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Becoming a Modern Nation: Educational Discourse in the Early Years of Ayub Khan (1958-64)¹

Rubina Saigol

The foundations of national education in Pakistan were laid during the early period of the first military rule imposed by General Ayub Khan (1958-1968). Prior to the takeover by Ayub Khan, various recommendations had been put forward in conferences, meetings and consultations, but a comprehensive national education policy was not formulated. However, far-reaching suggestions were put forward at the meetings of the Pakistan Educational Conference in 1947 and 1951. In 1952, there was a review of the situation of education in Pakistan and a National Plan for Education Development was devised, but the implementation remained weak. Similarly, the Educational Reforms Commission for East Pakistan made a series of recommendations in 1957, some of which were incorporated later, but a comprehensive programme remained elusive. There were recommendations for educational reform by the Advisory Board of Education, the Council of Technical Education and Inter-University Board, along with numerous foreign missions which presented their own proposals. Additionally, international conferences and seminars produced ideas about how education should be organized. Many of these suggestions were incorporated into the massive report prepared by the Sharif Commission, constituted by Ayub Khan’s government in 1958 and entrusted the task of reorganizing and reorienting the educational system of Pakistan. The recommendations of the Sharif Commission report of 1959 became the basis of Pakistan’s educational system in the following decade.

The Report of the Commission on National Education, 1959 (hereafter Sharif Report) was a detailed and comprehensive report, which can be considered the Magna Carta of Pakistan’s educational system. It envisioned

¹ Paper presented at the Conference on ‘Education in Modern South Asia: Social Change and Political Implications’ organized by the Center for Modern Oriental Studies Berlin, May 23-25, 2002. I would like to express my gratitude to Ms. Neelam Hussain of Simorgh Women’s Resource and Publication Center, for providing me access to the documents of the era of Ayub Khan.
massive and far-reaching changes, not only in the educational system, but also in ‘national consciousness’, which it aimed to reconstruct along the lines of modernity, development and Pakistani nationalism. The effects of the Ayub era educational policy have persisted beyond his time, and are discernible in contemporary educational discourse in Pakistan. I will, therefore, focus on the early years of the Ayub regime, when education was reoriented towards the perceived needs of a new nation-state attempting to find its moorings. This paper covers the period from 1958 to 1964, when the foundations of national education were consolidated.

Ayub Khan’s military government accorded high priority to educational reform because of the centrality of education in the construction of the ‘national’, and its alleged capacity to usher in modernity. In an address at the meeting of the Curriculum Committee, Ayub Khan stated that:

> Of all the reforms we have initiated in the last 20 months…the reconstruction of the education system is the one closest and dearest to my heart. No economic planning, social progress, or spiritual enlightenment can make such headway without sound, solid and realistic base of good education.

According to him, these reforms constituted the first landmark in Pakistan’s endeavour to bring the educational system in line with the requirements and realities of modern life. In his speeches and statements during the early years of his rule, he made frequent references to education and the need to modernize it along the requirements and realities of contemporary times.

The two overriding educational imperatives of Ayub Khan’s military regime, as manifested in his speeches and statements and the Sharif Report, were:

- national integration and homogenization
- modernization of the economy and society

Education was called upon to serve these two ‘national’ objectives by ushering in a modern, scientific and secular consciousness in economic and social activity, and by integrating a diverse and plural polity into a sense of singular nationhood. To achieve these two aims of contemporary times, it was necessary to erase, or at least diminish, the pre-modern identities arising from ethnic, caste, regional or sectarian belongings, and simultaneously to loosen the hold of tradition, local cultures, the past, and the alleged unscientific outlook of the people. In an address at the tenth Convocation of Peshawar University in March 1962, Ayub Khan remarked that if we give in
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to ‘geographical distances, linguistic disparities, local loyalties, cultural pulls...parochial pressures and you have an ideal hotbed for the germs of discontent, disaffection and disunity to flourish and thrive in’. Ayub Khan’s educational thinkers and planners set about the task of achieving the twin objectives of national integration and modernization, in their pursuit of the major task of forging a nation-state and national identity out of a vast array of regional diversities, and so-called pre-modern forms of social and economic organization.

The educational discourse of this early period, deploys the linear dimensions of time, that is past, present and future, in ways that divide time along the axes of pre-modern and modern, traditional and new, irrational and rational/scientific, divided and united, immoral and moral. However, it is a shifting discourse as the past is alternately constructed as good (representing great heritage, great tradition) and bad (representing superstition, ritualism, moral degradation). Similar constructions of the present and future also appear in the manner in which time is represented as discontinuous, rather than as a continuum. The dimensions of time in the construction of the ‘national’ will become clearer with the discussion of the two main objectives of national education during the early period of the creation of Pakistan.

**Part I – Becoming a Nation Forging a National Identity**

We gained our independence just under fourteen years ago, although as a people we have a history which stretches back in terms of centuries…. We have tribal consciousness and after independence our problem was how to weld the society into a society of a nation.⁴

You have to undergo similar educational curricula...the standard of values becomes common and from that cohesion emerges national feeling.⁵

Nothing is more important and nothing more urgent than the need for national unity and integration. To my mind it is the fundamental requirement of all progress in national life. Without unity there can be no order in society and no meaning in advancement.⁶

Modern nation-states, along with contemporary forms of nationalism, are premised on the notion of homogeneity. The presumed oneness of the
nation means the denial, and possible eradication of regional, local and provincial loyalties in favour of the nation-state. The path from regionalism to nationalism, and towards a centralized state, is riddled with violence and conflict. Older identities, however imagined or fictional, do not give way without resistance. Pakistan, as an idea, as a single unified national state, was carved out of India by amalgamating different regions, each with its own distinct cultures, languages, dress, food, attitudes, myths and beliefs. Bengal, Sindh, the Punjab, the North Western Frontier Province and Balochistan, each had their own separate histories, heroes, myths, legends, languages, castes, classes, politics, dress, food and cultural practices. One of the most intractable problems of Pakistan has been the inability of governments and ideologues to weld the people into a sense of a common history and purpose – a common and shared notion of nationhood. The secession of East Pakistan in 1971, and resistance movements in Balochistan in the 1970s and Sindh in the 1980s, all bear testimony to the fact that regional consciousness has relentlessly contested attempts to impose a national consciousness. This has been exacerbated by the perception, based on a fair amount of evidence, that the center in Pakistan is dominated by the Punjab. Being the largest province in Pakistan, the Punjab not only has the highest number of seats in the national legislature, Punjabis have also been over represented in the military and bureaucratic oligarchy. As a result, disaffection and alienation from the centralized state has been considerable, and the estrangement is intensified by economic disparities and class differences.

Newly independent, post-colonial states have tended to rely fairly extensively on education to create the sense of a ‘common brotherhood’, a shared national ethos which would override the divisions and distinctions based on class, ethnicity, tribal and sectarian affiliations, and reduce the consciousness of regional disparities. The move toward modernity has meant that tribal and local loyalties are shunned in favour of the larger collectivity represented by the centralizing bureaucratic state. Social sciences and social studies, in particular the subjects of history and civics, have been assigned the role defined in educational policies as ‘nation-building’ and creating citizenship or civic values.

Educational discourse in Pakistan has also centered heavily on the idea of nation-building and citizenship formation. The Sharif Report of 1959 contains a chapter on the role of education in character building, with the latter notion centered on good citizenship. References to nation building abound in the Sharif Report, as well as Ayub Khan’s speeches and
The disruptive forces of communalism, regionalism, and provincialism came to the fore in the sub-continent...progress and patriotism reflect, to a large degree, basic attitudes and values. After the first great surge that launched the nation, the magic was gone. Slowly the old attitudes that had been absorbed into the bloodstream of the nation during the last century returned to plague our national life and impede our progress. One by one we witnessed the reappearance of the old attitudes of passivity, indiscipline, opportunism and regionalism... In a situation where the overriding objective is that of nation building, and where there exist these centrifugal forces of regionalism, indiscipline, and non-cooperation, the immense tasks to be accomplished can only be carried out when a strong and responsible leadership emerges. Such leadership must come from the highest levels and it must be strong enough to overcome these forces and by its public behaviour change the attitudes behind them.\(^9\)

The Report laments that after the independence had been won, the ‘magic’ of being a separate single nation, was gone and old attitudes returned to plague our national life. Old attitudes are represented as being negative because they are rooted in regional loyalties. Regionalism is placed alongside indiscipline, non-cooperation and opportunism as impeding progress. The past here is negative and must be shunned for the sake of progress. The reference to strong leadership appears to be a justification for military rule and dictatorship. The idea is that we need ‘strong leadership’ (read dictatorship) to contain the ‘menace’ of regionalism and to create a homogenized nation of Pakistanis.

The appeal to patriotic nationalism is made repeatedly in the Report and in Ayub’s speeches, especially when he speaks of a divided polity and the need for national integration. In a message to the nation on December 24, 1962, Ayub Khan stated:

> Pakistan came into being on the basis of an ideology which does not believe in differences of colour, race or language. It is immaterial whether you are a Bengali or a Sindhi, a Balochi or a Pathan or a Punjabi – we are all knit together by the bond of Islam.\(^11\)

Consistent with the premise of the two-nation theory, religion is invoked for the purpose of national integration. Since religion seemed to be the only
common thread tying the different regions to each other, it was deployed as a strategy for national unification. However, even religion proved to be a weak bond when it came to ethnic consciousness, especially as religion is interpreted very differently across regions, sects and classes. This was the reason that in a later period of Pakistan’s history, a monolithic view of religion from above was attempted by General Zia-ul-Haq, in order to provide a prop for Islamic nationalism.

The Ayub era educational rhetoric seems to reflect a tension between the notions of change and preservation, aspirations for the future and the need to retain the ‘glorious’ past. While decrying communalism on the one hand, the policy makers state on the other that Pakistan’s educational system must play a fundamental part in the preservation of the ideals which led to the creation of Pakistan and strengthened the concept of it as a unified nation. They go on to state that it should protect our values, and the Islamic way of life. In this case, the communal past of the Pakistan movement must be preserved and it is a past that is good. Nevertheless, a little later in the chapter on Higher Education, the Sharif Report states that:

Pakistan is a relatively new state, destined to play…an important role in this complex world. Though it is politically young, its people have an historic past and fine cultural and educational traditions…Our attitudes are largely inherited from a social system no longer appropriate to an independent and progressive nation.

The Report then goes on to condemn what it calls ‘obstinate traditionalism’ as an impediment to Pakistan’s future and development. The selective defining of the past as glorious and worthy of preservation, and the past as indicative of ‘obstinate traditionalism’ and to be discarded, represents the political mobilization of the concepts of historical time in the construction of the ‘national’. The past represents both our continuity with ‘ancient greatness’, as well as our discontinuity with colonialism. The frequent references to the idea of an independent and free nation, are designed to reflect discontinuity with a subject past. Along with notions of Time, concepts of Space are also used to engender national pride. According to the policy makers:

It is proper that our people should have pride in the history of our ancient land and that they should know of achievement of our predecessors in these plains and mountains.
Proud references to the achievement of predecessors ‘in these plains and mountains’ in the ‘history of our ancient land’, combine elements of time (ancient land) and space (plains and mountains). The Past is remembered with glory in nationalist histories and ancestors are revered as heroes and saviours. The role of archaeology, according to the Sharif Report, is to dig into the secrets of the past to arrange the relics of past greatness in museums to preserve them and make them available to others. A student learns better, argue the policy makers, ‘at a well-arranged display than he can by hearing a lecture or reading an article’. The past has to be arranged like an exhibit for students to admire the glorious deeds of their ancestors and develop pride in being the heirs to such a heritage. In this discourse, the old and the traditional, as well as the past, is great, glorious and to be revered.

The past that is to be preserved and revered, is linked to the present through language. The Sharif report states that language as the repository of the thought and culture of a people linking its past with its present, is also a part of the concept of nationhood, enabling people to think, feel and act as a unified group. The past is thus the core of identity, enabling people to conceive of themselves as a group, as united. This is the reason why nationalist history takes great pains to reconstruct the past as a unified, uninterrupted and smooth narrative, undisturbed by the conflicts and violence of historical events. The policy makers understand the importance of national language in constructing such a narrative, and argue that national language is a powerful source for developing a sense of nationhood. It is one of the basic elements that welds people into homogeneous units. It is a symbol of a nation’s dignity and, like its flag, its national anthem, and its heroes, it fosters national pride.

National language is thus an icon, which constructs the ‘national’ as a unified, one, homogenized whole, existing from ‘time immemorial’, and simultaneously de-legitimizes the regional and sub-national languages that interrupt and pierce the neat fabric of ‘national oneness’. The Sharif Commission Report of 1959 also underscores the importance of script in preserving cultural heritage, and rejects Romanization of the Urdu script by arguing that it would ‘sever links with the past’, and future generations would be cut off from our literature and languages.

The tension between the notions of ‘new’ and ‘ancient’ is resolved by placing them in a continuum through literature. In a chapter on Arts and Our Cultural Heritage, the Sharif Report states:
In a new State like Pakistan, which at the same time has a very ancient cultural heritage, literature has a most important function as the repository of the annals and ideals of the past and as the means of expressing the people’s hopes, aspirations and their desire for unity and strength. The State has an important role in the establishment of conditions which should be conducive to literary development.¹⁹

This statement connects the past with future aspirations, thus rendering the past as good and as the repository of cultural heritage. The notions of an ‘ancient cultural heritage’ connected to a bright future reflecting the aspirations of the ‘nation’, are typical of most forms of nationalism. Such timeless constructions of Time, as in words like ‘ancient’ without reference to historical periods and specific events, tend to be the constitutive elements of ‘the empty Time of nationalism.’²⁰ This kind of nationalistic construction in educational discourses, tends to erase not only histories, but also the unique identities of sub-national groups as it refers to ‘the nation’ as one, single unified group with a ‘common history’. It also erases any idea of class, caste and gender structures that interrogate and fracture the seemingly smooth surface of all forms of ethnic, sub-national or national grouping.

In a broadcast to the nation on December 1, 1963, Ayub Khan referred to religion as the basis of ‘our emotional integration’ and proudly announced his regime’s success in erasing regional belonging in favour of homogenization. In Ayub’s words:

While East Pakistan was fortunate enough to be one homogenous whole, West Pakistan was divided into a number of provinces and states at the time of the birth of Pakistan. Big and small, mostly small, these units were a serious impediment in the way of political and economic growth, not only of that wing, but also of the country, as a whole. The integration of West Pakistan was, therefore, a landmark in the social, economic and political progress of our nation. I do hope that in a few decades, which is not a long time in the history and progress of nations, our people will forget to think in terms of Punjabi, Pathan, Sindhi, Balochi and Bengali and think of themselves as Pakistanis only…our religion, our ideology, our common background, our aims and ambitions unite us more firmly than any geographical boundaries could have.²¹

The move toward centralization, and the creation of the notorious ‘one unit’, were celebrated as one of the crowning achievements of the ‘Pakistani
nation’. However, abstract sources of unity proved weak when people found themselves separated by physical space, territory. Eight years later, his dream of ‘one Pakistan’ was drowned in the Bay of Bengal with the secession of East Pakistan and the formation of Bangladesh. In a prophetic sort of way, Ayub Khan had referred in the same speech to the dangers lurking within, the enemy/other of the nation residing deep within our own Selves.

The Making of the Citizen

The importance of creating a spirit of nationhood in all Pakistani citizens cannot be overemphasized. As a newly emergent nation, Pakistan must consolidate and develop the concept of Pakistani nationhood with particular emphasis on Islamic values. The school has a major role to play in the process, not only by training the men and women who will love and serve the nation and make sacrifices for it, but also in developing the characteristics of good neighbours, good citizens, and the patriot. We should foster among school children a love of their country, and a desire to serve it, based on a deep appreciation of its history, aspirations and cultural and social patterns, and a determination to correct its weaknesses and social injustices and contribute to its development as a free, progressive and prosperous nation.

An important task that education is expected to perform in contemporary nation-states, is the forging of modern and moral citizens. Apart from being homogenized into developing an emotional relation to the idea of ‘one nation’, people have to be disciplined and regimented into the requirements of modern citizenship. This requires the socialization of children to respect and revere the icons of the state – the flag, the national anthem, the military. Education, by its very organization and ‘hidden curriculum’, is ideally suited for this purpose. The daily routines and rituals of disciplining and regimentation in schools, offer vital opportunities for creating a disciplined, conforming, loyal and obedient subject/citizen of the state.

The qualities of a good citizen, according to the Sharif Report include: discipline, helpfulness, honesty in private and public life (honesty shops, honesty rooms), self-sacrifice, integrity, truthfulness, justice, fairplay, efficiency, disciplined behaviour, fellow-feeling, good character, cooperation, spirit of service, duty, trust, honour (honour code systems), respect for dignity of labour and technical skills. It was argued that the full development of the child should include the production of an individual, a citizen, a worker a patriot. The citizen should have modern vocational and
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technical skills, but with roots in ‘national culture’. Education should nurture ‘pride in the nation’, an understanding of its history and aspirations, and a willingness to serve it, as well as an appreciation of ‘universal brotherhood of man and spirit of international understanding’. Throughout the Report, there are references to ‘reorganizing and reorienting education according to our aspirations’, but it is never explained whose aspirations are ‘our aspirations’. Since the thrust of the policy is to create particular types of consciousness, modern and nationalist, the frequent reference to ‘our national aspirations’ seems like a contradiction, as it is presumed that what the government wants to do already exists as national aspiration. The possibility that people’s aspirations may be in conflict with what the state is attempting to create, is overlooked or denied.

The most central quality required in a good citizen is patriotism on which there is repeated emphasis. As the Sharif Report states:

We have also said that the school has an important part to play in developing national consciousness…It is, therefore, most important that this sense of patriotism be cultivated throughout this stage of schooling.

In order to become modern citizens, people must relinquish their pre-modern, narrower identities and loyalties. Regional and communal consciousness must give way to modern consciousness rooted in the ‘rational’ idea of the enlightened citizen of the state. Being Pakistani must overcome, and take precedence over, being Bengali, Punjabi, Sindhi, Pathan or Balochi. Parochial consciousness is the enemy – the Other within arising from the past that must now be altered. As Ayub Khan stated in a speech in December 1963: ‘Our laws, our institutions, our life in essentials is one, wherever you go in Pakistan. We have created conditions that make for a common outlook and the development of a healthy and vigorous nationhood’. The vast differences that characterize Pakistani society were underplayed, while commonalities were overemphasized in the construction of a ‘healthy and vigorous nationhood’. In Ayub Khan’s view, without national integration, ‘national culture tends to stagnate and lose its virile character’. The masculine metaphors of ‘vigorous nationhood’ and ‘virile character’, are juxtaposed against the emasculating notion of stagnation (which implies impotence), a metaphor frequently invoked in exhortations to ‘move forward’, ‘march with the times’, ‘change’ and ‘develop’. The latter notions will be discussed in the section on modernization.
In order to inculcate a sense of patriotism as Pakistani citizens, the policy makers recommended that the primary school should open each day with the national anthem in the assembly. This should be accompanied by the hoisting of the national flag and short talks emphasizing patriotism and character building. The value of the dignity of labour should be instilled through emphasis on working with the hands and working hard. A very strong emphasis should be placed on the national language at the primary stage and reading should build ‘desirable attitudes’, ‘good character traits’ and ‘industrious habits’. Religious instruction should be compulsory at this stage. The list ends with creating ‘a scientific outlook on life’ and the exhortation that the materials and activities should be related to the child’s environment and ‘national preoccupations’. The underlying assumption seems to be that people do not work hard, and a good citizen should be hard working and express respect for the dignity of labour – a good worker. A nascent industrializing economy required disciplined workers, and education was expected to supply trade, industry and the defence and civil services with patriotic, obedient, loyal, hard working and industrious citizen/workers. In most references to nation building and citizen formation, an appeal is made not only to patriotism, but also to religious instruction as a fundamental source of inculcating the ‘right values’. In the view of the policy makers, patriotism and character building have national and moral significance.

In the chapter on Character Building, the Sharif recommended that at the school stage, the day should begin with a formal ceremony which should include the singing of the national anthem and appropriate readings emphasizing the concept of the Pakistani nation. It was recommended that a national pledge be “composed” embodying these sentiments and once a month, the ceremony should be extended to include the hoisting of the national flag. It is interesting to note that in some of his speeches, Ayub Khan decried reducing religion to mere rituals, yet when it came to the more secular nationalist rituals, his education policy makers suggested their generous use in schools. The secular rituals of the nation-state inscribe the state on the child’s mind as a sacred entity to be loved and respected, and often also lead to obedience to all authority. Education becomes the training ground for later subordination to political authority in adult life. While in most of Ayub Khan’s speeches and statements, religion is called upon to usher in a modern, rational and contemporary sensibility, in education it is also expected to create the ‘moral citizen’. The discourse on nation building and citizen construction is underlined with moral exhortations reminiscent of the colonial discourse of the immoral, uncivilized and backward natives, who had to be schooled and educated into becoming moral and upright.
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While colonial education was designed to create quiescent subjects of the Raj, post-colonial education was meant to fashion ‘citizens’ in the same image – obedient, loyal, hard working and able to subordinate themselves to authority. As a new state, Pakistan had not fully emerged from its colonial past, which was denigrated in rhetoric and upheld in practice. Internal colonialism of local ruling elites, along with its discourse of modernizing the citizens and developing society from a backward to a contemporary state, replaced the direct colonial domination of foreigners. Speaking the language of the colonial administrator of earlier times, Ayub Khan, in his message to the nation on October 26, 1961, commented: ‘Without a sensible character pattern, no nation can advance materially or morally. It is in this crusade against national waywardness, that the most enlightened elements of our society like the intelligentsia, the press, public servants and all other men and women of means and education ought to take a leading part.’

In several speeches and messages, Ayub Khan referred to the corruption of politicians, black marketeering, dishonesty in public dealing and various other moral depravations, to argue that education should instill morality and a good character. Some of the speeches are reminiscent of Charles Grant’s ‘Observations’ of 1797, in which he expressed deep perturbation at the moral waywardness of the natives, and argued that by giving Indians a good, secular English education, their moral improvement could be achieved.

**Mass Schooling and the Manufacture of the Mass Man**

Education was expected to forge a standardized and modal citizen character because of its capacity to manufacture the ‘mass man’ of modern times. In spite of references to the ‘spirit of inquiry’, ‘independent thinking’, ‘freedom of thought’ throughout the Sharif Report, education was designed primarily to homogenize, standardize and engender conformity to the regime’s vision of a developed and modern nation. In the chapter on the role of education in character building, the writers assert:

None of the educational reforms that we have proposed will achieve the desired results unless they lead to the inculcation of personal and national values based on a deep concern for the welfare of Pakistan. Moreover, character...is a positive and active force and as such requires not only the intellectual recognition of certain values, but also the translation of these beliefs into constructive activity. We would like to begin this discussion with a consideration of those values which we are convinced must be held in common by all our citizens and then to consider various means of developing habits which are likely to convert these beliefs into behaviour.
It is inconceivable how a society divided by deep fissures and fractured vertically and horizontally along the lines of class, ethnicity, religion, sect and region, could be forced to hold common values, which could then translated into standardized behaviour. Notions of behavioural engineering, including the disciplining of the mind and body that underlie such thinking, reflect the deeply controlling nature of the proposed education under military rule. Modern citizens were to be regimented through 'mass consciousness', which is not the same as collective consciousness in the political sense.

Time in the Construction of Citizenship

A citizen must have deep and abiding love for his country. This is conceived not as a vague sentimental feeling, but as a genuine appreciation of the spirit of Pakistan. Pride in the nation’s past, an enthusiasm for its present, a firm confidence in its future, and a conviction that every citizen must have a basic responsibility to contribute what he can to the growth and strength of the nation. The essence of patriotism is a feeling of national solidarity in which the individual identifies himself with the common aspirations of all citizens; is moved by influences which bind the people together; and develops a consciousness of affinity and kinship. He feels that he belongs to Pakistan, in the same way that he belongs to his family, and he feels that whatever happens to Pakistan happens to him.

The above quote from the Sharif Report weaves the various facets of nationalism into a seemingly coherent whole. First, there is the reference to linear notions of time in which the past is good and there should be pride in it, the present demands enthusiasm (read for military rule), and there should be ‘firm confidence in its future’, the idea being that citizens should place their confidence in the leadership of Ayub Khan’s government which is taking the nation towards a glorious future. The idea of the ‘growth’ and ‘strength’ of the nation refer to nationalist ideas of superiority, strength and power. The reference to ‘national solidarity’ and ‘common aspirations of all citizens’ points toward homogenization and standardization of want and desire – we all must want the same things irrespective of our class, regional, caste, ethnic and religious differences. This homogenization is supported by reference to kinship and family, which represent blood ties and emotional investment often invoked in the service of the nation and the country.

Benedict Anderson likened nationalism to kinship and pre-modern, tribal forms of community ideology as compared with liberalism or socialism, precisely because of the former’s similarity to older forms of collective
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Constructions such as ‘the spirit of Pakistan’ seem to imply that there is one overriding spirit of Pakistan that supersedes other feelings and sentiments, in particular parochial ones. The citizen, as a member of the state, must think in terms of territory, rather than privilege his belongings based on a common language or other shared symbolic universes. This space (national territory) is located in continuous but ‘immemorial time’, that is, time not limited by collective human memory and history - where the past, present and future are all good, and they record national greatness. The past holds glory, the present enthusiasm, and the future progress and hope.

In a speech delivered by Ayub Khan at the Centenary Celebrations of St. Patrick’s High School, Karachi, on July 30, 1961, he argued that:

We must have the highest regard for traditions and that we must not ignore our past for the sake of future. There is a tendency amongst human beings today under stress of modern life to ridicule the past and not know exactly what they shall do for the future, for the spiritual and moral foundations.

In constructing citizens imbued with ‘national spirit’, traditions were held in the highest regard and the past was deemed too important to be ignored for the sake of the future. The past was not to be ridiculed and the future not left to chance, that is, without aspirations. The ‘moral and spiritual foundations’ were to be remembered, as memory preserves identity. In his message to the nation on November 18, 1961, Ayub Khan recognized Pakistan’s multicultural past as being rich and old. According to him, ‘the cultural heritage of Pakistan is both rich and old. Each period of this heritage has its distinct characteristics, and every race or people who came and settled here, left their individual, racial, religious and other marks.’

This statement is a clear acceptance of the diversity that characterizes Pakistan, and belies the false and state-imposed homogeneity. The statement also underscores the importance of preserving the past, which is ‘rich and old’. However, as we will see in Part II on modernization, tradition and the past were frequently derided as holding us back from ‘marching with the times’ and ‘moving forward’ toward a glorious future. When the overriding agenda was modernization and development, the past became a hindrance, a menace to be overcome. Memory made uncomfortable incursions into the present and the future, disturbing the smooth movement forward into a progressive and enlightened time.
Part II – Becoming Modern

Our present educational system is a legacy from the past. It was designed and devised to meet an entirely different set of conditions; it needs to be revised to meet the requirements of a free nation.37

The Commission has been given the task to suggest ‘ways in which education in Pakistan might be given a new orientation to fit the needs and aspirations of our people. To approach this task we have had to think of ‘the future of this society which it [education] should help shape. We have assumed that the educational system of a nation should be consonant with the country’s self-image, that it should be, in form and content, consistent with the hopes and aspirations the country holds for itself; indeed, that it is the medium through which these aspirations come to be realized’.38

Unless you have your research and development going on all the time, people who are thinking of the future and producing ideas would stagnate. In the life of today, you cannot stagnate. In industry if you stagnate, you go out of business.39

One of the foremost aims of the educational reforms and policies of the era of Ayub Khan was national integration and the unification of a diverse polity. The second major concern which fills the pages of the Sharif Report, and recurs frequently in the statements and speeches of Ayub Khan, is the persistent concern with becoming a modern nation, a progressive, industrialized and economically developed country, armed with scientific knowledge and technical know-how. The preoccupation with becoming modern required a modern citizenry, with a new consciousness steeped in aspirations for the future. The citizenry had to be schooled in modern thinking, which encompassed a scientific temperament, secular knowledge systems, technocratic consciousness and a consistent concern with development and the future. In this discourse, the future takes precedence over the past and the past, including tradition and old ways of thinking, become the hidden Other within the Self – the Other that had to be overcome in order to move forward. In the discourse on ‘national integration’, the enemy within was regional and parochial concerns, and cultural diversity. In the modernizing discourse of the state, the Other is all that is old, worn-out, out-of-date, traditional and backward.

Colonial binaries of backward versus modern, traditional versus innovative, religious versus secular, superstitious versus the scientific and ancient
versus contemporary, informed the discourse on modernization, as much as they formed the basis of the discourse on national integration. The Others of the national self, that is the cultural, regional and parochial loyalties that had to be eradicated, were also presumed to be located in the past that haunted the future. Similarly, backwardness, superstition, pre-modern loyalties and ways of being, tradition and rigid forms of religion, were Others that emanated from the past and threatened the present and future. The past now looked sinister and had to be undermined, as it represented all that the young country wanted to forget and erase from collective memory. The past, in its negative images, represented colonial domination, subjection, powerlessness, as well as superstition and lack of a scientific approach to life. The new catchwords were progress, development, the future. Along with these concepts, the idea of the modern man included the notions of efficiency, productivity, speed, movement and flexibility. These concepts related to ‘scientific sensibility’, appear frequently in Ayub Khan’s public discourse on modernity, development and progress. For example, in a speech at the All Pakistan Science Conference in March 1964, he asserted that ‘the quicker they [underdeveloped countries] enter the age of science, the better. They are in a desperate haste to achieve advancement and progress through science’. In the same speech, he stressed the idea of ‘shortening the processes of time’ to ‘accelerate the development of scientific and technological knowledge’. For a new nation, the hope of becoming a developed country lay, in Ayub Khan’s vision, in the era of science.

Like a young person who has aspirations and dreams of a future, and an old person who comes to live in memories of the past, Pakistan as a young country was looking forward to a great and modern future, even as it referred to its ‘centuries old history’ and glorious past when national pride had to be instilled. Pakistan was, simultaneously, existing within all three worlds – the past, the present and the future, but the leaders selectively appropriated elements of each as the political needs changed. For national integration, the past was good and provided a sense of greatness. For future development, modernization and progress, the past became a hindrance, an impediment on the road to greatness. It was difficult for the rulers to admit that Pakistan had no long past to be proud of, that it was barely eleven years old. The past that was invoked for creating images of greatness, belonged to the very Others, the provinces and regions, that had to be denied in the creation of the ‘national Self’. The construction of the ‘national’ meant that the rich regional and parochial past had to be forgotten.
Ironically, however, in the discourse on modernization and development, it was the national itself that had to be overcome. The need now was to ‘become like others’, especially like the other developed and modern countries. The pages of the Sharif Report and Ayub Khan’s speeches are littered with phrases such as ‘we are lagging behind’, ‘we have to catch up with other, more advanced nations’, ‘we are backward’, ‘we must learn from other countries, especially the modern and developed ones’, ‘we have a lot of leeway to make up’. The catch-up syndrome, discussed by Ashis Nandy, seems strongly evident in the modernizing rhetoric of the era. For example, Ayub Khan commented in his address upon the conferment of honorary doctoral degree by Cairo University:

We have not only to catch up with this time lag but we also have to prepare ourselves to move forward and keep pace with the fast-moving world of today and tomorrow.  

Ayub’s Khan’s construction of the world was couched in metaphors of stagnation and stasis versus movement, marching forward, a fast-moving and fast-changing world, race against others to catch up, and lagging behind. There are frequent references to competition, and to the idea that Pakistan is in some kind of a race in which it is way behind others. Most newly independent, post-colonial states were imbued with the catch-up ideology promoted by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Most of them were also borrowing heavily to become like the advanced western countries – modern, industrialized, scientific and with the manpower to run their machines. The idea of being modern was to become like the Other – the previously colonial master.

Early post-colonial nationalism differed from the later form that was invoked by General Zia-ul-Haq. In the early form, the ‘national’ was to be recast in the image of the international. The emphasis was on sameness and similarity with Others, rather than difference. National greatness and glory would lie in becoming increasingly like western countries and erasing or minimizing differences. Being unlike Others, that is backward, underdeveloped, steeped in superstition, unscientific, irrational and uncivilized, was a matter of national shame. The writers of the 1959 policy suggested that an educational system must not only respond satisfactorily to local needs but compare favourably with other systems.

The later nationalism of the era of General Zia, which drew heavily from the 19th century form articulated in the two-nation theory, laid much greater emphasis on religion, tradition and the past as sources of national pride. The
focus was on difference from Others, dissimilar traditions, and local culture. The Ayub era rhetoric makes a distinct move toward its concept of modernity, in first attempting to negate the local or parochial in favour of the national, and then negating the national itself in favour of the international, the global, the scientific and the universal. The ‘universal civilization is the civilization of science’, declared Ayub Khan in his address to the All Pakistan Science Conference in 1964. The writers of the Sharif Report, while upholding national integration in other places, write:

But narrow nationalism in the modern world is not enough; and if we gave the child only this, we would be doing him a disservice. Nations are a part of one another, and none stands alone. Pakistan is in a particular position of having cultural, historical and spiritual ties with the Middle East, Europe and North America. This rich heritage is itself a national asset and provides an ideal starting point for teaching international understanding and a realization of our membership in a comity of nations.

The report refers to the US and USSR as ‘great nations’ because of their technological and scientific advancement, and exhorts Pakistanis to learn from them. In a speech at the Pakistan Institute of National Affairs, Ayub Khan remarked: ‘when nationalism, in its extreme form, takes charge, human reasoning gets second place’. When internationalism as modernity was to be ushered in, the dangers of ‘narrow nationalism’ and ‘nationalism in its extreme form’, were voiced. This time, nationalism itself is the Other, but when regional diversity rears its head as the inimical Other, nationalism comes to the rescue.

For Ayub Khan, being different from others meant being lesser or inferior – left behind in the development game. As he said in his address at the Annual Convocation at Peshawar University in March 1959:

Indeed one of the reasons why we have lagged behind in world affairs after leading it for centuries as intellectual pioneers, is that we failed to make a continuous and realistic appreciation, evaluation and discovery of the world around us. After paving the way for renaissance in Europe, we slept like the hare in the fable, and lost the race for intellectual leadership.

For General Zia, being different meant being superior to, or better than the Other on account of a ‘golden past’ and having inherited ‘great traditions’. For Ayub Khan, the enemy within, the outsider lurking within the Self was
backwardness, underdevelopment and traditional attitudes. In a speech at a civic reception in his honour by the citizens of Dacca on March 7, 1964, he commented:

If we want to live as a forward looking and progressive people, the first essential we have to accept and practice is that of unity...having lived in the protective shell of tradition too long, people start extolling tradition. It is a good thing to extol tradition up to a point. But, basically, traditions are just like narcotics. They make you feel sleepy and they certainly help you in trying to evade the thinking process. But without original thinking, you can’t create anything new. You can’t create anything worthwhile. Life is dynamic, life is moving. In order to move with it and cater for its requirements, we have to think originally. I believe in these thinking processes.

In this statement, tradition is opposed to creating ‘anything new’ and to ‘original thinking’. The past as tradition lurks menacingly over us, and prevents us from moving forward and being dynamic. Tradition is likened to a protective shell from which we must emerge, or else it engulfs us like a drug – dulls the brain like a narcotic. The emphasis is on the new, the original and the dynamic. In an address to the National Union Rally at Cairo University in November 1960, Ayub Khan lamented:

When one casts a glance over the Muslim communities all over the world, they are the most backward, they are the most uneducated.... Is it not a matter of concern and should it not be a matter of concern to all of us to try to find out what is it that has gone wrong?

Using the colonial discourse of Muslim ‘backwardness’, Ayub Khan pleaded his case for ‘moving forward’ and ‘marching with the times’, phrases he frequently used in his speeches. Similar sentiments are echoed in his welcome address to the Rawalpindi Bar Association on July 16, 1963:

We are a developing country. What is the meaning of a developing country? We have been a subject country with the result that our life has not been dynamic; our life has not been progressive, and we became a stagnant society. Education was limited as well as enlightenment and awakening and, all of a sudden, we found ourselves independent. A country of some 100 million now; it has to run itself. It has got its internal and external problems. It can
only progress if it gets rid of its past, bad and evil practices and social customs and level the ground for further advancement of the society as a whole. 50

While Ayub Khan stressed the need to get rid of the past and the bad and evil practices emanating from it, for General Zia, the enemy within was all that was western, modern, innovative and secular – all that was reminiscent of the colonizing Other. The opposing ideas of the two dictators were designed to achieve similar effects – the legitimization of illegal military rule. Modernity and Islamization, the seeming adversaries, were equally implicated in propping up dictatorships.

For Ayub Khan, the claim to modernizing a backward people provided legitimacy for his dictatorship. The rhetorical provision of equal opportunity for all in education and in the employment structure, was one of the justifications for his rule. An examination of the official educational discourse of the era of Ayub Khan, supports the claim made by Bruce Fuller in his book, Growing Up Modern, that poor Third World states engage in massive expansion of schooling to signal modernity to their populations. 51 According to Fuller, ‘modern’ mass schooling systems are set up as a form of legitimization by the state, which claims to equalize opportunity in the midst of extreme poverty and structured economic differences. Since most heavily indebted states are unable to provide the kind of education that would make a difference to the people, they resort to providing low-quality mass schooling right down to the village level, as way of signaling modernization and development. Fuller explains how the bureaucratic and technocratic structures of schooling are set up in the process of incorporating the children of distant villages and towns into the state’s hierarchical organization. Signs and symbols of modernity are substituted for actual opportunities in life, but the state ‘shows’ its concern with the welfare and advancement of people by taking ‘education’ to the poorest of the poor and committing itself rhetorically to the ideals of Universal Primary Education and Education For All. 52 Fuller’s critique is valid not only for the Ayub era state education rhetoric, but also for educational interventions of contemporary times. Even today many governments are preoccupied with Universal Primary Education and Education For All, even though the quality of education, and mechanisms of delivery, are of a very low standard. The technocratic paradigm of schooling, discussed in Fuller’s incisive analysis of Third World educational interventions, prevails to this day. The Ayub era paradigm of ‘modern’ education, is deeply steeped in the technocratic ideology, which undergirds his entire educational reform agenda.

20
Machines, without men to handle them, are a national waste. In our country scientific developments are not unknown. We have railways, aircraft and machines but we failed to train technicians who could look after those things, maintain and create them and introduce fresh things in place of them. We have to take care of whatever technical facilities we have.

In Ayub Khan’s time, the official vision of a modern society was based on the production of a modernized working class in possession of technical capital, and able to produce wealth by applying technical skills to trade, industry and defence. A great deal of emphasis was placed on technical knowledge and skills, along with occasional denigration of subjects that are too ‘bookish’ or ‘literary’. The Council for Technical Education and a Central Manpower Committee were formed for the preparation of manpower for an industrializing economy. Apart from an entire chapter in the Sharif Report devoted to technical and vocational education, there is emphasis in nearly all the chapters on the need for a technically qualified workforce, able to face the challenges of modern science and technology. Education was divided into two streams, General and Technical. General Education would include the primary, secondary and higher education levels, while the technical stream would comprise technical/vocational education, polytechnics and engineering. The dominant view of development was centered on economic development, especially trade, industry, infrastructure and defence and civil services. It was repeatedly urged, by the writers of the Sharif Report as well as by Ayub Khan himself, that the need of hour, and ‘the requirement of the times’ was science, technology and a technically competent workforce. According to the Sharif Report:

A modern technological society based on the application of industrial processes to the exploitation of the forces and resources of nature, can only be built and function when there is available a large body of skilled and literate workers, apart from the engineers and technicians who help create it. The availability of such a body of manpower can only be ensured when some part of education is made compulsory and so universal.

The view of science was largely limited to technology and its applications in the service of human society. The notion of ‘exploitation of the forces and
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resources of nature’ reflects a positivist view of science, which was the prevailing view at the time. In his convocation address at Peshawar University in March 1959, Ayub Khan remarked:

When Europe was entering the age of industrialization, we were still clinging desperately to outmoded and antiquated techniques of production and our growth in scientific and technological fields became sterile and static...The problems faced by our country in this nuclear age demand that we make rapid progress in science and technology not only to make this country a prosperous and happy place to live in, but also to safeguard our liberty and our very existence as a self-respecting nation. The country needs scientists and technicians by the thousands to accomplish these national requirements. It is unfortunate that our present system of education is not completely suited to produce the kind of technical human material, which is needed to achieve our objectives. It was to meet these and other inadequacies that we have set up the Education Commission to review and recommend a system of education which, among other things, would help in overcoming these major handicaps in our continued under-development...we should also try very hard and very fast, to build up a tradition of scientific and empirical inquiry. It is this tradition that we must revive so that we are able to take rational view of our environment and project it in every facet of our individual and national activity.\(^57\)

This statement sums up Ayub Khan’s view of the role of education in an economy heading toward industrialization and modernity and, as he remarked in a speech at the Foundation Ceremony of the Dawood College of Engineering and Technology in August 1962, ‘our watchword today is progress’. The reference to ‘outmoded and antiquated techniques of production’ is a reference to old practices that must now be shunned in favour of modern forms of production. The metaphors of sterility and stasis, of lack of forward movement and of being sterile, are gendered metaphors that suggest that the nation should be dynamic and productive, that is masculine in temperament. Similar metaphors were used in Ayub Khan’s address at the passing out parade at the Pakistan Military Academy, Kakul in on April 25, 1959, when he said:

Nothing in the world is static: if you are to progress you must keep abreast of the advances in military thought and weapons.\(^58\)
Rubina Saigol

The preoccupation with the dichotomous notions of static versus dynamic, past versus future, tradition versus innovation, religion versus science, stagnation versus change, is evident throughout Ayub Khan’s speeches and statements. He tends to use these binaries in different ways for different purposes, at times upholding one side of the polarity, at other times advocating adherence to the opposite pole. In a shifting and fluid discourse, which partakes of opposing ideas, Ayub Khan creates the image of the world over which he rules.

Since the Sharif Commission Report had a heavy input from American educationists and universities, including Indiana University, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Ford Foundation and UNESCO, the bias was clearly American, with a focus on technology and its application to industry. In a move clearly influenced by American thinking of the time, history, civics and geography were lumped together to form a subject called social studies, as each subject independently was not deemed important for students. American influence is also the reason why so-called ‘literary’ subjects and ‘bookish’ knowledge were repeatedly de-emphasized and there was constant reference to the importance of ‘applied knowledge’. This was accompanied by laments that most people prefer not to work with their hands, and that manual and technical work should be accorded the ‘dignity of labour’ and proper respect. Pure science was separated from applied knowledge, and mental labour from manual, accompanied by incessant appeals to focus on applied knowledge and manual labour. The importance of ideas, norms, morals and philosophical discourses, as for example in literature, history or philosophy, was diminished, with the stress being on what is ‘practical’, ‘applied’ and ‘useful’, as opposed to subjects which were declared to be too ‘literary’ and ‘bookish’. Progress, it was asserted, depended on technical competence, and the buzzwords were utility and practical work based on modern know-how, as the Sharif Report states:

The educational system must be geared to serve the cause of national progress. This can be done only if we develop in our people, through the schools, a high level of technical competence in all spheres of national life and at the same time mould the character and leadership to utilize this competence fully.

In support of his argument that technical and scientific skills are a prerequisite for economic and industrial development, Ayub Khan argued that the history of the advanced countries shows that it was precisely such skills that transformed Western civilization, where the spread of skills was made possible by the expansion of education. This claim conflicts with Bruce
Fuller's finding that industrial expansion coincided with falling rather than rising enrolment, as youth would leave school in order to work in factories. Andy Green's finding that the relationship between skill formation and economic development has not been established, also contradicts the premise on which excessive emphasis on technical education was placed during the Ayub. Subsequent Pakistani history shows that despite hundreds of technical training institutes, economic development remained an unfulfilled dream. However, in pursuit of the modernization agenda, and in search of legitimacy for his rule by appearing to provide mass equal opportunity, Ayub Khan pleaded for the expansion of schooling, with special emphasis on technical education. Thus he argued in his speech at the opening ceremony of the Government Polytechnic Institute in Rawalpindi, that:

We are entering a technical and scientific age in the country. We should produce enough technicians to be able to assist us to develop our country and modernize various aspects of our sphere of life. The technical institutions of this nature are of a primary importance to Pakistan.

On several occasions, Ayub Khan acknowledged that technical and vocational education had been prioritized over purely theoretical, literary or academic subjects. At the Eighth Convocation of the Institute of Engineers on April 12, 1962, he proudly asserted that:

We believe our education now has a definite scientific and engineering bias, and technical bias is the best one going and is continuously being applied…the object of our efforts is to produce manpower for our future needs in every field of life…where the building of the country is involved.

In his attempts to promote and encourage the spread of technical and scientific education, Ayub Khan relied extensively on the private sector. At the opening ceremony of the Habib Institute of Technology in Nawabshah in March 1964, he attempted to convince the private sector to invest heavily in technical education in order to provide itself with a technically trained workforce. He repeated phrases about ‘marching with the times’ and ‘competing with other countries’, and emphasized the role of industry in national development. Industry, he argued should assist in social development by investing in technical education as the returns flow directly to the private sector. He laid particular stress on the competition with other industrialized countries and on becoming like them. Government investment
in technical education was seen as public benefit because it provided employment, while private sector investment was promised rich rewards in the form of private profit. However, public investment in technical education was also a major source of private profit, so while the costs of production were socialized, the benefits and profits were privatized.

The government of Ayub Khan was eager that students, especially those studying scientific and technical subjects, should study the English language because of the wealth of knowledge and information in English journals. At the founding ceremony of the Urdu College Building in May 1964, Ayub Khan again repeated the refrain of how the West had left us behind in science and technology in which every day new branches were sprouting. He argued that it is solely through the English language that we have access to the new knowledge in scientific subjects in which “speed is the order of the day”. The languages of modernity and development were English, along with technical terminology. Technical terminology was also transferred to teacher training and pedagogy. Apart from the emphasis on technical and vocational education, technocratic methodology was introduced in other areas as well. The fashionable notions of ‘activity based teaching’ and ‘child centered learning’, using film technology as teaching aids, along with the faddish ideas related to the use of psychological testing and psychometrics, were suggested as ways of becoming modern.

The Moral Ideals of the Modern Mass Man

In the creation of the modern mass man, Ayub Khan was cognizant of the ideals and values that the new citizen should espouse in order to signal modernity. These included the ideas of democracy, equality, liberty, mass opportunity, and reference to basic human needs. Despite military dictatorship, Ayub Khan spoke frequently of ‘true’ democracy and ‘real’ or ‘genuine’ democracy, which he would restore to the people of Pakistan. According to him, the politicians had only provided a farce and had looted and fooled the people in the name of democracy. In his speech to the curriculum committee, Ayub Khan referred to a good modern education as the basis of ushering in democratic values. He argued that a good education should produce an informed citizenry, aware of national issues and able to choose wisely among alternative candidates. Similarly, he referred to the importance of education in producing a ‘free and independent society’ in a speech at the Centenary celebrations of King Edward Medical College, Lahore.
One of the several arguments that Ayub Khan presented in favour of scientific and technical education was that it would usher in an era of prosperity and raise the standard of living. This was argued at the inaugural ceremony of the Institute of Educational Research at the New Campus, Punjab University. He claimed that Pakistan’s standard of living is directly determined by the trained ability of its scientists and technicians. In his speech at the All Pakistan Science Conference in March 1964, he assured the nation that only science and technology could deliver us from want and hunger. According to Ayub Khan:

The greatest image of our times is that the multitudes in Asia and Africa, who have recently won independence, are now being borne forward by the high tide of aspirations for a better life.

He went on to say that hunger and disease can be fought with superior knowledge and the higher productivity resulting from technical applications of scientific knowledge, will mean higher standards of living for millions of people. Science and technology will thus deliver happiness and freedom from want for the teeming millions. Science was thus presented as Saviour, as the answer to all economic, political and social problems, apart from its capacity to deliver democracy, equality and liberty.

In the early period of Ayub Khan, nationalism referred to becoming modern and secular. Religious difference and Otherness were not central components of this form of nationalism, as they became in the later era of General Zia. Religious tolerance and diversity of faiths were among the values espoused in Ayub’s period as part of becoming a modern and secular polity. In a history textbook produced for Class III in 1963, a separate chapter was devoted each to Jesus, the Hindu God Ram and Buddha, along with chapters on the holy Prophet of the Muslims. Jesus, Ram and Buddha, who were later excised from social studies textbooks, and their religions denigrated as false, appear in the Ayub era textbook as positive characters who represented peace, justice, humanity, generosity, kindness and truth. The Zia era textbooks on the other hand, created the Hindu, Buddhist, Christian and Jewish Others as eternal enemies of Islam, the Muslims and Pakistan. Radical changes in the construction of the Other of the Muslim Self as negative, begin to appear in the textbooks of the early phase of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto’s period. A possible explanation for this could be that the Pakistan army had suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of the Indian army in December 1971. With the secession of East Pakistan, national pride was at a low ebb. Bhutto’s educational policy of 1972 entailed the rebuilding of the image of the Pakistan army as a strong force capable of
defending the land and Pakistan as an invincible state. Hence one sees the
tolerance and religious diversity of an earlier phase diminish in favour of a
more virulent form of anti-Hindu nationalism.

Reconciling the Secular and the Sacred

The mass man of today is changing fast in every dimension. The speed and
tempo of life is becoming more and more dynamic and breathless. The
spread of universal education is breaking the crust of ignorance and
prejudice. The rapid advance of science and knowledge is storming the
citadels of blind faith. The quest for inquiry and interrogation is pressing
hard against many an accepted notion and conviction.  

I would not, on this occasion, enter into elaborate arguments
justifying the key role of scientific research and training in all our
measures for national development and for the economic
regeneration of the country. All that is universally recognized, and
the case of science needs no pleading the modern world.

We must place‘…greater emphasis upon the teaching of science
and mathematics which are essential to development of technical
competence in many fields; and a much greater emphasis on these
aspects of the programme which are designed to develop character
and create constructive attitude of patriotism and
service’….economic development will require for its rapid
achievement a generally literate population which will be able to
understand and apply the new discoveries of science and improved
technical and agricultural practices’.

While laying great stress on technical, vocational and practical knowledge,
Ayub Khan was not oblivious to the importance of science in bringing in the
new, the modern and the innovative. He understood that science was the
basis of technology and technical expertise, and exhorted educationists to
give emphasis to science, in many of his speeches. As science was viewed
with suspicion by a number of traditionalists and religious people, who saw
it as an instrument of the devil to take people’s minds away from faith,
Ayub Khan strongly advocated a liberal, modernist and progressive
interpretation of religion which would be compatible with the scientific
ethos. In the tradition of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, the great 19th century
educationist and reformer, and Allama Iqbal, the poet who is said to have
dreamed the dream of Pakistan, Ayub Khan insisted on the reconciliation of
religion and science. He frequently stated that there was no conflict in
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Science and religion and that religion itself required believers to seek knowledge. Religion was a national requirement as it was the only basis of unity between the provinces and regions of Pakistan. It had been regarded as the raison d’être of Pakistan by spokespersons of the two-nation idea. Religion could not be discarded from national education because of its centrality in national integration, but also because most people in Pakistan feel varying levels of attachment to their faith. In order to enable the Muslims to lead their lives in accordance with the teachings of Islam, the Advisory Council of Islamic Ideology was proposed in the Constitution of 1962. This body was to be fed by research done by the Islamic Research Centre, and together these two bodies were entrusted with the task of ensuring the compatibility of laws with the requirements of Islam. On the other hand, science was absolutely indispensable for Ayub Khan’s favourite agendas of modernization, economic development, industrialization, progress, and a technological and technocratic social order. Not only industry and commerce, but the defence and the civil services also needed ‘modern’, ‘rational’ and technologically sophisticated personnel.

Ayub Khan’s solution to this apparent dilemma was to convince the Ulema to make liberal and modern interpretations of Islam showing it to be consonant with the ‘requirements of the times’. His insistence that all religious instruction must be combined with secular knowledge, and that all religious teachers must have knowledge of modern subjects, contrasts sharply with General Zia-ul-Haq’s later directions that all scientific and secular knowledge be subjected to religion, and anything repugnant to Islamic principles be removed from the curricula. In a Convocation Address at the Dar-ul-Uloom Islamia, Tando Allahyar on May 3, 1959, Ayub Khan asserted:

One dangerous result which it (obscurantism) produced in our national outlook and culture was that those who progressed in the light of modern developments were dubbed worldly-wise Muslims, and those who clung to mere formalism and dogma and remained static, claimed to be true Muslims. Gradually those who looked forward to progress and advancement came to be regarded as disbelievers, and those who looked backward were considered devout Muslims. Every fresh advancement, every invention and every new educational system was suspected as a movement against Islam, and that is why fatwas (religious decrees) were pronounced against the leaders of revolutionary movements among Muslims in almost every period of history. …majority of these sermons are critical of even the minor innovations of modern life
merely because they are novel. This I consider a great disservice to Islam, that such a noble religion should be represented as inimical to progress.\textsuperscript{83}

This statement sums up Ayub Khan’s view of the debate between science and religion. He considered the movements against innovation and newness as a disservice to a ‘noble religion’. By presenting his case as disservice to Islam, he could convince religious leaders that Islam would suffer if it did not keep up with contemporary times. In a similar vein, he argued in a speech at the opening ceremony of Jamia Islamic, Bahawalpur on October 9, 1963 that:

It is the moral, national and even religious duty of our religious scholars that they should prove the everlasting and true principles of Islam, as such, by applying them to the needs and requirements of the present day. The only result of uncompromising adherence to trivialities or outmoded ideas which do not hold good now due to the change in the times, would be that future generations would become irreligious and Godless.\textsuperscript{84}

In several of his speeches and messages, he raised the fear that if Islam did not modernize itself, religion would suffer. The tension between ‘looking forward’ and ‘looking backward’ appears in his discourse, as religious leaders in his opinion tended to ‘look backward’, while science was inherently ‘forward looking’. In a conflict between the two, the former stood to lose.

In an address to the Writers’ Guild on January 31, 1959, Ayub Khan prevailed upon them to express the principles of Islam in the language of the modern mind which must be the language of science, the language of economics and the language of current affairs, because the world is getting too small, in which we all fit in and play our part.\textsuperscript{85} In this near-Shakespearean message, he constructed the world spatially as small, implying that religion must not keep us from interacting with the Other who speaks the language of current affairs, economics and science. He asks of education to Liberate the spirit of religion from the cobwebs of superstition and stagnation which surround it and move it forward under the focus of modern science and knowledge.\textsuperscript{86}

Superstition and stagnation (absence of forward movement) are the Others of progress and science, and religion must be emancipated from these Others of a darker past, and brought into enlightened and modern times. In
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A letter to Mufti Muhammad Shafi, Chairman Managing Committee, Dar-ul-Uloom in June, 1961, Ayub Khan again stressed the idea of liberating religion from the debris of wrong superstitions and prejudices to make it keep pace with the march of time. He expressed his belief that Islam is the only religion, which cannot become out of date in any age or climate of material or mental progress. In a similar statement made during a message to the nation on March 23, 1962, Ayub Khan averred that Muslims should be proving that Islam is timeless and that it is dynamic and can move with the times. By making Islam ‘timeless’, it is removed from history and placed on a transcendental plane where human time, the time of events and history, cannot touch it. This kind of the construction of time serves the political purpose of using any dimension of time to one’s own advantage by proving its relevance to all times.

The language of superstition and prejudice with reference to religion, was borrowed from the colonial discourse of superstitious natives whose faiths were steeped in prejudice and wrong beliefs. In arguing that Islam cannot become out of date in any age, Ayub Khan was essentially invoking the Islamic idea of Ijtehad (learned consensus) that was used by the poet Iqbal to show that Islam has a dynamic nature. In a speech delivered at the Jamia Taleemaat-e-Islamia, in Karachi on September 3, 1962, Ayub Khan in fact asserted that there is no conflict between science and religion. In his words:

Science has made tremendous progress – man has not only orbited the earth but is reaching for the moon. On the other hand, religious thought has lost its original dynamism and is bogged down in the quagmire of stagnation. Actually there is no conflict between science and religion…our country has still much leeway to make up. There is the greatest need to fall in step with scientific progress and to meet the requirements of the times. It is, therefore, essential that we strike a healthy balance between the teachings of the Qura’an and the Sunnah and modern science, so that as we progress in the field of science, we will not lose contact with our precious religious heritage.

Science, it was argued, would enable Pakistan to make up for lost time in development and progress, and help us meet ‘the requirements of the time’, while religion will help preserve our heritage sans the negative aspects from the past. In Ayub Khan’s time, while several institutes of modern science and technology were established including the Habib Institute of Technology, Dawood College of Engineering and Technology and Adamjee Science College, a large number of Madrassas and institutes for religious
instruction were also created. Some of the latter include Jamia Taleemaat-e-Islamia, Dar-ul-Uloom Islamia and Jamia Islamia. Science and technology were made the cornerstones of national education, and the Ulema were called upon to interpret Islam in favour of such a move in a state-sponsored reconciliation of the sacred and the secular.

**Homemakers of the Nation**

For it is the home-makers of the nation who can best instill the values of order and beauty in the consciousness of the rising generation.\(^9^0\)

Since colonial times, the acid test of modernity has been the level of women’s emancipation and education. Women’s backwardness was the colonizers’ main argument against ‘illiterate, savage natives’. The nationalists in India, as elsewhere, tried to provide education for women as proof of having become modern, rational and civilized. However, in most cases nationalist leaders who argued for women’s education, ensured that such an education would remain within the bounds of tradition and local culture. They made sure that the content of what women were taught remained firmly in their own hands.\(^9^1\) The well-known Muslim educationist, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was basically a progressive and modernist in his thinking, but when it came to women’s education, he advocated only religious, domestic and moral education designed to make them good housemakers, wives and mothers.\(^9^2\) Secular modern education was considered dangerous for women and not suitable for their roles in society. The same is the case with the otherwise ‘enlightened’ poet, Allama Iqbal and the 19\(^{th}\) century reformer novelist Dipty Nazeer Ahmad. All of them recommended that it was time to bring women into schools, not to study history, geography or Algebra, but domestic science, homemaking, cooking, sewing and taking care of children.\(^9^3\) The Sharif Report of Ayub Khan’s era does the same. It recommends women’s education and then restricts it traditional, religious and domestic subjects designed to make women better wives, mothers and homemakers. The Sharif Report claims that women need education just as Pakistan needs educated women. The chapter on ‘Women’s Education’ is replete with the usual clichés about how educated women make better mothers and housewives. The common phrase that unless a mother is educated, there will never be an educated home an educated community, appears in the report to underscore the commonly held belief that ‘if you educate a woman, you educate a family’. The subjects and professions recommended for women are extensions of their traditional roles. For example, the policy of 1959 suggests teaching women elementary
homecraft, needlework, tailoring, weaving, cooking, and home and childcare. It is suggested that vocational centers for women should teach nursing, teaching, photography, typing, textile printing, commercial cooking, hospital aid, dietetics, nutrition expertise, textile design, supervision of village aid hospitals, supervision of nursery schools, midwifery, child psychology, household management, interior decoration, and for national emergency situations women should learn to become stenographers, typists, clerks, secretarial workers and telecommunication operators. Education was thus divided along gender lines and the low-paid professions were feminized.

The Sharif Report suggests that such subjects would make women more effective and modern wives and mothers. Functions, traditionally assigned to women, were recommended but in modernized form, so that women could become more scientific and rational wives, mothers and homemakers. The general health and well being of the family were declared to be solely female responsibilities. Art education was recommended for women since they were 'more likely to become a permanent part of family and community life'\(^{94}\). In spite of all the rhetoric about becoming modern, women’s education was gendered in a way that their traditional roles from the past would be reinforced. Becoming a modern woman in the sense of being part of the public sphere of politics and commerce, was considered dangerous for women as it could lead to intermingling with men of other nations. Thus, women were to be confined to home and family based knowledge, however updated to ensure that motherhood and home care did not suffer from ‘backwardness’ and outdated methods. In the policy of the Ayub era, the gendered nature of education was reproduced. However, the manner of doing this was according to the requirements of a modern and developed society. Women were responsible for preserving remnants of the past that were essential for the Muslim Self to construct its identity in difference from Others – women were the guardians of a past that was slipping away under the juggernaut of modernization. The Muslim Pakistani Self came to depend on the bodies of women, the biological and cultural reproducers of the nation, to preserve and protect the remaining vestiges of the ‘glorious’ Muslim past.

It is noteworthy that there was not a single woman on the Commission for National Education. It comprised representatives from among prominent educationists, vice-chancellors of Universities, the Director of Army Education, Director of Organization, GHQ (General Headquarters), a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, but no woman, worker, peasant
or ‘ordinary’ member of civil society. This composition itself reveals a great deal about the thrust of education under military rule.

**Summary and Reflections**

Pakistani education was massively re-organized and reoriented during the martial law period of Ayub Khan (1958-1968). The Report of the Commission on National Education (1959) is the most comprehensive document on education and covers every area of curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation, financing of education, educational administration, women’s education, religious education, technical, vocational and commercial education, and primary, secondary and higher education. This report can easily be called the Magna Carta of Pakistani education, which is still influenced in many ways by the priorities outlined in the report.

The Report of the Commission on National Education (1959), outlines mainly two areas of high priority, national integration, and economic development and modernization. Since Pakistan was forged as a new entity in 1947, and was carved out of India by amalgamating five distinct regions/provinces, each with its own history, culture and local traditions, national integration was a major state imperative. Pakistani identity had to be imagined, elaborated and inscribed on the children’s minds. Regional belonging, and the sentiments associated with it, had to be diminished if not eliminated. Education was assigned the task of creating the ‘good Pakistani citizen’ with love for and loyalty to Pakistan. The values of patriotism, duty, obedience, honesty and service were emphasized in the process of forming the good citizen, capable of thinking in national rather than parochial terms.

The second major imperative of the new state was economic development and modernization. The latter was defined as possession of the scientific temperament, secular knowledge, technocratic forms of work organization, and liberal and democratic political thinking, although this rhetoric contradicted Ayub Khan’s position as a military dictator. The good citizen had to be patriotic and nationalistic, as well as modern, secular, scientifically inclined and internationalist in outlook. Education was called upon to create the technocratic workforce armed with technical knowledge, capable of grasping the hierarchical and bureaucratic organization of work, and able to apply practical knowledge for economic and commercial development, as well as in the defence and the civil services.
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The linear dimensions of time – the past, present and future - were deployed in the official state discourse to resolve the apparent contradictions that emerged between tradition and modernity, the past and future, the desire to glorify ‘ancient heritage’, and herald a future free of the prejudices and superstitions allegedly belonging to the past. Time was conceived as a linear movement from backwardness to modernity, and from regionalism to nationalism and centralization. In a shifting and mobile discourse, the past was alternately good and bad, modernity was desirable as well as to be repudiated. When the aim was the creation of nationalism, the idea of oneness of all Pakistanis, the past of ‘Muslim greatness’ was conjured up to establish the ‘fact’ that all Muslims, irrespective of region or language, had a common ‘golden past’. Nationalism was modern and contemporary compared with older, pre-modern regional or local identities. However, when the aim was to create the modern citizen with a futuristic outlook, the past took on sinister aspects and became imbued with bad traditions, superstition and rituals. Religion was a great binding asset when it came to the construction of the national as opposed to the regional. When it came to becoming modern, religion could prove to be potentially intractable and had to be ‘brought up to date’, modernized and liberally interpreted. In the construction of the international, religion could prove to be an impediment. But since it could not be discarded because of its utility in the construction of ‘indigenous nationalism’, it had to be altered to suit the present and future – its uncomfortable relationship with science had to be smoothed and its associations with the past severed.

The nationalism of Ayub Khan era differs from the later nationalism of Zia-ul-Haq’s time, as well as from many other forms of nationalism. In most cases, nationalism is premised on the idea of the superiority of one’s own nation over Others who are described as morally or otherwise inferior. For example, English nationalism, which later became the basis of English imperialism, was premised on the ideas of English superiority over others, and the White Man’s Burden to civilize, modernize Others and improve their morals. General Zia’s Islamic nationalism also invoked Muslim superiority over infidel Others. This kind of nationalism privileges difference from various Others to construct itself. However, Ayub Khan conceived of the national as modern, international, secular, scientific and developed. National meant being like the Other, resembling the more advanced western countries in industrial and economic development. The more unlike one was, the more the national Self was backward and unprogressive. Steeped in the colonial discourse of superstitious and backward natives, living in some other, darker time, Ayub Khan’s dream was for Pakistani people to move forward toward the future and become like
people in the advanced countries. Difference was used only when national glory had to be imagined, otherwise it was *sameness* with the more developed Other that was sought and upheld.

In the difference/sameness dichotomy, women occupied both positions – they had to be different (Pakistani, Muslim women), but they also had to be the same (modern, developed, educated like western women). Women are usually regarded as the ‘repositories of culture and tradition’, those who retain the precious past within the secure boundaries of the home, and protect the ‘pure and untainted’ private sphere from encroachment by the corrupting outside influences. However, when modernity and its associated notions of equality, liberty and democracy, demanded that women too be liberated and considered equal, they were given an education, but one that was steeped in tradition, local culture and religion. This was a compromise between the demands of modernity and the need to preserve culture within the body of the woman. Women must remain within the past, while outwardly expressing the signs and signals of modernity.

For Ayub Khan, the sources of pollution were internal Others – corruption, bribery, black marketing and other forms of debased activities in which he saw the Pakistani public and leaders enmeshed. The enemies for him were the internal Others in the form of regional loyalties, parochial affiliations and provincial sentiments. The enemy of the national Self was the enemy within, rather than the outsider. It was only after the 1965 war with India that the rhetoric of the external Other intensified. The external Other, prior to the war with India, was mainly seen within communism against which Ayub Khan railed in many of his speeches. The menacing Others within the National Self had to be overcome through a homogenized curriculum. By becoming modern, national and then international, Pakistan could defeat the enemy residing within its own boundaries. Ayub Khan’s nationalism was rooted in feelings of inferiority, backwardness, having been left behind in the race, lagging behind in development, while the Others have moved forward at a dizzying pace. This backwardness, living in a time that was not contemporaneous with the Other, could be overcome by means of reforms designed to improve the morals and thinking of the citizens. Thus while Ayub Khan’s policy makers repeatedly referred to the idea of making education ‘consonant with national needs and aspirations of the people’, the aim was to instill precisely these needs and aspirations. The state saw as its duty to shape public consciousness, while claiming to work in accordance with it. The consciousness that the state aimed to create was primarily technocratic, and technical education was, therefore, given the highest priority.
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The colonial metaphors and binaries of backward versus modern, religious versus scientific, traditional versus innovative, regional versus national and national versus international, were used and located in different dimensions of time as the need arose. The backward, traditional, religious, regional and superstitious were located in the past that had to be erased. But residing in the past, along with these, were also Muslim greatness, glory and pride. The modern, developed, scientific, rational and international lay in the future towards which movement had to be made. However, the negative within the scientific and rational was not to disturb the good that lay in the past. Time was divided into discrete units instead of being perceived as a continuum. The notion of the national also kept shifting. When regional consciousness had to be lessened, the national was good and patriotic. When internationalism and modernity had to be embraced, the national became the repository of all that was undesirable and ‘narrow nationalism’ was denounced. In the latter construction of ‘narrow nationalism’, Ayub Khan foreshadowed the globalization of modern times in which the state is often seen as a hindrance in the way of the ‘free market economy’. Early seeds of what is today called ‘globalization’, are discernible within the educational discourse of the period of Ayub Khan.

Certain tentative hypotheses about the difference between the earlier and later forms of educational nationalism can be derived from the course of history in the post-Ayub Khan era. The earlier, more forward-looking, optimistic, futuristic and hopeful nationalism of Ayub Khan’s time became predominant when Pakistan was still a relatively new and young state that had recently emerged from colonial rule, was intoxicated with the idea of freedom, and looked forward to a prosperous future. The only enemies that blocked progress were within – within the people and inside the borders. By the time of Zia-ul-Haq’s rule, Pakistan was a thirty year old state, defeated in a war that tore it apart and struggling with its identity and moorings. Nationalism now takes on backward-looking, inward-looking, insular and insecure aspects. The enemies lurk on the borders – physical as well as ideological borders. The sources of danger come to be located outside, and the national Self turns inward for protection and recedes into the ‘secure past’. One reason for this change appears to be the defeat at the hands of India in 1971 and the loss of a part of the Self. The two-nation form of nationalism needed to be re-invoked, reiterated and re-imagined, with a far less strong a base than before.

However, another reason for the shift during the second long dictatorship could be the failure of the early dream. Neither one of the two main
objectives of the early educational policy was fully realized. National integration remained tenuous and conflicts deepened each year with inter-provincial struggles over resources such as water. Provincial and parochial sentiments, far from diminishing, became intensified during Zulfiqar Bhutto’s period in Baluchistan, and General Zia’s era with the Movement for Restoration of Democracy in Sindh. Ethnic sentiments and identity struggles, which overlaid economic struggles, became multiple as the provinces fought over the distribution of national resources. Pakistan has often been described as a ‘failed state’ and there have been frequent references to ‘failure in national integration’. The faith in national education to forge ties that can overcome ethnic sentiments, has been shaken. External enemies can perform the function of ‘national unity’ more efficiently, and this may be one reason for conjuring them up.

The dream of economic development, modernity and a scientific temper was also not fulfilled – at least not completely. Despite the spread of mass schooling, the proliferation of technical training institutes, and enhancement in the teaching of science, prosperity remained elusive for most Pakistanis, as increasing numbers of people kept falling below the poverty line. Technical training did not lead to the vast numbers of jobs that were promised because they were not created. Economic prosperity remained confined to a small crust of the upper and upper middle classes. Pakistan came to be referred to as ‘a shattered dream’ as the progress, advancement and modernization promised by Ayub Khan failed to reach the working poor, the toiling mass. The educational promises of equality of opportunity through the universalization of education rang hollow in a shrinking economy with scarce jobs - jobs that did not require the training delivered anyway. The uselessness of educational testimonials and degrees became increasingly obvious in an economy that required low-cost, illiterate and unskilled labour.

The failure of the state’s legitimizing ideology of economic opportunities, progress and advancement, pressured the state to resort to alternative ideologies of legitimation. The failure of the developmentalist and modernization paradigm, required a paradigmatic shift which occurred during the Zia era in the form of Islamization. The latter promise of delivering Islam was less ambitious and more achievable than the earlier one of economic well being of the people. When you cannot fill people’s stomachs with food and cover their bodies with clothes, you can fill their minds with Islam and cover their naked hunger with morality. This in a nutshell was the message of the state during the era of Islamization. The class dimensions of the failure of secular developmentalism have been
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explored by many writers but need further attention. In the absence of a class analysis of the failure of modernization to deliver, a resort to religious and nativist arguments can impede the process of understanding.

The role of education will also have to be reconsidered. Is it necessarily a modernizing force? Prejudice, cant, hatred and superstition, ostensibly belonging to a ‘backward’ past, have not only persisted with educational expansion, in many cases they have grown. Education itself has been implicated in the process of inculcating prejudice and hate through the constructions of the enemy. If educational expansion has not ushered in economic prosperity, a secular and scientific outlook, or national cohesion, what are or should be the aims of education? What kind of education can we imagine that would create critical thinking, preserve what is best in the past, and usher in a hopeful future? The tension between preservation and change is a real and persistent one within educational discourses. Future research needs to address these issues in creative ways.
Rubina Saigol
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