

Part-A**Read the following text and answer the questions that follow:**

The concept of universal human rights, codified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), serves as the architectonic foundation for global ethical consensus. These rights—inherent, inalienable, and indivisible—are the sine qua non of a dignified existence, forming a transcendental moral framework intended to be impervious to the caprices of sovereign states. Yet, the persistent global reality is one of systemic and manifold violation, suggesting a profound dissociation between declared principle and practical adherence. From mass atrocities in conflict zones to the insidious erosion of civil liberties under ostensibly democratic regimes, the narrative of human progress is constantly punctuated by instances of stark regression. The international human rights infrastructure, despite its laudable ambitions, frequently appears impotent when confronted with the obduracy of powerful nation-states or the logistical impediments of securing justice in fragmented or authoritarian territories.

In the South Asian context, and particularly in nations like Bangladesh, the struggle for rights is often characterized by a unique conflation of historical socio-economic vulnerabilities and contemporary political challenges. Following periods of democratic transition, the nascent institutions intended to safeguard fundamental freedoms are frequently subject to exigent pressures. Issues such as the rights of minority groups, the security of indigenous populations, and the freedom of expression face perennial jeopardy. The digital age, initially hailed as a tool for democratization, has become a double-edged sword, providing a new vector for state-sanctioned surveillance and the chilling effect of draconian laws designed to curb journalistic and activist dissent. The phenomenon of enforced disappearances and extrajudicial killings represents a particularly egregious breach of the right to life and due process, creating a climate of fear and self-censorship that attenuates civic space. This state-perpetrated impunity is a direct challenge to the nation's foundational commitment to justice and human dignity.

The global economic architecture further complicates this predicament. The drive for rapid industrialization and foreign direct investment (FDI) often engenders a subtle but pervasive form of human rights dereliction. Labour rights, particularly in sectors prone to exploitation like the ready-made garment (RMG) industry, are frequently sacrificed on the altar of competitive pricing and global supply chain demands. Workers, often operating in precarious conditions, struggle against the machinations of powerful capital interests, their right to association and collective bargaining perpetually circumscribed. Environmental degradation—a significant factor in displacing vulnerable populations and threatening the right to livelihood—is another critical dimension, often treated as an externality to economic planning rather than a central human rights concern. The victims of these policies are often the least vocal and most structurally marginalized, trapped in a cycle where economic precarity dictates their susceptibility to rights abuses.

Moreover, the discourse surrounding human rights is increasingly subject to epistemological challenges. The concept of cultural relativism, when strategically deployed, is often used to elide the universal application of rights, providing political cover for autocratic tendencies. Furthermore, the rise of powerful, globally connected non-state actors, including transnational corporations and organized criminal networks, presents an intractable governance problem. These entities operate outside the traditional confines of nation-state accountability, complicating the enforcement of international legal norms and creating zones of effective anomie. The principle of state sovereignty, originally intended to protect citizens from external interference, is paradoxically invoked to shield internal abuses from legitimate international scrutiny.

The path forward demands a concerted, multi-scalar response. It necessitates bolstering the domestic institutional capacity of national human rights commissions, ensuring their genuine independence, and providing them with the requisite legal authority and resources for effective investigation and redress. Internationally, there must be a move beyond mere declarative advocacy to the creation of robust, legally binding mechanisms that impose tangible costs—economic and political—on egregious violators. Ultimately, the vindication of human rights hinges not just on legal texts, but on the cultivation of an indefatigable civic consciousness and a collective repudiation of apathy. This sustained vigilance, both local and global, is the only antidote to the pervasive normalisation of injustice, ensuring that the UDHR remains a living document rather than a historical artifact.

1. Answer the following questions in your own words without copying any sentence from the passage. Copying from text above may affect the evaluation.

3 × 10 = 30

- (a) What is the main problem between UDHR and global reality?

Answer: The fundamental problem lies in the significant dichotomy between the aspirational moral code set forth by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the pervasive, practical reality of global rights observance. The UDHR established a transcendental framework of inherent and inalienable rights intended to be universal and non-negotiable. However, the prevailing global context is one of systemic breach, where sovereign states routinely engage in practices—ranging from subtle legislative overreach

to overt mass atrocities—that constitute a stark repudiation of these declared principles. Essentially, the core issue is the chasm between the verbal commitment to human dignity and the persistent failure of national governments to translate that commitment into genuine, accountable adherence on the ground.

(b) What is the "double-edged sword" significance of the digital age?

Answer: The "double-edged sword" metaphor describes the paradoxical nature of the digital age concerning human rights. On one side, technology was initially celebrated for its democratizing potential, empowering activists, enabling instantaneous communication, and facilitating the documentation of abuses globally. On the other side, however, this very technology has been swiftly co-opted by state authorities to establish a new vector for oppression. This includes sophisticated, state-sanctioned surveillance mechanisms and the deployment of vaguely worded, draconian laws intended to enforce a chilling effect on free expression and journalistic dissent, thereby transforming a tool of liberation into an instrument of control.

(c) What factors complicate the rights struggle in nations like Bangladesh?

Answer: The rights struggle in South Asian nations, including Bangladesh, is made highly complex by the confluence of multiple, intersecting vulnerabilities. Specifically, the battle is aggravated by endemic historical socio-economic fragilities that create structurally marginalized groups. This vulnerability is then overlaid with acute contemporary governmental pressures, especially those that emerge during the sensitive periods following democratic transitions. These factors collectively ensure that core entitlements, such as the rights of religious or ethnic minorities, the security of indigenous populations, and fundamental freedoms like assembly and expression, remain in perennial jeopardy.

(d) What does "attenuates civic space" mean, and what causes it?

Answer: The phrase "attenuates civic space" signifies the critical shrinkage, weakening, or degradation of the public realm in which citizens can freely organize, debate, criticize, and engage in political life without fear of retribution. This perilous condition is directly precipitated by state-perpetrated abuses intended to instill generalized terror and suppress dissent. The specific actions leading to this erosion include extrajudicial killings and the particularly egregious practice of enforced disappearances, which together cultivate a climate of pervasive fear that compels self-censorship and civic withdrawal.

(e) How does the economic model cause human rights "dereliction"?

Answer: The current dominant global economic paradigm, with its relentless focus on rapid industrialization, ceaseless growth, and competitive FDI, inherently generates human rights "dereliction" (neglect). In a drive for global competitive advantage, essential labour rights, such as the right to association, safe working conditions, and fair wages, are consistently subordinated to the demands of capital and supply chain efficiency. Furthermore, resulting environmental degradation is often treated as a mere economic externality—a cost external to the core business model—rather than an existential human rights issue that threatens livelihoods and displaces vulnerable populations.

(f) How is "cultural relativism" misused politically?

Answer: "Cultural relativism" is a philosophical argument positing that human rights principles should be interpreted relative to specific local traditions or cultural contexts. Politically, this argument is often strategically deployed and weaponized by autocratic regimes as a rhetorical shield. Leaders misuse this concept to elide (sidestep) their obligations under international law, claiming that universal human rights standards (like freedom of speech or due process) are "inappropriate" for their specific nation. This provides a convenient political alibi to justify systematic abuses and prevent legitimate international scrutiny.

(g) Why are transnational non-state actors a difficult governance problem?

Answer: Transnational non-state actors, such as enormous multinational corporations and sophisticated organized criminal networks, present an "intractable" (difficult to manage) governance problem because their operations transcend the spatial boundaries and jurisdictions of traditional nation-states. They effectively operate in a state of anomie (lawlessness or normlessness) relative to international enforcement mechanisms. Since these entities are not conventional sovereign states, they complicate the process of assigning legal liability and enforcing accountability for abuses committed across multiple borders.

(h) What is the contradiction in the use of state sovereignty?

Answer: The fundamental contradiction lies in the perverse inversion of state sovereignty's intended function. Historically, sovereignty was conceptualized as a legal principle designed to protect a nation's people from external military or political interference. However, in contemporary practice, this very principle is paradoxically invoked by governments to establish an impenetrable wall, allowing them to shield their internal rights violations—such as institutional corruption or mass abuses—from necessary international oversight, thereby transforming a protective shield into a tool of impunity.

(i) **What two things are needed to make national human rights commissions effective?**

Answer: To transform national human rights commissions from symbolic bodies into effective institutions, two critical elements are required. Firstly, they must be granted genuine institutional independence, meaning they must be protected from political interference to conduct their work without fear. Secondly, this independence must be paired with the requisite legal authority and sufficient resources, empowering them to conduct rigorous, thorough investigations and to ensure that victims receive prompt, adequate redress and justice.

(j) **What is the "antidote" to normalizing injustice, and its two qualities?**

Answer: The ultimate "antidote" to the pervasive acceptance (normalisation) of injustice is the successful cultivation of a vigorous and unyielding civic consciousness. This defense must possess two key qualities: Vigilance and Resolve. Vigilance refers to the sustained, active monitoring and critique of power, ensuring that abuses are immediately identified and documented. Resolve refers to the collective, uncompromising determination to actively repudiate indifference (apathy), ensuring that citizens translate their awareness into pressure for meaningful action and systemic change.

2. **Write the contextual meaning of the following words in English (the words are underlined in the text):**

1 × 5 = 5

(a) **Architectonic**

Meaning: Serving as the fundamental, overarching structural framework or governing base.

Synonyms: Foundational, Structural, Principal, Governing, Chief.

(b) **Sine qua non**

Meaning: An absolutely essential and indispensable condition or requirement.

Synonyms: Essential, Prerequisite, Indispensable, Necessity, Obligatory.

(c) **Egregious**

Meaning: Conspicuously, shockingly bad, or profoundly offensive.

Synonyms: Atrocious, Flagrant, Heinous, Outrageous, Abominable.

(d) **Machinations**

Meaning: Secret, complex, and deceptive schemes or plots designed to achieve a sinister end.

Synonyms: Schemes, Plots, Ploy, Intrigues, Conspiracies.

(e) **Repudiation**

Meaning: The forceful act of firmly rejecting an idea, commitment, or obligation.

Synonyms: Rejection, Disavowal, Denial, Renunciation, Disownment.

3. **Give an antonym for each of the following words and make sentences with the antonyms:**

2 × 5 = 10

(a) **Inalienable**

Antonyms: Alienated, Transferable, Negotiable, Ceding, Acquirable

Sentence: The right to the vehicle's title is fully transferable upon completion of the sale agreement.

(b) **Insidious**

Antonyms: Harmless, Benign, Straightforward, Transparent, Obvious

Sentence: The committee ensured the new funding process was completely transparent to avoid any suspicion.

(c) **Exigent**

Antonyms: Trivial, Optional, Nonessential, Dispenseable, Minor

Sentence: While desirable, the extra feature on the software was ultimately nonessential for the project's success.

(d) **Obduracy**

Antonyms: Flexibility, Compliance, Pliability, Submission, Amenability

Sentence: The success of the diplomatic talks depended on the flexibility of both nations to compromise on key issues.

(e) **Laudable**

Antonyms: Censurable, Blameworthy, Discreditable, Reprehensible, Deplorable

Sentence: The company's decision to pollute the river was widely condemned as utterly reprehensible.

4. **Mark the following sentences as true or false according to the text.**

1 × 5 = 5

(a) The UDHR aims to create a moral framework that is easily influenced by state power.

(b) The "chilling effect" primarily refers to the physical violence used against activists.

(c) Labour rights are often protected effectively in developing nations due to increased FDI.

(d) Cultural relativism can be used by governments to justify non-universal rights application.

(e) State sovereignty always ensures external scrutiny of a nation's internal affairs.

- (a) FALSE
- (b) FALSE
- (c) FALSE
- (d) TRUE
- (e) FALSE

5. **Change the following words as directed and make sentences with the changed words.**

1×5 = 5

- (a) Transcendental (Adverb)
- (b) Conflation (Verb)
- (c) Logistics (Adjective)
- (d) Scrutiny (Adverb)
- (e) Marginalized (Noun)

(a) Transcendental (Adverb)

Changed Word: Transcendentally

Sentence: The composer's final symphony was transcendently beautiful, moving every member of the audience to tears.

(b) Conflation (Verb)

Changed Word: Conflate

Sentence: The historian warned the students not to conflate the two distinct concepts of sovereignty and tyranny in their analysis.

(c) Logistics (Adjective)

Changed Word: Logistical

Sentence: Organizing the emergency aid shipment presented significant logistical challenges, particularly regarding transportation routes.

(d) Scrutiny (Adverb)

Changed Word: Scrutinizingly

Sentence: The accountant examined the ledger scrutinizingly, searching for the slight numerical discrepancy that had halted the audit.

(e) Marginalized (Noun)

Changed Word: Marginalization

Sentence: The policy was designed to combat the systemic marginalization of indigenous communities in the job market.

6. **Make sentences of your own with each of the following words as directed: Copying, vagueness and ambiguity must be avoided.**

1×5 = 5

- (a) Vulnerabilities (Comparative)
- (b) Redress (Simple)
- (c) Advocacy (Compound)
- (d) Impotent (Interrogative)
- (e) Predicament (Complex)

(a) Comparative : The system's vulnerabilities to phishing attacks are more extensive than its susceptibility to brute-force intrusion methods.

(b) Simple : The community sought redress from the factory for the damage caused to the water supply.

(c) Compound : Environmental advocacy requires commitment, and it demands that activists understand complex governmental regulations.

(d) Interrogative : Given the lack of enforcement power, is the regulatory body entirely impotent when facing these large industrial giants?

(e) Complex : Although the research team understood their predicament, which involved limited funding and a tight deadline, they refused to abandon the crucial project.

7. **Use appropriate capitalization, punctuation and quotation marks where required:**

2.5 × 2 = 5

(a) The writer argued that only “tangible costs” can make governments respect human rights; otherwise, declarations will remain meaningless.

(b) “Civic awareness,” the author noted, “is the only antidote to the normalization of injustice in any democratic society.”

8. **Write briefly the main idea of the above text. Add your comments. Give a suitable title to it. (all within 100 words)**

10 + 7 + 3 = 20

Title: From Declaration to Action: Reclaiming the Spirit of Human Rights

Main Idea:

The text underscores the stark contrast between the ideals of universal human rights and their uneven practice across the world. While the UDHR envisions dignity and equality for all, many nations continue to violate these principles through political repression, censorship, and economic exploitation. In South Asia, weak

democratic institutions, state surveillance, and impunity aggravate this crisis. Global economic systems further marginalize the poor, making rights conditional on privilege. Thus, the struggle for human rights today is both political and moral—a fight to translate lofty declarations into genuine protection for every individual.

Comments:

To bridge this gap, governments must be held accountable through tangible consequences, not mere criticism. Civil society must nurture an enduring civic consciousness that refuses to normalize injustice. Real change begins when citizens, institutions, and nations act with shared moral courage to defend human dignity.

9. **Write a feature article for the editorial page of an English daily highlighting the bold measures needed from governments and civil society to bridge the gap between human rights principles and their practical implementation. Include a forwarding note to the editor.**

20

To
The Editor,
The Daily Observer,
Dhaka.

Subject: Feature Article on Bridging the Gap Between Human Rights Principles and Practice

Sir,

I am submitting a feature article titled “From Declaration to Realization: Turning Human Rights into Lived Realities” for possible publication in your esteemed daily. The article examines the widening gap between human rights principles and their practical enforcement, particularly in developing contexts like Bangladesh. It emphasizes the need for accountability, institutional reform, and a revived civic conscience to ensure genuine protection of human dignity.

Given the growing public interest in issues of justice, equality, and governance, I believe this article will add valuable insight to your editorial page and encourage thoughtful public dialogue.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours faithfully,
K
Dhaka, Bangladesh.

From Declaration to Realization: Turning Human Rights into Lived Realities

Seventy-five years after the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the world still grapples with the paradox of eloquent principles and persistent violations. Though the language of rights has entered constitutions, courtrooms, and classrooms, the lived experience of millions tells a story of neglect, exploitation, and injustice. In many developing nations, including Bangladesh, the struggle for human dignity remains caught between political expediency and systemic inertia.

The gap between principle and practice stems largely from a lack of accountability. Governments often invoke sovereignty to shield abuses, while international bodies hesitate to act against powerful states. To bridge this moral and institutional divide, bold measures are imperative. States must strengthen independent human rights institutions, ensure judicial neutrality, and protect whistleblowers and journalists who expose violations. Moreover, the global community should establish tangible costs—economic sanctions, trade restrictions, or diplomatic isolation—for those who repeatedly breach international human rights norms. Rights must have consequences, not mere condemnation.

However, laws and institutions alone cannot sustain justice. Civil society plays a vital role in awakening public conscience and resisting the normalization of oppression. Educational institutions, media, and youth-led organizations must foster an indefatigable civic consciousness—a moral vigilance that refuses to accept silence or apathy in the face of cruelty. The digital era offers immense potential for awareness and activism, but it must be used responsibly to empower, not to surveil or divide.

Human rights are not luxuries bestowed by governments; they are the birthright of every individual. To honor this truth, citizens must reclaim ownership of the human rights discourse, demanding transparency and fairness at every level. Only when civic courage meets political will can the UDHR evolve from a noble document into a living covenant of justice and equality.

Yours sincerely,
K
House #X, Road #Y, Mirpur,
Dhaka-1216, Bangladesh.
Email: abcdefgh@example.com