

**Understanding Nationhood from a Social
Constructionist Lens: A Study of Pakistan's
Political Discourse (1947-1988)**



Aizah Azam

NUST201664811MCIPS79516

Supervisor

Dr Ahmed Waqas Waheed

**Centre for International Peace and Stability (CIPS)
NUST Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (NIPCONS)
National University Of Sciences and Technology (NUST)
Islamabad**

August, 2018

Understanding Nationhood from a Social Constructionist Lens: A Study of
Pakistan's Political Discourse (1947-1988)

Aizah Azam
NUST201664811MCIPS79516

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MS Peace and Conflict Studies (MS-PCS)

Thesis Supervisor
Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

Thesis Supervisor's Signature: _____

Centre for International Peace and Stability (CIPS)
NUST Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (NIPCONS)
National University Of Sciences and Technology (NUST)
Islamabad

August, 2018

Declaration

I certify that this research work titled “Understanding Nationhood from a Social Constructionist Lens: A Study of Pakistan’s Political Discourse(1947-1988)” is my own work. The work has not been presented elsewhere for assessment. The material that has been used from other sources it has been properly acknowledged / referred. All the errors, structural and otherwise in this dissertation are mine alone to bear.

Signature of Student

Aizah Azam

NUST201664811MCIPS79516

Plagiarism Certificate (Turnitin Report)

This thesis has been checked for Plagiarism. Turnitin report endorsed by Supervisor is attached.

Signature of Student
Aizah Azam
NUST201664811MCIPS79516

Signature of Supervisor
Dr Ahmed Waqas Waheed

Copyright Statement

Copyright in text of this thesis rests with the student author. Copies (by any process) either in full, or of extracts, may be made only in accordance with instructions given by the author and lodged in the Library of NUST Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (NIPCONS). Details may be obtained from the Librarian. This page must form part of any such copies made. Further copies (by any process) may not be made without the permission (in writing) of the author.

The ownership of any intellectual property rights which may be described in this thesis is vested in NUST Institute of Peace and Conflict studies (NIPCONS), subject to any prior agreement to the contrary, and may not be made available for use by third parties without the written permission of the NIPCONS, which will prescribe the terms and conditions of any such agreement.

Further information on the conditions under which disclosures and exploitation may take place is available from the Library of NUST Institute of Peace and Conflict studies (NIPCONS), Islamabad.

Acknowledgments

I express my deepest gratitude to everyone who supported the task of writing this thesis through their academic expertise, their intellectual reviews, and their insightful discussions or merely through their presence. Each one of you has been an added pillar of strength in the past few months, indeed.

I am endlessly indebted to my supervisor Dr Ahmed Waqas Waheed for his generous and uninterrupted guidance and stimulating encouragement during the course of writing. I am at loss of words to completely appreciate his unstinting support through the entire research. I can possibly never express my utmost gratitude to Dr Muhammad Makki, whose encouragement and receptivity towards academic discussions through the research phase aided the task of writing in inexplicable ways.

I would like to profoundly extend the most special token of thanks to Ibrahim Sb., our librarian and one true asset at CIPS for his readiness to help during the data collection for this thesis. His company and constant words of support during the course of writing are of immense value.

I am extremely grateful to my family, especially my father, for his constant prayers that I firmly believe, are a crucial part of my life. I thank Wajeeha Azam, my youngest sister, for her timely rounds of tea and coffee on my visits back home. I owe a token of thanks to Saud bin Ahsen and Maria Sajjad for their willingness to attend to my untimely requests for audience. A very candid gratitude goes out to Nida Liaquat for her supportive presence at all times when I needed unwinding.

This token of acknowledgment will remain incomplete without a heartfelt gratitude to Faryal Khan and Masooma Jafri- two excellent people I have had the pleasure of knowing and cherishing for the rest of my lifetime. Faryal, as much as I want to, thanking you enough for being synonymous to 'Everything' is certainly something very hard to do. And 'Best' is too small a word to define my deepest and fondest wishes for you, today and for the times to come. Thank you for being You!

August 2018

Aizah Azam

Dedicated To

Abba & Amma

*Thank you for giving me everything you had
And for believing in me even in the times I did not.*

Abstract

This dissertation examines the case of nationhood in Pakistan from a social constructionist lens. After outlining the fundamental explanations of the inherently elusive subject of nationalism and its associated branches, primarily; nationhood, the building blocks of Pakistan's nationhood are established. It is argued that Pakistan emerged as a 'constructed' territory and hence, most part of its national narrative is an ensual of the discourse generated by its political elites, since the beginning. For this reason, discourse analysis of the rhetoric and monologue of noteworthy political figures including, Quaid e Azam, Gen. Ayub Khan, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and Gen. Zia ul Haq; is carried out to establish the indubitable influence of Pakistan's political leadership in constructing the country's sense of nationhood. This socially constructed sense is explored in the background of political and social milieu that facilitated the nourishment of a particularly non-cohesive sense of nationhood. The changing pattern in the political rhetoric and its subsequent effect on national behaviour is then used as a basis to essentially stress the role of political elites in forming well-bound nations.

Key Words: Nationhood, nationalism, Pakistan, political discourse analysis, social constructionism, political rhetoric.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Declaration | i |
| Plagiarism Certificate | ii |
| Copyright Statement | iii |
| Acknowledgement | iv |
| Dedication | v |
| Abstract | vi |
| Chapter 1: Introduction..... | 1-17 |
| 1.1: Methodology..... | 5-6 |
| 1.2: Literature Review..... | 6-17 |
| Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework | 18-31 |
| 2.1: Construction of Nationhood..... | 18-21 |
| 2.2: 'Social' Construction of Nationhood..... | 21-28 |
| 2.3: Political Discourse Analysis (PDA)..... | 26-31 |
| Chapter 3: A Study of Pakistan’s Political Discourse (1947-1988)..... | 32-60 |
| 3.1: The Birth of Pakistani ‘Nation’..... | 32-34 |
| 3.2: Pakistan’s Nationhood under Quaid- e- Azam (1947 - | |
| 1948)..... | 34-43 |
| 3.3: Pakistan’s Nationhood under Ayub Khan (1958-1969)..... | 43-51 |
| 3.4: Pakistan’s Nationhood under Zulfikar Ali Bhutto (1971- | |
| 1977)..... | 51-57 |
| 3.5: Pakistan’s Nationhood under General Zia ul Haq (1977- | |
| 1988)..... | 58-60 |
| Chapter 4: Conclusion | 60-65 |
| References..... | 65-68 |

Chapter 1: Introduction

Nationalism has been an eminent area of study since the end of eighteenth century. Various academic accounts from the time stress its significance as an ideology and its remarkable influence in governing the course of world politics. Regardless of its status as an essential component of the late eighteenth century nationalist movements, the academics have admittedly failed in attending to its related concepts and in chalking out an agreeable definition for the term (Billig,2002; Brubaker,1996; Kohn, 1965; Ting, 2008; Watson, 1977). Not just the inherent elusiveness of the subject has remained persistent, the definitional dilemma has rather widened with each passing year. This broadened vagueness in terms of defining nationalism rests primarily in the largely unattended/ underexplained transformations that it has been through, and secondarily, in the faulty and interchangeable use of its derivative terms (Croucher, 2003).

The unremitting pertinence of 'nationalism', that has only deepened in varied forms, across time and space, has essentialized the need to appropriately define the term and its relative conceptions. The traditional understanding of nationalism explains it as a political ideology that upholds/ demands the congruence of the 'political' and the 'national' faction of the society. The national in this sense refers to a group of individuals with their supreme loyalties dedicated to their native land and people. It is then indoctrination of 'national sentiment' to a point that galvanizes the masses to emerge as carriers of what can be referred to a 'nationalist movement' (Gellner, 1983). Nations, being the key actors, in this traditional sense, can be explained as a group of people who share a sense of communion that is engraved in their shared historical and cultural legacies and their staunch territorial allegiances. However, as suggested earlier, the nationalist trajectory has starkly changed over the years and has mutated into a rather more multi-faceted area of study that epitomizes the

role of social constructions and human engineering in the existence and persistence of nations. This advancement in the discourse on nationalism beyond a study of blind loyalties owes a great deal to the post-modern thought. The postmodern explanations of nationalism problematize it beyond the traditional parameters and call for in-depth explications for phenomenon such as nationhood/nation-ness, nationality, national character, national consciousness etc. (Croucher, 2003).

To begin with, such an explanation describes 'nation' in a rather broad fashion, referring to it as an extension of self that is essentially a product of myriad social, mental and historical constructions. This emphasizes the role of human intervention in shaping nations on one hand and their discursive nature on the other. 'Nation-al' then becomes any and every element of nations, which objectifies this conscious sentiment of togetherness rooted in daily lives of the people. As much as this sentiment of togetherness lies at the heart of nationalism, there are certain connotations which surface from an individual-centric understanding of the idea. The use of the term 'nationality', for instance, became popular only after the emergence of nation-states. Unlike other relevant fields of nationalism that highlight the element of collectivism, nationality is rather centred on a more individualistic dimension of loyalties. Nationalities hence emanate from a 'personal' sense of association with the 'state', more precisely state boundaries, and cannot essentially be regarded as a sentiment (Kohn, 1965). Another definition in order in this regard, is that of 'patriotism'. Patriotism holds in high regard, the state, coupled with its historical legacy and national sacrifices. With an emphasis on valuing and guarding the spirit of national origin, patriotism is yet another individual trait that forms an important constituent of what is referred to as the 'national character'. In lines with the aforementioned explanations of 'national', it is considerably easy to chalk out an agreeable explanation for national identity. National identity refers to a mutually homogenizing and an inclusive sense of communion among nationals of a country that

trumps/ is superior to their ethnic, cultural or regional micro- identities. A consolidated and inclusive national identity is crucial to inculcate a collective sense of nationhood. Nationhood or nation-ness can be referred to as a sentiment of ownership of anything and everything that has to do with one's nation. The said connotations or sub- fields of nationalism establish its significance and its constant presence, however, on a trajectory of peace and unity and beyond that of a separatist, violent movement. This dissertation calls for the need to understand nationalism along the aforesaid overtones. It equates nationalism with underexplored phenomena such as nation-ness and nationhood that rationalize national existence beyond the proclivities derived from the discourses which stand redundant for contemporary times. It places the significance attached to the construction of nations as a product of the political discourse/ rhetoric and the relevance of this sentiment of integration and cohesion vis a vis Pakistan, as its central theme.

Pakistan earned independence on the basis of a religiously guided nationalism. This strand of nationalism essentially advocated the conflicting religious thought of the Hindus and Muslims as a major impediment to their co-existence in the sub-continent. Hence, in the course of striving for a separate homeland, Muslim identity remained the fundamental constituent of defining the then forthcoming Pakistani 'national'. However, it was not long after the partition, that this religiously guided Muslim identity mutated into a more 'politicized' sense of nationality. This renewed niche of nationhood, essentialized by the post-partition milieu, reproduced the Pakistani national identity as a contradistinction to the idea and presence of India. Regardless of the long term consequences of this identity shift, several academic accounts regard it as a problematic turn in the national identity formation of Pakistan. They contend so, believing that this course of transition, evidently divided the Pakistani nation leaving a considerable number of masses maintaining the religious ideology as a definitive element of their nationality (Nasr, 2005; Shafqat, 2009). Hence, the earliest

glimpses of nationalism with regards to Pakistan rightfully embody an illustration of ‘Islamic cohesion’ which should have conversely been, ‘national’ cohesion from the first day of its existence. Seven decades following the formation of Pakistan, religion has proved itself incontestably inadequate in ‘nationalizing’ i.e. inculcating a sense of integrated nationhood in the Pakistani nation (Akbar, 2011; Ram, 2015). That said, the role of religion, is too broad a category and one that demands a fair share of attention, especially in case of Pakistan. Hence, it stands beyond the scope of this thesis.

Pakistan is currently confronted with myriad challenges, threatening its social, political and international life. More concerning and worrisome however, are the periodic internal conflicts that have become a routinely matter in the recent past. These conflicts emerge out of massively unaddressed sense of alienation among the countrymen. As a derivative of multiple complex reasons, the provincial ethnicities in the country hold adamant cynicism against each other. Considering a state of national integration/cohesion that cannot be regarded as idyllic, the need to decipher the sense of nationhood among Pakistanis has essentialized itself in the face of multiple challenges that encircle the country. The evidently prevalent national fragmentation t can only be understood with a prior insight and a deeper cognizance about the construction of discourse on nationhood. Such an insight includes the role political elites in potentially all realms of nation-building. It is perhaps, some substantial cleavage in the manner that Pakistan’s nationalist discourse was constructed, that has led to the formation of a fragmented and a friable ‘nation’.

The scope of this dissertation is limited to analysing the role of Pakistan’s *political* leadership in construction of its nationalist (nationhood) discourse, primarily through rhetoric and their public speeches. In order to arrive at meaningful conclusions, the study reflects upon the rhetoric pursued during the initial years after Pakistan’s inception. It tries to trace the construction of national affiliations in the light of discourse generated by the father of the

nation; Quaid e Azam himself and by Gen. Ayub Khan, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and Gen. Zia ul Haq. The said leaders have been chosen keeping in high regard their significance in the political history of Pakistan. The dissertation does not take into account the overshadowing presence of religious dimension in Pakistan's nationalist trajectory. Nor does it attend to domestic issues that are a remarkable driver in fuelling national fragmentation. It rather seeks to look for instances that establish the existence of an underlying potential among the political leaders that enables to construct identities as they deem fit. It precisely aims to investigate the 'social' construction of Pakistani 'national' from a political standpoint with an emphasis on nationhood, that otherwise remains rather amorphous and underexplored. As has been noted earlier, the uses of terms such as nationalist, nationalism, nationalistic, refer to patriotic and nation-centred connotations of the idea and not the Pakistan movement

1.1 Methodology

In order to compose and analyse the discursive construction of the Pakistani nation since its inception, a thorough insight into the political discourse fashioned since 1947 is central to this research. Keeping in regard the prescribed depth of the dissertation, political discourse from the first forty years of Pakistan's existence is analysed along the theoretical framework built for the study. Considering the nature and scope of this research, the dissertation employs a qualitative research method to trace the social construction of nations. The aforesaid methodology is critical to address the domains of the research inquiry i.e. One, to understand the discursive construction of nations based on theoretical and textual evidences available and to place Pakistan's nationhood along this trajectory. Two, to ascertain the existence of a relationship between the patterns in the political discourse and this construction of 'national'. Keen attention is dedicated at elucidating the role of political leadership in social construction of the projected 'nationhood' among Pakistanis. In analysing the role of

political elites, the changing patterns in the political rhetoric over the years is pertinently focused upon. The analysis on the construction of the narrative on nationhood in context of Pakistan is based on an in-depth review of secondary data on the subject. In addition to this, analysis of the political discourse/rhetoric floated through public speeches by the political elites, is carried out using a social constructionist view of events. This includes an analysis of the political rhetoric that prevailed under Jinnah, Ayub Khan, Z. A Bhutto and Zia ul Haq. The said regimes are chosen on the basis of their relevance in shaping up the political history of Pakistan in its initial years of struggle. The intended and unintended political influence towards inculcating, facilitating or otherwise, tarnishing the sense of nationhood among Pakistanis is explored in the said analysis. In order to arrive at pragmatic conclusions in the light of the results obtained from the analysis of the political rhetoric, conversations during informal discussions with notable political and military elites have also been included. On the theoretical front, the research predominantly relies on the theory of social construction to substantiate its claims regarding the discursive formation of nations.

1.2 Literature Review

Intriguing findings and explanations came to light upon review of the textual evidences and interpretations available in terms of scholarship on nationhood in general, and Pakistani nationalism/ nationhood, in particular.

Nations being the fundamental elements of all nationalism related studies are also relatively problematic constructs. The problem lies not only in tracing the largely contested origin of 'nations' themselves but also in the fact that formation of nations is largely a grey area. It is rather puzzling to gauge the internalization of the nation-forming constituents among the individuals and the diffusion of a collective sense of consciousness. Hence, there is not much to reflect upon in terms of referring a group of people as nations or 'not nations'. This dilemma associated with the rightful discernment of nation-al origins is perhaps one of

the reasons that most academics have come to define nations strongly on the basis of ancestral linkages and territorial associations (Connor, 2010). Hugh Seaton Watson, known for his invaluable contribution to the field of nationalism, contends in his *Nations and States*, that it is the ultimate truth that there is no scientific definition that can be devised to define the term 'nation'. However, it is certain that the phenomenon is an old one. It has existed for a long time and it will continue to exist for as long as we live.

The fact that there are no determinants to gauge the tangibility of the nations coupled with the ambiguity etched in the attitudes that they uphold, the endeavour to rationalize their presence and sense of consciousness, has been made all the more difficult. There is extensive textual evidence on the fact that nations have existed for a very long time in history. Their presence however, has been noticed during the events that potentially impugned or threatened to impugn their existence. This, in the light of literature, was followed by acts of guarding one's nation or conversely in, securing a distinct territorial boundaries in an attempt to ensure their peaceful existence (Watson, 1977). The realization of constituting a nation hence, can be observed along a multi-faceted trajectory, possessing cultural, social, psychological, ideological, ethnic and patriotic focal points. From a traditional lens, nations have been explained as a group of individuals who share a common history and have mutually shared cultural legacies, primarily language, in addition to their collective sense of belonging to a demarcated piece of land. Hence, in this sense, a mutual adherence to a shared past is the basis of explaining the existence of nations. From a psychological viewpoint, nations are essentially mental constructs that do not need hard facts such as territory and history as their definitional elements. This view does not necessarily deny the influence of the aforesaid factors on formation of nations. It merely shuns their role as fundamental 'nation-makers'.

Daniele Conversi aptly puts this, contending that defining nations is perhaps becoming a challenging enterprise because one can certainly not define something whose own purpose

is to define. This essentially brings in the component of national identity as well (Conversi, 1997). From a social lens, the existence of nations has been equated with the extended role and presence of human agency that has come to form and re-form nations across time and space. This discursive characterization of nations is embedded in the long term internalization of the sentiments that are critical to the formation and existence of nations. Nations are hence, the root of all nationalisms and nationhoods embedded in the existence of states and the individuals inhabited in it (Billig, 2002).

In light of the fact that nationhood has emerged as one the branches/ offshoots of nationalism, an insight into the origin and advancements of nationalism itself requires prior attention. The notion of nationalism and its splitting manifestations symbolize an inherent elusiveness that has kept most of its students from concluding an all-encompassing definition for the concept. There is however, wide agreement, pertaining to the boundlessly extensive dimensions of nationalism that have added to the complexity of defining the term (Anderson, 2006; Connor, 2010; Kohn, 1965; Ting, 2008; Watson, 1977). Academics on nationalism trace its origin in the eighteenth century European nationalist movements (Billig, 2002; Brubaker, 1996; Kohn, 1965; Ting, 2008; Watson, 1977). Nationalism has been studied from various standpoints, most significantly, from the modernization hypothesis. Regardless, most textual underpinnings, it must be noted, view it as an ideologically driven, political movement, pursued in the interest of a larger 'nation' (Gellner, 1983). Ernest Gellner sees nationalism from the lens of modernization, as a tool that was used by the eighteenth century nationalists to establish a political legitimacy that their respective nations sought. He established this national-political congruence hypothesis. And, in so doing he contended, that whilst the existence of a nation and that of a state were two separate issues and completely unrelated to each other, modernization had not just brought them closer, but also, it seemed as if the presence of one, necessitated the existence of the other (Gellner, 1983; Hobsbawm,

1989). The primordial thought assumes that the creation of humans as a part of wider nations/national groupings overshadows any other reality (Smith, 2000). This has been challenged by the modernists occasionally.

For primordialists, the defining characteristics of a nation are embedded in hard facts such as their cultural roots and not in some loosely-defined social facts, that change, based on human experiences. They uphold that nationalism and the matters relating to national presence are etched in the historical and cultural niches of individual and have absolutely nothing to do with human agency in terms of altering them. Perennialism conversely, regards nationalism as a phenomenon that was operationalized to awaken nations, supposing that the nations were existent all along. For modernists, however, the basis of nations and nationalism was embedded in the fact that both the phenomena are principally a consequence of modernization (Gellner, 1983; Hechter, 1977; Hobsbawm, 1989; Kedourie, 1960). The fact the earliest academic and non-academic accounts on nationalism characterize it as a movement towards carving out separate states for distinct nations or simply as ideology put to force by sheer right wing politics, cannot essentially be regarded as misleading. As such the said explanations of nationalism stand completely in lines with the circumstantial underpinnings from the time. In our times however, other branches of national existence and consciousness have become more relevant. Despite having substantial roots in elements such as history and culture, nations, they contend, are fairly ‘constructed’ concepts and very nascent in nature (Ortega, 2013).

The modernist literature has in fact, essentialized the need to let go the traditional ingredients of nationalism has been stressed by many academics and has establish grounds to argue the everyday construction of nations. Earnest Renan referred this everyday construction of nations as a ‘daily plebiscite’ (Renan, 1996). In the view of Clifford Geertz, in order to come into terms with the prevalent order of the day, it was imperative to let go the affiliations

with one's nation, which stemmed from primordial niches such as territory, kinship, language, ethnicity etc. For Geertz, an alienation from this redundant conception of nationalism was central in ensuring, the existence of a purely modern civil order (Geertz, 1998). Elie Kedourie's placement of nationalism at the junction of modernity and pre-modernism is regarded as a significant account in the study of nationalism. For him, nationalism can be best explained as comfortably etched in the point where primordial values become numb and modern values are instituted (Kedourie, 1960). It is in reference to these modern values that the present day conceptions of nationhood and national belonging can be best explained as extensions of nationalism.

The academic discourses available on the very subject of nationhood view it in close coherence with the notion and dynamics of national identity. This does not undermine the distinctive significance attached to the subject of national identity itself. Rather, it regards the construction, placement and behaviours of national identities at the root of establishing definitional determinants of nationhood. In the task of making sense of the term, nationhood is also at times wrongly conflated with patriotism. As such, the sentiment of ownership predicated under nationhood does resemble the afore-explained definition of patriotism on certain terms. To mention one, the sentiment of collective attachment under patriotism and nationhood unlike traditional nationalism, do not necessitate hatred for the 'other' (Janowitz, 1983). However, the fact that the terms such as patriotism, loyalty or allegiance do not spell out the 'nation' literally/ rhetorically, places nationhood at a higher pedestal as an area of study that deserves a fair share of attention. Moreover, the definition of nationhood is often placed along the contours of 'us' and 'who we are' and 'where we come from' etc. Rarely is the existence and glorification of one's national character explained in relation to the distinctiveness vis a vis the 'other'. In Anderson's terms, such sentiment could be called as 'nation-ness' (Anderson, 2006; Billig, 2002; Shin & Schwartz, 2003). Nationhood has thus,

been understood as the gradual internalization and institutionalization of the national character that engenders all levels of social existence, be it cultural, political, historical, psychological etc. (Brubaker, 1996). This systematic and perpetual instilment of national thought 'reproduces' nations on a routinely basis, in the course of their existence. Vast textual evidence suggests that this assertion of belonging to a 'people'/ a 'class' is crucial to establishing a staunch sense of nationhood with one's motherland. That is to say that a thorough insight into the dynamics of nationhood cannot be ensured if clarity on matters of national identity and nation itself is left unattended. Just as the exhaustive task of defining 'nations' has continued to add to its significance, an insight into the nationhood discourse of states remains central to make sense of their existence in the world as a strong sense of nationhood is critical to an internally integrated nation.

The most distinctive feature of the postmodernist scholarship on nationalism/nationhood is indeed its attempt to establish foundations that emphasize the role and influence of human agency and social milieu in engineering realities (nations), beyond the constricted primitive lineages. The social constructionist theory in its original form however, can be traced back to the seminal work of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckman. Their book titled *Social Construction of Reality* can safely be regarded as the Bible of Social constructionist thought.

Before highlighting the marked elements of the social constructionist thought, it is central to mention the exhaustive theoretical efforts to omit the casual conflation of social constructionist theory with constructivism. As much as the two sound alike and are used interchangeably, stark differences exist between the two paradigms, ranging from the basic thought to the areas of their application. Constructivism (i.e. without the social component) broadly includes the construction of human thought process from a 'cognitive' perspective. Social constructionism on the other hand essentially emerged as a sociological academic

enterprise, focuses more on the 'how' component of knowledge and reality. Hence, where the constructivist understanding of events is bounded by individual cognitivist factors, social constructionist accounts conversely, focus on the social plurality and inter-action. The enterprise equates the social and worldly existence of beings and their routinely dealings as deeply rooted in the socially and semantically mediated inter-actions (Bruffee, 1986; Andrews, 2012). The paradigm contends that the origin of all meaningful reality and knowledge is a consequence of human interaction and agency. It theorizes the fact that all constructions, be it knowledge, reality or truth, emerge out of and are reproduced in a certain social setting, the prime actors in which, are humans (Berger & Luckman, 1967). Whilst asserting reality and meaning making as both an objective and a subjective enterprise, the social constructionists ascribe significant weightage to language and how it facilitates socialization. As much as the social constructionist approach has gained relevance in the recent times, it has served as a significant trajectory to problematize the subject of nations as well.

The modernist dispositions in context of nationalism emphasize the role of social agency whilst regarding nation- building as an endeavour carried out socially and mutually by actors who themselves, belong to the category of social constructions. This delineates nationhood and the sense of national consciousness as social constructs that develop over time, under the influence of the social setting and the agents i.e. the humans; in this case: nationals (Ting, 2008). Such an explication of nation/ nationhood from a social constructionist lens posits its existence as ever-transitioning and mischievously illusory (Anderson, 2006; Brubaker, 1996; Day & Thompson, 2004). The social constructionist paradigm hence, accentuates the problematization of conceptions regarding the nation and the national identity beyond the traditional philosophical principalities, which epitomize primordial predispositions. In this view, the constructionist trajectory emphasizes the role and

influence of factors such political rhetoric and the significance of power in sociology of meaning making and narrative building. Benedict Anderson's idea of 'Imagined Communities' also resonates closely with this trajectory. For Anderson, it is intriguing how individual members who consider themselves a part of a larger group: nation; relate with other individuals on so many levels, without personally knowing them. It is owing to this hypothesis that Anderson refers to nations as 'imagined' political communities whose unity is embedded in an 'idyllic' state of cohesion with individuals who reside in the same setting as theirs. This sense of 'national' identity has been regarded as the most significant social construct of the modern world. However, it loses its centrality when explained in a frivolous concoction with the ideas of group identity. As wide as the scope of scholarship on nationalism might be, the centrality of national identity and its non-negotiability in terms of its 'conscious' acknowledgment is at the heart of entire nationalist discourse (Calhoun, 1997; Greenfeld, 1993). Conversely the compromise of national identity and taking it for granted has been a central theme of Michael Billig's thesis. Billig in his *Banal Nationalism* postulates several manifestations of nationhood and explains how the symbolic reproduction of nations is ignored on a routinely basis (Billig, 2002). Vast literature has been penned down to understand/ make sense of the nation-formation and nationalist discourses of various countries, along a social constructionist trajectory.

In Pakistan's case, there is expansive textual evidence that points towards the construction of the Pakistani nation along a socially mediated trajectory. Whilst most of such accounts recognize the role and influence of political rhetoric in shaping the country's 'national' narrative, remarkable significance is also attached to the historical component of nation-building. Despite the dire need to rightfully place its nationalist discourse, most academics have failed to trace this sense of a dividend nation with an absolutely problematic sentiment of nationhood (Nasr, 2005). And hence, the scholarship available in this regard

conspicuously illustrates the country's sense of nationhood as an embodiment of bewildered perplexity. From the very first day of its inception, Pakistan was confronted with myriad existential challenges and consequently, the then leadership failed to notice the fragmentation of the nation that had stood up to carve out this piece of land for themselves. The complexities of this weakening nationhood hence, owe a great deal to an imperfect nation-building process, since the beginning, which matured into an indelible state of national fragmentation (Thornton, 1999; Cohen, 2002; Shafqat, 2009). Pakistan's imperfectly defined nationhood is also embedded in reasons beyond its multi-lingual culture and multi-layered society. This is evident from the fact that both Pakistan and India in their post-independence phase had vastly diverse people to deal with. Yet India managed to survive this diversity and transformed it into one of its major strengths whilst Pakistan stability and prosperity stood vulnerable to its diverse ethnicities pitted against each other (Marriott, 2000; Akbar, 2011). Though the subnationalisms that grew out of inter-provincial discords in the passing years have a set of factors that fuelled them, it remains intriguing how these ethnic divisions managed to gain a significance that overshadowed the 'national' factor (Hyman, 1986). Among the plethora of complex reasons behind the inefficient nation-formation, the most significant are indeed the intricate interplay of religion and language in the country and its notoriously complicated ties with the neighbouring India.

As mentioned earlier, Pakistan's tale of independence unlike other countries did not entirely rest on claiming a territory for its people. It rather stemmed from a religious niche for a people who did not necessarily get a chance to develop an identity that was superior to their religious base. The separate land was needed for the Muslims and hence the 'Pakistani' never truly could emerge as a meaningful identity in the country even in the post-independence phase. It is perhaps for this reason, in the view of academics that the religious component has continued to loom over and influence the course of post-independence events for Pakistan.

Such overpowering role of religion has been immensely hard to ignore when at play with the political forces in the country. This has been further complicated by the definition of Pakistani nationals in a contradistinctive fashion against India (Qureshi, Winter 1972-1973). Also, episodic interruptions in the democratic course of governance in its early years further diversified the scope of various regime inputs as an important point of concern for the academics. The prevalent scholarly thought on this suggests that these interruptions impacted the construction of 'nationals' quite negatively. That is so because, in the course of ignoring the rise of linguistic and ethnic forces, the regime change often wrongly viewed all issues of instability from the viewpoint of law and order rather than from a national or political standpoint, for that matter (Widmalm, 2013). In addition to this, academics have also equated the underdeveloped sense of nationhood with the considerable schism prevalent between the religious and political elites, since independence. Coupled with the aforementioned differences, both religion and politics have dominantly regulated the idea of nationhood/ nation-ness (Shafqat, 2009).

Most pertinently, the notion of indoctrinating a cohesive sense of togetherness; i.e. nationhood, has been manipulated by the religious and political elites of the country at multiple times. This has been done primarily through propagation of a certain stream of thought through public speeches and secondarily through legislations in terms of education etc. (Hoodbhoy & Nayyar, 1985). The discord among the various ethnic groups in the country has only widened in the past few years. The available literature does evidence an underlying connection between the national attitudes and the political rhetoric that prevails. This does not essentially imply that all political rhetoric is intentionally aimed at forging or moulding national behaviours. However, there is a wide agreement on the role and influence of such rhetoric as a meaningful source to do so. The political rhetoric has essentially added to the manipulation of the marginalized under the impression of issuing representation. Another

concerning feature of Pakistan's nationhood is the dominant micro-identities which over-rule the national identity in terms of superiority and belonging-ness. As much as this is has ingrained a poor sense of cohesion among the Pakistani nationals, the role of political elites in reinforcing these micro-identities has also been an important factor (Ram, 2015). One of Pakistan's renowned economist, Shahid Javaid Barki referred the Pakistani nation as '*still in the making*' thirty nine years after its existence (Burki, 1986). This thought was well received and agreed to by another scholarly account a decade later, contending that not much had changed. Ironic as it might sound, having passed seventy years of its existence, rightfully placing and defining the Pakistani national identity is still an ordeal (LaPorte, 1999). It must be noted, that the comprehensive literature on the subject, does provide reasons and factors that have led to this fractured sense of association with one's country and its countrymen.

However, in doing so, it lacks the required depth and exploration of the role played by the political leadership in forging nations. It is this inefficient exploration of the Pakistani 'national' and more essentially its construction with regards to the political rhetoric that had the potential to instil the values of national bonding (that it perhaps didn't), that makes up the central objective of this dissertation.

As the discourse on nationhood in general and on Pakistani nationhood in particular is quite expansive, and more so, elusive by every definition, the thesis does not really work towards removing this inherent ambiguity in the subject. It merely establishes the need to ascertain the role of political discourse in forging the Pakistani 'national' construct. In doing so it closely looks at the political discourse generated in the initial forty years of Pakistan's troubled existence. Brief historical accounts of the said regimes are also included (where necessary) in order to contextualize the basis and origin of the generated discourse. The following chapter sets a detailed theoretical framework to understand the relevant conceptions of nationhood in general and Pakistan's nationhood discourse in particular. It establishes the

pertinence of social constructionism in making sense of political rhetoric as a means to forge critical constructs such as 'nations' (in this case; the Pakistani nation).

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

In an attempt to eliminate the inherent evasiveness attached with the subject of nations and nationhood, this dissertation aims to place nations as products of human engineering, whose behaviour in nationalistic terms, is essentially shaped up in the light of socially mediated events. Political manipulation through rhetoric (i.e. Political discourse) is placed as a prime tool of such social mediation. The notion that deep national associations; nationhood in this case, stem from or are in some manner related to the political discourse, is based upon the theory of social constructionism. In order to arrive at the fundamental theoretical underpinnings that govern the course of this dissertation, it is critical to establish the contextual overtones associated with the major variables of the study.

2.1 Construction of Nationhood

In trying to elaborate the conception and construction of 'nationhood', it is of pertinence to look into the idea and social construction of 'nation' itself. In addition, it must be noted that understanding nations in a multi-faceted fashion, as is critical for this study, also requires an insight into the role and place of 'national identity'. Hence, the debate that follows will attend to the said relevant definitional issues one by one. Nations have been explained along various trajectories, from a political standpoint to anthropological, social, philosophical and psychological. 'Nations' have importantly most been explained as an ideological and more so, a psychological construct. It is mostly this psychological dimension that has been referred to as a major impediment to completely define the term and course of nations and nationhood. This dimension of nations can be traced in Michael Billig's referral to the case of Joshua Fishman's *Language and Nationalism*. Quoting from the findings of Fishman, Billig narrates the case of indigenous villagers whose basic idea of belonging is embedded in their association with their 'village' i.e. 'their' homeland. Not just Billig traces the origin of 'Us

vs. Them' in this centuries old instance that earned much significance in the later years. He also places self 'consciousness' as a pre-requisite of asserting nationhood. It is on these lines that Billig explains the abstract nature of nations that is paradoxically placed in a rather concrete sense of ideological or for that matter, psychological consciousness. Another significant study that deserves attention in this regard is that of Earnest Renan. Renan (1992) in one of his lectures titled '*What is a Nation?*' referred to nations as essentially, a spiritual understanding of self-affiliation with a body of land and its people. And hence, he suggests that instead of forging ties of nations in a narrow association with merely physical borders of a state or its dynastic cultures and histories, it is indeed better and recommended to ask an individual of his 'national' lineage. This notion rests in Renan's understanding of nations beyond a matter of dedicated loyalties to the state boundaries. Some academics tend to place Benedict Anderson's (1991) hypothesis of *Imagined Communities* under the same category given it an overpowering psychological niche. Anderson's central assertions when explaining nations characterize them as mentally 'imagined' worlds. He contends so, iterating that the members of a smallest nation do not and cannot certainly know their fellow nationals. And yet, they have immense regard for the sense of communion that they share with these fellow country-men that they have physically never met. This not just reiterates the elusiveness inherent in the study of nations, but also paves the way to understand them as structures beyond the traditional building blocks of culture and history.

As much as these instances explain the fundamentals of nations and nationhood, little has been achieved in terms of eliminating the intangibility that comes with it. Where some academics have epitomized the role of state in defining nations, others have accorded prime significance to factors such as shared language, culture, traditions and ethnic origins. This has been broadly grouped under the categories of perennialism, primordialism and modernist approaches by Anthony Smith who is regarded as the father of modern nationalism (Smith,

2002). It must be kept in mind however, that Smith's assertions on the subject are rooted in the case of European nationalism. Centrality of cultural supremacy and the sense of ownership that it generates lie at the heart of the perennialist and primordialist school of thought. It makes up at least one factor where the two agree on. Singularly however, primordialists define nations as hard facts that can only be explained along objectively perceptible realities such as language, culture, religion, ethnicity and heir-ship to a shared history. Clifford Geertz (2000) being one of the significant proponents of this approach refers to this concoction of historical and cultural legacies as '*givens of human existence*'. For primordialists, there is absolutely no place for tracing the conception of nations along the role and influences of human agency (Geertz, 2000).

In placing nation-states as definitive constituent of nations, Hans Kohn (1944) in his ground-breaking work *The History of Nationalism* tries to answer a rather paradoxical question. His work tries to elaborate if individuals are born into nations or if nations are a construct forged as a result of individual efforts (Kohn, 1944). Although the debate pointing towards the significance and role of human agency in nation-formation formally emerged in the years following this work, the traces of constructionist thought can safely be found in the mid-1940s. In contrast to the primordialists, the perennialist school of thought upholds the existence of nations in immemorial origins, contending that they are not a new phenomenon. A strand of perennialist school also positively agrees on the perpetual nature of nations that is to say that it recognizes their transformed and continual nature vis a vis the advancements of time. The perennialist thought, however is deeply criticized on the account of merely placing/racing the origin of nations in the existence of mankind. The fact that the trajectory ignores and that is essentially significant to problematize is to reflect upon how these nations are constructed. Another remarkably unattended domain under the perennialist course of 'national' understanding is its disregard for the influence and outcomes of social penetration.

Smith's explanations of nations under the modernist school however, are based on interpretations that can be potentially tweaked in order to lead the course of this dissertation. The modernist strand in nation/ nation-hood studies, as explained by Anthony Smith, rationalizes the existence and persistence of nations beyond hard facts such as a piece of land, a shared language and culture and belonging to a specific ethnicity. It accords the existence of nations and their perpetual re-construction with regards to a shift and change in the time frame, as fundamentals to make sense of 'national' presence of states. Ernest Gellner points out in his seminal writings, that the existence of nations is not necessarily embedded in their pre-historic antecedents and that, the permanence in their character is by no means guaranteed. Although, what Gellner originally refers, to is in a quite different setting. He implies the said notion in the context of various distinctive nations emerging as new and re-forming their national identities with time according to the shifts in European politics of the time. That said, the 're-formative' feature of nations and 'national' character for that matter, is indeed true for all nations. In order to arrive at a workable definition for this dissertation, Smith's three pronged categorization to understand national existence needs more depth. The notable factors of the afore-explained trajectories do put forth some convincing points of explanations but lack a fundamental and sufficient explanation of 'national' construct in an absolute relevance to this study. It is hence important to turn to a post-modern understanding of nations and nationhood.

2.2 'Social' Construction of Nationhood

The post-modern approach is a step forward from the aforesaid traditional understandings of the subject. The approach incorporates enormously expansive avenues of understanding the said nationalistic conceptions beyond the traditionally defined components i.e. culture, history, language and territory. The most significant contributions in making

sense of nations as human constructs under the postmodern school of thought have been that of Rogers Brubaker, Graham Day and Andrew Thompson. Homi Bhabha's (1999) interpretation of nations as 'narrations' also somewhat falls in the postmodern category, given the remarkable attention that she places on the role and significance of 'myths' in nation-making. Tracing the existence and persistence of nations somewhere at the junction of social and political rationalizations, Bhabha insists on identifying and valuing the role of social politics in the 'national' lives of states (Bhabha, 1999). Graham Day and Andrew Thompson (2005) in their work *Theorizing Nationalism* present nation-building, more precisely, 'nationalization' as something that can just not progress without the facilitation of social agency. They view the internalization of, what can be referred to as national thought, as essentially a process that is guided by structural stimuli. They do not equate the formation and rooting of national sentiments with something that is under human control. For Thompson and Day (2005), nations and their behaviour have little to do with their ethnic, cultural or political histories and instead more to do with the tools that are employed to instil those behaviours. In contending this, they assert that not just is this national behaviour something that is beyond the voluntary control of individuals. They rather assert that it is essentially a concocted product of mutual efforts of society and all actors in it. These efforts are not necessarily always intentional.

Rogers Brubaker's account most significantly marks an entrance study into the subject that essentially broadened the outlooks that allow the recognition of nation-building factors emanating from social settings of individuals. Brubaker directs his focus on uncovering the understanding of nations and nationhood as realist entities and regards it as an understanding that eliminates the abstract nature of nations. Unlike others before him, Brubaker's account on the subject stands out as distinctive as he primarily tries to make sense of how are the 'national' tendencies institutionalized in individuals. He suggests that

problematizing 'nations' and constantly attempting to chalk out an agreeable definition for the term and its relevant fields has now become an out-dated ordeal. And what needs more attention and exploration instead, is the process and tools that internalize the sentiments that bind an individual with his/her 'national' orientation. It is following this lead of cognitive and socio-political insight into the subject of nations that the ensuing academic accounts presented a rather multi-faceted interpretation of nations (Brubaker, 1996). These renewed interpretations regarding nations focus more on the instilment of national thought/ sentiment in the individuals instead of the traditional contesting explications regarding how are nations formed. It must be noted that despite its dependable significance and relevance to this dissertation, the basis of Brubaker's findings and others along him, popularly relate to and address the case of European nationhood.

In a similar line of thought, Michael Billig (1995) in his *Banal Nationalism* puts forth his thesis asserting that how the reproduction of nations on a daily basis in the symbolic forms is taken for granted by the nationals of a country. Although his work too, draws much from American and European nationalisms, his assertions on the constant flagging of nations on routinely basis that goes unnoticed, remains relevant for the interest of this study. Billig's idea that discourse reproduces nations on a daily basis and in the long term as well downplays the role of ideology and other traditional ingredients of forging nations. From TV programmes to official buildings and from food cultures to architectural patterns, Billig offers a comprehensive study on how the configurations of national reproduction are ignored and taken for granted. In doing so, he also stresses the role of political discourse in national-formation that serves as the core interest of this study (Billig, 1997).

In order to arrive at meaningful conclusions, the gist of the afore-explained theoretical underpinnings is used to craft a workable definition for nations and nationhood. Nations in this context and in relevance to the course of this dissertation are explained as *socially*

mediated mental constructions that tend to systematically evolve during their existence.

Factors such as language, territory, history and cultural ownership only stand as indicative components of such constructions and do not serve as their definitive elements. Nationhood is then explained as a construction accentuated by the social milieu and as a sentiment that enroots in the minds and hearts of individuals gradually over a period of time. It must be stressed that nationhood as a sentiment evolves simultaneously alongside the evolution of nations or so to say; national character/ behaviour. This definition does, by no means, ease the definitional crisis that has been reflected upon earlier. It does however clear paths to contextualize nationhood along a social constructionist trajectory which expresses social and human agency as critical drivers to nations. The debate that follows establishes the relevance of the social constructionist thought with this study and stresses the significance of political discourse among other tools of such construction.

The social constructionist school of thought is often wrongly conflated with constructivism (i.e. without the 'social'). It must be noted that although both constructivism and social constructionism belong to the post-modern school of thought, stark differences exist in their stream of thought. For constructivists, the basis of knowledge and reality can be traced within individuals. They place the individual character at the heart of all meaning – making enterprise. Constructivists emphasize the role of cognition and the manner in which societal actions are interpreted in an individual capacity. On the other hand, relatively a new strand in the post-modern thought, the origin of social constructionism can be traced in Berger and Luckmann's *Social Construction of Reality* (1967). For Berger and Luckmann, all knowledge and reality is a product of human agency and inter-action that is essentially conveyed/ passed on through the generations driven by social contexts. In simplistic terms, social constructionist trajectory places an insignificant amount of responsibility on the discourses and conversations carried out on a routinely basis. Their assumption that all

meaning-making and realities, for that matter, are embedded in the social exchange and interaction of humans, has earned much popularity over the years. The approach takes into account every little gesture of each and every social actor in when establishing the constructions of thoughts and ideas.

Given its broad impact, the social constructionist trajectory has been implied by academics to understand a vast range of phenomenon as socially mediated events. Nation building and the existence of nations itself makes up one such significant area of interest. A social constructionist view to analyse the existence of nations beyond borders and loyalties emerged in the mid-1900s. As mentioned earlier, the invaluable contributions of Benedict Anderson, Rogers Brubaker and Andrew Thompson and Graham Day deserve an important place in social constructionist explanations of nations. Their respective contributions along with the work of Michael Billig insist on viewing nations in a constant process of reproduction. This reproductions, they suggest, is led by the course of social event and the inter-action on various levels in the society. With an emphasis on the discourse and the impact that it has in establishing the course of nation-building, the fundamentals of this approach also reiterate the flexible patterning of nations.

This broadened view to makes sense of nations and their behaviours has been termed by Edward Said as 'interpretative communities'. In chalking out this phrase, Said essentially established nations as communities that could be individually interpreted along variant time and space particularities. Said's view on nations as communities explains them as 'imagined' as suggested by Anderson and as simultaneously interpretative. In addition to this, social constructionist understanding of nations and nationhood give considerable importance to the role of language. As mentioned earlier, that discourse is the backbone of making sense of nations in view of the said approach, the use of particular language, syntax and other circumstantial factors are also of significance. In this context, academics, especially Billig,

has singularly attended to explore the construction of 'us' as a nation and 'them' as foreign. He emphasizes an insight into social construction of 'us vs them' as a critical to understand national affiliations of nations during the course of their existence. Social construction of nationhood hence, goes on to explain nations as products of the prevalent discourse and communication over time. The use of political discourse as a tool of social construction of nations and nationhood as a mystically unifying sentiment is critically relevant to the course of this dissertation.

The discourse generated by the political elites of the country is considered as crucially significant in terms of inculcating sentiments of affiliations among the individuals with their respective nations. Such discourse is primarily understood in terms of linguistics i.e. the use of word such as 'ours', 'us', 'here', 'we' etc.. A microscopic analysis of the intentional and unintentional target areas during public speeches of influential elites establishes the role of the potential relationship that underlies their thought process and the construction of nations. For Billig (1997), the national character and necessarily everything that has to do with nations once they are created, are embedded in the communication carried out between the governing and the governed. And in stating so, Billig's emphasis rests on the texts in the state newspapers in terms of daily reproduction of nations. He justifies the significance of political rhetoric in forging nations by contending that the political elites and their respective rhetoric are not just influential because of the power position that they hold. But also, in the modern electronic age, their presence and accessibility through media in terms of communication has increased by and large unlike the times when the common man wasn't very familiar with them. The fact that their actions and gestures can now be noticed as they speak, deliver a speech or an interview has added to the value of political discourse and to its role as a nation-making enterprise, contends Billig. Another feature that adds to the relevance of political discourse in forming nations is that of representations. That is to say that the chosen political

figures are essentially seen as representatives of nations who are instituted in their current position in the light of a policy that involves the role of people. And that issues a kind of ‘people-approved legitimacy’ to policies that they make and the things that they say. Their thoughts and ideas on issues of relevance and significance to the state, act as forces that keep national identities alive and active on a daily basis.

Kenneth Burke (1969) in his *Rhetoric of Motives* highlights the said issues of representations attached to the political rhetoric among its other features. Among other distinctive features of political rhetoric that instil sentiments of national affiliation, Burke (1969) attaches high value to aspects such as ‘labelling’ and ‘rhetoric of identification’ etc.. Rhetoric of identification and labelling are evident in the political speeches of leaders in their ‘collective’ referral to ‘we’ as nations, ‘us’ and ‘our’ common good. In using such rhetoric the leaders group themselves with the people that they are communicating with (i.e. the nation) in order to arrive at a close sense of association with them. Patriotism, political imagination and reflections from a glorious past are often used as significant rhetorical devices to achieve this sense of association. The same significance is attributed to the element of ‘deixis’ in the writing of Billig. He points to the importance of ‘deixis’ as an influential linguistic device that focuses on essential components of utterances in terms of circumstances and the audience being addressed. Answers to the questions of who, where what and how are all framed under the said linguistic device. Deixis and rhetoric hence, make up important components of political discourse.

An important task to attend to while establishing the role of political leadership in constructing nations is to analyse the underlying meaning in their text and talk beyond their utterances. Such an analysis is referred to as ‘political discourse analyses’. Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) is of central relevance to this dissertation in instituting the hypothesis that nations and nationhood as a sentiment are socially mediated constructs; that primarily are

products of political discourse fed to the public over the years. In the words of Billig, such discourses enable the people to identify with their respective areas of belonging and with other people who live in it. He calls this as ‘peoplehood’.

2.3 Political Discourse Analysis (PDA)

It must be noted that not all political discourse is necessarily intended at becoming a part of the meaningful and constructive chapter of political histories. At times, mere statements uttered in an informal setting end up having potentially far-lived impacts and vice versa. For the purpose of this dissertation, political rhetoric built/ uttered during *public gatherings* has been taken into account and not the statements said during interviews. It is also of pertinence to chalk out the definitional bounds of the PDA approach as well so as to determine further course of this dissertation. Teun A. van Dijk explains the fundamentals of PDA as an offshoot of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). For Dijk the Political discourse analysis eliminates the ‘power’ factor in CDA to merely establish the role of political rhetoric in various realms of public life. As the name of the approach suggests, the main actors in the construction of all political discourse are political officers; commonly termed as ‘*politicians*’.

Politicians refer to all members engaged in the governmental/ institutional framework of working. This includes political officers, senators, presidents, prime ministers, parliamentarians and essentially elected ‘representatives’ serving the government. The course of this dissertation is however limited to the statements from the highest offices i.e. that of the prime minister and president. As mentioned earlier, PDA is a bipartisan approach. Whilst at one end are the political elites, the other end is held by the audience that not just elects them to their respective positions, but is also a direct recipient of their services. In terms of relevance to this study, the audience to all political discourse are the ‘masses’ engaged in public/ political gatherings in general. The task of the PDA approach is to unpack the politics

of words that lies under the uttered statements through text and speech. It is also important to take note of the ‘contextualization’ factor when conducting PDA of political speeches. This means that PDA only considers the rhetoric as ‘political’ that is intentionally contextualized and does not emanate from light-mode conversations. To put it more simply, contextualized rhetoric occurs or is uttered in places such as addresses to notable gatherings, at events or during formal interviews. PDA does not consider the statements said and positions held during informal conversations and exchanges as ‘political’ rhetoric. Van Dijk in his account chalks out broad definitions for the terms that fall under the scope of politics including, political institutions, political officers, political relations, political groups and others. He declares it critical to define these terms beforehand in order to arrive at comprehensive PDA of the content of the text and talk.

The construction of ‘political discourse’ itself is hence, a discursive phenomenon that is formed over time, in the light of legislations and decision-making carried out under various leaderships. It must be reiterated that the PDA approach is used here as a mere tool to make sense of the prevalent thought process in the light of political discourse fed to the public over the years. In doing so, it does recognize the fact that the political aim of interacting with the public changes over time and is not something that remains static. Dijk refers to this as ‘*political action*’ that is necessarily defined as an offshoot of *social* action and inter-action. For him, in order to unpack the inherent ambiguity in the text and talk of political officers/politicians, it is critical to establish coherence between their political actions and discourse structures. By the term discourse structures Dijk means the series of pointers that are implied to analyse pieces of text and talk from them.

The components of discourse structures as presented by Dijk are central to the course of this dissertation. These include *phonology, graphics, syntax, meaning, speech acts, style/rhetoric, conversational interactions* etc. It must however be reiterated that all of the

aforementioned components are applicable *only* if the instances of text and talk are politically contextualized. Other significant elements of discourse structures include the choice and relevance of content at hand, the choice of words, the use of rhetorical devices and most importantly the physical expressions and gestures during such meaningful interaction.

In the following chapter(s), Pakistan's political discourse and its impact on the formation of its nationhood is analysed along the aforementioned discourse structures. That is, that it looks at the speeches of its political leaders primarily in terms of their *topics* (content) of their speeches. In doing so it establishes the scope of their thought process. It has been observed in the light of observations established by Dijk that in most cases, the political leaders tend to reiterate their concern for the public, its bright future and the restoration of the glorious past, no matter what the actual topic of their debate. Another point of emphasis in the following chapter is to understand the underlying meaning hidden in the distribution of discourse vis a vis the reasons *why* a certain statement was issued. A collective referral to the 'nation' as one unit also falls under the same category. For Dijk, by doing so, the established polarization of identities i.e. the Us vs. Them line of thought is instituted. The role of local semantics in glorifying the 'self' and 'our' nation is also emphasized. In Pakistan's case, the expression of Pakistani identity as a contradistinction to the Indian presence has been explained as one of the major barriers to the constructive emergence of Pakistani 'nation'.

The instances from the political discourse generated during the initial years of Pakistan's birth are used to establish the aforesaid theoretical reflections. Moreover, special attention is dedicated to uncovering and understanding the lexicon i.e. choice of words during certain chosen debates. In addition to the lexical structures, distinctive attention is also placed at the syntax patterns. That is to say that a keen focus is directed at looking for the contextual changes in the choice and use of rhetorical devices by the leaders and the kind of impact that it has triggered. In terms of rhetoric, it is observed that how have the Pakistani political elites

have used it beyond a mere tool of persuasion and more as a driver to instil national sentiments and loyalties. In doing so, the rhetorical patterns in repetition of certain phrases, sentence forms, deliberate retort to past memoirs, additions and deletions in conversations and other such elements, are taken into account. As a major part of political language and discourse is usually a concoction of cherishing past histories and correcting present blunders, speech acts have been given special attention. Speech acts such as denials, accusations and counter-accusations have also been made a part of the extensive PDA of Pakistan's political discourse that follows.

In the light of the aforementioned theoretical reflections, the case of Pakistan's nationhood is studied as a socially constructed idea that is primarily a product of the political discourse that has been fed to the public over the years. In the following chapter, the political discourse established under Quaid e Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah himself and later under Ayub Khan, Z. A. Bhutto and Zia ul Haq, are analysed along the aforementioned theoretical understandings of political discourse. As mentioned in the earlier part of the study, the said leaders are chosen on the basis of the relevance and primacy of their time periods. An analysis on the construction of national sentiments, more essentially, nationhood, is carried out. The objective at hand in doing so is, one, to ascertain the influence of political rhetoric/discourse in construction of national affiliations and two, to note the variations in the thought pattern under the aforesaid leaders. Conclusions are drawn on the basis of lessons that are a reflection of concoction of theory and reality of political discourse.

Chapter 3: A Study of Pakistan's Political Discourse (1947-1988)

3.1 Birth of Pakistani 'Nation'

The emergence of Pakistan and India as separate and sovereign dominions marked an official end to an era of British colonialism in the region. As much as the creation of the two states has been regarded a milestone in the history of the world, there are contesting literatures regarding the need and after-effects of this partition. Among the said contestations is a strand of literature that questions Muhammad Ali Jinnah's vision for building a separate homeland for the Muslims of subcontinent. Unpacking this vision for what the Jinnah referred to as a separate 'nation', is central to this dissertation. In making sense of the underdeveloped, struggling or as some academics contend, lost '*Pakistaniat*' i.e. a staunch sense of Pakistani nationhood, it is of critical significance to take note of the first use of the term in context of Pakistan. In tracing the origin of referral to the inhabitants of this piece of land as one 'nation', it is intriguing to note that Quaid e Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah was not the first man to use the term for the Muslims of the subcontinent. Leaders before him, most significantly Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and his followers had termed them as '*qaum*' in their speeches and sermons. Qaum in Urdu refers to 'nation' and necessarily distinguishes a group from the other on the basis of certain distinct traits.

There is a wide agreement however, that Jinnah was in fact the first leader who had realized this distinctiveness on the basis of religious and cultural dissimilarities in the subcontinent and upheld it under the 'Two Nation Theory'. The theory serves as an important starting point to build a case of Pakistan's nationhood (Aziz, 2015). For Quaid e Azam, Muslims of the subcontinent formed a distinct nation by means of their belief system, their cultural values and their different civilizations. The underlying thought behind this Two Nation Theory is however, often misunderstood or perhaps is deliberately portrayed in a

faulty manner. Contentious interpretations of the said theory from both sides of the border have blurred its reality and have essentially transformed it into a subject whose relevance hasn't diminished even after seventy long years of independence. Given this relevance, understanding nationalism/ nationhood in Pakistan (and India as well, for that matter) in the post-independence phase has been an important area of study in past few decades.

In terms of nationhood, the roots of Pakistan's independence are embedded in a quite keen sense of 'Muslim nationalism'. The quest for a separate homeland i.e. Pakistan, spearheaded by Quaid e Azam reflected the need for a space that allowed unrestricted practice of religious beliefs for all Muslims. This being the gist of the Two Nation Theory mentioned above, its misinterpretation began in the post-independence phase. A prime reason for this has been accorded with the lack of understanding among the people who failed to realize that the Two Nation Theory as an ideology was carved out in order to attain a separate homeland for them, and that its permanence and role after the intended independence was neither promised nor envisioned. This failed realization had two grave consequences. One, the national identity among the Pakistanis grew in a uni-directional fashion i.e. in contradistinction to Indian identity. That is to say that the sense of nationhood that should have been more focused towards 'who we are' became more about 'who we are not'. And the second consequence was the emergence of religious and provincial affiliations as superior constructs over and above the national existence of Pakistanis (Thornton, 1999). This reluctant national acceptance/ affirmation of the transformation in the sense of nation-ness that should have taken root and the one that actually did, has been a major driver in further constructing the evidently manifest poor sense of national affiliation among the countrymen. As much as this sense of nation-ness has transformed over the years, there has been an active role of the political leadership in binding and dividing the nation, often dictated by their will and also by the circumstantial needs in some cases.

The following paragraphs look into the political discourse that has been generated since the earliest days of Pakistan's birth in order to trace the patterns of transformation in the sense of nationhood among Pakistanis.

3.2 Pakistan's Nationhood under Quaid- e- Azam (1947-1948)

Muhammad Ali Jinnah accepted the first governor general-ship of Pakistan; a former British colony that earned independence as a result of his untiring efforts. In the early days of partition, the role of the political leadership in terms of keeping the nation bounded in a well-knit sentiment of one-ness and solidarity was multiplied by leaps and bounds. The newly independent state of Pakistan under the governor-ship of Quaid e Azam had to put up with the troubled British legacy of East Pakistan divided by a hundred mile border, a contentious division of assets, episodic violence and many other issues that needed attention. In such unstable times, the Quaid e Azam's main focus to instil a national ownership among the newly independent folks and to make them realize the cost of this piece of land that they had just earned (Ahmed, 2001). Most of the speeches made by Jinnah during his brief but dedicated years of political service to the newly independent state of Pakistan convey a sheer sense of ownership, association and solidarity with Pakistan. It is perhaps these values that he aimed to instil in the minds of the people pitted against each other in times that demanded unity and faith in national supremacy. Some of the instances of the unifying rhetoric that the Father of the Nation tried to indoctrinate among the national of Pakistan are as follows. The analysis regarding the said speeches has been framed in lines with the theoretical underpinnings highlighted in the preceding chapter.

In his speech at a Dinner Party given by the late Mr Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah at Karachi Club on August 9th, 1947, a week before the day of independence, he said;

‘Let us trust each other. Let us judge by results, not by theories. With the help of every section- I see every class is represented in this huge gathering- let us work in double shifts if necessary to make the Sovereign State of Pakistan really happy, really united and really powerful.’

It is important to take note of the tone used by Jinnah in the course of making the gathering realize how keenly he placed his focus at acknowledging the presence of each and every segment in a gathering of thousands. Another point of significance is his inclusion of self with those being addressed. As chalked out by van Dijk in his explanations about Political Discourse, this art of counting self with the masses not just develops a sense of association among the addressees but also enhances their confidence in the leader. Jinnah’s meaningful emphasis on the need to work for multiple hours then leads to positive consequences including the creation of a ‘united’ Pakistan. This signifies the seriousness and criticality attached to the dis-united people of Pakistan after independence.

In his presidential address to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan on August 11, 1947, he took the people in confidence and referred the creation of Pakistan to a **cyclonic revolution** that he was certain, must have left the world wondering of the momentous qualities of forging nations that the people of this land possessed. It is from this debate that the most frequently quoted excerpt is often used to establish interfaith harmony in the light of the values that the Father of the Nation held. The said values stress the elimination of individual religious niches and a consolidation of self into a single nation. This point where faith ceases to matter and citizenship i.e. the ownership of the national responsibility entrusted on the people, is above everything, and perhaps marks the idyllic state of nationhood that Quaid himself looked forward to. In disseminating among the mass public the need for unity and solidarity in the earliest days of its existence, Quaid e Azam asserted;

‘If you will work in cooperation, forgetting the past, burying the hatchet, you are bound to succeed. If you change your past and work together in a spirit that every one of you, no matter to what community he belongs, no matter what relations he had with you in the past, no matter what is his colour, cast or creed, is first, second and last a citizen of this state

with equal rights, privileges and obligations, there will be no end to the progress that you will make.’

It is important to mention here that while Quaid made this historic speech at the Constituent Assembly, the social milieu of the newly segregated subcontinent was marred by bloodshed and a state of absolute chaos. Hence in urging the people to bury the hatchet, Quaid e Azam literally meant for them to get past their hoary antagonistic perceptions of each other and advance into future as true nationals of Pakistan. In rhetorical terms, the repetitive use of the phrase ‘no matter’ in chalking out the various determinants of individual identity points at how Jinnah asserts citizenship of the state as supreme vis a vis all other affiliations. Linguistically, this rhetorical repetition is referred to as *anaphora* and is aimed at adding emphasis to the point at hand. Jinnah’s referral to the centrality of citizenship reflects his underlying desire of togetherness, of one-ness and nation-ness that he perhaps wished to instil in the disenchanting masses of the time. It is in the similar address, that while stressing the need for unity on minority-majority basis and insistence on letting go provincial loyalism, he assertively contended;

‘We should begin to work in that spirit and in course of time all these angularities of this majority and minority communities, the Hindu community and the Muslim community- because even as regards Muslims you have Pathans, Punjabis, Shias, Sunnis and so on and among the Hindus you have Brahmans, Vashnavs, Khattris, also, Bengalis, Madrasis and so on, will vanish. We are starting with this fundamental principle that we are all citizens and equal citizens of one state. I am sure that with your support and cooperation I can look forward to Pakistan becoming one of the greatest nations in the world.’

It is intriguing to note how in every speech of his Jinnah tends to always symbolically group himself with the masses, perhaps to develop that sense of association with them. The aforementioned excerpt from one of Jinnah’s most significant speeches maximally portrays his rationality. In saying so, He entrenches His direction pertaining to assembling as a cohesive nation in the rational rejection of sectionalist and provincialist thought. in a valid point that reflects on how the religious identities are further branched into micro-divisions, Jinnah makes his point of classifying oneself into a singularly identifiable unit i.e. the nation.

It must also be noted that in highlighting the role of nations, he does not let the importance of state be overshadowed. For Jinnah, both the state and the nation are distinctive constructs and this underlying thought in his assertions and instances is further explored in the subsequent instances from the political discourse that he generated through his text and talk.

In his message to the nation on first Eid ul Fitr as an independent dominion in 1947, Jinnah reverberated the national spirit by reiterating to the nation that;

‘Great responsibilities have come to us and equally great should be our determination and endeavour to discharge them and the fulfilment thereof will demand of us efforts and sacrifices in the cause no less for construction and building of our nation than what was required for the achievement for the cherished goal of Pakistan.’

It is evident how for Jinnah, the task of ‘**constructing**’ the nation enjoyed supreme primacy since the earliest days of Pakistan’s birth. It must also be noted that when referring to this construction, Jinnah’s agreement to nations as constructed concepts can be avidly sensed. He placed the state and the nation distinctively on two different junctions that conjoined in forming constructive nationhood. His evident attention to the nation building as an endeavour critical for the existence of the newly born country points at his understanding of nations as unified coherent constructions. It also puts forth his view on nations as well bonded entities that held aspirations of brotherhood, love and unity for each other, regardless of factors such as cast colour and creed.

In his address at the Khaliqdina Hall, Karachi on October 11, 1947 while speaking to the Civil, Naval, Military and Air Force Officers, Jinnah stressed the efficacy and need for a cohesively united nation saying;

‘This is a challenge to our very existence and if we are to survive as a nation and are to translate our dreams about Pakistan into reality we shall have to grapple with the problem facing us with re-doubled zeal and energy. Our masses are today disorganized and disheartened by the cataclysm that has befallen them. Their morale is exceedingly low and we shall have to do something to pull them out of slough of despondency and galvanize them into activity.’

This instance clearly puts forth the primacy that Quaid attached to the individual agency in building a strong national character. Contextually, the speech was made in the purview of myriad challenges that the country had to confront in the initial few months of its existence. The lexical usage of the term ‘re-doubled’ zeal and energy reflects the fact that the status of unity and one-ness back then was also perhaps unsatisfactory in terms of what Jinnah himself had himself envisioned. Another significant feature of this instance lies in the concern that is inherent in the disunited and divided nation there was.

Among some of the most important and impactful speeches made by Jinnah was his address to the nation through a Radio broadcast. In this broadcast speech from the Radio Pakistan on October 30th, 1947, Quaid e Azam reflected on the challenges that confronted the newly established state of Pakistan. In epitomizing the said challenges and the need to overcome them, he did not forget to emphasize the significance of unifying into one unit of a nation. His insistence on emerging as a united and resilient nation capable of putting behind it all its hardships has been a key element of his speeches. In his words;

‘Let us now plan to build, reconstruct and regenerate our great nation and our sovereign State of Pakistan which you know is not only the biggest Muslim state but also the fifth biggest sovereign state in the world.’

The use of *epithet* as a rhetorical device to chalk out the kind of ‘great’ national values that he wanted to instil in the people of the country and referring to the task as ‘re’-construction and ‘re’-generation of such values, sufficiently establishes the unsatisfactory development of nationalism among the people.

Quaid e Azam in his address during a visit at the Sibbi Darbar in February 1948 made an important speech that remains relevant even today. With an attention to Baluchistan as the most resourceful province of Pakistan, Quaid’s policy toward the province portrays and conveys a sheer sense of inclusiveness. Talking of provincialism to the people of Baluchistan,

his views highly project the invaluable significance attached to the province and also of including the Balochis in the public polity on a non-partisan basis. The reason that this stands of central relevance at present is embedded in how the inter-provincial harmony has drastically weakened over the years and the consequent disenchantment that has taken root among them. To quote his words;

‘I’ve thought and thought, considered and pondered over the ways and means of improving the lot of our people in this province and of enabling them to secure for themselves, the same position and the same political status within the polity of Pakistan which are open to their brethren in other provinces...I have decided to make a small but all the same an important move immediately to enable the people to associate themselves with the governance of their province. I hope that this will bring the citizens of Pakistan living in Baluchistan closer to the Governor-general and the head of your administration.’

Quaid’s emphasis on the ‘pondering and all the thinking’ in terms of Baluchistan point to his preferential treatment of the province on the basis of its resources and also take into account a meaningful share of support from its people. This does not just put forth an inclusive approach on political level as a basis of fostering inter-provincial harmony since the earliest days, it also establishes how serious Quaid himself was to witness a sense of common nationhood prevail among the people of Pakistan.

In his speech at a public gathering in Dacca on March 21st, 1948 Jinnah embarked upon some critical issues related to provincialism and to the issues pertaining to adhering with one’s nation. The gathering comprised of several hundred thousands of enthusiasts who, as per the news reports from the time contend, were in dire need of such bounding affirmations as made by the Quaid e Azam during his speech. Some of the most significant excerpts of this speech stressed the need of letting go micro identities and to submerge them all into a grand national identity, the sanctity and honour of which surpassed all other associations in individual and collective capacity. In the words of Jinnah;

‘It is by national cooperation, good spirit and goodwill that you will be able to not only preserve Pakistan which we have achieved but also make it a great State in the world.’

Are you now, after having achieved Pakistan, going to destroy it by your own folly? Do you want to build it up? Well then for this purpose you need complete unity and solidarity amongst yourselves’.

This extract from yet another historical speech of Jinnah prioritizes the role and need of national cooperation to bring about a state of nationhood/ national ownership that was perhaps, seen as critical in the survival of this newly formed State. The said spirit of good will and good spirit is necessarily put forth in the view of each other as that later parts of the same speech unfold. In a sense of rhetorical metanoia,(i.e. the art of self-answering the questions proposed during a speech or conversations) the underlying purpose of the questions asked appears to meaningfully motivate the already charged crowd and instilling in them this sense of national unity as a fundamental driver to lead them to progress. In the same historical speech, he said that;

‘...the enemies of Pakistan have now turned to disrupt the Pakistani state by creating a spilt among the Muslims of Pakistan. These attempts have taken the form of encouraging provincialism. As long as you do not throw this poison out of your body politic, you will not be able to weld yourself, to mould yourself, galvanize yourself into a true real nation. What we want is not to talk about Bengali, Punjabi, Sindhi, Baluchi, and Pathan and so on. They are of course units. If I may point out, you are all outsiders here. Who were the original inhabitants of this land? - Not those who are now living here. So what is the use of saying that we are Sindhis, Balochis or Punjabis? No, we are Muslims.’

This brings to attention another significant feature evident in Quaid’s political speeches i.e. his insistence on emerging and functioning as a single, cohesive and a well-knit nation, in contending and so, nowhere do his speeches underplay the role of provincial identities and the sentiments of affiliations that the individuals might have with their respective ethnic origins. His emphasis is rather on merely placing the national association above any and all other identities. The aforementioned excerpt has two distinguishing elements. One, in it Quaid e Azam calls for quashing all micro-provincial identities in the face of a superior national orientation. And two, in this instance, he emphasizes the religious identity of Muslims of the newly independent Pakistan. Whilst there are numerous instances of Jinnah’s referral to the nation as Pakistani i.e. derived from State. Here, he chooses to

significantly elaborate the Muslim identity as yet another component of the Pakistan's nationhood discourse. In the very next passage of this speech, Quaid conveys a sheer sense of nationhood pleading vehemently to let go of all genres that have the potential to divide the country. His words iterated that ;

‘... you are a nation now; you have carved out a territory; a vast territory. It belongs to you. It does not belong to any Punjabi or a Sindhi or a Baluchi or a Pathan or a Bengali. It is yours. You have a central government where several units are represented. Therefore, if you want to build yourself up as a Nation, for God's sake give up this provincialism. Provincialism has been one of the curses. So has been sectionalism- Shia, Sunni etc. So you should think, act and live in terms that your country is Pakistan and you are a Pakistani.’

Contextually, this speech at Dacca mainly addressed a gathering that comprised of people who, the Quaid feared, were an easy target to fall for all sorts of manipulation. In warning them of falling for any of such divisive factors, Jinnah's call for a united consolidation of a 'national' allegiance that was based on a sheer sense of good will and brotherhood among all provinces is of momentous significance and stands relevant even in the current times. Lastly, the depth and the concern inherent in the statement that says 'Your country is Pakistan and you are a Pakistani' is something that needs reiteration in true letter and spirit today, after seventy long years of Pakistan's existence.

In another instance in a reply to the students of Islamia College Peshawar in April 1948, Jinnah addressed a mammoth crowd comprising mainly of the student body. He expressed his trust and hope associated with the youth of Pakistan and his certainty if stepping into a stable future, given the presence of such great minds. In a brief statement during this address, he quoted the most accurate and comprehensive division of affiliations for the nation. The following words aimed at not just inculcating an absolute sense of reverence and patriotism towards the state but also at instilling a sentiment of nationhood (or peoplehood) or national ownership. His words quoted;

‘...you must learn to distinguish between your love for your province and your love and duty to your State as a whole. Our duty to the state demands a broader sense of vision and a greater sense of patriotism. Our duty to the state often demands that we must be ready to submerge our provincial and individual interests for the common cause and common good. Our duty to the State comes first and that to our province, our district, our town and our self comes next.

We need a wider outlook; an outlook that transcends the boundaries of provinces, limited nationalism and racialism. We must develop a sense of patriotism that should galvanize and weld us all in into one united and strong nation.’

In a thought provoking speech, Jinnah’s inherent desire for his people to have a sense of distinguishing their roles and duties vis a vis their provinces and the State, is quite evident.

Also manifest is the superiority that he attaches to the idea of patriotism in terms of national ownership of the State and the people in it. Another point of emphasis is Jinnah’s interpretation of provinces as mere territorial units. That is to say that the sanctity of their individual boundaries is duly respectable but does not in any sense surpass the importance of *national* affiliation. Quaid’s referral to such a territorially bounded logic of affiliation as ‘limited nationalism’ is an aptly put phrase that engenders a very broad sense of prevalent dissension and disunity on national level that remains absolutely relevant at present as well.

In general, the fundamental themes derived from political discourse generated under Muhammad Ali Jinnah during his brief governor general-ship are rooted in his experiences during these early years of independence. To begin with, one of the major themes in the entire political rhetoric is Jinnah’s assertion that nation and state go hand in hand. He distinguishes state and nation on administrative intervals, terming the state as a collection of administrative and institutional set-ups. For Jinnah, the efficacy of these set-ups and their maximal performance is embedded in the effective construction of nations as firm, resolute, and well-bound groups who place the national interest above their respective individual interests. Not just the political discourses constructed during the early years revolve around inclusiveness to generate a cohesive sense of identity among people from all provincial units. It also suggests equal representation as an effective means to ensure the inculcation of such a sentiment. As such, Jinnah’s views on inducing a sense of nationhood do aim at harbouring this sentiment

alongside Muslim nationalism. However, this religious mention is quite moderately manifest. Another significant theme of the political discourse generated under Jinnah reflects self-sacrifice and the notion of prioritizing national interests over individual interests and aspirations as fundamentally important in constructing a united nation.

3.3 Pakistan's Nationhood under Ayub Khan (1958-1969)

Ayub Khan entered the government in a military coup imposed on October 27th, 1958. Khan's declared and underlying motives behind instating himself as the head of the country were based in bringing about economic growth, prosperity and adding to the stature of the country on the international front. Politically, Ayub Khan's justification in taking the driving seat of Pakistan is embedded in his attention to chalking out a stable constitution and the preceding political turmoil that prevailed between 1947 and 1958. In the course of four inconsistent terms, these first ten years were marked by episodic jostling for power and a state of weakened political system. Ayub's main area of interest after coming to power was to address the political weakening in the country, with a keen focus on illiteracy. In doing so, Khan's political rhetoric also portrays glimpses of fostering a sense of collective association among the citizens of Pakistan. A central theme of this indoctrination however, has been a focus on turning to religious affinity into a fundamental and defining element of nationhood. Events such as the constitutional crisis, the traditionally continued incidents of violence in the east Pakistan and the conflict with India in 1965 marked important focal points in transforming the political rhetoric from time to time. National consolidation and overcoming internal dissensions was not merely a construct that should have been in the nation but also a necessity to confront the external aggression.

Just as Quaid e Azam before him, nationhood does enjoy a superior and noteworthy position Ayub Khan's political rhetoric but it runs parallel with the supremacy of state i.e. in

administrative/institutional terms and the primacy of incorporating the religious component in order to form well-bounded nations. Ayub Khan's rhetoric on inculcating a deep sense of nationhood also projects that the internalization of such a sentiment can be ensured by means of inducing a spirit of sacrifice and through education alongside religion. In this context, the presidential addresses to the 'nation' on the first day of each month were also a norm under Khan's term. Despite the declared and underlying promises of building the Pakistani nation and steering it towards the right path, Ayub's role in nurturing a sense of national ownership among Pakistanis remains controversial in the historical accounts. It is also pertinent to mention here that the intended modernization that Ayub Khan envisaged for the country also stemmed from his version of political Islam, some glimpses of which are mentioned in the following paragraphs.

In his presidential address on March 23rd, 1959 while reiterating the spirit of Pakistan Day, Ayub Khan said that;

‘...the true greatness of a country is judged not so much by its physical proportions as by a united character of its people.’

The contextual relevance of the day and the archival evidences suggest the pertinence of this piece and the seriousness of the public towards hearing this broadcast. The use of comparison in order to remind the audience of the kind of unity that was needed of them is indeed an intriguing point to note.

On March 2nd, 1964, in an address to a charged political gathering, Ayub attributed national integration as not just necessary but essentially a product of political stability. In contending so the President used the word ‘precedence’ to point the place of national integration among the people of the country contending;

‘...political stability is a pre requisite for national integration that has precedence over all other things in the country.’

A similar instance from Ayub's political discourse is that from March 29th, 1964 when on the issue of allowing Balochis in the Pakistan Muslim League, Ayub Khan spoke highly of his party as a '*national*' party that was open to all '*patriots*' of the country, '*sincerely committed*' to work towards its advancement. In welcoming the said Balochis, Ayub made it clear that what Pakistan demanded of them was a '*selfless*' service to it and its nation. This does show some glimpses of provincial parity that might have been an important agenda in Khan's politics, but the depth of this thought in comparison with that of Quaid's remains fairly less.

In another speech made at in the same month i.e. March, 1964 at a Civic Reception at Dacca, President Ayub Khan keenly stressed the significance of a staunchly united nation. This speech was addressed at a public gathering that in the light of archival evidence was immensely thick. Khan went on to make some historically important points in this political speech. It clears his vision on nationhood by a great deal. In establishing the need for unity as something that could lead the country out of its problem he said;

‘...all that exercise of effort in developing and building the country is possible, only if there is complete unity on the basic problems of the country. That is absolutely vital because unless there is a unity of thought among the people, any amount of development that may take place is not going to help the matters. We will always be vulnerable, the country will be vulnerable and all that we have achieved will be vulnerable unless people are united in their thought and therefore, in their action.’

The most significant part of the aforementioned excerpt is Khan's emphasis on the 'unity of thought on the basic issues'. It is perhaps this phrase that makes this part of the speech relevant even in the current times. It is in terms of developing this sense of national affiliation and unity on the basic needs and concerns of national importance that the present Pakistani society suffers with a state of absolute dissension and chaos. In addition to this he made it clear that in stressing integration on the basic issues of states he nowhere implied that

the provincial leaders must forget their grudges and grouses for the centre. Instead, he contended;

‘...let us have our local complaints and grouses by all means, let us also express and air these so that they are rectified. But there must be unity on essentials of Pakistan.’

He regarded in this speech of his, the unity of thought among people and patriotism towards Pakistan and dying for it if need be as basic requirements that were expected out of nationalist Pakistani. Attending to the provincial harmony, Khan’s assertion was that in establishing a successful and consolidated state of Pakistan it was critical that the people in its provinces were close despite being territorially apart. Now, as much as the discussed points of emphasis in this speech project Ayub’s emphasis on nationhood and his efforts in garnering that sense among the individuals, his understanding of patriotism as merely a sentiment to die for one’s homeland appears to be quite narrow.

In his address at a gathering in Dacca on August 26th, 1964 President Ayub Khan made a spirited plea for national integration and unity in the context of Muslim history. This stands again, in lines with his previous referral to Muslim nationalism as the basis of Pakistani nationhood (discussed in an earlier instance). He held that;

‘...it is a pity that the Muslims of subcontinent did not have unity of thought and that whenever they talked of Muslims they forgot their association with them. It is very necessary to strengthen ourselves unanimously. Our betterment lies in Islamic nationalism which we should promote at all costs.’

For him, this stood as a major impediment in the way of emerging as ‘one’ nation. Ayub Kahn’s episodic relapse into the institution of Islamic thought as the definitive niche of Pakistani identity distinguishes his political rhetoric from that of Quaid e Azam who moderately referred to the element of ‘Muslamaniat’ in defining the nationals of Pakistan. As the speech in question was made in Dacca and was addressed to the people, many of whom had separatist indulgences, Ayub vehemently tried to shun down such sentiments and instead contended that;

‘Those who preach separatist tendencies are not friends of the country. No nation can develop if its people instead of working for the good and welfare of their community continue to preach such sentiments that create differences among the Punjabis, Bengalis and Pathans.’

On December 24th, 1964, a day before the birth anniversary of Quaid e Azam, President Ayub Khan in his address to the nation stressed the need for national consolidation. He asserted that;

‘First and foremost the Quaid asserted on us unity, faith and discipline. In the light of this, the people must re-dedicate themselves to the consolidation and progress of Pakistan and must refrain from creating confusion, dissension and chaos.’

Ayub Khan’s thoughts on nation- building and developing a cohesive sense of nationhood lied at great lengths from what Quaid had himself projected and upheld through his political rhetoric. Yet, it is intriguing how he reiterates the spirit in Quaid’s slogan of ‘Unity Faith and Discipline’. An important point of concern in the aforementioned excerpt is the usage of the term ‘re’-dedicate. It signifies the reality of a national society that was perhaps fragmented or insufficiently bonded that Khan felt the need to address the concern as an altogether re-dedication of resources in attaining the envisioned state of unity. In lexical terms, it is intriguing to note the usage of terms synonymous in meaning i.e. confusion, dissension and chaos to chalk out the needless attributes in a healthy national character. Contextually, this recommendation on consolidating and emerging as one unit preceded an important event. That is that the country was expecting its first ever general elections in a few months after that this speech was made.

In a statement issued on January 21st, 1965 in the post-election milieu characterized by political elites pitted against each other, Khan stressed the reality that members from all political parties were in fact all ‘citizens’ of Pakistan. He added that now that the elections were over they must work as true patriots towards the betterment of their country and their nation and close all doors of previous political wrangling. He urged the political workers to put aside all passions of prejudice in order to emerge as one nation that was cognizant of its

strength and greatness. He reiterated the above concerns in his address to the nation on February 2nd, 1965, asserting that with a successful conclusion of the election process, the public as well as the political workers were bound to set aside their factional and personal considerations and work in close coherence with each other to build an ideal state to live in.

In another instance, on April 13th, 1965 during his address to the nation on the auspicious occasion of Eid, Ayub Khan yet again emphasized the need to constructively build nations through inculcating a deep spirit of sacrifice among the people. He held that;

‘May the spirit of sacrifice for a higher cause inculcated by this day be our guiding light in all walks of life. No nation can progress or even survive unless it learns to make sacrifices.’

Regardless of the fact that the speech was made on the occasion of Eid ul Azha that itself embodies the said spirit, generally too, Ayub’s rhetoric borrows a great deal from the religious teachings of Islam. His side by side placement of nationhood and religious teachings will be evidently manifest in the course of the instances borrowed from archives in the following paragraphs. In the aforementioned excerpt from his speech, it is indeed fascinating to note his equation of national survival with a religiously driven sentiment of sacrifice. It also signifies the primacy of sacrifice in terming it as vitally important for ‘national’ survival.

In his speech made on April 29th, 1965, while addressing a religious gathering, Ayub Khan stressed the role of prayers beyond being a mere religious obligation. He asserted that;

‘The Ulema and pesh Imams had also a great role to play in impressing upon the people the need for collective work and by their action they would be helping the cause of our nation. I urge the people of our great nation to welcome the said teachings and make them a part of their daily lives.’

This highlights the emphasis that Khan placed on the role of religious leaders in indoctrinating a sense of ‘collective’, unified sentiment of national togetherness as a critical ingredient of building nations. The direction to make add the religiously guided teachings of

collective work and action a part of daily individual life adds to the pertinence of Islamic teachings and their relationship with nationhood, as forged by Khan.

President's speech at the Lahore Anjuman made in May, 1965 also reflects his views on patriotism and the means through which it and other forms of national adherence could be instilled in the Pakistani nation. One of the most significant excerpts from the said speech quotes that;

‘I would like the Anjuman to intensify its efforts to infuse the spirit of patriotism and Muslim nationalism, search for stability and national service among the citizens of this country.’

This excerpt is of great importance as it puts forth an important part of Ayub's political rhetoric i.e. Muslim nationalism. It must be kept in mind that by this Muslim nationalism Ayub Khan did not only mean the Muslim nationalist ideology that was the basis of Pakistan's creation but also a sense of faith in adhering to the State of Pakistan and the diverse ethnicities in it on the basis of unity and equality. The use of words ‘infuse’ and ‘intensify’ point to two realities i.e. one that they essentialize the role of religious thought in developing a strong sense of nationhood. And two, ‘intensifying’ the course of such an infusion establishes the probable unsatisfactorily united nation back in that time.

In his broadcast address to the nation on August 1st, 1965, while iterating his dealings with the US delegates over delayed financial instalments in the backdrop of tensions with India Khan said,

‘...my reaction to all this was as simple and straight forward as that of any patriotic Pakistani who values his nation's honour and security more than anything else.’

As brief as it is, the definitional elements of a patriot as uttered by Ayub Khan stand of much importance in his political discourse. Khan evidently puts national honour and security as features of a ‘patriotic’ Pakistani. There is no mention of a sense of cohesion and nationalism among the provincial ethnicities. This interpretation of patriotism stands in stark

difference to that of Quaid's who attributed central importance to internal harmony in defining a patriotic Pakistani.

In his broadcast address aired on the first day of September, 1965 when the India and Pakistan were locked in a state of heightened tensions, Khan ensured that his words were meaningful enough to stress the need for internal cohesion among the people. There were other several important aspects of this address as well that tried to best serve as a motivating force during times of crisis. His concluding words were that;

‘...my fellow countrymen it is in times like these that nations fulfil their destiny. They survive by the strength of their faith and their united character. May god grant us the courage to face this trial with courage and determination.’

As much as the confrontation was a gruesome affair, Ayub didn't seem to have missed the chance of iterating the fruits of unity. Also, in this instance, his equation of such a unity with the achievement of a national destiny that is perhaps an ideal state to be in is also intriguing.

Hence, the general themes from the political rhetoric that took roots under Gen Ayub Khan can be classified under the broad categories of self-less sacrifice, education, national integration, political stability, role of religious institutions and a very narrow understanding of patriotism as fundamental ingredients critical in survival of nations. In the context of education, it was in an address made at the Inauguration of the Aligarh Convention, that President Ayub Khan suggested the importance of a single syllabus in schools and a uniform education system as central to establishing a sense of closely knit national spirit. He stressed the introduction of similar syllabus in schools all over Pakistan in all subjects as far as possible in order to prepare human material for advanced training and inculcating among the students a spirit of the Pakistan ideology. In the light of the afore-discussed political rhetoric, Ayub's role, more precisely, his efforts as a leader, in instilling a sense of national communion among

the people of Pakistan beyond their geographical, ethnic and other micro affiliations can be ascertained. Ayub Khan has been perhaps the only leader in Pakistan's political history who developed a system of addressing the nation every month in order to develop with them an association and also to update them about the challenges confronting the country. Mostly, as is explained above, it is in these addresses that Khan has stressed the need of united, cohesive and well-bounded nations. His addresses also speak of provinces as geographical divisions and not as something that has the potential to internally divide the nationals. That said, although a sense of ethnic and provincial parity is evident through the said discourse, it still appears distinct from Quaid e Azam's clear and vehement shunning of fostering inter-provincial differences. Another significant addition that appears in his rhetoric is the mention of Islamic/ Muslim nationalism as basis of constructing an integrated nation. It is confusing as well as paradoxical and more than anything it depicts a shift from Quaid e Azam's moderately religious rhetoric.

3.3 Pakistan's Nationhood under Zulfikar Ali Bhutto (1971-1977)

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto is classified as one of the most warm-headed, outrageously blatant in his rhetoric yet intellectually capable leader associated with Pakistan. His political expertise and his abilities as a negotiator and otherwise as a politician have intrigued many political historians. Tracing the origin of Bhutto's political presence has been a rather tough task. Various political analysts suggest recording Bhutto's political rhetoric since the year 1948. This suggestion is based on his active role as a student in the Pakistan movement under the valued leadership of Quaid e Azam himself. However, if considered on practical grounds, Bhutto entered the stage of Pakistani politics as a minister in Gen. Ayub Khan's cabinet in 1958. It was eventually with due course of time and in the light of his overarching ambition, that Bhutto managed to be appointed as the foreign minister of Pakistan in 1963. As a foreign

minister of a country struggling through the early years of its independence, Bhutto's policy was open-ended rather very independent in every aspect. As a consequence of coming up with such an open ended framework of foreign policy, differences on procedural grounds began to take roots in Bhutto's ties with Ayub Khan. The frustration and disenchantment in the said regard eventually led Bhutto to resign from Ayub Khan's cabinet in 1966, only to pursue his independent political career. In this course, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto formed his own political party in 1967 under the name of Pakistan People's Party (PPP).

Initially, Bhutto's struggle was antagonistically based around putting an end to Ayub Khan's dictatorial regime and uncovering the poor prioritization of national affairs in the party during his service as a minister. In a very brief time period of roughly a year or two, the PPP earned popularity among the masses. This popularity made itself uproariously evident in the 1970 elections when PPP stood victorious- sweeping majority in both wings of the country. Speaking of wings, the East Pakistan conundrum is one the most significant and most studied political blunders of Bhutto's rule. The fact that the tragic fiasco was experienced under the leadership of Bhutto does not establish his role in it (even though many contend otherwise). Despite the immensity of this blunder Bhutto and his party managed to keep the popular support. Until, year by year further political errors took place, worsening the condition for the party. One of the said political errors and perhaps the largest, was the 1973 military crackdown in Baluchistan that Bhutto ordered fearing an uprising from the province. It was feared that Baluchistan might become the next Bangladesh for Pakistan as a consequence of this act. The tensions rooted in the province back then continue to loom till date. Also troublesome was Bhutto's assent to the Anti Ahmedi laws in the country in 1974, declaring them as non-Muslims. It is argued that he did so to please the religious stakeholders in the government and also as a desperate face-saving tactic. This act gravely tarnished the already crumbling state of national cohesion in the country that was marked by prevalent

aversion from the Ahmedis. Disunity and fragmentation of the national institutions, including the nation itself continued, paving the path for Gen. Zia ul Haq to take over the country in 1977 (Zafar, 2014).

The said political milieu from Bhutto's term in office has been laid down in order to contextualize the significance of national affiliation/nationhood that must have been eliminated/ poorly tarnished during such disorder and chaos. The necessity of unpacking the sense of nationalism that prevailed under Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in the light of his popular speeches addressed to huge gatherings is augmented, given the afore-explained events that took place under his rule. With leaders pitted against each other and in manifesting policies of crackdowns and segregation, the following paragraphs trace the impact of Bhutto's political rhetoric on the sense of national ownership among the masses. Bhutto's rhetoric and the one primarily directly targeting internal unity in Pakistan is rare.

However, the archival evidences do suggest his indirect referral to the essentiality of national integration in various forms. For instance, in his address at the Young Lawyers Association at Lahore on February 25th, 1967, while popularizing his newly established political party among the public, he said that;

‘... our country presently needs political stability. But what is this political stability? It refers to stability in policy, in points of view, in national prestige and in love for ones homeland. What our nation presently needs is this stability, this permanence in ideology, in approach, and it cannot be found in elusiveness. We need permanence in singleness of our national purpose. Let's leave to the people to decide upon the fate of this country and their own fate as united nationals of Pakistan.’

The said political rhetoric puts forth political stability in terms of a state of constancy in the national prestige and sentiments towards ones country. Though the excerpt does not directly reflect on internal unity, the phrase such as ‘united nation’ and ‘singleness of our national purpose’ do signify and convey a sense of political agreement over national concerns.

In his address at the Muzafargarh Bar Association in January, 1968, Bhutto tried to align the disenchanted people from different provinces from Pakistan who stood against each other along a trajectory of unfair economics. For Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the leaders following Quaid e Azam and Liaquat Ali Khan had damaged the country beyond just weakening its political fabric. For him, a larger damage was inflicted in terms of economy. Bhutto was a huge fan of socialism, which he referred to in a Pakistani context as the ‘Islamic socialism’. And he ardently believed that all curses including poverty, weak administrative frameworks and national disunity were all inherent in the faulty economic structure of Pakistan. In the said speech he made a similar reference and contended that;

‘... in Sindh, my people are unhappy. If I go to Punjab, I see unhappiness. In the frontier also, people are unhappy. Also, in Baluchistan. In East Pakistan too, the people are unhappy. They are all unhappy because they are living under a system of exploitation. It is not a Sindhi exploiting a Punjabi or a Punjabi exploiting a Balochis. I am certain that my people are united in their resolve and spirit against the system that is exploitative. Change the system and all your tensions will ease.’

In singularly attending to the disenchanted masses in every province, Bhutto’s rhetoric not just develops a realization of their distinctive characters but also goes on to build up a notion of trust in them. In contending the certainty in their togetherness, the rhetoric places the blame of garnering disunity in the non-socialist system of economy. This theme of leading to socialist explanations of dissension and chaos will be noticed in further instances as well. In the same speech while stressing the need for integration among the people of Pakistan, Bhutto held that;

‘... we need internal unity. We need internal strength. Unity does not come for the asking. People must know what unity means. People must know what unity is going to bring. It is essential for our country to get together, for a better future for itself.’

This makes one of the very few instances where Bhutto stresses the significance of unity within. Although, the said understanding of unity conveys quite a materialistic

explanation in terms of questioning what lies at the end of it. Not seeing it as an end in itself and essentially a necessity does not really add to the depth in Bhutto's thought.

In an address to the female workers of his party in January 1968, Bhutto stressed the role of women in the success and prosperity of nations. In doing so, he contended that,

‘... you have all the rights to participate in the nation building efforts. You have a great task ahead of you to build Pakistan. Pakistan cannot be built by any one section of its society. All of us have to harmonise our efforts and work collectively in a spirit of equality in order to confront the challenges that face the country.’

Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto was known for his liberalist stance in and beyond Pakistan. This speech portrays glimpses of his inclusive stance vis a vis women and the role he thought they could play in building integrated nations. The use of words such as ‘harmonise’ and ‘collectively’ add to the spirit of nationhood; or at least an urge to facilitate it. In his address at the Nawabshah Bar Association in February 1968, Bhutto took the same road of iterating the glory of Muslims and their resilience in bringing Pakistan to life. But contextually, as the contestation with India over Kashmir had passed just two years ago, the speeches made between 1966 and 1968 portray an effort of instilling a realization among the public regarding reuniting as one nation. In Bhutto's political rhetoric however, as has been stressed earlier, this realization came alongside an urgency to end the manipulation and instate a socialist system of economy. In the said address Bhutto resorted to a conversational style of speech and asked the addressees;

‘...in the history of mankind, has unity sprung from exploitation and domination? Unity has emerged from equality and a sense of justice which are denied to the people in this country of ours. Why should the crisis mount and the unity among our countrymen weaken? The government must be consolidating the unity of this fine nation, this great nation, which, united together had succeeded in carving out Pakistan against the opposition of Congress and British imperialism. This is the same nation he said, that united magnificently then and it is capable of uniting again if you remove domination and exploitation and give it equality and justice.’

In iterating his traditional linking of unity with an economic system, ill-suited to the country, Bhutto's emphasis in this instance is placed more on the factors that instil unity and a

sense of togetherness. Thematically, the attribution of indoctrinating unity as a sentiment as a task that falls under the responsibility of the ruling government, also forms an important point. Bhutto used his nostalgic relapse into the glorious independence as a plea for binding the people in search of potentially the same consequences in the conclusion of the excerpt. Such a conclusion does add by leaps and bounds to the motivation level of the public in troublesome times.

In a pamphlet released in the late 1960s, Bhutto penned down the political milieu that prevailed. In the said pamphlet he covered all social, political and economic aspects of administration in both wings of the country. As contextually speaking, the seeds of discord sown in the East wing were beginning to outgrow the hollow state of association; Bhutto immensely emphasized the need for unity and renewed national affiliation in this pamphlet. He said,

‘Pakistan is one nation, an indivisible nation. The division by geography does not divide the nation. No part of it has any precedence over the other, for all are equal. Pakistan was cast in one piece at one and same time. Neither of its geographical parts has the right to the name of Pakistan to the exclusion of the other. The people of both wings have suffered and sacrificed for the sake of freedom, for the sake of Pakistan. But they must remember that national interest is common and that unity will return if all parts are administered with democratic equality.’

Now although the directions to feed collective existence as one unit and elimination of all discords were made in the context of East Pakistan, Bhutto’s lexical choice of words and his vehement negation of territorial divisions indeed communicate an impactful need for a deep sense of nation-ness/ national affiliation that was critical for Pakistan.

In his address to the nation in a Radio broadcast after assuming the government with a sweeping majority, Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto reflected on the challenges that confronted Pakistan. In shedding light on the pressing issues, he contended that;

‘... it was an unfortunate reality that after 23 years of its existence, the country was jostling over the institution of a comprehensive constitution. This coupled with prevalent

regional and provincial prejudices were major impediments in the course of Pakistanis to emerge as a true nation.'

In a statement that ended up as an important part of the historical and political discourse, Bhutto communicated his concern and the urgency to align 'together' on a national basis, in the following words;

'Despite the depressing disparities, I have a firm believe that this great nation will emerge united in near future. I promise the people of Pakistan to put an end to all social evils that have degenerated our society. We will make it a priority to respect all cultures and all languages of all our people. The provincial autonomy will be safeguarded to the optimum and we will make sure the existence of a well-connected pluralistic society that cherishes the diversity in its culture.'

It is important to take note of the tone in establishing the realization among the masses to recognize the people in other provinces of the country as their brethren. Also of great significance is Bhutto's point of celebrating diversity instead of feeding on it to nurture dissension and discord.

In general terms, a study of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's political discourse reveals an inherently monotonous collection of justifications for the decisions he made as the foreign minister and later as the leader at the helm of affairs. It is also based on repetitive reiterations of the former glory of Muslims in successfully earning independence for Pakistan on the basis of their unity. In terms of nationhood and infusion of a cohesive national sentiment, Bhutto's political rhetoric uses the phrase 'internal unity' to term the idyllic state of communion. The study of Bhutto's political rhetoric also reveals that his primary focus in almost all his addresses revolved around his validations for the socialist system as ideally suited for Pakistan's economy and its coherence with Islam. Glimpses of turning to religiously guided nationalism nationhood are also evident in Bhutto's rhetoric.

3.4 Pakistan's Nationhood under General Zia ul Haq (1977-1988)

General Zia ul Haq entered the stage of Pakistani politics in a military *coup d'état*, the third of its kind for the democratically infertile country, on July 5th, 1977. Zia ul Haq's policies and his so-called reformation of the Pakistani society have remained an important area of study for academics and political historians. Zia's policy and his outlook towards the governmental institutions were deeply rooted in a religious orientation. Despite contesting arguments pertaining to a meaningful national conditioning, there is a wide agreement on the fact that the breeding ground for Zia's religious reformation to gain impetus was in fact laid under Ayub regime and strengthened under that of Bhutto. With subsequent dosage of religion as the basis of nationhood, the leaders following Jinnah fed the masses of the people with a line of thought that they had hardly moved ahead of. By the time that Zia took power, the religious base had grown so strong among the people, that this period in Pakistan's history has been regarded by most academics as 'remaking' of Pakistani nation. Following the systemic ouster of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Zia resorted to make use of the same religiously motivated faction that had flourished under Bhutto himself, to build his case for re-constructing Pakistan on lines of Islamic teachings. Given the overt liberalism projected in the policies and rhetoric of his predecessor Bhutto, it wasn't very hard for Zia to turn the public against him and to re-align Pakistan's course of existence along a theocratic trajectory. Within a year of ceasing power, Zia managed to Islamize the Pakistani society, educationally, socially, politically, economically and culturally. In the course of this islamization however, the sense of Pakistani nationhood once again was re-situated along a religious orientation. That is to say that the 'Muslamaniat' trumped 'Pakistaniat'.

The political discourse generated under Zia for the afore-explained reasons is termed as religious-political discourse based on his two way politicization of religion and religiofication of politics. The said political discourse, as will be noted in the following paragraphs, is in stark difference

from the discourses on nationhood that prevailed under Jinnah and for that matter even under Ayub Khan Regime.

In his address to the nation on the beginning of new Islamic year, Zia urged the nation to stay collectively joined in their resolve and advancement into a new era. In relevance to the context, he stressed the need to abide by all principles of Islam and to inculcate them in the daily routines in order to emerge as well-constructed Muslim societies. It must be made clear from this point that in the entire political rhetoric, there are minimal instances of Zia's direct referral to Pakistanis as nationals or towards inculcating a sense of association with the country itself. Unlike others before him, Zia's address revolves around formation of a Muslim society and absolutely no mention of national character or national consolidation when stepping into a new year. This is very unlikely for a new year's speech. In an address made on 12th Rabbi Ul Awal that marks the birth of Holy Prophet (PBUH), Zia stressed with great vehemence that;

‘...what is the meaning of Pakistan? The meaning of Pakistan is that there is no God,
but God.’

This brief statement engenders the entire trajectory running in the General's head in his governance of Pakistan. It not just establishes the supremacy of God Almighty in defining the state of Pakistan but also conveys Zia's belief in the fact that He was sent as God's agent to save Pakistan from the tumultuous times that it had been confronting before his cessation of power.

Zia in an address at Lahore in February, 1978 reminded the audience of their national origin contending that;

‘...none of you must forget that you and this country of yours is a product of Muslim
nationalism. Your original ideology is that of Islamic nationalism and you must keep it alive
in your daily businesses.’

This conveys a rather very narrow understanding of nationalism that does not go beyond the Pakistan movement. It also establishes the fact that for Zia, the Muslim identity

never transformed ever since the creation of Pakistan and that the ‘national’ sentiment never grew enough to supersede or had the potential to run in parallel to the ‘religious’ component of the country. Similar overtones are evident in Zia’s speech made on March 23rd, 1978 at Pakistan Day Parade. In reiteration of the fundamental principles for national existence as chalked out by Jinnah, Zia stressed the need to *keep Unity, Faith and Discipline aglow*. This direction however tweaked Quaid’s message a bit. In Zia’s interpretation of the said principle, he urged the masses to recall the Muslim unity in the subcontinent and to make it a part of their lives. Another point of emphasis in the said address was Zia’s pledge to and from the Pakistan army. In a moment of religious reverence, he declared them Pakistan army personnel’s as

‘...soldiers of Islam whose goal was to make Pakistan an impregnable fortress of Islamic “ummah” ’.

Some of the most significant addresses made by Zia iterated the need of unity among the people of Pakistan in three popular contexts. One, as a pre requisite for infusing within a Muslim character. Two, along lines of Afghan policy, urging them to unite and show resilience to all external threats. Three, to establish Muslim unity as the driver of all state affairs. Not just does the nation-hood discourse that took roots under Zia project immense religiosity; it is also quite intense in its nature. That is to say that in numerous instances, Zia has equated nationhood and national ownership with the *shedding the last drop of blood in bodies to save national honour and pride*. Rare mentions of collective thought, internal unity and the development of a cohesively bonded national enterprise are available in the said discourse.

It is important to mention here that the lack of quotable references in Zia’s political discourse owe to the inefficiently recorded data at the National Archives.

Chapter 4: Conclusion

The study has tried to reflect on the subject of nationhood/ nationalism beyond its traditional understanding that largely surfaces from the eighteenth century European nationalism. The prime objective has been to elucidate nationhood/ nationalism beyond the spectrum of a politically motivated movement and to define it more in terms of a socially mediated human construct that tends to alter, given political manipulation. With a keen attention directed towards unpacking theoretical explanations on nation-building, a deeper understanding about the construction of ‘national’ consciousness, and that sense of associating with one’s ‘national’ identity, is established in the light of theoretical and conceptual underpinnings available in the field. The issue of problematic attention to nationhood as a mere sense of collective existence in contradistinction to the immediate neighbour is also addressed in the theoretical explanations. Extraordinary significance is accorded to the evolution of post-modern thought that contributed remarkably in terms of adding multi-faceted dimensions to the nationalist discourse. The trajectory has been explained viewing the phenomenon in a broad fashion, beyond the subject of loyalty to and dying/killing in the name of one’s nation.

The need to understand nationhood along a psychological understanding of association emanating from patriotism-centred overtones is discussed. The study equates nationalism with underexplored phenomenon such as nation-ness and nationhood which rationalize national existence beyond the proclivities derived from the discourses that offer scanty explanations for contemporary times. It places at the centre, the significance attached to the discursive construction of nations/nationalities in social settings and their relevance in ensuring an integrated/ well-bounded ‘nation-al’ societies with particular reference to Pakistan.

A discussion on Pakistan is carried in the light of the theoretical underpinnings highlighting its troublesome inception and ensuing struggle that followed its creation. The study has revealed the case of Pakistan in terms of nationhood/ nationalism as immensely convoluted and labyrinthine. The development of national bond as a sentiment has been explored alongside the political discourse fed to the people in the earliest years of Pakistan's existence. In doing so, attention is also directed at the quest for a separate homeland i.e. Pakistan that initially developed out of a purely religious niche. The emergence of a religiously steered nationalism and its mutation into a politically- centred sense of nationhood, owing to the contemporary developments, unfolded by time, in the post -partition phase have been discussed in great depth. The political discourses of prominent leaders from the first forty years of independence have been included to make sense of the said transformation and the consequent faulty orientation of national affiliation. The study reveals the failure of Pakistani ruling class to understand the inherent impossibility in co-opting faith and nationalism (or national chauvinism) as one of the major reasons behind a lost sense of nationhood. It would be an understatement to disregard the complexities that the Pakistanis as a collective nation have faced in letting go one niche and transferring to another. The study of political discourse in the preceding chapter ascertains that in the course of this transition, a huge chunk of the Pakistani nation appears to have been left stranded at their hoary inclinations, guarding the religious dogma as a definitive element of their nationality (sense of nationhood). Hence, it is observed that the earliest glimpses of nationhood with regards to Pakistan rightfully embody an illustration of 'Islamic cohesion' which should have conversely been, 'national' cohesion from the first day of its existence.

Seven decades following the formation of Pakistan, religion has proved itself incontestably inadequate in 'nationalizing' (inculcating a sense of integrated nationhood in) the Pakistani nation. It has however stimulated national fragmentation (Akbar, 2011; Ram,

2015). That said, the role of religion, is too broad a category and one that demands a fair share of attention, especially in case of Pakistan. The scope of the dissertation was hence, confined to analysing the role of Pakistan's *political* leadership in construction of its nationalist discourse, primarily through rhetoric and their public speeches. Considering a state of national integration/cohesion that isn't idyllic, the aim has been to decipher the sense of nationhood among Pakistanis and its construction. National fragmentation as a root cause of internal conflicts can only be understood with a prior insight into and a deeper cognizance about the construction of discourse on nationhood in the first place. Such an insight includes the role political elites in potentially all realms of nation-building. Pakistan's nationalist discourse built during its early years is unpacked with the aim of tracing the reasons behind the formation of a divided, fragmented and a friable 'nation'. As has been noted in earlier parts of the study, the use of terms such as nationalist, nationalism, nationalistic have been implied to refer to patriotic and nationhood-centred connotations of the idea and not the Pakistan movement.

It has been observed that this intricate tale of Pakistani nationhood also has other intriguing yet, simultaneously perplexing dimensions to it. That is to say that at home, the 'microidentity' that prevails (supersedes/overshadows) the 'national' allegiance is always an individual's ethnic origin (Ram, 2015). Upsetting as it may appear, Baloch, Pashtun, Punjabi and Sindhi presence of individuals has at many times overshadowed their existence as 'Pakistanis'. And, as a derivative of multiple complex reasons, these provincial ethnicities hold against each other, adamant cynicism. On the other hand however, these Pakistanis despite their divergent ethnic associations are noticed to be quite accommodating and patronizing towards other Pakistanis in a 'foreign' setting. It is indeed distressing to make sense of what exactly is the materializing force behind the projection of nation-ness abroad and not at home. It is in the light of the aforesaid considerations that the 'social' construction

of Pakistani 'national' from a political standpoint is assessed in the dissertation. Keeping in view Pakistan's political history that is marked by course of an intermittent democracy and episodic military interventions, immense significance is attributed to regime inputs in terms of establishing the 'national' component. It must be noted that, in arguing national fragmentation and internal conflicts as a major concern to Pakistan at present, the factors such as unequal resource allocation and other grievances towards the centre have been purposefully left out of the scope of this study. The dissertation has attempted to explore the case of Pakistan's nationhood that otherwise has remained rather amorphous and underexplored.

References

- Ahmed, D. R. (2001). Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah's Functioning as the First Governor
Genreal of Pakistan 1947-1948. *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture*, 11-19.
- Akbar, M. J. (2011). *Tinderbox: The Past and Future of Pakistan*. India: Thompson Press.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*.
London: Verso.
- Andrews, T. (2012). What is Social Constructionism. *Grounded Theory Review*, 1(11).
- Aziz, K. K. (2015). *The Making of Pakistan*. Rawalpindi: Izharsons Printers.
- Berger, P., & Luckman, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality*. England: Clays Ltd.
- Bhabha, H. (1999). *Nations and Narrations*. New York: Routledge.
- Billig, M. (1997). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Billig, M. (2002). *Banal Nationalism*. India: Sage Publications.
- Brubaker, R. (1996). *Nationalism Reframed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brubaker, R. (1996). Rethinking Nationhood: Nation as institutionalized form, practical category,
contingent event. In R. Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed:nationhood and National Question
in New Europe* (pp. 13-22). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1986). Social Construction, Language and Authority of Knowledge: A Biographical
Essay. *National Council of Teachers of English*, 773-790.
- Burki, S. J. (1986). *Pakistan: A Nation in the Making*. Westview Press.

- Calhoun, C. (1997). *Nationalism*. Chicago: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cohen, S. P. (2002). The Nation and State of Pakistan. *Washington Quarterly*, 25(3), 109-122.
- Connor, W. (2010). A Nation is a nation, is a state, is an ethnic group, is a... *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 1(4), 377-400.
- Connor, W. (2010). When is a Nation? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 92-100.
- Conversi, D. (1997). *The Basques, The Catalans and Spain: Alternative Routes to Nationalist Mobilization*. Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press.
- Croucher, S. L. (2003). Perpetual Imagining: Nationhood in Global Era. *International Studies Review*, 1-24.
- Day, G., & Thompson, A. (2004). *Theorizing Nationalism*. New York: Macmillan.
- Day, G., & Thompson, A. (2005). *Theorizing Nationalism*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Geertz, C. (1998). Integrative Solutions: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in New States. In A. D. Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism* (pp. 70-97). London: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (2000). *Available Light; Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. England: Basil Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Greenfeld, L. (1993). *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. England: Harvard University Press.
- Hechter, M. (1977). *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1989). *The Age of the Empire*. New York: Vintage.

- Hoodbhoy, P. A., & Nayyar, A. H. (1985). Rewriting the History of Pakistan. In A. Khan, *Islam, Politics and the State: The Pakistan Experience* (pp. 164-177). London: Zed Books.
- Hyman, A. (1986). Pakistan in Uncertain Times. *The Royal Institute of International Affairs*, 118-121.
- Janowitz, M. (1983). *The Reconstruction of Patriotism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kedourie, E. (1960). *Nationalism*. London: Hutchinson.
- Kohn, H. (1944). *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study of its Origin and Background*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Kohn, H. (1965). *Nationalism, Its Meaning and History*. Florida, USA: ROBERT E. KRIEGER PUBLISHING COMPANY.
- LaPorte, R. (1999). Pakistan: A Nation Still in the Making. In S. S. Harrison, P. H. Kriesberg, & D. Kux, *India and Pakistan: First fifty Years* (pp. 45-60). United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Marriott, A. (2000). Nationalism and Nationality in India and Pakistan. *Geographical Association*, 85(2), 173-178.
- Nasr, S. V. (2005). National Identities and India Pakistan Conflict. In T. V. Paul, *India Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry* (pp. 178-201). New York: Cambridge.
- Ortega, A. G. (2013, August). The Social Construction of the Spanish Nation: A Discourse- Based Approach. University of Birmingham.
- Qureshi, S. M. (1972-1973). Pakistani Nationalism Reconsidered. *Pacific Affairs*, 45(4), 556-572.
- Ram, M. M. (2015). When Identity and Politics meet Strife-torn Pakistan. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 21(3), 313-334.
- Renan, E. (1996). What is a Nation. In G. E. Sunny, *Becoming a National: A Reader* (pp. 40-55). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Shafqat, S. (2009). Pakistani National Identity: Muslim, Multilingual, Multicultural? *Quarterly Research and News*, 2-5.
- Shin, H. J., & Schwartz, M. (2003). The Duality of Patriotism. *Peace Review*, 15(4), 419-426.
- Smith, A. (2000). The Sacred Dimension of Nationalism. *Journal of International Studies*, 791-814.
- Smith, A. (2002). *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology and History*. Wiley.
- Thornton, T. P. (1999). Pakistan: Fifty Years of Insecurity. In S. S. Harrison, P. H. Kriesberg, & D. Kux, *India and Pakistan: The First Fifty Years* (pp. 170-188). United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Thornton, T. P. (1999). Pakistan: Fifty Years of Insecurity. In P. H. Selig S. Harrison, *India and Pakistan; The First Fifty Years* (pp. 170-188). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ting, H. (2008). The Social Construction of a Nation: A theoretical Exploration. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 14(3), 453-482.
- Watson, H. S. (1977). *Nations and States: An Inquiry into the Political Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.
- Widmalm, S. (2013). Kashmir Conflict and Nationalism in India and Pakistan. In I. Talbot, *The Independence of India and Pakistan: New Approaches and Reflections* (pp. 186-199). Karachi: Oxford University Press.