

Conflicting Moralities in Pakistan as Represented by Shoaib Mansoor's Feature Film Bol: A Nietzschean Critique

Muhammad Azmat

Abstract

Ideologically, Pakistan is an Islamic country with sound moral and spiritual values serving as its guiding principles, but ironically, it is passing through a very difficult time of its history mainly because of the conflicting and predominantly distorted versions of morality underlying a number of its serious political, religious, and social issues. The great German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, however, identified morality as of two major types, that is, master morality and slave morality. Accordingly, this article was written with the aim of exploring as to how these moralities shaped highly conflicting mindsets over even very serious issues. However, in view of a proliferation of issues addressed by Bol, the analysis was delimited only to the major and the most controversial issue of producing more and more children vs. contraception as taken up and treated so elaborately by Shoaib Mansoor's feature film Bol. For this purpose, the relevant discourses of different characters from Bol, i.e., Hakeem Shafahatullah, Hakeem Shafahatullah's Wife, Zainab, and Police Officer, from their respective dialogues with one another from different parts of the film, were selected and analysed in light of Nietzschean concept of morality as well as the Qur'anic view of the worth and sanctity of human life. It is finally concluded that there is a frequent interplay of the master and slave moralities in Bol, represented by Hakeem Shafahatullah and Zainab respectively: The former being a conformist, fatalist, pessimist, dissembler, mentally-sick, having a retrogressive and Islamically distorted view of life, while the latter performs a dual role, that is, the one of being a Nietzschean critic of the slave morality and the other of an aspiring practitioner of master morality, having a rationalist, progressive, optimistic, healthy, and joyful view of life, more in accordance with the life-asserting teachings of Islam.

Keywords: *master morality, slave morality, contraception*

1. Introduction

That Pakistan is nowadays passing through a very difficult time of its history regarding severe political, religious, ideological, humanitarian, and moral crises and conflicts is very hard to deny. Ideologically, it is an Islamic country and “religious beliefs have great influence on our institutional (family, education, government, politics etc.) and social behavior”, but as Malik (2003) posited, “Islam is widely misrepresented and misinterpreted, in the society, from individual to public affair. Thus many of the so-called ‘values’, and ‘norms’, that are supposedly rooted in Islam, are actually an outcome of this misinterpretation” (p. 16).

In view of the scenario, as depicted above, the role of mass media in Pakistan, specifically TV, internet, and cinema, has become very crucial than ever in tracing and highlighting all the moral, spiritual, philosophical, and economic factors which are involved in the creation and promotion of different issues and problems on ground. By performing this role with responsibility and fairness, the mass media can exert its immense influence in giving true awareness to the people about Islam and the modern world. In this regard, TV channels, internet, and cinema have so far produced a number of useful dramas and feature films to watch and get much awareness from.

Of all the previous feature films, one but perhaps unique of its kind is *Bol*, a written, produced, and directed Lollywood film by Shoaib Mansoor, which as its very title means ‘Speak out’ (i.e., in an imperative form), speaks out boldly enough about a number of social problems, such as, “rape and domestic violence, and attitudes towards transgendered people, contraception, prostitution, art, music, and girls’ education” (Shah, 2011, para 3). The researcher believes that, while presenting different views of different characters about the aforementioned issues, the film digs deep into conflicting versions of underlying morality, which is generically believed to be one, universal, uniform, and divinely-constructed, thus unveiling the disregard and distortion of Islamic teachings about the sanctity of life, women rights, equality, and love for all the creatures of God, such as, the male human, the female human, and the transsexual human as well.

This article is, however, delimited to analyze the conflicting moralities with reference to one key issue of vital and highly controversial nature, that is, the practice of producing more and more children vs. contraception as elaborately represented by Shoaib Mansoor's film *Bol* in light of the two conflicting versions of morality, i.e. master morality and slave morality, discussed and expounded by the great German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche in his famous treatise *On the Genealogy of Morals*. For this purpose, the relevant discourses of different characters from *Bol*, i.e. Hakeem, Hakeem's Wife, Zainab, and Police Officer, from their respective dialogues with one another from different parts of the film, have been selected for analysis, presented later in this article after a brief, critical review of the text selected and the framework applied on it in the sections to follow respectively.

2. Shoaib Mansoor's *Bol*: An Overview

Bol is a remarkable film in the history of Pakistani cinema. "[It] was released on June 24, 2011, under the banner of Geo Films. The film established a new box office record in Pakistani cinema. It became the highest earning film in Pakistan in its first week of release, breaking all previous records ... *Bol* did a business of PKR 62.792 million in six days" (Wikipedia).

The film starts with Zainab, the protagonist, who is soon to be hanged. However, consequent upon the acceptance of her last appeal before death by the President of Pakistan, she is allowed to speak out (i.e. *Bol* in Urdu) while standing on the hanging place. The narrative is then shifted to the past, flashing back the circumstances leading up to the murder of Zainab's father by Zainab herself and the consequent capital punishment proclaimed on her by the court of justice.

As for the beginning of its plot, the scene shifts to Hakeem Shafahatullah, Zainab's father, who always wanted a son. In this effort, he kept on producing children. While six children died, Zainab still lived with 6 sisters, and her parents in Lahore, the second largest city of Pakistan. However, the search for a son ended up with the birth of a transsexual, named Saifi. Hakeem did not like Saifi. Out of pity for her mother, one day Zainab got the mother operated upon so that no more babies could thenceforth be conceived from her. When Hakeem came to know about this, he got very furious to Zainab.

Meanwhile, Mustafa, Zainab's friend and a singer in the neighbourhood, and Zainab's sister Ayesha developed liking for one another. Hakeem despised Mustafa's family as they were from 'Shia' sect. Hakeem's pharmacy shop was also not making much business. Mustafa got Saifi a job in a shop where trucks were painted. Saifi was harassed at work place, later was raped, and ultimately brought to the home by some other transsexual. Hakeem overheard the story when Saifi was telling the story to his mother and sister. Hakeem killed Saifi by suffocating him with an iron bag.

Things started deteriorating for Hakeem. The police demanded a heavy bribe from him. Hakeem was, therefore, forced to give money as bribe from Masjid's funds. Afterwards, on Masjid (Mosque) administration's demand, Hakeem had to return the money by getting help from Sahaqa Kanjar, a type of brothel-head, whom Hakeem had refused so disgustingly in response to a request for a recipe to get more sexual power and produce more and more children, ideally the females for his brothel, at the start. Now Hakeem even agreed to teach Quran to the children of Sahaqa's locality. However, still deficient in money, Hakeem had to marry Meena, a prostitute, to produce a girl for Sahaqa Kanjar as per the deal. Subsequently, at the birth of a girl, Hakeem begged Meena to let him take the daughter away to secure her future, Meena refused. Meanwhile, Sahaqa Kanjar came and kicked Hakeem out of his house.

Later on, Meena came to Hakeem's house and gave the child to his family. Therefore, Hakeem had to expose the secret to his family on which his wife started objecting noisily and was severely beaten whereupon Zainab and her mother and sisters decided to leave the house next day. But it happened that Sahaqa arrived to take the child. Hakeem was going to kill the child when Zainab killed him by giving him a heavy blast on the head. Consequently, Zainab was given the death penalty and this is how she is soon to be hanged.

3. Theoretical Framework: Nietzschean Concept of Morality

Traditionally, morality is considered as a universal phenomenon. However, it is commonly believed that different civilizations and different ages have quite different moralities. Stace (1965) elaborated this view as under:

What morality ordains in one place or age may be quite different from what morality ordains in another place or age. The moral code of Chinamen is quite different from that of Europeans, that of African Savages quite different from both. Any morality, therefore, is relative to the age, place, and the circumstances in which it is found. It is in no sense absolute. (p. 27)

Supporting the above-stated view of morality, Nietzsche also believed that there was no single morality of universal nature, i.e., there was no uniform code of values which we were bound to follow. However, he held that morality was relative to the psychology of the powerful and the powerless, as manifested by history. Broadly speaking, he introduced two types of moralities in his *Beyond Good and Evil* and discussed them more elaborately in his *On the Genealogy of Morals* i.e. 'master morality' and 'slave morality'.

According to Nietzsche (2006), master morality is good/bad morality, while slave morality is good/evil morality, being a resentful inversion to master morality. The three valuations, i.e. "good", "bad", and "evil" can be traced to have originated from the ancient history of human civilization. As for the terms "good" and "bad", in Nietzsche's views, they emerged under the nobility in ancient Egypt. The nobility called itself as good, and from this, the low classes came to be known as bad (p. 5).

Afterwards, the priests opposed the knightly-aristocratic values. They hated the noble, the powerful, the masters, and the rulers. This hate was due to their impotence. Nietzsche further observed that the Jews were the priestliest and the most dangerous people, recorded as under:

Nothing that has been done on earth against 'the noble', 'the mighty', 'the masters' and 'the rulers', is worth mentioning compared with what the Jews have done against them: the Jews, that priestly people, which in the last resort were able to gain satisfaction from its enemies and conquerors only through a radical revaluation of their values, that is, through an act of the most deliberate revenge. Only this was fitting for a priestly people with the most entrenched priestly vengefulness. It was the Jews who, rejecting the aristocratic value equation (good = noble = powerful = beautiful = happy = blessed) ventured, with awe-inspiring consistency, to bring about a reversal and held it in the teeth of the most unfathomable hatred (the hatred of the powerless), saying:

‘Only those who suffer are good, only the poor, the powerless, the lowly are good; the suffering, the deprived, the sick, the ugly, are the only pious people, the only ones saved, salvation is for them alone, whereas you rich, the noble and powerful, you are eternally wretched, cursed and damned! (p. 17)

Nietzsche proceeded further to say that with “this most fundamental of all declarations of war” (p. 18), began “the slaves’ revolt in morality” which has got a history of 2000 years behind it and it “has only been lost sight of because . . . It was victorious” (p. 18). This relates the origin of the conflict of master morality with slave morality.

Slave morality, according to Nietzsche, is pregnant with resentment, which has a general mechanism to follow, of which the case mentioned above is one big example. According to this mechanism, the group that feels repressed directs its hatred towards another group, which is considered a part of the hostile external world. A few more examples of resentment as creating values are Christianity, socialism, democracy and anarchism – different examples of what Nietzsche called slave revolt in morality (pp. 48-50). Nietzsche discussed the working mechanism of this slave revolt in these words:

The beginning of the slaves’ revolt in morality occurs when resentment [i.e., resentment] turns creative and gives birth to values: the resentment of those begins who, denied the proper response of action, compensate for it only with an imaginary revenge. Whereas all noble morality grows out of a triumphant saying ‘yes’ to itself, slave morality says ‘no’ on principle to everything that is ‘outside’, ‘other’, ‘non-self’: and this ‘no’ is its creative deed. This reversal of the evaluating glance – this essential orientation to the outside instead of back onto itself – is a feature of resentment: in order to come about, slave morality first has to have an opposing, external world, it needs, physiologically speaking, external stimuli in order to act at all, - its action is basically a reaction. (p. 20)

The above quotation suggests that slave morality is based on a creative, distressful emotion marked by resentment, reaction and imaginary revenge, and submerged hatred. On the contrary, master morality or “the noble method of valuation” ...

acts and grows spontaneously, seeking out its opposite only so that it can say 'yes' to itself even more thankfully and exultantly, - its negative concept 'low', 'common', 'bad', is only pale contrast created after the event compared to its positive basic concept, saturated, 'we the noble, the good, the beautiful, the happy!' (p. 20)

This shows that the origin of the moral concepts 'good' and 'bad' does not belong to the moral sphere of values as they do today.

While the master is capable of fighting against odds to bring a change in his favour, the slave is powerless to bring a change in his conditions. He can only act according to his master's will rather than his own drives. When he drives for aggression, cruelty, love for power, he cannot do outwardly and naturally, so these drives turn inward and eventually take revenge against life - the internalization of man in Nietzsche's language. The slave carries out his revenge by converting the master's attributes into vices.

In slave morality, people assert themselves to be good for being moral, no matter how miserable their life may be. By telling 'lies', they tempt to evade the facts to make themselves appear to be better off than they really are. Bittner (as cited in Schacht, 1994, p. 130) indicates that the reaction of a slave morality follower is just like that of La Fontaine's Fox. It satisfies itself by saying that the grapes are green and sour, although they are fully ripe because he is unable to reach them. In this way, the slave denies those desires that he is unable to satisfy and conspires against those who can satisfy them, eventually declares such desires and those who are able to satisfy them 'evil'.

Whereas Nietzsche lauded master morality by allowing coexistence with different types and morals, he criticized slave morality for its "sickliness" (p. 89). In this regard, he showed his apprehensive concern as: "The sick are the greatest danger for the healthy; harm comes to the strong not from the strongest but from the weakest" (p. 89). According to Nietzsche, slave morality or Christian morality, assuming that we are all equal before God, claims universal status for itself. This claim serves as a strategy of the slaves for inhibiting the best. By masking as the only possible morality, slave or Christian morality succeeds in regulating the lives not only of the majority, the weak who needs its codes to live their lives, but also the few healthy ones who do not need it.

Nietzsche criticized Christian morality not simply for its values but for the reason that the ascetic priest, the leader of slaves, provided the men of resentment with an interpretation which on the one hand, blamed them for their suffering, and, on the other hand, promised redemption through belief in God. In order to relieve his inner tension, the slave projected suffering onto someone who could be responsible for his misery and, taking a step further, he projected the supreme God who was able and willing to fight against the 'evil' masters. The slave found consolation from God and believed in future happiness in an afterlife. This interpretation promoted an inspiration for the slave, giving him a strong sense of power and eventually enabling him to overcome even the master. Thus, by interpreting the noble mode of valuation as evil, slave morality implied that the noble was indeed free not to act, that he was free to choose not to be evil. In this way, the slave interpreted the weakness and inability to act, which was typical of himself, as something positive – as 'freedom'.

At the end of the first essay of *On the Genealogy of Morals*, Nietzsche remarked that the two opposing valuations, that is, good/bad and good/evil, had been locked in a tremendous struggle for thousands of years, as in "the two opposing values 'good and bad', 'good and evil' have fought a terrible battle for thousands of years on earth; and although the latter has been dominant for a long time, there is still no lack of places where the battle remains undecided" (p. 32). The struggle originated with the war between Rome (good/bad) and Judea (good/evil). What began with Judea was the triumph of resentment; its hold was broken for a moment by the Renaissance, but reasserted by the Reformation (which, in Nietzsche's view, restored the church), and refreshed again by the French Revolution in which the "ressentiment", i.e., "instincts of the rabble" triumphed (p. 33).

Master morality and slave morality refer to the division between what strengthens and enhances life and what weakens and mutilates it. Master morality is based on the consequence-based actions, while the slave morality goes after intentions. Master morality believes in progress; it looks to future. On the other hand, slave morality is pessimistic about the human condition, doubting the goodness of this life, sees people as weak and pitiful (hence fatalistic and pre-deterministic). Master morality is an expression of power and strength. The strong can attain maximal happiness by overcoming resistance –

the greater the resistance, the greater the happiness. In contrast, the weak avoid struggle and resistance, both because of laziness and impotence. The weak is powerless, dependent and lacks self-mastery. Nietzsche (2006) compared the strong to a bird of prey and the weak to a lamb, stating that it was a mistake “to blame the large birds of prey for carrying off the little lambs” (p. 26), because the actions of the birds of prey stemmed from their inherent strength, rather than any malicious intent. In short, master morality is what Nietzsche felt to be on par with the principles of nature, while slave morality takes the opposite route, whereby it negates nature and life itself.

4. Analysis

The analysis, as aforementioned, is based on the Nietzschean concept of morality underlying the social practice of producing more and more children in refutation to contraception as reflected from the contesting discourses in *Bol*. However, before the in-depth analysis of the issue, it is quite relevant to quote the remarks of the director’s own remarks about *Bol*:

Having been so blessed in life, I often think of the things that I should be grateful for. The list always seems to be never-ending, but invariably it ends at one thing that I was born as a MAN.

Nothing in the world scares me more than the thought of being born a woman or a eunuch in a country like Pakistan, where obscurantism the deep roots. It is very unfortunate that we make tall claims, full of pride, about the rights of woman granted by our religion and yet when I look around in underdeveloped Muslim countries in general and Pakistan in particular, I find things totally the opposite. Tragically, our interpretation and application of religion seems to begin and end with woman. Leave the 5% urban educated elite aside, woman seems to be the playground (battleground) where we practice a medieval form of religion. (Mansoor, 2010)

The above quotation clearly shows that there are serious moral crises in the social and moral spheres of life in Pakistan, especially in terms of women’s predicaments for being too often subjected to tyranny, selfishness, religious orthodoxy, and strict compliance to the wishes of the male counterparts in this world as their gods, so as to get a compensation in the afterlife by God ultimately. As a matter of fact, these issues stem out of a specific approach to

this life, projected on to the females by the males in Pakistan, to which Nietzsche refers to as the slave morality.

In relevance to the above-drawn picture of life in Pakistan in general, *Bol* quite overtly and barely questions many social practices, like the worth of a human being, may it be a woman like Hakeem Shafatullah's afflicted wife in particular or a person born with a birth defect like Hakeem Shafatullah's transsexual offspring Saifi. More specifically, it questions the morality behind putting restrictions on women to go for contraceptive measures and vehemently justifying the practice of reproducing more and more children in search of a son without bothering about doing hard work, earning the resources, taking the responsibility of their dignified brought up, and even the death of one's wife out of delivering more children than her capacity, rather ultimately attributing it all to God's will, thus falsifying and misrepresenting the life-asserting and life-glorifying Islamic thought and teachings with a typical slave-morality mindset. In *Bol*, this view is expressed by Hakeem Shafahatullah in answer to his wife's anxious question in the following manner:

بیوی: کھانے والے اتنے زیادہ ہیں اور آپکی آمدنی دن بدن کم ہوتی جا رہی ہے
کیا بنے گا؟

(Wife: There are so many to eat, whereas, your income is lessening day by day; what will happen?)

حکیم: جس نے چونچ دی ہے اس نے چوگا بھی دینا ہے۔

(Hakim: Who (God) has given the beak, (He) shall give the feed as well.)

It can be noted from the above excerpt that the world of Hakeem is marked by sheer fatalism, laziness, lack of will to look up for consequences of his actions. His is the world of blind faith, dictating him to disregard his wife's legitimate protest against the countless production of children from her, rather blaming her for the action he himself considers as embarrassing in itself, as is obvious from his following sarcastic remarks directed to his wife:

حکیم: خدا نے تمہیں دو ہی ہنر دیے ہیں: ایک کھانا خوب پکاتی ہو اور دوسرا
بیٹیاں خوب پیدا کرتی ہو!

(Hakim: God has given you only two skills: one, you cook plentiful food; two, you produce plentiful children!)

The way Hakeem maintains his control at the micro level of the family by the exercise of his slave morality is quite analogous to the way the state exercises a “legitimate violence” (Clastres, 2007, p. 152) over the society at the macro level. With this onset of the central issue of countless production of children necessitated by the exponent of the slave morality, *Bol* progresses onwards to set the stage for a fuller exposure of the slave morality, represented by Hakeem, thwarting all positive, healthy, and life-asserting master-morality mindset as represented by Hakeem’s daughter Zainab, with reference to the other side of the coin of the practice of producing countless children, i.e. contraception, which is a no-go area in Pakistan for most women just like Hakeem’s wife in *Bol*. In this connection, Said (as cited in Siddiqui, 2011) reported:

According to the Economic Survey 2010-11, Pakistan has the highest fertility rate of 3.5 in South Asia, with the lowest contraceptive prevalence rate of 30 per cent. Dr. Saeed adds that religious beliefs are one of biggest hurdles in increasing contraceptive prevalence amongst women in Pakistan. (The Express Tribune, July 12th, 2011)

Bol, being an exquisite Lollywood feature film to highlight the social issues of Pakistan as aforementioned, paints the reality in relation to a typical Pakistani family in which Hakeem Shafahatullah, a devout follower of slave morality, attributes his deliberate, ambitious production of a large number of children to God’s will, as something preordained. In a sharp reaction, Hakeem’s eldest daughter Zainab questions the wisdom of condemning children to living death by her unforgettable inquiry in a typical master-morality mindset like this:

زینب: اگر زندگی لینا جرم ہے تو زندگی دینا جرم کیوں نہیں؟ اگر کھلانہیں
سکتے ہو تو پیدا کیوں کرتے ہو؟

(Zainab: If taking a life is a crime, why is giving a life not crime? If you cannot feed, why do you give birth?)

Here, Zainab critiques her father's version of slave morality, sunk deep in retrogressive, fatalistic, blind action based on intention rather than consequence. However, it is quite later in the novel that Hakeem has to confess about his blind, foolish act when he is tamed by the police on the true charge of the murder of the transsexual Saifi by his/her father Hakeem himself, as under:

حکیم: مدد کیجیے، میرا تو گھر بیٹیوں سے بھرا پڑا ہے! انکا کیا ہوگا؟

(Hakim: Please help (me). My house is full of daughters. What will become of them?)

پولیس افسر: یہ تو آپ کو پہلے سوچنا چاہیے تھا!

(Police Officer: This, you must have thought about earlier!)

On the contrary, Zainab presents a cheerful, optimistic, life-asserting and progressive view of life, whereby she makes a valuation of life in terms of health, life-enhancement, joy, and indeed, the sanctity of this life. Therefore, speaking in favour of contraception and her act of having got her mother operated upon, Zainab denounces the life-threatening sequel of conceiving fourteen children on her mother's part in compliance to the husband's priestly slave morality. This is evident from her bold stance against her father's morality laden taunts, manifested by the corresponding discourse presented as under:

زینب: میں نے اس گھر کی آبادی کو روکنے کے لیے امی کا آپریشن کرا دیا۔

(Zainab: In order to control the population of this house, I have got the mother operated upon.)

حکیم: خدا غارت کرے تجھے! یہ کیا کر دیا تو نے! تجھے پتہ ہے کہ کتنا بڑا گناہ

کیا ہے تو نے! خدا کے کام میں دخل دیا ہے، ارے زندگی دینے والا تو وہ ہے۔

(Hakim: O you be damned! What have you done! Do you know that how great a sin you have committed? You have intervened in God's will! Oh, the One (Who has the privilege) to give life is He.

The above dialogue shows that, while Hakeem believes only in the production of children, without caring whether his wife lives or dies, believing that contraception is a great sin and considering this practice an interference in God's will, Zainab emphasizes on the quality and preservation of life, in a typical master morality vein, raising objection to his father's misappropriating and misquoting the teachings of Islam for his self-gratification rather than upholding the fact that Islam lays infinite emphasis on the sanctity of life, as for example, "if anyone killed a person not in retaliation of murder, or (and) to spread mischief in the land - it would be as if he killed all mankind, and if anyone saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of all mankind" (Qur'an 5:32, Al-Hilali and Khan, 1432 AH, p. 146).

Hakeem's religious hypocrisy is soon exposed when he kills his transsexual son Saifi by his own hands without having even the least fear of Allah, rather trying to get away with his unethical request made to the police officer in the following words:

حکیم: آپ کو اس پروردگار کا واسطہ، اس بات کو یہیں دبا دیجیے!

(Hakim: In the name of that Cherisher and Sustainer, please suppress (ignore) this matter as it is!)

The above-cited earnest request of Hakeem to the police officer shows that there is no fixed justice, no fixed creed of Hakeem: he admits his sin rather before the state, i.e., police by applying for a special privilege, irrespective of any reverence and fear of God. Begging the police in the name of God, in compensation for having been an ally of the Devil, Hakeem (and suchlike devout followers of slave morality) always carries guilt and bad conscience. In fact, the root cause of sheer embarrassment that Hakeem has created for himself lies far entrenched in his heart is his resentment due to having a host of daughters and his stubborn desire to get power through the achievement of a male issue from God – the main refuge for the powerless, lazy, slavish maniacs like Hakeem.

حکیم: ہمارے ہاں اتنی خزاہوں کے بعد بہار آہی ہے۔ خدا کے لیے اب تم
یہاں سے چلی جاؤ۔

(Hakim: Spring has visited our quarters after so many autumns. For God's sake, go from here now.)

The religious vanity, under the religious garb is expressed in the following implicit way when Hakeem expresses his joy over the news of the birth of a son in his house, although he has to soon pine over the loss of fleeting happiness because the newly born is rather a transgendered child, as made out by a neighbouring woman after the examination of the baby:

It is noticeable here that Hakeem uses the metaphor 'autumns' for his daughters and 'spring' for a son, which reflects his repressed desires resulting in a 'bad conscience'.

On the contrary, Zainab stands for the opposite view of morality; she abhors such slave morality as is followed by her father and suchlike people. Hers is not a good/evil concept of the world, but she rather respects and prefers life, health, family planning and happiness which are the hallmarks of a healthy, master morality. She speaks in favour of such actions which are based on consequences, as evident in: 'The more the mouths, the greater the food is required!' This is more beautifully illustrated by her through a comparison

between the numbers of her father's produced children with those of their neighbour Master Akhtar Hussain.

There is a huge difference in the size of both the families: her father's large family and Master's short family. In her view, this difference is based on man's will rather than the will of God. Master has two children and both are doctors; whereas, Hakeem has eight children and all are illiterate. The point to be noticed about Zainab's approach is that it is based on such typical master morality valuations as quality/quantity, life/death, education/illiteracy, exercise of free will/ blind faith, and prosperity/adversity, as reflected brilliantly by her these words: "How can such a great Prophet say so? He must have said that his ummah should be great, but great in honour, in stature, in advancement. How can he say that they must be largest in number, even though they be donkeys, largest in number even though they be dying out of hunger?"

The above-mentioned valuations overall characterize Zainab as a Nietzschean critic of slave morality in favour of master morality, reflecting an aspiration for health, nobility, and power. Ultimately, supported by this state of mind, Zainab exercises her power, first by killing her father to save the life of her small half-sister (daughter of Meena), and then 'speaking' against all the tame followers of the slave morality in a masterly, champion-like manner.

5. Conclusion

The analysis of the issue of contraception vs. production of more and more children on the basis of those discourses in the film that centers round the issue shows that in *Bol*, there is a frequent interplay of slave and master moralities, each trying to dictate the other behind various social issues, like contraception. These moralities are represented by the two main characters of the main plot: Hakeem Shafahatullah, being powerless, conformist, retrogressive, staunch believer in fatalism behind his every action, is a true follower of slave morality; whereas, Zainab performs a dual role: the one of being a Nietzschean critic of the slave morality, and the other of an aspiring practitioner of master morality, having a progressive, optimistic, healthy, joyful view of life and power, though facing an irony of fate at the end in that she has to commit such an act she abhors so vehemently once at the time of Saifi's murder and then

at the time of the attempted murder of her baby step-sister, i.e. Meena's daughter, ultimately killing her father by her own hands.

References

- Al-Hilali, M. T., & Khan, M. M. (1432 AH). *The Noble Qur'an: English translation of the meanings and commentary*. Madina Munawwarah: King Fahd Glorious Qur'an Printing Press.
- Bol (film). *Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia*. Retrieved August 02, 2017, from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bol_\(film\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bol_(film))
- Clastres, P. (2007). *Society against the state*. New York: Zone Books.
- Malik, M. I. (2003). *Institutional failure in Pakistan*. Retrieved from <http://www.letsstartthinking.org/articles/Institutional%20Failure.pdf>
- Mansoor, S. (2010). 'Bol' synopsis, cast, music credits and director's statement. Retrieved from <https://www.facebook.com/notes/shoib-mansoor/-Bol-synopsis-cast-music-credits-and-directors-statement-shoib-mansoor/169524996402898/>
- Nietzsche, F. (2006). *On the genealogy of morals*. (C. Diethe, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Orig. pub. 1887).
- Siddiqui, T. (2011). In Pakistan, contraception is a no-go area for most women. *The Express Tribune*, July 12th, 2011. Retrieved from <https://tribune.com.pk/story/207794/world-population-day-contraception-a-no-go-area-for-most-women/>
- Schacht, R. (Ed.) (1994). *Nietzsche, genealogy, morality: Essays on Nietzsche's On the Genealogy of Morals*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shah, M. (2011). *Bol: Speaking silence*. Retrieved from <https://blogs.tribune.com.pk/story/6540/bol-speaking-silence/>
- Stace, W. T. (1965). Ethical relativity and ethical absolutism. In Donaldson, T. and Werhane, P. H. (1988). *Ethical Issues in Business: A Philosophical Approach* (3rd ed.). Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.