

149 What education

Prof. Shamsul Haque

US... that any serious discussion on education must consist of two parts—first and foremost—the philosophy of education that primarily centres round man, his ultimate destiny; second, the mechanics of education that are related to the organisational and psychological side of education. The first must determine the end, the second, the ways and means of achieving that end. The first may be compared with the 'Statue' and the second with the 'Scaffolding'. If we come to agreement with the ultimate end of education in relation to man and his destiny—the sort of life he has to lead and the ideals he aspires to achieve, we can easily group round him the accessories of his life.

Every age has assumed its own meaning of human life and to achieve that life has made demands upon education. The materialism of the West no less than the economic determinism of Karl Marx has made its own assumption about man. The educational system under both the social orders—Capitalism and Communism must necessarily be organised in a way as to achieve their respective goals—material prosperity in the one and the 'dehumanised' citizen in the other. One is educated to worship Mammon and the other to deify the Party and the State.

We will however begin by

saying that the central figure in any scheme of education is man, not only as a creature of necessity imposed by environmental and inherited conditions, but more as a self-determining person whose actions are to some degree determined by rational foresight and consideration. The prime purpose of education, therefore, is to enlighten students in the way in which free, rational and responsible choices are made. This is the other and more important part of self-knowledge. Our key word in all educational discussions is the word "freedom". We take notice of the expressions of human freedom that are evident in science, in arts and in friendship. Our ability to understand others depends, upon our sharing a common humanity with them and through a common humanity, common experience. Our concept of education is at variance with the American concept on the one hand, in which the lives of young people are shaped by circumstances and on the other from the totalitarian concept in which man is educated only to be an "obedient citizen" or a "loyal worker". Our concept of education is concerned with the way in which man as a rational being is able to learn to understand circumstances and by understanding them to transform them. It is even more with the way in which man through

his rational powers and expressions of freedom conceives of the concrete ideals by which alone he can make his life, a "good life" in the ethical sense.

With this concept of education in mind my discussion on education will be incomplete if it fails to raise the question: should education in Bangladesh aim merely at fostering among the younger generation unreserved loyalties to social structures or, the state or should it also aim at creating conditions for the growth of personal freedom through which man creates himself, creates sciences, arts and other elements of human culture.

We live in two worlds—the world of social relationships and the world of personal relationships. In most of the political and economic theories, particularly in the Marxian theory of economic determinism, the world of personal relationships is often confused with the world of social relationships. The social scientist, bound by the laws of his discipline cannot help to look upon man merely as a social creature—a worker, a citizen, a follower or a leader. This is a partial view of man and his life. To look upon man only as a func-

tionary is to ignore him as a person—a total person with his resolves and purposes, his own wills and ideals, his own consciousness and freedom of choices.

Individuals entering into an institution or social structure do so for a purpose in which they share but the purpose is not equated with all the purposes and intentions of the members. Social structures exist for the partial intentions of the constituent members. The point for reflection is: by giving the due share of our loyalties to the social or political institutions do we exhaust all our royalties? The answer is unreservedly no. In any of these relationships we manifest only a part of ourselves. After giving our partial loyalties to all these institutions we still retain the core of our loyalty to ourselves. Our participations in social institutions is nothing more than a contract. A given individual may belong to a number of organisations—to the Trade Union to the Labour or Conservative Party, to the football club in his village or to a scientific or cultural society. But only a part of his loyalty is demanded and given by him to the institutions to which he belongs as a member. In doing

should aim at

Shaidai

so he is manifesting only a part of his total personality that relates to the given purpose of the club or the political party. These institutions or organisations have no right or justification to make a total demand upon his person or loyalties. In these institutions I am not a total person. The sum-total of all these relationships does not exhaust all my love and loyalties. We are most ourselves when we have the freedom and the will to enter into communion with other human beings on purely personal level and not merely as a citizen, a member of a club or a political party. Communism stands condemned under this proposition. The entire scene there is dominated by "worker", the "person" is nowhere in existence.

Education in Bangladesh suffers from lack of a clear concept of man and his becoming although the whole teaching of Islam centres round this concept. Its neglect will only mean the weakening of faith in the fundamentals of human life. Islamic concept of man will challenge many generalisations in educations that are imported from abroad by our "phoren trained" specialists in education.

The structure of society is

not an end in itself but the "scaffolding" for human friendship and love—which are an end in itself. This conception arises out of our implicit faith in the dignity and worth of man round which the notions of Islamic sense of justice and universal brotherhood of men revolve. All great religions of the world in general and Islam in particular centre round the idea of man as a person with freedom and responsibility to make a moral choice and bear the inevitable consequences of his choosins. Any relationship that is based on compulsion whether in prestige or power or exploitation of sympathy is less than the best that is humanly possible. It is this concept which alone can give education a spiritual basis and thus confer on it the sanctity equivalent to worship, piety and prayer. Any system of education that demands from us our total loyalties and obedience to social or political structures is the negation of all that education stands for. We must not mistake the "scaffolding" for the "statue".

We are never tired of talking about the spiritual life but in practice we have lost faith, as we have lost many human values in what Ibn Khuldun

calls "dual citizenship" of man—of this world and the world hereafter.

In Islam as well as in other great religions of the world the common claim rests in a belief in the Infinite person who himself makes ultimate claims. The supreme duty of the Momin is to do his will: This doing of the will of God cannot be accomplished merely by a relationship to God: it involves relationship with other fellow beings. The requirement that we love God cannot be separated from the requirement that we love our neighbours.

Today the world is spiritually distracted. It is filled with the din and clamour of conflicting claims made upon man by many breeds of false gods. Total loyalties are required of him.

Education within the framework of Islamic ideology is bound to take serious account of the concept of man where he is recognised as a being facing himself under the supreme claim of God. No educational system that derives from this concept could be diverted solely to the strength of the state without regard to the freedom and responsibility of man. Living experiences cannot be confined by any social or political structures and principles. To live is to confront crises. The world is not organised in such a way

that education can be directed towards "adjustment", the idea of "adjustment" cannot be in accord with a world of irreconcilable demands and unresolved paradoxes. The educator cannot supply a recipe for living. He may be under obligation to help the young to meet their responsibilities by giving them better understanding and a more informed and fuller comprehension of the nature of the humanity of which they themselves exemplify, but he must recognise and augment the awareness in his pupils that the individual lives ultimately in his own world of decision making.

In a time when great political and social issues are before the public mind such as the choice between democratic and totalitarian ways of life the importance of such a decision is apparent to all that recognise the need to strengthen the inward freedom of man to make a free, rational and responsible choices Today this choice is demanded.

Education cannot afford to lose sight of it, much less ignore it. It cannot cease fostering and strengthening that powerful stream of moral forces that lies embedded in the collective psyche of all the peoples, at all time and in all classes.