*Genocide and Liberation War | 9 ISSN 2789-1062 DOI. 10.68002/2693*

**Shahid Kader Chowdhury***

# The Jagatmallapara Genocide: Violence, Persecution and Memory in 1971

## Abstract

This article reconstructs the genocide experienced by the predominantly Hindu community of Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan, Chottogram, Bangladesh during April–May 1971. It examines the social setting of the locality, the arrival of Pakistani military forces in Raozan, the organization of the 13 April attack, the subsequent killings of 5 May, the destruction and displacement experienced by residents, and the post-war struggle to preserve the memory of the victims. The study draws on oral-history interviews conducted between 2013 and 2015, published historical works, victim and family records, field investigation, and evidence from the memorial site. Particular attention is given to distinctions among direct eyewitness testimony, retrospective family memory, documentary evidence, and claims concerning perpetrators. The available evidence indicates a coordinated episode of genocidal violence in which Pakistani military personnel and alleged local collaborators targeted a predominantly Hindu neighbourhood, assembled civilians under the pretext of a peace meeting, and subjected them to mass shooting and subsequent persecution. The source record, however, contains an unresolved discrepancy: the working victim register identifies forty deaths, whereas the memorialization section refers to thirty-nine, and the memorial itself reportedly contains thirty-five names. Rather than concealing these inconsistencies, the article treats them as source-critical problems requiring further documentary verification. It argues that Jagatmallapara demonstrates how the broader structures of the 1971 Bangladesh genocide became visible at the level of households, neighbourhood networks, displacement, and post-war memory.

**Keywords:** Bangladesh Liberation War; Bangladesh Genocide; Jagatmallapara; Hindu Persecution; Genocide; Local Collaboration; Memory

## 1. Introduction

The history of the Bangladesh Liberation War has been reconstructed through national political narratives, military histories, diplomatic records, survivor testimonies, local investigations, and studies of genocide. Yet a substantial part of this history remains embedded in particular villages, neighbourhoods, households, and sites of killing. Localized studies are important because genocide was experienced through concrete encounters: the arrival of soldiers, the identification and assembly of civilians, the destruction of homes, the separation of families, displacement, and the subsequent struggle to remember the dead. Jagatmallapara in Raozan, Chittagong, provides a significant case for such a microhistorical approach.

Jagatmallapara was a predominantly Hindu neighbourhood in West Sultanpur. The available source material describes

* *Professor, Department of History, Jagannath University, Dhaka, Bangladesh*

approximately forty-five to fifty families and around 150 inhabitants living there in 1971. The locality was situated near the Kundeshwari complex and beside the Chittagong–Rangamati highway, placing the neighbourhood within a setting where residential life, major transportation routes, and institutions associated with Kundeshwari intersected.

The principal attack occurred on 13 April 1971, shortly after Pakistani military forces entered Raozan. Residents were reportedly called together under the pretext of a peace meeting and were subsequently subjected to mass killing. The research record also identifies three additional killings on 5 May. The genocide was accompanied by looting, destruction, fear, and displacement, with some survivors eventually fleeing toward India.

This article examines Jagatmallapara through four interconnected dimensions: the organization of the attack; the destruction of families and a minority community; the reported involvement of Pakistani military personnel and local collaborators; and the post-war politics of memory, recognition, and preservation. The killing of Nutan Chandra Singh at the nearby Kundeshwari complex on the same day is also considered because the source materials connect the two events chronologically and through reports implicating some of the same actors. Singh's death, however, is analytically distinguished from the victims killed at Jagatmallapara because it occurred at a different location.

## 2. Objectives and Methodology

The study has four objectives. First, it reconstructs the chronology and character of the genocide at Jagatmallapara in April–May 1971. Second, it documents the victims and



examines the destruction of individual families and the wider neighbourhood. Third, it analyzes the reported relationship between Pakistani military personnel and local collaborators while distinguishing allegation from corroborated evidence. Fourth, it examines how survivors and victims' families have remembered the genocide and how the killing site and memorial have been treated after independence.

The study adopts a qualitative historical case-study approach. Its sources include oral-history interviews, published historical works, victim and family records, field investigation, memorial-site observation, and materials concerning the genocide in Raozan. Interviews were conducted with Jyotsnabala Chowdhury, Arunangshu Bimal Chowdhury, Dwijay Krishna Chowdhury, Ashish Chowdhury, Ratan Chowdhury, Bishweshwar Chowdhury, and Sanjit Bijoy Sarkar between June 2013 and May 2015.

The interviews represent different forms of evidence and are therefore not treated as equivalent. Jyotsnabala Chowdhury was a direct survivor of the attack. Dwijay Krishna Chowdhury recalled hearing gunfire and fleeing with his family, while subsequently learning details of the killings from others. Arunangshu Bimal Chowdhury had left the locality before the principal attack and later witnessed its immediate aftermath. Other interviewees preserved family memories concerning victims and post-war consequences. Direct testimony is therefore used primarily to reconstruct experience and sequence, while retrospective family accounts are used for victim identification, family relationships, displacement, and memory.

Published works are used primarily for historical contextualization. Oral testimony is evaluated according to

the interviewee's proximity to the event, while retrospective accounts are treated as evidence of family and intergenerational memory rather than as equivalent to direct eyewitness testimony. The study also applies internal source criticism. Most importantly, the working victim register identifies forty deaths, whereas the memorialization section refers to thirty-nine. The memorial itself reportedly contains thirty-five names. These figures are retained as separate elements of the source record rather than silently reconciled.

The distinction between the Kundeshwari and Jagatmallapara sites is equally important. Nutan Chandra Singh is included in the broader working register associated with the genocide under study, but he was killed at Kundeshwari rather than at the Jagatmallapara killing ground. Accordingly, his death is treated as historically connected to the episode but is not counted as a victim of the Jagatmallapara killing ground itself.

## 3. Geographical and Social Context

Raozan Upazila lies in the Chittagong region and is bordered by Fatikchhari, Boalkhali, the Karnaphuli River, Rangunia, Kaukhali, and Hathazari. Jagatmallapara is a small neighbourhood of West Sultanpur, close to the Raozan administrative centre and alongside the Chittagong–Rangamati highway. In 1971, the locality was part of Sultanpur Union.

The social character of Jagatmallapara is central to understanding the genocide. The source material describes the neighbourhood as overwhelmingly Hindu, with approximately forty-five to fifty families and about 150 inhabitants. The community had close social and



occupational connections with the adjacent Kundeshwari Oushadhalaya and educational institutions. Surendra Bijoy Chowdhury is identified in the source material as a respected elder of the neighbourhood.

The location was significant because the highway connected the locality with wider routes through Chittagong and the hill districts. The proximity of Kundeshwari also placed the neighbourhood within a broader local network that became important when Pakistani military forces entered Raozan.

## 4. From Military Entry into Raozan to the Attack

According to the source material, Raozan remained outside the control of Pakistani forces until 11 April 1971, when Pakistani military personnel entered the area and established camps, including one at Raozan College and another at what was then Chittagong Engineering College. The arrival of the military generated immediate fear, particularly in Hindu-majority areas, prompting some residents to leave their homes.

The events surrounding Kundeshwari provide important chronological context. Nutan Chandra Singh, the founder of Kundeshwari Oushadhalaya and associated educational institutions, remained at Kundeshwari despite repeated advice to leave. Anisuzzaman's *Amar Ekattor* records the wider movement of people seeking shelter during this period and describes attempts to persuade Singh to leave for safety (Anisuzzaman). The present study uses this account primarily to establish the atmosphere of insecurity surrounding Raozan at the time.

The source material also records warnings given to residents in the areas surrounding Kundeshwari and Jagatmallapara.

Some families left for safer locations. Arunangshu Bimal Chowdhury recalled leaving with his entire family for his father-in-law's house at Binajuri (Chowdhury, Arunangshu Bimal). His account illustrates how residents perceived the military advance as an immediate threat even before the principal attack on Jagatmallapara.

The chronology becomes particularly significant on 13 April. The source record places the killing of Nutan Chandra Singh at Kundeshwari at approximately 10:00 a.m. and the attack on Jagatmallapara at approximately 11:00 a.m. This close temporal relationship is one reason the two events have frequently been narrated together. Nevertheless, their locations and victim groups should be analytically distinguished. Singh was killed at Kundeshwari, whereas the principal mass killing at Jagatmallapara occurred approximately one hour later in the neighbouring Hindu community.

**5. The Genocide at Jagatmallapara**

The central event in the Jagatmallapara case was the assembly and mass shooting of civilians on 13 April 1971. The source materials describe Pakistani military personnel approaching the neighbourhood accompanied by local collaborators. Residents were reportedly invited to attend a peace meeting. If this account is accepted, local social knowledge and trust were used as a means of assembling civilians at a single location.

An eyewitness account preserved in the research record states that residents gathered in a courtyard after being summoned to the purported meeting. Once the civilians had assembled, gunfire was opened on them. The account



identifies local collaborators who allegedly assisted the operation and estimates that more than thirty people were killed. Because this estimate differs from the later working victim register, the two forms of evidence should not be treated as numerically identical.

Jyotsnabala Chowdhury provides the most important direct survivor testimony. She was the wife of Kiran Chowdhury, one of the victims, and was herself wounded by gunfire during the attack. Her recollection places the event between approximately 10:30 and 11:00 a.m. She recalled that residents were gathered after being told that a peace meeting would take place and that soldiers subsequently opened fire (Chowdhury, Jyotsnabala).

The genocide extended beyond the immediate killings. The source materials describe the looting and destruction of homes and property, followed by the displacement of residents. Arunangshu Bimal Chowdhury returned after the war and described extensive destruction in the village. His testimony also records his family's movement toward India (Chowdhury, Arunangshu Bimal). These accounts indicate that the consequences of the attack extended beyond loss of life to the disruption of residence, property, family life, and community continuity.

Lethal genocide associated with the locality continued after the principal attack. The working victim registers records three additional killings on 5 May: Bidhubhushan Chowdhury, Bijay Krishna Chowdhury, and Dhirendra Chandra Mahajan. These deaths indicate that killings connected to the Jagatmallapara case were not confined to 13 April, although the available source material does not by

itself establish that the 5 May killings formed part of the same operation as the earlier mass shooting.

**6. Victims, Families, and Patterns of Destruction**

The working victim register compiled in the research materials contains forty names. It records age, family relationship, and address for most victims. The register includes men, women, students, and domestic workers. It also includes people who were not permanent residents of Jagatmallapara but whose livelihoods connected them to the community.

The destruction of families is one of the clearest features of the record. Seven members of Gopal Chandra Chowdhury's family are listed: Gopal Chandra Chowdhury, his wife Ranibala Chowdhury, and their five children—Manju, Khinu, Runu, Debu, and Swapan. All five children were students. The record also identifies multiple deaths within the families of Yogesh Chandra Chowdhury and Bishwambhar Chowdhury.

The register further identifies women and domestic workers among the victims. Three women are described as domestic workers from Banshkhali rather than permanent residents of Jagatmallapara. Their inclusion demonstrates that the genocide affected both resident households and people whose livelihoods connected them to the locality.

The victim list is therefore more than a memorial register. It allows the genocide to be analyzed at the level of family destruction. The deaths of parents and children within the same household indicate the destruction of family units rather than the killing of isolated individuals. The register



also reveals how the genocide affected different generations and social roles within the community.

The register nevertheless requires further archival verification. One name appears in incomplete form as "Rajendra... Lal Chowdhury," another address is recorded as "Unknown," and one relationship field is incomplete. These entries should be checked against family records and other documentary sources before the list is treated as a definitive archival register.

**7. Eyewitnesses, Survivors, and Family Memory**

The reconstruction of the Jagatmallapara mass killing depends significantly on oral testimony. Because the genocide occurred within a closely connected rural community, survivors and relatives retained memories of the victims, the attack, the destruction of property, displacement, and the subsequent fate of the community. The interviews used in this study were conducted between June 2013 and May 2015 with eyewitnesses, survivors, and members of victims' families.

These accounts do not represent the same type or evidentiary position. Jyotsnabala Chowdhury was a direct eyewitness and survivor of the attack. Dwijay Krishna Chowdhury heard the gunfire and fled with his family, subsequently learning details of the killings from others; his testimony therefore combines direct sensory experience with information acquired indirectly. Arunangshu Bimal Chowdhury had left the locality before the principal attack and later witnessed its immediate aftermath. Ashish Chowdhury, Ratan Chowdhury, Bishweshwar Chowdhury, and Sanjit Bijoy Sarkar primarily preserved memories of the killings through family

experience and subsequent recollection. Read together, these testimonies provide a layered account of the genocide and its consequences, while their differing relationships to the events require them to be assessed according to their respective evidentiary positions.

## 8. Testimonies of Survivors and Families

### 8.1 Jyotsnabala Chowdhury: Direct Eyewitness and Survivor

Among the available testimonies, that of Jyotsnabala Chowdhury is particularly important because she directly experienced the attack and survived it. At the time of the interview, she was eighty-four years old and lived in Jagatmallapara. Her husband, Kiran Chowdhury, was killed during the attack, while she herself sustained gunshot wounds (Chowdhury, Jyotsnabala).

According to her testimony, the attack occurred on 13 April 1971 between approximately 10:30 and 11:00 a.m. Before the Pakistani military arrived, two Bengali men came to the locality and informed residents that the military would hold a "peace meeting." Residents were therefore asked to assemble in a courtyard. Jyotsnabala recalled that she went there with her husband, Kiran Chowdhury, and that approximately thirty to thirty-five people gathered at the location. The gathering was subsequently attacked by Pakistani soldiers with machine-gun fire. According to her recollection, almost everyone present was killed. Her husband was among those who died, while she was also shot but survived (Chowdhury, Jyotsnabala).

Her testimony is significant not only because it describes the killing itself but also because it provides information about the mechanism through which civilians were assembled. The promise of a peace meeting transformed an ordinary civilian gathering into an opportunity for concentrated genocide. This element of the testimony is also consistent with accounts of other residents who described civilians being gathered before the shooting (Chowdhury, Dwijay Krishna).

Jyotsnabala also recalled that her neighbour Amalendu was shot and killed during the attack. After she was wounded, her younger brother-in-law, Arunangshu Bimal Chowdhury, took her to her father's home in Binajuri. Her testimony therefore connects the immediate violence at Jagatmallapara with the subsequent flight of survivors from the locality.

Her account is also important for understanding the long-term consequences of the genocide. She survived with a permanent physical injury and experienced displacement from her home. The research record further indicates that her testimony was later presented in proceedings concerning crimes committed during the Liberation War. Her recollection thus became part of both family memory and the formal documentation of wartime genocide.

The testimony of Jyotsnabala should therefore be treated as a primary oral source for reconstructing the attack. At the same time, because it was recorded more than four decades after the event, it should be read alongside other testimonies and documentary materials rather than treated in isolation. Its particular evidentiary value lies in her direct presence at the site of the shooting, her own physical injury, and her personal knowledge of several victims.

### 8.2 Arunangshu Bimal Chowdhury: Flight, Return, and the Destruction of the Community

Arunangshu Bimal Chowdhury provides a different perspective on the genocide. He was not present at the beginning of the mass shooting, but his testimony records the warning that preceded the attack, his family's flight, his

discovery of an injured relative, the subsequent movement toward India, and the destruction he encountered after returning home.

According to his testimony, he was practising medicine in Ranirhat, Rangunia, in 1971. On the day of the attack, Kaykobad Chowdhury, the chairman of Rajanagar in Rangunia, came to his shop and advised him to return home immediately and move his family away from the main road. Arunangshu followed the advice and went with his family to his father-in-law's house in Binajuri. Approximately two hours after arriving there, he heard that people in Jagatmallapara had been shot and killed (Chowdhury, Arunangshu Bimal).

He then attempted to return toward Jagatmallapara to determine what had happened. On the way, he found his sister-in-law, Jyotsnabala Chowdhury, wounded by gunfire. His testimony therefore provides an independent account of the immediate aftermath described by Jyotsnabala herself. He also reported that looting had begun in Binajuri and that his family hid in the fields for safety.

The subsequent trajectory of his testimony illustrates the relationship between mass killing and displacement. That night, around 9:00 p.m., Arunangshu left for India with his family. They travelled on foot toward the border, crossed the river, and eventually entered India. After the Liberation War, they returned to Jagatmallapara. He described the village as heavily destroyed and reported that several members of his family had been killed, including Himangshu Bimal Chowdhury, Nilubala Chowdhury, Sitangshu Bimal Chowdhury, Surendra Chandra Chowdhury, Charubala



Chowdhury, and Kiran Chandra Chowdhury (Chowdhury, Arunangshu Bimal).

His testimony consequently expands the meaning of the genocide beyond the moment of killing. For him, the experience consisted of warning, flight, genocide, injury, looting, refugee movement, destruction of homes, and the loss of multiple family members. His account also demonstrates how survivors reconstructed the scale of destruction gradually, as they returned to the locality and learned about the fate of relatives and neighbours.

### 8.3 Dwijay Krishna Chowdhury: Gunfire, Flight, and the Mass Grave

Dwijay Krishna Chowdhury, who was an SSC candidate in 1971, offers another account of the attack. His testimony begins not with direct observation of the genocide but with the sound of gunfire. At approximately 9:00–10:00 a.m. on 13 April, he heard gunfire from the western side of his house. In response, he, his parents, his brother, and his sister-in-law began moving toward his maternal aunt's house in Dabuya. Even after they had travelled some distance, they continued to hear gunfire from the direction of their home (Chowdhury, Dwijay Krishna).

Dwijay subsequently received information from local people about what had happened. According to the account he recorded, local Razakars, members of Al-Badr, and Pakistani military personnel had entered the locality and, under the pretext of a peace meeting, gathered people in the courtyards of Kiran Bikash Chowdhury and Surendra Babu before opening fire. He estimated that thirty to thirty-two people were killed. He further recalled that two or three days later

people from Barua Para came and buried the bodies in a mass grave near the courtyard of Kiran Bikash Chowdhury's house (Chowdhury, Dwijay Krishna).

This testimony is particularly useful because it preserves information about the treatment of the dead. The reported existence of a mass grave indicates that the violence produced not only immediate deaths but also a collective burial process under emergency circumstances. Dwijay further stated that after the war the remains were exhumed and cremated according to Hindu religious practices. A memorial was subsequently established at the location associated with the mass grave.

Unlike Jyotsnabala's account, Dwijay's testimony regarding the actual shooting is partly based on information he received from others. This distinction is methodologically important. His testimony should therefore not be used to claim that he personally witnessed every aspect of the genocide. Rather, his account documents his direct experience of the gunfire and his family's flight, as well as the community's subsequent knowledge concerning the mass killing and burial of the victims. The references to specific local organizations or groups should likewise be treated as reported information rather than as independently established fact.

### 8.4 Ashish Chowdhury: Family Loss, Destruction, and Displacement

Ashish Chowdhury's testimony illustrates the destruction of a family through the killing of several of its members. He was interviewed in February 2015 and was the son of



Premangshu Bimal Chowdhury, one of those identified as a victim of the genocide.

On the morning of 13 April, Ashish went with his mother and sisters to the home of his paternal aunt in Binajuri. During the afternoon, he learned from his maternal uncle, Arabinda Singh, that Pakistani military personnel had entered Jagatmallapara with the assistance of local collaborators and had killed people in the locality. According to the information he received, among those killed were his father, Premangshu Bimal Chowdhury; his elder brother, Anup Kumar Chowdhury, alias Ashok; his aunt, Rama Chowdhury; his uncle, Sitangshu Bimal Chowdhury; and his elder cousin, Samir Chowdhury (Chowdhury, Ashish).

Ashish also recalled that houses were set on fire and that approximately thirty to thirty-five people were killed during the attack. He identified Jyotsnabala Chowdhury and Amalendu Chowdhury among those wounded. After receiving the news, he and his family moved first toward Barua Para and subsequently travelled toward India, eventually reaching Agartala through Sabroom (Chowdhury, Ashish).

His testimony therefore complements the direct eyewitness testimony of Jyotsnabala and the flight narrative of Arunangshu. It demonstrates how information about the genocide circulated among displaced family members and how the killing of individual relatives was experienced as the destruction of an entire family network. His account of returning after independence and finding the village destroyed further demonstrates the physical consequences of the genocide.

### 8.5 Ratan Chowdhury: Family Memory and the Preservation of the Killing Site

Ratan Chowdhury represents a different generation of memory. He was very young in 1971 and therefore did not retain a detailed direct memory of the genocide. His knowledge came primarily through the accounts of his parents and other family members. His testimony is consequently an example of intergenerational memory rather than eyewitness testimony.

According to Ratan, his grandfather Surendra Bijoy Chowdhury and grandmother Charubala Chowdhury were killed on 13 April. Their household domestic worker, Ananta Bala Pal, locally known as "Bakulir Ma," and his paternal uncle Kiran Chowdhury were also killed (Chowdhury, Ratan). Because he was very young at the time, he acknowledged that he did not personally remember much about the event. Instead, he learned details from his parents.

The importance of Ratan's testimony extends beyond the reconstruction of individual deaths. He described how the memory of the genocide influenced his decision to participate in the creation of a memorial. When an initiative was undertaken to establish a memorial at the killing site, he donated one and a half gonda of his family's homestead land for its construction. He explained that he did so to preserve the memory of his grandparents and the other victims for future generations (Chowdhury, Ratan).

His testimony demonstrates how family memory can become public memory. A personal history of loss was transformed into a physical commemorative site. At the same time, Ratan's account points to a continuing sense of neglect among victims' families. He recalled that despite the passage of decades, no one had formally inquired about his family's experience or provided recognition or assistance.



### 8.6 Bishweshwar Chowdhury: Remembering a father through Maternal Memory

Bishweshwar Chowdhury's testimony demonstrates another form of intergenerational memory. His father, Kiran Bikash Chowdhury, was killed during the 13 April attack, while his mother, Jyotsnabala Chowdhury, was wounded. Because Bishweshwar was too young to retain a clear memory of his father or the genocide, his knowledge of the event was transmitted primarily through his mother.

Bishweshwar recalled that after the attack his injured mother fled to India with him and his brother. Following independence, she raised the children under difficult circumstances while carrying the physical consequences of her injury. He explained that although he had no clear childhood memory of his father's death, his mother repeatedly narrated the circumstances of the killing. Through this repeated narration, the memory of his father and the genocide became an important part of his own identity (Chowdhury, Bishweshwar).

The family returned to Bangladesh in January 1972. Bishweshwar recalled that Santosh Ranjan Chowdhury, a member of the local community, took responsibility for the family and helped them continue their education and sustain themselves. His testimony therefore reveals the importance of community support in the aftermath of genocide.

It also illustrates the long-term consequences of wartime genocide. His mother lived with the physical injuries caused

by the shooting and struggled economically after the war. According to Bishweshwar, she received neither government assistance nor official recognition. The memory of the genocide was therefore transmitted within a family whose post-war life continued to be shaped by the material consequences of the attack.

### 8.7 Sanjit Bijoy Sarkar: The Loss of a Father and the Experience of Displacement

Sanjit Bijoy Sarkar's testimony provides another account of the destruction of a family through the killing of a single member. His father, Hirendra Lal Sarkar, was fifty-two years old and worked in Chaktai, Chittagong. Sanjit was approximately fifteen or sixteen in 1971.

According to Sanjit, the family was already aware that a military attack might take place. They had been keeping watch at night because of rumours that the military could attack the locality. On 12 April, his father sent his wife and children to the maternal uncle's house in Dabuya, while he remained behind. The following day, Sanjit received news that Jagatmallapara had been attacked and that his father had been killed (Sarkar).

The family could not immediately return to the locality to recover the body. Sanjit recalled that people fleeing from Jagatmallapara were moving toward Dabuya, and he first learned of his father's death from a relative. He later heard that his father's body had remained at the site for almost a day (Sarkar).

This account reveals the relationship between killing and displacement in particularly stark terms. The family's decision to move to a safer location may have protected the



other members of the household, but it also separated them from the victim and prevented them from immediately recovering his body. The testimony therefore demonstrates how genocide disrupted ordinary practices of mourning, burial, and family responsibility.

Sanjit's recollection also contains an important post-war dimension. At the time of his interview, he stated that his family had received no government assistance and had not received official recognition as the family of a martyr. His emotional response while recalling these experiences illustrates how the consequences of wartime genocide could remain present long after the physical violence had ended.

Taken together, the testimonies demonstrate the diversity of memory surrounding Jagatmallapara. Jyotsnabala Chowdhury provides direct survivor testimony; Dwijay Krishna Chowdhury recalls hearing gunfire and fleeing with his family; Arunangshu Bimal Chowdhury describes warning, flight, injury, and the post-war destruction of the locality; while Ashish Chowdhury, Ratan Chowdhury, Bishweshwar Chowdhury, and Sanjit Bijoy Sarkar preserve family and intergenerational memories. Their differences are not weaknesses in the evidence. Rather, they allow the genocide to be reconstructed through multiple levels of experience and memory.

## 9. Destruction, Displacement, and Aftermath

The consequences of the genocide extended beyond the immediate deaths. Accounts in the research materials describe looting and destruction of houses and property. Survivors therefore returned not simply to bereaved families but to altered physical and economic environments.

Displacement was another major consequence. The threat generated by the military advance and the attack forced residents to seek safety elsewhere. Arunangshu Bimal Chowdhury's account records movement first to Binajuri and subsequently toward India. Such movement illustrates how local episodes of genocide contributed to the broader refugee experience of the Liberation War.

The social consequences were intergenerational. The loss of parents, children, spouses, siblings, and domestic workers disrupted household structures. Later testimony demonstrates that the event continued to shape family identity and memory decades afterward. The genocide should therefore be understood not only as physical destruction but also as social rupture.

**10. Memory and Commemoration**

The post-war history of Jagatmallapara reveals a tension between local commemoration and the inadequate preservation of the killing site. According to the research materials, no substantial memorial initiative was undertaken immediately after independence. In 2008, local residents initiated the construction of a memorial, and Ratan Chowdhury donated approximately one and a half gonda of family land for the project.

The foundation stone was laid on 18 July 2008. The memorial incorporated elements of the national flag and a human figure representing sacrifice, while the names and ages of victims were inscribed on the structure. Yet the source record notes that only thirty-five names were included. Four names—Sarojbala Chowdhury, Sona Chowdhury, Mrinal Chowdhury alias Pintu, and Phanindra Dewanji—were reportedly omitted.



This produces an important source-critical issue. The memorialization section refers to thirty-nine victims, while the working victim register identifies forty. The memorial itself reportedly contains thirty-five names. These figures cannot simply be treated as interchangeable. They may reflect different stages of victim identification or memorialization, but the supplied source base does not establish the precise reason for the discrepancy.

The killing ground presents a second problem. The source material describes the principal site as approximately three shatak of private land and states that it was also used as a local cremation ground. Some victims were reportedly buried near the road rather than within the principal killing ground. The site therefore constitutes both a physical place of death and a contested space of memory.

The community's effort to construct a gateway and its demand for preservation and a library demonstrate that memory has been produced from below. Families and local residents have attempted to compensate for inadequate preservation by donating land, constructing memorial structures, and maintaining oral histories. The history of the site thus reveals not only how genocide e is remembered but also how communities negotiate recognition when institutional commemoration remains incomplete.

**11. Evaluation: genocide, Targeting, and Local Collaboration**

The evidence assembled in this study supports treating Jagatmallapara as a localized episode of organized genocide

against a predominantly Hindu civilian community. Several characteristics are significant.

First, the attack occurred shortly after Pakistani military forces entered Raozan and after Hindu residents had begun fleeing. Second, the principal attack involved the assembly of civilians at a particular location rather than an accidental encounter during combat. Third, the source record repeatedly identifies cooperation between Pakistani military personnel and local collaborators, although the precise identity and role of individual collaborators require source-by-source verification. Fourth, the victims included whole families, women, students, and people working in the locality. Fifth, the genocide was accompanied by looting, destruction, fear, and displacement. Sixth, lethal genocide continued into May.

These characteristics distinguish the episode from a single battlefield encounter. The evidence points toward a process in which a civilian population was identified, assembled, attacked, and subsequently displaced. The predominance of Hindu victims is significant. It does not, by itself, establish every element of genocidal intent; rather, it constitutes one component of a wider evidentiary pattern involving targeting, repeated killing, family destruction, persecution, and displacement.

Local collaboration deserves particular attention. The attack cannot be understood solely through the presence of Pakistani troops. Local actors appear in the source record as guides, intermediaries, and alleged participants. Their knowledge of the neighbourhood and its inhabitants would have reduced the informational barriers faced by outside forces. The reported peace-meeting invitation illustrates how local social knowledge could be converted into a mechanism for assembling civilians and facilitating genocide.

The killing of Nutan Chandra Singh at Kundeshwari on the same morning is chronologically important. His death should not be collapsed into the Jagatmallapara killing-ground count. Nevertheless, the proximity in time and the source record's reports of involvement by some of the same actors suggest a possible historical connection between the two incidents. A broader study of Raozan could examine whether these attacks formed part of a coordinated local pattern of genocide against Hindu communities and institutions.

At the same time, not every claim in the source record has the same evidentiary status. Assertions concerning individual perpetrators, estimates of troop and collaborator numbers, and explanations of motive should be attributed unless independently corroborated. The strongest argument is therefore not that every detail has already been established, but that multiple categories of evidence converge on a pattern of targeted genocide requiring further archival examination.

The post-war record adds another dimension. The fact that families themselves contributed land and labour to memorialization while the principal killing site remained inadequately preserved demonstrates the uneven institutionalization of memory. Jagatmallapara is therefore valuable not only for studying genocide but also for examining the politics of local remembrance, recognition, and preservation.

## 12. Conclusion

Jagatmallapara demonstrates how the history of the Bangladesh Liberation War can be reconstructed through the close study of a single community. The vof April–May 1971 was experienced locally through the arrival of Pakistani forces, the reported participation of local collaborators, the deceptive assembly of civilians, mass shooting, destruction of families, looting, displacement, and subsequent killing. The surviving testimony and documentary record show that the consequences extended far beyond the day of the principal genocide.

The article's central contribution is to place victim identification, oral history, local collaboration, physical sites, displacement, and post-war memory within a single analytical framework. The working victim register reveals the destruction of households; survivor testimony preserves the experience of the attack; family testimony records long-term consequences; the memorial site reveals the struggle over recognition; and the inconsistencies within the source record demonstrate the importance of critical verification in reconstructing local histories of genocide.

The evidence also demands caution. The source materials contain unresolved inconsistencies, most notably the difference between forty victims in the working register, thirty-nine in the memorialization narrative, and thirty-five names reportedly inscribed on the memorial. The precise status of some claims concerning perpetrators likewise requires source-by-source verification. These are not merely editorial problems. Accurate reconstruction of genocide depends on transparent evidence, careful attribution, and an explicit distinction between direct testimony, retrospective memory, documentary evidence, and allegation.

Jagatmallapara should therefore be understood as more than a local tragedy. It represents a site where the broader structures of the 1971 Bangladesh genocide became visible at the level of households and neighbourhood life. The case demonstrates how military genocide, local knowledge, civilian vulnerability, family destruction, displacement, and struggles over remembrance could intersect within a single locality. Further research should compare the Jagatmallapara evidence with other Hindu-majority communities in Raozan and Chittagong, verify the working victim register against family and state records, examine the documentary record concerning local collaboration, and undertake systematic preservation research on the killing site.

## Appendix
## Working Register of Victims Associated with the Jagatmallapara–Kundeshwari genocide

The following list reproduces the victim information supplied in the research materials. It is retained as a working research register and should be checked against original documentary and family records before publication as a definitive list.

| No. | Name of Victim | Father/Husband's Name | Age | Address |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Principal Nutun Chandra Singh | Akhil Chandra Singh | 71 | East Gahira, Kundeshwari, Raozan |

| No. | Name of Victim | Father/Husband's Name | Age | Address |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Tejendra Lal Ghosh | Nityananda Ghosh | 52 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 3 | Somir Kanti Chowdhury | Chandra Kumar Chowdhury | 20 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 4 | Anup Kumar Chowdhury alias Ashok | Premangshu Bimal Chowdhury | 18 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 5 | Premangshu Bimal Chowdhury | Yogesh Chandra Chowdhury | 45 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 6 | Sitangshu Bimal Chowdhury | Yogesh Chandra Chowdhury | 42 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 7 | Kiran Bikash Chowdhury | Mahendra Chowdhury | 44 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 8 | Surendra Bijoy Chowdhury | Chaitanya Charan Chowdhury | 62 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 9 | Nirabala Chowdhury | Husband—Dr. Himangshu Chowdhury | 47 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 10 | Charubala Chowdhury alias Binodbala | Husband—Surendra Bijoy Chowdhury | 52 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 11 | Anantabala Pal alias Bakulir Ma | Domestic worker (Surendra Bijoy Chowdhury) | 37 | Banshkhali, Chittagong |
| 12 | Rajlaxmi Chowdhury | Domestic worker | 50 | Banshkhali, Chittagong |



| No. | Name of Victim | Father/Husband's Name | Age | Address |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Kamini Rudra | Domestic worker | 70 | Banshkhali, Chittagong |
| 14 | Jatindra Lal Sarkar | Purna Chandra Sarkar | 48 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 15 | Hirendra Lal Sarkar | Purna Chandra Sarkar | 52 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 16 | Prabhati Sarkar (student) | Jatindra Bhushan Sarkar | 14 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 17 | Debendra Lal Chowdhury | Nishikanta Chowdhury | 52 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 18 | Rajendra... Lal Chowdhury | Nishikanta Chowdhury | 53 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 19 | Ajit Kumar Chowdhury | Dr. Upendralal Chowdhury | 72 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 20 | Paritosh Chowdhury (student) | Fanindra Bijoy Chowdhury | 20 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 21 | Bhabatosh Chowdhury | Unknown | 31 | Unknown |
| 22 | Gopal Chandra Chowdhury | Haricharan Chowdhury | 45 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 23 | Ranibala Chowdhury | Gopal Chandra Chowdhury | 40 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 24 | Manju | Gopal Chandra | 18 | Jagatmallapara, |

| No. | Name of Victim | Father/Husband's Name | Age | Address |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Chowdhury (student) | Chowdhury | | West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 25 | Khinu Chowdhury (student) | Gopal Chandra Chowdhury | 16 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 26 | Runu Chowdhury (student) | Gopal Chandra Chowdhury | 12 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 27 | Debu Chowdhury (student) | Gopal Chandra Chowdhury | 9 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 28 | Swapan Chowdhury (student) | Gopal Chandra Chowdhury | 14 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 29 | Phanibhushan Chowdhury | Peyari Mohan Chowdhury | 48 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 30 | Madhusudan Chowdhury | Bishwambhar Chowdhury | 50 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 31 | Bipin Chowdhury | Bishwambhar Chowdhury | 62 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 32 | Kusumbala Chowdhury | Husband—Madhusudan Chowdhury | 47 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 33 | Prabhavati Chowdhury | Jatindralal Sarkar | 15 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 34 | Sarojbala Chowdhury | Husband—Kamini Chowdhury | 40 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |



| No. | Name of Victim | Father/Husband's Name | Age | Address |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35 | Sona Chowdhury | Upendra Bijoy Chowdhury | 42 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 36 | Mrinal Chowdhury alias Pintu | Phanindra Bijoy Chowdhury | 46 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 37 | Phanindra Dewanji | Domestic worker of Naba Chandra Singh | 52 | Resident son-in-law |

## Victims Recorded for 5 May 1971

| No. | Name of Victim | Father/Husband's Name | Age | Address |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 38 | Bidhubhushan Chowdhury | Rasik Lal Chowdhury | 47 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 39 | Bijay Krishna Chowdhury (Rakhal) | Harichandra Ukil | 45 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |
| 40 | Dhirendra Chandra Mahajan alias Dhrita Mahajan | Peyari Mohan Chowdhury | 54 | Jagatmallapara, West Sultanpur, Raozan |

## Works Cited

Anisuzzaman. *Amar Ekattor*. Sahitya Prakash, 1997.

Chowdhury, Ahmed Amin. *Muktijuddho O Raozan in the Light of History*. Balaka, 2012.

Chowdhury, Nasiruddin, editor. *Muktijuddhe Chattogram*. Bangladesh Muktijoddha Sangsad Chattogram District Unit Command, Chattogram, 2013.

Ibrahim, Sheikh Muhammad. *Ekattorer Bijoy Gatha*. Bhumika, 2014.

Rahman, Mahbubur. *Bengali Nation's Struggle for Liberation and the Liberation War*. Research Centre for the Liberation Struggle of Bangladesh and Freedom Fighters, Chattogram, 1993.

Uddin, Gazi Saleh. *Pramanik Dalil Muktijuddhe Chattogram*. Balaka, Chattogram, 2013.

**Interviews**

Chowdhury, Arunangshu Bimal. Personal interview. 18 June 2013.

Chowdhury, Ashish. Personal interview. 25 February 2015.

Chowdhury, Bishweshwar. Personal interview. 29 May 2015.

Chowdhury, Dwijay Krishna. Personal interview. 18 June 2013.

Chowdhury, Jyotsnabala. Personal interview. 18 June 2013.

Chowdhury, Ratan. Personal interview. 29 May 2015.

Sarkar, Sanjit Bijoy. Personal interview. 29 May 2015.





*Ashish Chowdhury, son of martyr Premangshu Bimal Chowdhury, is showing the site of the Jagatmallapara mass grave.*



*Jagatmallapara Martyrs Memorial*