

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.
All rights reserved.**

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

THE PARADOX OF SOVEREIGNTY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE HISTORY, LEGITIMACY, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS IN INDIA

AUTHORED BY - HEBA ANSARI

Thakur Ramnarayan College of Law, F.Y. B.A. LL.B

Abstract

This paper discusses the historical background, validity, and exercise of Emergency Provisions in India under Articles 352 to 360 of the Constitution. It follows them from a protector of constitutional principles to an instrument of dictatorial excess, and then returns. These were born of a real dilemma, rooted in Carl Schmitt's concept of the State of Exception. How can a new, federal nation survive during periods of crisis without surrendering the liberties it has pledged to protect? Dr. B.R. Ambedkar supported these provisions during the Constituent Assembly debates, which he called a "necessary evil" and wished they would never be used. Unfortunately, that was not true. The Constitution had provided for emergencies in 1962, 1971, and again in 1975, a supposed brake that was turned into a creative whirlwind. Courts were removed from the process, press freedoms were stifled, and citizens were rounded up without trial. In the case of *A.D.M. Jabalpur v. Shivkant Shukla* (1976), it was held by the Supreme Court that during an Emergency, even the right to life could be suspended. This figure of history is considered one of the darkest spots in the Indian constitution. That darkness was India's 44th Amendment in 1978. It substituted ambiguous wording with precise legal norms, insulated Articles 20 and 21 against suspension, and demanded parliamentary accountability at every point in the process. It sought to undo the damage done by the 1975 Emergency, which had broken people's faith in their Constitution. This study concludes that, anyway, they are legitimate only in the rule of law.

Keywords: Emergency Provisions, State of Exception, 44th Amendment, Fundamental Rights, Judicial Review, Constitutional Democracy, and B.R. Ambedkar.

Introduction & Philosophical Foundation

The hallmark of a democracy lies not only in its fundamental framework of rights and liberties provided to its citizens, but also in the ability of a state to maintain an equilibrium among its authority, responsibilities, and individual freedom during a crisis. Primary to this authority of the nation lies the concept ¹“State of Exception.” The concept of the State of Exception was popularized in the 1920s by a German Philosopher and jurist, Carl Schmitt.

A ²*State of Exception* generally refers to a “situation of crisis or emergency in which a government invokes extraordinary powers by suspending normal legal rules to restore order or preserve the nation in light of that crisis or emergency.” In the Indian Context, this Anomaly is codified within the “Emergency Provisions” of the Constitution (Article 352-360).

³After the passage of the Indian Independence Act, 1947, India became a Dominion, and the Dominion Legislature made laws from 1947 to 1949 under the provisions of section 100 of the Government of India Act, 1935, as adapted by the India (Provisional Constitution) Order, 1947. Under the Constitution of India, which came into force on the 26th January 1950. After the enforcement of the Indian Constitution, India adopted a Federal Government Structure.

⁴George Jellineck said, “*Federal State is a state formed out of several states, the power of the former being derived from the states which compose it, and to which latter are bound together as to form a political entity. It is an association of States, which, as a result, formed the institution of a sovereign power superior to the associated states, but in which, however, the latter participate.*”

In simple words, A federal government is a singular political union created when several states meet and join together to form a central government, which is more powerful than any other state, but it also allows individual states to keep their own identities. However, this structure has its own demerits. The division of power can create dangerous ambiguity during times of emergencies. To resolve this, governments come up with the concept of ‘State of Exception’ or ‘State of Emergency.’ The Indian Constitution provides for conferring extraordinary powers

¹ States of Exception, <https://www.statesofexception.org/statesofexception> (last visited May 4, 2026)

² Emergency, Cambridge Dictionary, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/emergency> (last visited May 4, 2026)

³ Law Comm’n of India, Post-Independence Developments, <https://lawcommissionofindia.nic.in/> (last visited May 4, 2026) Durga Das Basu, Introduction to the Constitution of India (22nd ed. 2015).

⁴ R.C. Agarwal, Political Theory (Principles of Political Science) (S. Chand & Co. 2006).

upon the Union in case of an emergency. These powers enable the federal government to acquire the strength of a unitary system when required. The inclusion of these provisions in the Indian Constitution raises real concerns about how the Central authority might expand and, in turn, dilute its liabilities. Therefore, there is an urgent need for a clear distinction to balance the functional authority and constitutional liability and manage a crisis.

The Birth of Emergency Law

⁵In the early 20th Century, the German Empire was dissolved, and a constituent assembly in Weimar established a new federal republic, called the Weimar Republic. Article 48 of the Weimar Constitution authorised the President to take emergency measures, including issuing decrees without prior parliamentary approval.

⁶The Constituent Assembly of India, established in 1946, was tasked with drafting the Indian Constitution, with its membership including prominent figures such as Frank Anthony, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Minoo Masani, G. Gurmukh Singh, and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. One of the drafting committee's most prominent figures was B.R. Ambedkar, who proposed the Emergency Provision in the Indian Constitution.

In the draft of the Indian Constitution, the Emergency Provisions were drafted as Article 278 (now Article 356). ⁷This Article was raised in the Parliamentary Debate on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th August, 1949. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar and Alladi Krishnaswamy Iyer argued that these powers were a "necessary evil" required to protect the nation's fragile unity against the threats of internal chaos and external aggression post-Partition. On the other hand, H.V. Kamath, Shibban Lal Saxena, and H.N. Kunzru held the opposite view, arguing that the provisions were a "Charter of Slavery." They feared that the complete authority granted to the Centre, particularly the power to suspend fundamental rights and dismiss state governments, would be misused for political agendas, effectively transforming the democratic republic into a totalitarian state.

Despite the critics' opinions, the assembly passed the draft of Article 278 because it was made

⁵ Vineeth Krishna, *In Weimar's Shadow: Emergency Powers and India's Constitutional Design*, CONSTITUTION OF INDIA (May 7, 2020), <https://www.constitutionofindia.net/blog/in-weimars-shadow-emergency-powers-and-indias-constitutional-design/>.

⁶ *Constituent Assembly*, CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, <https://www.constitutionofindia.net/constituent-assembly/> (last visited May 5, 2026).

⁷ *Constituent Assembly Debates*, CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, <https://www.constitutionofindia.net/constitution-assembly-debates/> (last visited May 5, 2026).

to prioritise national stability at the time of external and internal threats. Dr. Ambedkar played a major role here because he understood his responsibility as a drafter and wanted to provide a “safety valve” for democracy. However, Dr. Ambedkar said, "I hope that such articles will never be called into operation and that they would remain a **dead letter**". This was said because he wanted these provisions to be the last resort and only used in extreme situations.

The Constitutional Triad (Articles 352–360)

⁸Section XVIII of the Constitution codifies the concept of “State of Exception” under Articles 352-360. Each article represents a separate, specific functional mandate.

All the articles can be divided into four separate groups: The Proclamation, the Effect, and the Financial.

Group-1 The Proclamation

The Proclamation or the announcement of Emergencies is mentioned in Articles 352, 356, and 360 of the Indian Constitution.

Article 352 (National Emergency):- Article 352 says that the President can declare an emergency if there is a great threat to India’s security by “external aggression” or “armed rebellion”. This Article is like the switch that allows the Executive to bypass standard federal limitations.

Article 356 (State Emergency):- Article 356 says that if the President receives a report from the Governor specifying failure of Constitutional Machinery in a State. This allows the Union to dissolve or suspend a State Government. This is commonly known as the President’s rule for constitutional intervention in state governance.

Article 360 (Financial Emergency):- Article 360 says that if the President understands that the Financial Stability or the Credit of India or any of its territories is threatened, he may declare a Financial Emergency.

Group-2 The Consequences

Articles 353, 354, and 355 represent the consequences or the impact the three kinds of emergencies will create.

Article 353:- Article 353 explains the Union Government's control over the State during the emergency. Here, they become subordinates to the Union's directions. The Legislation also

⁸ INDIA CONST. arts. 352–360.

gains power here to make laws on the subjects of the State lists. This Article effectively suspends the autonomy of the state, and the Country acts as a single unit.

Article 354:- Article 354 deals with the application of provisions relating to the distribution of revenues while a Proclamation of Emergency is in operation. It states that the President can issue orders to modify the taxes and revenue distribution among the Union and the States. At the time of an emergency, when the Central Government has to look after everything altogether, it may need more funds for defence or security. The President can reduce or stop the funds of the State. However, it can leave States in a critical position.

Article 355:- Unlike giving more power to the Union through Articles 353 and 354, Article 355 puts an obligation on the Union. It states the duty of the Union to protect the state from internal disturbance and external aggression. It also makes it the obligation of the Union to ensure that the government of every state is carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

Group-3 The Suspension of Liberty

During an Emergency, certain articles are suspended, and this suspension is declared under Articles 358 and 359. These articles determine the fate of Fundamental Rights during an emergency.

Article 358:- This Article speaks for the elimination of Article 19 of the Indian Constitution. Basically, when a National Emergency is declared on the grounds of War or External Aggression, Article 19 of the Indian Constitution, part of Fundamental Rights under Part III, ensures essential freedoms necessary for a democratic society, is automatically suspended. This automatic suspension allows the State to make laws or take executive actions that would otherwise be unconstitutional.

Article 359:- This Article means that the President can suspend the right to move any court for the enforcement of Fundamental Rights. Article 359 does not suspend the Fundamental Rights; it basically suspends the remedy (the right to go to court). Unlike Article 358, Article 359 does not get activated automatically but needs a President's order.

Group 4: The Article of Procedural Power

The last Article, Article 357, provides the specific machinery and procedure for exercising legislative powers. This article ensures that the State's administration and finances continue to run smoothly during an emergency.

Suspension Of Rights

During an Emergency in India, under Articles 358 and 359, there is a temporary suspension of rights.

Under Article 358, Article 19 (democratic freedoms) is suspended automatically during a National Emergency if the country is under an external threat. Article 19 is re-enforced only after the emergency ends. This suspension applies to the entire country. Article 358 suspends citizens' rights during this period, which can result in significant consequences. The state may require making and implementing laws during an emergency that would not otherwise be constitutional. Typically, Article 19 provides citizens with fundamental rights; in the event of external aggression, these rights may be subject to misuse by individuals, and anti-national elements can potentially disrupt the executive's functions.

Consequently, under Article 359, the President is empowered to suspend any right; however, such suspension is not automatic and requires Presidential Assent for rights other than those under Article 19. In contrast to Article 358, which suspends rights only during External Emergencies, Article 359 permits the suspension of remedies for rights during both External and Internal Emergencies. The provisions of Article 359 may be applied to the entire country or to a specified region and remain effective for the duration specified in the Presidential order. The requirement of a Presidential Order comes as a check-and-balances mechanism. Basically, the framers of the Constitution of India felt that not every right needs to be frozen during the Emergency, so the President can have the authority to consciously decide which rights are actually creating a hindrance in the state's ability to handle the crisis. If the suspension of rights in this article were automatic, it would create vagueness, but the Presidential Order was passed with responsibility. The idea behind this Article is that the suspension of the right to remedy is so grave and impactful that it should happen only through a formal and structural order. So, by making the Article dependent on Presidential Order rather than an automatic suspension, the Constitution shifts from “automatic necessity” to “executive accountability”.

The interplay of Article 358 and Article 359 indicates the Attempt of India Constitution to navigate during emergencies between national preservation and individual liberty. While Article 358 prioritizes automatic necessity, Article 359 serves as a crucial safeguard by demanding executive accountability. These articles do not exist to destroy democracy but to provide the State with the temporary legal resilience required to protect the sovereignty of the state. By demanding specific intent and parliamentary oversight, the Constitution ensures that an emergency remains a temporary protective measure rather than a permanent path or

authoritarianism.

Case Studies in Legitimacy

The Emergency of 1962 (Sino-Indian War)

The Emergency of 1962 was India's first Emergency. This Emergency occurred as a result of China's war against the North-East Frontier Area (NEFA) of India.

This Emergency was proclaimed on the grounds of war and External Aggression. As the emergency was announced, Article 358 was automatically imposed, suspending the provisions of Article 19. In pursuance of this Emergency, the President of India at the time, **Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan**, passed an order under Article 359, suspending Articles 14, 21, and 22.

The emergency gave the government the power to exercise and effectively manage a situation. However, the ⁹The Defence of India Act, 1962, provided the Central Government with legal methods to maintain public order. It granted the authority to make rules for public safety and the defence of India. Under Section 3 of the Act, the government had the power to make rules that were necessary or expedient. This act had one conflicting power; the act allowed preventive detention of any person suspected of acting in a manner that could be against the national security of India.

The Preventive Detention caused conflicts in the judicial process, resulting in the case of ¹⁰Makhan Singh v. State of Punjab (1964). In this case, the issue that arose was, Does the Presidential Order under Article 359 create an absolute prevention of a citizen's right from filing a Habeas Corpus petition under Section 491 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC)? The Supreme Court held that because of the President's order under **Article 359**, the detainees had no "locus standi" (right to appear) to move the court to enforce their rights under Articles 14, 21, and 22.

This judgment caused a huge turmoil among the citizens. The doors of the judiciary were completely closed over here. Now, during the drafting of the Constitution, Dr. B.R Ambedkar had called the Emergency a "safety valve" for the country. And he hoped it remained a "dead letter". Basically, never wanting such a situation to arrive where an emergency has to be implemented. He basically did not want Emergency to be used for general governance. But during the emergency of 1962, the goal of the Emergency to act as a shield changed to just an

⁹ The Defence of India Act, No. 51 of 1962.

¹⁰ Makhan Singh v. State of Punjab, AIR 1964 SC 381

instrument of executive expansion for simplifying the internal administration. The emergency turned from a safety valve to a significant erosion of civil liberties for the citizens of India. The right to approach the court under Article 32's enforcement was suspended by the Presidential order passed under Article 359. Even though the Sino-Indian war ended in 1962, the Emergency continued till 1968. By allowing the Emergency to continue until 1968, the Government forced the Judiciary into a position of helplessness and left citizens depressed and without any rights. The government used the Defence of India Act to legally shield itself in a very particular way from public outrage, making the Executive untouchable.

The Emergencies of 1971 and 1975

In 1971, there was the second National Emergency of India. This was announced on the grounds of a war threat to India's security by Pakistan. On 3rd December 1971, the National Emergency was announced by President V.V. Giri on the advice of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. Before this Emergency ended in 1977, another emergency was announced on the grounds of Internal Aggression in the Country by President Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, again on the advice of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. The first emergency was due to an external threat, but it later shifted to internal political survival.

Following the 1971 Emergency, the government exercised its authority through the ¹¹Maintenance of Internal Security Act (MISA), 1971, and the ¹²Defence of India Act 1971. Under Section 3 of the MISA, 1971, the central and state governments got powers to make orders detaining individuals to prevent prejudiced actions towards the state. Section 13 of the same act allowed for a detention for up to twelve months or the duration of the emergency, creating a cycle of imprisonment without a trial.

The Defence of India Act, 1971, provided for more sword-like administrative powers. Under section 3, the central government was granted the power of unlimited rule-making for public safety. Moreover, the officials got more protection through this act. Section 40 of the act states that no suit or prosecution could lie against any official for actions taken in good faith under the act. Together, both acts made sure that the executive has both the legal weapon and immunity to avoid accountability for their actions. This turned the contradiction of Dr. Ambedkar's intended constitutional restraint into a reality.

The legal shield created for the officials by these Acts reached its breaking point in 1976. The

¹¹ The Maintenance of Internal Security Act, No. 26 of 1971

¹² The Defence of India Act, No. 42 of 1971

¹³A.D.M. Jabalpur v. Shivkant Shukla, also known as the “Habeas Corpus Case,” served as a landmark judgment. The question that was raised in the case was whether a citizen could file a writ of habeas corpus under Article 226 or if the presidential order under Article 359 took it away. The Supreme Court ruled against the citizens. Now. Since the president had issued an order under Article 359 suspending the enforcement of fundamental rights, the right to life and personal liberty, the citizens had no locus standi to move to any court for a writ of Habeas Corpus. The court ruled that even if a detention was plainly illegal, the judiciary could not intervene. They argued that the liberty of an individual is not a gift of law, and if the law is suspended, the individual has no protection.

The judgment in the Habeas Corpus Case showed how Emergency provisions were being misused, not only ripping the basic rights of citizens but also reducing the judiciary's power and authority to zero. The bench during the case included Justice H.R. Khanna, the only one to disagree and argue that the right to life and liberty is not a “gift” from the law but a natural right that should exist as long as a person is a human. He, solely on the bench, believed that no government should have the power to deprive a person of the right to life or liberty without the authority of law, regardless of the emergency.

The most unjust consequence was the judicial abdication of duty. In a democracy, the judiciary is the final gatekeeper. By the removal of the right to have a locus standi, the Executive had removed all kinds of checks and balances it could ever face. Unfortunately, the Judiciary was unsuccessful in adhering to the Rule of Law.

The Correction: 44th Amendment

The 1975 Emergency served as a basis for the 44th Constitutional Amendment. It revealed that India's emergency laws were not merely a “safety valve” but had major loopholes that became a weapon against its own citizens. ¹⁴The 44th Amendment was introduced as a promise to the citizens that such a dark chapter would never be repeated in India.

This amendment was a massive restoration project. Its process started with the Bill No. 88 of 1978. It was a piece of legislation designed to stick to the constitution and remove the authoritarian additions made during the emergency. The bill was introduced in the Lok Sabha on May 15, 1978, by Shanti Bhushan, the Law Minister at that time. The bill's authorship was a collective effort by the Janata Party, including figures like Morarji Desai and Atal Bihari Vajpaaye.

¹³ A.D.M. Jabalpur v. Shivkant Shukla, AIR 1976 SC 1207

¹⁴ The Constitution (Forty-fourth Amendment) Act, 1978

¹⁵The bill was debated a lot upon its introduction. It was passed by the Lok Sabha on August 7, 1978, and by the Rajya Sabha on August 31, 1978. The Bill was then officially enacted after Presidential Assent by President Neelam Sanjiva Reddy (Presidential Assent was required because the bill had necessary amendments in the powers of the Union and State and High Courts), on April 30, 1979.

Changes with the 44th Amendment

Article 352: The term “Internal Disturbance” was replaced with “Armed Rebellion”. Previously, the amendment was very vague. It could identify peaceful protests, civil disobedience, or large strikes as dangerous to the state's security. This vagueness was dangerous and had to be changed.

The amendment mandated that the President will require a written advice from the Union Cabinet and act only based on it. This imposed Collective Responsibility and ensured that the President could not misuse his power or be misled by unnecessary oral advice.

It included a “Special Mandatory” 2/3rd approval of the Parliament for the implementation of a National Emergency. This change protected the country from a transient majority. Rather than a simple majority representing a political party, rather than a National Consensus.

It also required the renewal of the Proclamation of an Emergency every 6 months. This change transformed the Emergency from a permanent switch to a temporary loan of power. It forced authoritative responsibility on the government. Additionally, it gave 1/10th of the members of the Lok Sabha the power to force a special meeting with a notice within 14 days of the emergency to consider a resolution for disapproving the emergency. This power made sure that the government was being held accountable in the public eye during a crisis.

Article 353: The amendment added a Proviso to Article 353, stating that even though a proclamation of emergency was limited to a specific part of India, it could be extended by the Union's power to another state and make or amend laws only if the other state is affected by actions happening in the area where the emergency is actually in force. This was like a preventive blanket for the whole country to avoid an increase in conflict. It limited the spillover effect of an emergency.

Article 354: The amendment changed that every order made by the President to modify the distribution of revenue between the Union and States must be laid out before each of the Houses of Parliament “as soon as may be”. It forced Financial Accountability. Also, prevented the

¹⁵ The Constitution (Forty-fifth Amendment) Bill, 1978, Bill No. 88 of 1978 (as introduced in Lok Sabha)

President from doing an unjust distribution of revenue, only in order to punish the opposition-led states.

Article 356: The amendment changed the period of Parliamentary Approval for the continuance of President's Rule from 1 year to 6 months. By reducing the duration to six months, the authors ensured the Centre could not "occupy" a state administration for long periods without frequently returning to Parliament for a fresh mandate. Before 1978, the Central Government frequently used Article 356 to dismiss state ministries led by opposition parties. This change was to stop the Centre from using constitutional failure as a basis for political gain.

The amendment mandated that a President's rule can not be extended beyond a year unless there is a national emergency or the Election Commission certifies that holding elections in that state is difficult. Before 1978, the Central Government frequently used Article 356 to dismiss state ministries led by opposition parties. This change was to stop the Centre from using constitutional failure as a basis for political gain.

Additionally, the amendment deleted the cause that made the president's satisfaction final and non-justifiable. This change was like restoring the dead letter by Dr. B.R. Ambedkar.

Article 358: The change mandated that Article 19 will only be suspended during a National Emergency declared on the grounds of war or external threat. This was really important to safeguard the rights of citizens, especially in the sectors of the Press and Social Gatherings. There will basically be no automatic suspension of rights under Article 19 through Article 368 if there is a national emergency due to Armed Rebellion. This was a major relief for the Press as it ensured freedom for them so that nothing could be hidden from the public.

Article 359: Lastly, the amendment mandated a non-negotiable restriction on the President's power. It established that the suspension of fundamental rights can be suspended during an Emergency, but this Power cannot be extended to Article 20 and Article 21.

Article 20 protects individuals from arbitrary criminal punishment, while Article 21 guarantees the right to life and personal liberty under a fair legal procedure. By protecting Article 20, it ensured that the state cannot create new crimes to punish past behaviour or force confessions during an Emergency. Additionally, Article 21 not being suspended during the Emergencies ensured that the government may treat every prisoner with the basic dignity required by the Rule of Law.

The 44th Amendment stood as the definitive legislative restoration of the Indian Democratic fabric. After the 1975 Emergency, it was important to restore the trust of Indian citizens in the government and the constitution. The primary importance of the Amendment lay in removing

any space in the law of emergencies that could be misused, and India could be turned into a Constitutional Dictatorship rather than a Constitutional Democracy. It turned the Emergencies from a “loan” of Power to stabilize the Government into the safety valve that it was once intended to be. The amendment’s most prominent achievement was the restriction on the Suspension of Articles 20 and 21. It restored basic human rights and guaranteed the right to life, and the Writ of Habeas Corpus remains inviolable even during the war.

The 44th Amendment was the “Constitutional Safety Valve” that restored the Rule of Law in India. It effectively shifted the Constitution from a tool of potential overreach back into a permanent shield for individual liberty and constitutional overreach.

Critical Analysis

George Jellineck defined the federal state as an association that creates a sovereign power superior to its components. However, the Indian Constitution provides for Emergency Laws to maintain balance during external or internal threats to the country. The laws are defined in such a way, especially after the 44th Amendment, that there is a peaceful federal state that can exercise authority and use power responsibly.

Dr. Ambedkar had emphasized that the Emergency was a “necessary evil”. By this, he was attempting to resolve the dangerous ambiguity that division of power could create during an Emergency.

The absolute liberty the government has during a crisis, however, is questionable. It is a fundamental challenge, and it can be very difficult for citizens to identify whether it is a political survival or a national necessity. State of Exception is the most dangerous tool in the Constitution. The government, on its own, claims absolute liberty to handle a crisis, which can be used to mask political agendas, making it nearly impossible for the average citizen to understand.

In a crisis, the government holds a monopoly on the information. For example, before the amendment, there were restrictions on the Press, which is the 4th pillar of the Indian democracy, and it was majorly affected negatively. Exactly, here is where there is a transient majority trap by the government, where the emergency can be misused.

However, the monopoly of the Government lies with military data, intelligence reports, and

administrative updates. Monopoly lets the government have control over the required areas to reduce tension in the country and restore peace in the country. It is highly possible that citizens, during a threat, revolt against the government and create disturbance, or the citizens can be harmed through war-like situations, and this can create a feeling of fear and panic among the citizens. Hence, there needs to be a critical balance between how the emergency is used and how the President exercises his power during an emergency to make it legitimate and not violate the rights of citizens under the name of 'threat'. The laws of emergency can be saved from political exploitation through the mandatory approval of the Houses of Parliament.

As much as an emergency is known to be an evil provision, it is a "necessary evil" and can be exercised within limits and responsibility. Moreover, the Press and media can act as a major messenger and hold the government accountable for its actions. So, if there is any kind of threat, the implementation of an emergency plan can be initiated.

Conclusion

The Evolution of Emergency Provisions in the Indian Constitution. Dr. Ambedkar initially conceived these provisions as a 'necessary evil' and a 'dead letter', meant to be invoked only for the preservation of the nation at peril, but by the time we lived through the horrendous chapter that was the 1975 Emergency, it uncovered a structural irony in our democratic architecture, the very mechanism set up to protect the Republic could also be easily turned into its destroyer: this so-called 'safety valve'. The "Transient Majority Trap," supported by the state monopoly on information and judicial shirking of responsibility in the ADM Jabalpur case, demonstrated that in the absence of explicit safeguards, the "State of Exception" would devolve into a "State of Impunity."

The 44th Amendment of 1978 is the most comprehensive corrective legislation in India. The deletion of nebulous expression of "internal disturbance," and replacing it with objective ground to the reality in "armed rebellion" and immunity for Articles 20, 21 from suspension posed the key changes in this amendment that institutionalized that the right to life and liberty is a natural right, pre-constitutional, not a state-provided right. It has successfully transitioned constitutional balance from "Trust-based" to "Check-and-Balance" model wherein any suspension of democracy is temporary, transparent to the system, and accountable both in Parliament and the Judiciary.

In the end, what is most crucial about the 44th Amendment is that it appreciates that a nation cannot survive if its soul dies. In our contemporary era, while the National Security vs Individual Freedom "Tug-of-War rages on, these protections are still the last line of defence against authoritarianism.

This research concludes that while the "State of Exception" remains a functional necessity for a sovereign state, its legitimacy depends entirely on its ability to remain answerable to the Rule of Law. Through the 44th Amendment, the Indian Constitution transitioned from a document that could be silenced by a crisis to one that speaks most loudly when the Republic is under threat. The research ends upon the standpoint asserting how the "State of Exception" acts out in character as a survival tool for any sovereign state, yet finds its legitimacy rooted entirely in being rendered accountable to the Rule of Law. Hence, the Indian Constitution was transformed from a canon that may be muffled by crisis to one that emits the most noise when the Republic is beleaguered through the 44th Amendment.

