived many features of the original Constitution. It is widely seen as re-establishing people's sovereignty and was achieved through political consensus, reflecting the nation's verdict for democracy.

13th Amendment (1996): Introduced the Non-Party Caretaker Government system to oversee neutral elections [12]. This unique innovation (the result of street agitation for fair polls) temporarily entrusted power to a neutral council after Parliament's term, to ensure credible elections. It was used in three elections (1996, 2001, 2008) and initially praised as safeguarding voting rights. However, in 2011 the Supreme Court invalidated the caretaker system as unconstitutional, citing a breach of the democratic chain of governance.

15th Amendment (2011): A comprehensive change under Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina's government. It restored many of the 1972 core principles notably secularism was re-introduced into the Constitution, effectively voiding General Zia's Islamization of the charter [12]. The 15th Amendment also scrapped the caretaker government system, made "Bangladesh" (not "Bangalee") the demonym for citizens, and added a clause (Article 7B) protecting the "basic provisions" of the Constitution from future amendment [13]. It increased reserved women's seats in Parliament and recognized indigenous cultures (Article 23A). This amendment was a milestone in reconciling the Constitution with its original spirit: Bangladesh was reaffirmed as a secular, democratic republic though Islam remains the state religion per Article 2A (a point of some contention with secularists).

• 16th Amendment (2014): Briefly empowered Parliament to impeach Supreme Court judges (as in 1972) but was struck down by the judiciary in 2017 for undermining judicial independence. The recurring theme of judicial independence versus political control has been an ongoing constitutional conversation since the 4th Amendment's changes to the judiciary.

Throughout these changes, Bangladesh's commitment to fundamental human rights and the structure of the state has been tested and eventually balanced. Many amendments under military regimes were later nullified by the Supreme Court as violations of the Constitution's "basic structure." This jurisprudence the idea that some core features (like nationalism, socialism, democracy, secularism, unitary state, republicanism) are inviolable – has kept the Constitution's soul alive. For instance, in the landmark 2005 High Court judgment on the 5th Amendment, the court observed that the removal of secularism and introduction of religious politics had "distorted the Constitution's fundamental character," leading to their restoration [12].

Institutions: The Constitution established key institutions that continue to underpin governance. The Jatiya Sangsad (Parliament) is a powerful legislature, though its effectiveness depends on political culture. The Supreme Court, with a High Court and Appellate Division, is guardian of the Constitution, empowered to interpret and even nullify unconstitutional amendments (as seen in the Fifth and Seventh Amendment cases). The Election Commission and Public Service Commission are constitutional bodies aimed at ensuring free elections and a merit-based civil service respectively [14]. Another innovation was the directive to establish local government bodies (Article 59) to decentralize power – a goal still pursued via Union Parishads and other local councils. The Constitution also created the post of Ombudsman (Article 77) for oversight, though this has yet to be effectively implemented. Over time, some institutions have been

reformed by amendments – for example, the 15th Amendment strengthened the Election Commission's independence in law.

The Constitution of Bangladesh (1972–present) is a living document that encapsulates the nation's ideals, provides a framework for governance, and evolves through amendments. Its drafting was imbued with the Liberation War's dreams democracy, social justice, secularism, and nationalism and despite periods of derailment, those core principles have resurfaced as guiding lights. Major amendments mirror Bangladesh's political journey: from one-party rule to military coups to the return of multiparty democracy and constitutionalism. Today, the Constitution guarantees fundamental rights comparable to any modern democracy and outlines institutions that, when allowed to function, ensure accountability and rule of law. In essence, the story of Bangladesh's Constitution is one of resilience: born of a heroic freedom struggle, challenged by authoritarian interruptions, but ultimately reasserting the "will of the people" as its fundamental premise. As Bangladesh moves forward, its Constitution remains the anchor for the republic's values and a roadmap for achieving a society of equality, human dignity, and justice for all its citizens.

References:

1.no Q&A:

1. The Genocide the U.S. Can't Remember, But Bangladesh Can't Forget
https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/genocide-us-cant-remember-bangladesh-cant-forget-180961490/

2.no Q&A:

[1.1] Elections of 1970, its Campaign and Results: A Case Study of West Pakistan (ResearchGate).
[1.2] 1970 Pakistani general election (Wikipedia).
[1.4] Aftermath of the Elections 1970: From Disparity to Dissection (Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education).
[2.1] Elections of 1970, its Campaign and Results: A Case Study of West Pakistan (ResearchGate).
[2.3] 1970 Pakistani general election (Wikipedia).
[2.4] Was there an Indian plot to break up Pakistan in 1971? (The Hindu)
[2.7] 'Cyclone Not Above Politics' : East Pakistan, disaster politics, and the 1970 Bhola Cyclone (Cambridge University Press).

3.no Q&A:

4. War of Liberation, The - Banglapedia
https://en.banglapedia.org/index.php/War_of_Liberation,_The
6.. Mujibnagar Government - Banglapedia
https://en.banglapedia.org/index.php/Mujibnagar_Government
7. Dec 7, 1971: Gen Yahya demands action against Russia, India
https://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/299951/dec-7-1971-gen-yahya-demands-action-against
8. 1971: In US Senate, Ted Kennedy spoke for the Bengalis
https://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/345544/1971-in-us-senate-ted-kennedy-spoke-for-the
9. Arab nations were on the wrong side of the history during Bangladesh's freedom struggle
https://scroll.in/article/991876/arab-nations-were-on-the-wrong-side-of-the-history-during-bangladeshs-freedom-struggle

5.no Q&A:

12 50 Years of Bangladesh Constitution In a nutshell | The Daily Star
https://www.thedailystar.net/law-our-rights/news/50-years-bangladesh-constitution-nutshell-3160281
13 Bangladesh 1972 (reinst. 1986, rev. 2014) Constitution - Constitute
https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/Bangladesh_2014
14 Constitution - Banglapedia

https://en.banglapedia.org/index.php/Constitution
15 Constitutional Amendments - Banglapedia
https://en.banglapedia.org/index.php?title=Constitutional_Amendments