

MAJOR FACTORS IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CARETAKER GOVERNMENT AS AN INSTITUTION IN BANGLADESH

Md. Aminul Islam^{*}, Mansoureh Ebrahimi^{**} and Kamaruzaman Yusoff^{*}

Abstract: Rigging an election is common in Bangladesh. After independence in 1971, Bangladesh moved to a parliamentary-based democratic system. A group of military extremists murdered Sheikh Mujibur Rahman^{***} and his family during a coup on 15 August 1975. The country had, since then, suffered the ongoing autocracy that influenced a 1990 mass uprising. Sequential dictators had continually used governmental machinery during elections to bolster their regimes. This study reveals major factors that caused political parties to finally create a caretaker government. These factors include a weak democratic culture, conflicts among political parties, a long-term military regime and the 1990 mass uprising. A qualitative approach is used in this paper to explore reasons and actualities for the formation of the caretaker government. Government documents from their official printing press hold significant evidence revealing that a caretaker government was/is indispensable for any peaceful transformation of power considering the political situation in Bangladesh.

Keywords: Rigging election, military, political instability.

INTRODUCTION

The volatile Bangladesh political ethos had lacked mutual trust and consideration. All political parties employed any means whatsoever to seize power. Over 80 parties agitated the political arena but only two dominated real practice: the Awami League and the Bangladesh Nationalist Party. The Bangladesh Awami League is one of the largest and was initially established as the Pakistan Awami Muslim League. After independence, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman controlled the party and renamed it the Bangladesh Awami League. The party ruled four terms after liberation and is presently the ruling party. The Bangladesh National Party is the other major political party established on 1 Sep. 1978 by President Ziaur Rahman and had ruled Bangladesh for three terms since its birth.

There were many elections from independence in 1971 to 1990 but none were ever deemed free or fair. Major General Ziaur (Zia) Rahman was leader of the 'Z' force brigade during the liberation war and it was he who broadcast the declaration of independence in 1971. After the assassination of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and as the result of a series of counter coups, Ziaur Rahman became head of the army under martial law and took over the presidency in 1977. He was also founder of

* Faculty of Islamic Civilization, University Technology Malaysia (UTM), Malaysia

** Corresponding author, Faculty of Islamic Civilization, University Technology Malaysia (UTM), Malaysia. Email: mansoureh@utm.my

*** Awami league leader known as father of the nation.

the Bangladesh Nationalist party and became popularly known as General Zia. On 30 May 1981 he was assassinated during a military coup, after which Lt. General Hossain Mohammad Ershad organized parliamentary and local elections to transform the regime and impart civilian legitimacy. This same Hossain M. Ershad, ex-military dictator, seized power via a bloodless military coup against President Abdus Sattar in 1982 and became the tenth President of Bangladesh. He created a political party named the Jatiya Party (National Party) and remained in office until the end of 1990. However, the military, rather than an election commission that ensured free and fair balloting, controlled the process and allowed civil administrators and military intelligence personnel to manipulate results. Indeed, free and fair elections were far too difficult regardless of the political system, be it presidential or parliamentary. Evidently, no one could guarantee equitable outcomes. Hence, after the 1990 revolution, the country established its first 'Caretaker Government' system to ensure free and fair voting. We now provide a background for the creation of this system in Bangladesh.

WEAK DEMOCRATIC CULTURE

Bangladeshi people had experienced colonial and military rule, mass uprisings, as well as presidential and parliamentary rule due to the absence of a strong political culture. Under military and parliamentary leadership, Bangladesh political culture was based on familial and schismatic interests that spread submissive obedience rather than independent collaboration and equality.

The key dilemma in Bangladeshi democracy was its lack of a real political culture. To erase all obstacles, the development of democratic institutions requires a specific political culture but Bangladesh suffered an absence of all requisite preconditions. Currently and historically, Bangladeshi culture holds characteristics that conflict with real democratic values. First is the lack of mutual trust between political parties. Second, people's confidence in government run elections is extremely low. According to M.M. Awal Hossain:

“Presently, Bangladesh exercises a weak democratic culture. This includes the absence of the rule of law; a lack of political morality; a strong civil society with effective political leadership; confrontational politics; ineffective political institutions; corruption and terrorism; plus negativity, double standards and a lack of tolerance and reciprocity” (Hossain 2013:20).

CONFLICTS AMONG POLITICAL PARTIES

Although Bangladesh has more than 100 political parties, since 1990, national politics have been dominated by only two, the Bangladesh Awami League and the Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP), with which most smaller parties have alligned

themselves. The Awami League established in 1949, is the oldest in Bangladesh and enjoys extensive popular support, especially because of its high profile during the war of liberation in 1971. BNP began in 1978 with General Zia at the helm and enjoys similar popular support. “*Sometimes, the political parties worked together to achieve a particular national goal but they always remain factionalized*” (Moniruzzaman, 2009:84). A report by UNDP (2005) showed that political conflicts (Hartals) are on the rise in Bangladesh (Table 1).

TABLE 1: HARTALS (POLITICAL PROTESTS) IN BANGLADESH (1971–1990)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Regime type</i>	<i>Number of hartals</i>
1971-1974	Democratic	36
1975-1978	Military	1
1979-1982	Democratic	48
1983-1986	Military	52
1987-1990	Democratic	245

Source: Md. Moniruzzaman (2009:93), *South Asian Survey*.

Issues related to these political conflicts can be classified into two categories: ideological and institutional.

IDEOLOGICAL ISSUES

Awami League ideology is rooted in Bengali nationalism, democracy, secularism, the liberation war and the major role played by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and related ideology. Bengali nationalism essentially prescribes ethnic identity to Bangladeshi citizens.

“The Awami League believes that the BNP is a party conceived by army officers and penetrated and affected by pro-Pakistani elements and cannot be a democratic organization by any stretch of the imagination” (Islam, 2002:67).

However, the BNP announced that it had freed the country from an autocratic regime and restored multi-party democracy. Furthermore, there are claims that the Awami League is a fascist party that works as a stooge for India (Rasheduzzaman, 1994:981).

BNP and other rightist parties, including the Jatiya Party, believe Bangladesh’s citizens are recognized as ‘Bangladeshi’ just as India’s people are ‘Indian’ and Japan’s people are ‘Japanese’. Hence, national identity should be based on geography as well as religion. Actually, 90% of Bangladeshi Muslims support BNP’s manifest Islamisation as its political ideology with ‘absolute trust and faith in The Almighty’, in opposition to the Awami League’s secularism. On the other hand, Jammat-e-Islami Bangladesh and other Islamic political parties have separate political ideologies based on respective sectarian views of Islam.

THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE

Secularism divided political parties into two major factions. The Awami League tends toward left wing parties that deeply uphold the separation of religion and state and thus support the banning of Islamic political parties in Bangladesh. Their original intent was to separate politics and religion from the outset of anti-independence activities during the 1971 liberation war (Moniruzzaman, 2009:89). During Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's rule (1972–75), secularism was included in the constitution and steps were taken against Islamic political parties and their policies. Hence, the Awami League's policy generated negative responses and became recognized as anti-Islamic.

Nevertheless, rightist BNP and other parties proposed that secularism was not permissible due to the culture of Bangladeshi nationalism, which was totally unprepared and deeply Islamic (Moniruzzaman, 2009). Islamic political parties were therefore totally against secularism and advocated that secularism was antithetical to religiousness. To support this political ideology, religious parties began organizing Islamic ideology into a state system (Moniruzzaman, 1990:79).

LIBERATION WAR ISSUES

“The roles played by political parties during the 1971 liberation war mark a another significant issue that created serious conflicts among political parties in Bangladesh” (Haque, 2011:24). The Awami League leader, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman (father of the nation), declared independence and played a positive role during the liberation war. On the other hand, *“Some rightist and religious parties such as the Muslim League, Jammata-e-Islam, Nizam-e-Islam played anti-liberation roles for a united Pakistan”* (Shehabuddin, 2008:577–603). After independence, individual party roles during the war polluted politics and slowly created political conflict (Sen, 1980:52–55). BNP and Jatiya parties remained neutral on liberation war issues due to the rehabilitation of many razzakar, al-bodor and al-shams (anti-liberation politicians) in their parties. Recently, the Awami League proposed that the election commission ban Islamic political parties. In 2009, they established an international war crime tribunal to investigate and prosecute genocide during the liberation war 1971 by the Pakistani military and their local allies. Five major leaders from Jammata-e-Islam, including AbulKalam Azad, Abdul Kader Mullah, Kamaruzzaman, Ali Ahsan Mohammad Mujahid, Mir Quasem Ali and Salauddin Quader Chowdhury from the Bangladesh Nationalist Party were hanged for their war crimes (*The Daily Prothom Alo*, 13 May 2016).

INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

Major political institutions were/are also involved in political party conflicts. The seizure of government power by one political party prevented diversity in important

political institutions (Jahan, 1986:220–245). Of note is the election commission that became an important focus of political conflict. After independence, the entire government failed to form an independent election commission and separate it from the prime minister's office. Rulers and their appointees in government always appointed 'friends' to the election commission causing the opposition to demand their removal (Islam, 2015:373).

FIFTEEN YEARS OF MILITARY REGIMES

Historically, the most important issue leading to the establishment of the caretaker government as an institution in Bangladesh politics was the prolonged period of military rule. For fifteen years, military interventions had inconvenienced the normal course of institutionalized civilian politics from independence onward. Bangladesh suffered numerous military coups and counter-coups and remained under military rule from 1975 to 1990. Moreover, all political institutions were also militarized by army officials during this period. This militarisation of civilian administrative offices extended unprecedented examples during military tenure. According to Binayak Sen from Pranab Kumar Pandey's article, more than 277 retired army officials had been appointed to important government positions in a most exhaustive range of civil administration from 1987 to 1990 (Pandey, 2004:28). Both Hossain Muhammad Ershad and General Zia formed political parties, the Jatiya Party and Bangladesh Nationalist parties, respectively, with the 'appearance' of retired army officers. However, both parties had originated in the cantonment that ensured privileges for military officers (Pandey, 2004).

GENERAL ZIAUR RAHMAN'S REGIME (1977–81)

After the assassination of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman on 15 August 1975, Bangladeshi politics took a new turn, suffering military coups and counter-coups, one after another. The military divided into groups such as leftist, rightists, etc. A socialist such faction supported the Jatiya Samajtrantic Dal (National Socialist Party) called 'Sipahi Janata Biplop' (Soldiers and People's Coup), led by Cornel Abu Taher who then killed Brigadier Khaled Musarof (Hossain, 1997:1–160). Following a meeting in the Dhaka cantonment, an interim government was formed with Justice Abu Sadat Mohammad Sayem as president and General Zia as chief martial law administrator. General Zia then became president when Justice Abu Sadat Mohammad Sayem resigned due to illness on 21 April 1977. Justice Sayem was president in name only, as real power was exercised by Zia from the cantonment (Hossain, 1997).

Although Zia was a military leader, he ruled based on laws. It was his policy to gain popularity and be charismatic. An example of his leadership style included army officials in civil administration positions. Military personnel assumed 30% of secretarial posts, 70% of police superintendent positions, and 50% of public

corporation management roles. The diplomatic corps was also militarised, including ambassadors (Kochanek, 1993:60).

GEN. ZIA'S CIVILIANIZATION PROCESS

Gen Zia's tenure can be divided into two phases: military and civilian. "*Actually, Zia came to power in Bangladesh in November 1975 after the third bloody military coup during the first section of his regime (7 Nov. 1975 – 21 April 1977). He governed as a military man*" (Franda, 1981: 357). After becoming the seventh president of Bangladesh (21 April 1977), General Zia concentrated all government power in his hand. By law, to be a civilian president he formed the Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP) on 1 September 1978 with ex-army officers and experienced politicians. Zia's goal was to gain support from government officials and abolish Presidential Order No. 9 (1972). Under this order, the president can dismiss any government employee without the right of appeal (*The Bangladesh Gazette*, 1975: No. XLIV). In addition to multi-party democracy, he also established a new village political institution called 'Gram Sarkar' (village government), an entirely voluntary organization also called the 'Village Defense Force' (VDF). Nevertheless, during the first three years of his regime political parties were not permitted to undertake any political activities. To achieve international approval for the legitimacy of his government, he established the 'South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation' (SAARC) and attended numerous international conferences such as the Islamic conference in Morocco and United Nations sessions, etc.

ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUM SUNDER PRESIDENT ZIA'S GOVERNMENT

When military coups and counter-coups beleaguered the country, General Zia announced in a radio broadcast: '*He is a soldier, not a politician*' (Radio speech of Major General Ziaur Rahman, 11 Nov. 1975). After assuming government power he took several steps to legitimize his tenure such as a referendum, a presidential election and a parliamentary election, etc. On 30 May 1977, President Zia organized a 'presidential confidence referendum' for which results are listed below:

TABLE 2: PRESIDENTIAL CONFIDENCE REFERENDUM RESULTS(1977)

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Yes	33,400,870	98.8783
No	378,898	1.1216
Blank votes	0	–
Total	33,779,768	100
Voter turnout		88.1

Source: Zillur R. Khan, 1981: *Asian Survey*, University of California Press.

Having achieved huge popular support, Zia promoted his legitimacy and declared in April 1978 that there would be a presidential election and that all restrictions on political parties would be lifted in May 1978 (Radio speech of Major General Ziaur Rahman, 11 Nov. 1975). All political parties had been banned prior to 1978. Prior to the presidential election, Zia announced new rules and regulations that allowed different political parties to ally with two fronts: The Jatiyotabadi Front (the Nationalist Front), and The Ganatrantik Oikkyajote (the Democratic United Front) (Banglapedia: 'Military Rule'). The Jatiyotabadi Front chose General Zia as its presidential candidate while the Ganatrantik Oikkyajote nominated retired General M.A.G. Osmani. General Osmani had been Chief Commander of the Mukti Bahini (Freedom Force) during the 1971 liberation war and became a minister in Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's cabinet. They scheduled 3 June 1978 for the presidential election. According to Zillur Rahman Khan, "*In the 1978 presidential election, Zia's unlimited use of governmental machinery won the election*" (Khan, 1981:560). Table 3 summarizes these election results.

TABLE 3: PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION RESULTS, 1978

<i>Candidates</i>	<i>Party alliance</i>	<i>Secured votes</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Major General Ziaur Rahman	Bangladesh Jatiyotabadi front (Bangladesh Nationalist front)	15,733,807	76.6
General M.A.G. Osmani, Ret.	Ganatantrik Oikkyajote (The Democratic United front)	4,455,200	21.7
8 other candidates	–	342,554	1.7
Blank votes	–	354,010	–
Total		20,885,571	100
Voter Turnout	–	–	54.3

Source: Zillur R. Khan, 1981: *Asian Survey*, University of California Press.

After winning the election, Zia became the legitimate president and began the task of establishing his political organization. On 1 September 1978 he launched a new political party, the Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP) with a civilian-military blend. Table 4 lists the occupational backgrounds of its central committee members.

TABLE 4: OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF BNP CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Businessmen	57	33.5
Professionals	53	31.2
Agriculturist	28	11.8

<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Teachers	20	11.7
Bureaucrats	11	6.5
Trade unionist	2	1.1
Others	7	4.2
Total	170	100

Source: Sayed Serajul Islam, 1984: *Asian Survey*, University of California Press.

To complete the formal legitimization of his regime, Zia announced that a second national parliamentary election would be held on 18 February 1979. A total of 31 political parties participated. “*The results of the election were a virtual endorsement of Zia’s regime. His BNP won a two-thirds majority of parliamentary seats*” (Islam, 1984:565). Table 5 lists the second parliamentary elections results.

TABLE 5: PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS RESULTS, FEBRUARY 1979

<i>Party</i>	<i>No. of seats contested</i>	<i>No. of seats won</i>	<i>% of seats</i>	<i>% of votes</i>
BNP	298	206	68.3	41.2
Awami league (Malek)	295	40	13.3	24.4
Muslim league- Islamic democratic league alliance	265	19	6.3	10.0
Jatiya Samajtrantac Dal (JSD)	240	9	3.0	4.9
Awami league (Mizan)	183	2	0.7	2.8
Independents	425	17	6.1	12.9
Other parties	419	7	2.3	1.7
Total	2125	300	100.00	100.00

Source: Sayed Serajul Islam, 1984: *Asian Survey*, University of California Press.

The second parliamentary elections saw 19 bureaucrats elected, 17 of whom were retired army officers along with two civil bureaucrats. Zia thus fully legitimized his regime. However, on 30 May 1981 President Zia was assassinated by a faction of officers from the military in the Chittagong Circuit House.

HOSSAIN MOHAMMAD ERSHAD’S REGIME (1982-1990)

Military chief of staff, Lieutenant General Hossain Mohammad Ershad, also took power in a bloodless military coup at gun point. He installed himself as chief martial law administrator, suspended the constitution, dissolved parliament and dismissed the cabinet of President Sattar. He appointed himself chief commander of armed forces, proclaimed martial law rules and regulations and installed Justice

Abul Fazal Mohammad Ansar Uddin Chowdhury as president on 27 March 1982 (Hyman, 2007:4). Though Justice Ansaruddin Chowdhury became president by martial law, he had no right to use his power without approval from the chief martial law administrator (Hyman, 2007). Ershad governed the country by martial law until 1983 and then took over the presidency from Justice Chowdhury.

After becoming president, Ershad ‘inspired’ politicians and bureaucrats with a view to consolidate all government power in his hand. He established an autocratic military regime ruled by the president and created a platform filled with army officers in civil administrative positions.

“Ershad appointed army officers as 28 secretaries in different ministries, with a total of 22 in chief positions, 14 in public sector corporations, and one-third of diplomatic posts in foreign countries. At the political level, 40% of his cabinet were from the army or were retired army officers” (Kochanek, 2000:535).

Indeed, President Ershad’s presidency endured an abject lack of legitimacy from the beginning, corruption was institutionalized and there was no accountability. He was toppled by a mass uprising in December 1990 (Pandey, 2004:31).

THE PROCESS OF HOSSAIN MOHAMMAD ERSHAD’S CIVILIANIZATION

In 1983 Ershad established a new political party, the Janata Dal (People’s Party) with factions and politicians drawn from various parties. In 1985, he formed a political front with a group of leaders from BNP, the Muslim League, the Ganatrantic Dal (Democratic Party) and the United Peoples Party. On 1 January 1986, Ershad launched a new political party called the ‘Jatiya Party’ (National Party) with a manifesto calling for a presidential system of government. However, by the time Ershad had lifted the ban on political activities, the Jatiya front had dissolved.

Ershad announced presidential and parliamentary elections for 24 May and 25 November 1984, respectively. However, the opposition declared they would contest the elections if martial law was not withdrawn. A failure to settle the dispute resulted in a referendum on 21 March 1985 seeking public confidence in his policies and programs.

ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUM UNDER PRESIDENT ERSHAD’S GOVERNMENT

Ershad organized elections and a referendum to legitimize his regime. On 21 March 1985 the referendum took place under military rule. Results (Table 6) are listed below.

TABLE 6: REFERENDUM UNDER MILITARY RULE, 1985

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Yes	32,661,233	94.14
No	1,911,281	5.86
Blank votes	0	–
Total	47,910,964	100
Voter turnout	–	72.14

Source: www.ec.gov.bd

The election commission declared the people's confidence level in President Ershad's rules and regulations at 94.14% with a voter turn out of 72.14%. However, national and international observers reported that voter turnout was not more than 15 to 20% (Umar, 1986:1934). However, the referendum marked a milestone for Ershad's legitimacy.

Ershad then announced parliamentary elections for 26 April 1986. At first the opposition decided to boycott the election but on 21 March 1986 the Awami League Alliance changed its position. Ershad postponed the election to 7 May 1986 due to BNP's boycott. Results are listed (Table 7) below:

TABLE 7: THIRD PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION RESULTS(1986)

<i>Parties</i>	<i>No. of seats won</i>	<i>% seats won</i>	<i>No. of votes received</i>	<i>Percent votes received</i>
Jatiya Party	153	51.00	12,079,259	42.34
Awami League	76	25.33	7,462,157	26.16
Jammat-e-Islam	10	3.33	1,314,057	4.61
Communist Party of Bangladesh (CPB)	5	1.66	259,728	0.91
National Awami Party (NAP)	5	1.66	368,979	1.29
National Socialist Party (JSD)	4	1.33	725,303	2.54
Bangladesh Muslim League	4	1.33	412,765	1.45
Other Parties	11	3.66	1,285,377	4.43
Independents	32	10.66	4,619,025	16.19

Source: Ahmed Shafiqul Huque and Muhammad A. Hakim, 1993: *Elections in Bangladesh: Tools of Legitimacy*, Taylor and Francis Ltd.

According to Rehman Sobhan, "In the third parliamentary election no party obtained an absolute majority. BNP boycotted the election and there were widespread changes, manipulation and rigging" (Sobhan, 1993:48). After the election, the Jatiya Party entered the government when 23 of 32 independents joined them and an additional two seats were secured by a by-election. In November 1986,

Ershad legitimized his martial law administration from 24 March 1982 to 1986 by passing the Seventh Amendment of the Constitution in parliament.

In November 1987, BNP and the Awami League united and began a movement against Ershad's regime that culminated with the 1990 mass uprising. Another parliamentary election was held on 3 March 1988 but BNP, the Awami League and Jammāt-e-Islām boycotted the election. The Jatiya Party secured 251 seats out of 300 in the fourth parliamentary election. Although the election commission announced voter turnout at 54.93%, unparalleled vote rigging took place (Haque & Hakim, 1993:257).

THE 1990 MASS UPRISING

One of the most important events leading to the establishment of a caretaker government was the 1990 mass uprising against Ershad. During his autocratic tenure (1982-1990), the expectations of restoring democracy and Bangladeshi destiny were quashed by his military hand. Ascertaining these circumstances, the two major political parties (Awami League and BNP) were joined by a large faction of leftist military officers as well as other interested groups, including professionals, civil societies, trade unions and students. Collectively, they began a movement to restore democracy (Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada, *The Fall of President Ershad*, 1 February 1991).

Initially, major opposition party leaders, Sheikh Hasina and Khaleda Zia, quarrelled over Ershad's parliamentary district council bill that would allow the appointment of army officers to oversee district offices. But on this issue they eventually allied and called for half-day strikes in Dhaka on 23 and 30 June 1987 in most major cities. After the bill passed in parliament on 12 July 1987, opposition groups became more closely united in their determination not to return unless Ershad resigned and elections were held under a non-partisan caretaker government. From 23 to 24 July, the opposition called for public demonstrations in Dhaka, Chittagong and Khulna. Thousands of protesters, including workers and employers, joined in a united front chanting 'down with President Ershad'. Police fired tear gas to disperse the protesters and arrested 500 people or more throughout the country (Kim, 2012) but the opposition's alliance held and continued to pressure Ershad.

On 28 October 1987, opposition parties declared a series of actions against Ershad's regime beginning on 10 November called the 'Dhaka Seize'. In an attempt to prevent it the Government closed the University of Dhaka and forbade public gatherings of more than five persons and also mobilized a para-military force in the city (Khan, 2013:16). On the first day, thousands of opposition supporters fought with para-military and police forces. Twelve protesters died. A representative from the Awami League (youth league), Nur Hossain, was gunned down by police when he wrote slogans on his chest, "Sairachar Nipat Jak" (down with autocracy), and

on his back, “Ganatranta Muki Pak” (let democracy be free) (see picture below). His sacrifice inflamed Bangladeshis and increased the uprising’s fervor against Ershad. President Ershad proclaimed a state of emergency on 27 November 1987, which allowed him to arrest more protesters, including both opposition leaders, Sheikh Hasina and Khaleda Zia. (*The Bangladesh Gazette*, Ordinance No. 22/1987).



Source: <http://www.en.prothom-alo.com/bangladesh/news/85565/Shahid-Noor-Hossain-Day-observed>

The uprising slowed during the emergency until June 1990 when professionals, professors and students united to formulate a series of programs to remove the dictator forthwith (Maniruzzaman, 1992:203–224). When the general public and politicians combined forces, Ershad proclaimed yet another ‘Emergency’ on 28 November 1990. He then suspended fundamental rights for all Bangladeshi citizens and all schools, colleges and universities remained close. However, Dhaka University students violated the emergency and the teacher’s union announced their resignations. In addition, a total of 19 MPs from the ruling party, including the Deputy Prime Minister resigned as members of the para-military force laid down their arms. A senior army officer said, “.... *At this point junior military officers began openly criticizing the President*” (*New York Times*, 9 Dec. 1990). The dictator resigned from his post as president on 6 December 1990.

After Ershad’s removal from power, all political parties agreed to establish a caretaker government headed by supreme chief Justice Shahab Uddin Ahmed to organize a free and fair election within three months.

CONCLUSION

Our discussion clarified that the institutionalization of the Bangladesh ‘Caretaker Government’ was a direct consequence of prolonged military regimes and a weak political culture. In addition, issues linked with the evolution of Bangladeshi politics after Ershad’s resignation led to challenges that included organizing free and fair elections in contradistinction to the threat of rigged elections under military cum partisan rule. These latter mis carriage of justice had contributed to the deterioration of Bangladesh’s democratic efforts while also preventing representative political developments.

References

- Banglapedia: Military Rule, http://en.banglapedia.org/index.php?title=Military_Rule accessed 04 Oct. 16.
- Canada: Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada, *The Fall of President Ershad*, 01 Feb. 1991. Available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6a8050.html> — accessed 05 Nov. 16
- Franda, M. (1981). ZiaurRahman and Bangladeshi Nationalism. *Economic and Political Weekly*, **16**(10/12): 357 —<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4369609>, accessed 04 Oct. 16.
- Haque, A.R. (2011). *The Politics of Intransigence and the Erosion of Democracy*. Foreign Service Programme, University of Oxford, p. 24.
- Haque S. A. and M.A. Hakim (1993). Elections in Bangladesh: Tools of Legitimacy. *Taylor & Francis Online*, **19**(4): 257. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30172168>— accessed 03 Nov. 2016.
- Hossein, M.S. (1997). *Bangladesh: A bloody Chapter In 1975-81*. Palok Publishers, Dhaka. ISBN: 9789844450407, pp. 1–160.
- Hossain, M. A. (2013). Democracy in Bangladesh: Problems & Prospects. <http://www.researchgate.net> — accessed 30 Sep. 2016, p. 20.
- Hyman A. (2007). Bangladesh under martial law. Index On Censorship. *Taylor and Francis Online*, **12**(4). Accessed 03 Nov. 16.
- Islam, S. A. (2002). “Political Parties and the Future of Democracy” in A.M. Chowdhury and Fakrul Alam (eds.), *Bangladesh: On the Threshold of the Twenty-First Century*, (p. 67). Asiatic Society of Bangladesh, Dhaka.
- Islam S. S. (1984). The State in Bangladesh under Zia (1975-81). *Asian Survey*, **24**(5): 565, University of California Press.
- Islam M.M. (2015). Electoral violence in Bangladesh: Does a confrontational bipolar political system matter? *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, **53**(4): 373.
- Jahan, R. (1986). *Bangladesh Politics: Problems and Issues*. University Press Limited, Dhaka, pp. 220–245.
- Kochanek, S. A. (1993). *Patron-Client Politics and Business in Bangladesh*. University Press Ltd., Dhaka, pp. 60.
- Kochanek, S. A. (2000). Governance, Patronage Politics, and Democratic Transition in Bangladesh. *Asian Survey*, **40**(3): 535, University of California Press.
- Kim R. (2012). Bangladeshis bring down Ershad regime (1987–1990). Global Nonviolent Action Database.

- Khan T.N. (2013). *Military Coups in the History of Bangladesh and People's Uprising*. Department of Television and Film Studies, University of Dhaka.
- Khan Z.R. (1981). Politicization of the Bangladesh Military: A Response to Perceived Shortcomings of Civilian Government. *Asian Survey*, **21**(5): 560, University of California Press.
- Moniruzzaman M. (2009). Party Politics and Political Violence in Bangladesh: Issues, Manifestation and Consequences. *South Asian Survey*, **16**(1): 84, 89.
- Maniruzzaman, T. (1990). *Bangladesh Politics: Secular and Islamic Trends*. South Asian Publishers, New Delhi, p. 79.
- _____(1992). The Fall of the Military Dictator: 1991 Elections and the Prospect of Civilian Rule in Bangladesh. *Pacific Affairs*, **65**(2): 203–224, University of British Columbia.
- Pandey, P.K. (2004). Political culture in Bangladesh: Does leadership matter? *Sage Journal*, **34**(4): 28.
- Pandey, P. K. (2004), “Political culture in Bangladesh: Does leadership matter?” *Sage Journal*, **34**(4): 31.
- Rasheduzzaman, M. (1994). The Liberals and the Religious Rights in Bangladesh, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2645348>— **34**(11): 981, University of California Press, accessed 03 Nov.16.
- Speech of Major General Ziaur Rahman, Radio Bangladesh, 11 November 1975.
- Shehabuddin, E. (2008). *Jamaat-i-Islami in Bangladesh: Women, Democracy and the Transformation of Islamist Politics*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 577–603.
- Sills, D.L. (1968). *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 3. Macmillan, New York, p.218.
- Sen, S. (1980). Bangladesh: The Unfinished Revolution by Lawrence Lifschultz. *Review Work*, **7**(1): 52–55, Indian Internal Centre.
- Sobhan R. (1993). *Bangladesh: Problems of Governance*. University Press Ltd., Dhaka, p. 48.
- The Bangladesh Gazette, additional number, No. XLIV, Presidential Order No. 9, 1972. Published by authority, 22 August 1975.
- The Bangladesh Gazette*, additional No. S. R.O. law No. 277, Proclamation of Emergency, Ordinance No. 22/1987, published by authority, 27 November 1987.
- The New York Times*, 9 December, 1990. <http://www.nytimes.com/1990/12/09/world/revolution-brings-bangladesh-hope.html>.
- Accessed 07 Oct. 2016.
- The Daily Prothom Alo*, 13 May 2016.
- Umar B. (1986). Martial Law Wears a New Garb. *Economic and Political Weekly*, **21**(44/45): 1934. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4376297>. Accessed 06 Oct. 2016.