

**WHO CONSTITUTES THE SINDHI LEFT?**  
**CHARTING THE RISE AND FALL OF LEFT DURING**  
**1954-1991**

**Submitted by:**  
Muhammad Qasim

M. Phil Thesis



**National Institute of Pakistan Studies**  
**Quaid-i-Azam University**  
**Islamabad**  
**2016**

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PAKISTAN STUDIES  
QUAID-I-AZAM UNIVERSITY  
ISLAMABAD**

**CERTIFICATE**

I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under my supervision by

**Mr. Muhammad Qasim** entitled:

**“WHO CONSTITUTES THE SINDHI LEFT? CHARTING  
THE RISE AND FALL OF LEFT DURING 1954-1991”**

Be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree  
of Masters of Philosophy in Pakistan Studies.

**DR. AASIM SAJJAD AKHTER  
SUPERVISOR**

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PAKISTAN STUDIES  
QUAID-I-AZAM UNIVERSITY  
ISLAMABAD**

**CERTIFICATE**

This dissertation submitted by **Mr. Muhammad Qasim** entitled:  
**“Who Constitutes the Sindhi Left? Charting the rise and fall of Left during  
1954-1991”** is accepted in this present form by National Institute of Pakistan  
Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad for the Degree of Master of  
Philosophy in Pakistan Studies.

**SUPERVISOR:** \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Aasim Sajjad Akhter

**EXTERNAL EXAMINER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DIRECTOR:** \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Hanif Khalil

**Dedicated**

**To**

***Mr. Zulfiqar Ahmed Bachani,***

**a person behind my every little and great achievement**

## **DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my individual research and that it has not been submitted concurrently to any other university for the purpose of any other degree.

**Muhammad Qasim**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many persons without their support and guidance, producing this thesis was not possible. First of all, I am very thankful to my Father and Mother, both of them helped me a lot financially and morally. Then, I am also very grateful to my all family members especially my elder brother Ada Ghulam Nabi who has been encouraging me since when I was in primary school.

Surely, I am delightful and say many thanks to my supervisor Dr. Aasim Sajjad Akhter who supported me throughout my research work and it is true that without his guidance, I was not able to produce such productive research work. I am thankful to Saeen Irshad Sodhar, and Saeen Irshad Soomro for moral support and encouragement. I also cannot forget support of Mr. Muhammad Asif Noor who fully cooperated with me throughout my M.Phil degree.

I am really grateful to those Leftist leaders/workers and intellectuals of Sindh who not only shared their experiences and views regarding my thesis topic, but at the same time, they provided me stuff related to my research topic. These people are; Mr. Ahmed Salim, Comrade Jam Saqi, Comrade Sohail Sangi, Comrade Imdad Qazi, Comrade Iqbal Mallah, Comrade Hameeda Ghanghro, Saeen Ayaz Latif Palijo, Comrade Wahid Bux Banglani, Saeen Dastagir Bhatti, Saeen Jami Chandio, Saeen Zaib Sindhi, and Comrade Bakhshal Thalho.

In the last, I must say many thanks to one of my close friends Samreen who has been encouraging me for more than six years, and making me proud that I have potential to achieve my selected goals. Therefore, I thank her for being with me in every difficult time and during happy moments of my life as well.

## Table of Contents

Chapter No. 1 .....	9
Introduction:.....	9
Significance of Study .....	15
Key Research Question (s).....	16
Literature Review.....	17
Books and Research Articles .....	17
Reports/Papers/Documents .....	32
Research Methodology .....	35
Sources of Data Collection .....	35
Interviews.....	35
Chapter No. 2.....	37
Peasant and Class Struggles: The Case of Sindh Hari (Peasant) Committee and Communist Party of Pakistan .....	37
Ideological Debate about Sindh Hari Committee .....	41
SHC's Struggle for Rights of Haris (Peasants).....	44
Struggle for Sindh Tenancy Act and Half Batai (share-crop).....	45
Formation of Communist Party of Pakistan and State Response to Communists .....	47
The Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case .....	51
CPP banned and went underground.....	54
Chapter No. 3.....	57
The Role of Left in Anti-One Unit and Movement for Restoration of Democracy (MRD) .....	57
One-Unit Formula: Parity or Greater Punjab? .....	58
Resistance against One-Unit Scheme and Formation of Anti-One Unit Front .....	64
Students' Role in Anti-One Unit Movement and Student Uprising of 4 <sup>th</sup> of March 1967.....	69
Hyderabad Student Federation (HSF).....	71
Student Uprising of March 4, 1967.....	72
Sindh National Students' Federation (SNSF) .....	75
MRD and the Left of Sindh.....	76
Movement Begins .....	79
Plane Hijacking.....	81
Role of Left in MRD.....	82

Contribution of Jam Saqi/Communist Case in MRD.....	87
Chapter No. 4.....	94
Pakistan People’s Party: Socialist or Populist?.....	94
Concept of Socialism in PPP Manifesto .....	95
Bhutto’s Concept of Socialism .....	97
Bhutto’s logic behind advocating Islamic Socialism.....	101
Left Inclination towards PPP .....	104
State Repression against Karachi SITE and Landhi Labor Movement.....	109
Chapter No. 5.....	115
Causes and Consequences of Ideological Split and Ethnic rifts within the Left.....	115
Formation of National Awami Party (NAP) .....	116
Pro-China and Pro-Moscow division in NAP .....	117
Sindhi V/S Urdu Speaking Communists and the National Question.....	122
Conclusions.....	131
Bibliography .....	136



# Chapter No. 1

## Introduction:

The 20<sup>th</sup> century was a century of socialist and communist revolutions, which gave new hopes to the masses of the world. It was Russian revolution popularly known as October revolution in 1917, which proved the theory of Karl Marx that if the labourers and peasants unite and fight for their rights, they could get their rights and make a history. After communist revolution in Russia, the movements for bringing socialist and communist revolutions were launched all over the world. The history of the world is witnessed that many countries brought changes, and a socialist regimes were formed there. Amongst such countries, China, Cuba, Vietnam, North Korea, Venezuela and some other countries, are included, which successfully formed socialist governments.

Apart from above mentioned countries, there were many political elements of other countries of the world who were highly inspired by communism and socialism. In this regard, the political uprisings for bringing a socialist/communist revolution were launched in different countries. At the same time, the world was divided into two super powers i.e. United States of America (USA) which was following the capitalist line and the other one was Soviet Union was following the communist and socialist line. In this ideological division, each super power was trying to control over the world through spreading her ideology.

During the revolutionary movements going on in Russia which later brought October Revolution, India was under the control of another capitalist power i.e. British, but at the same time; post October revolution gave inspiration to some political parties of India who initiated

movements to bring a socialist revolution. As Sindh was a part of India before partition, so there were some political forces who were also inspired by socialism and the movements of Left were initiated in Sindh also.

Before partition, a political party i.e. Sindh Hari Committee (Sindh Peasants Committee) was formed to mobilize haris (peasants) in order to get their rights from landlords. This party was formed in 1930 and was mainly following communist lines and also it was following the slogan “Jo khere so khaye (those will eat, who will sow)” given by Sufi Shah Inayat Shaheed. Sindh Hari Committee was also demanding the distribution of lands among landless haris of Sindh.

Sindh Hari Committee continued its struggle for peasants’ rights after the creation of Pakistan as well. The major contribution of SHC was getting ‘Sindh Tenancy Act’ passed from Assembly in 1950. This act gave much benefit to haris like the right of getting 50 percent batai from landowners, and landowners were forbidden to get extra labour from their haris.

After partition, in party congress of Communist Party of India (CPI) held in Calcutta in 1948, it was decided to form a separate communist party for newly born country Pakistan. Accordingly, the Communist Party of Pakistan (CPP) was formed, and some communist leaders like Sajjad Zaheer and Sibt-e-Hassan were sent to Pakistan for organizing communist party of Pakistan. Sajjad Zaheer was selected as first Secretary General of CPP. Although, CPP was a countrywide party, so its branches were opened in Sindh as well. But, it couldn’t long last openly and the party was banned under the charge of Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case. The Communist Party of Pakistan was banned in 1954, and Sajjad Zaheer was forced to leave Pakistan.

After banning CPP, the party workers went underground, and it was not possible for Communist Party to keep continuing its struggle from CPP platform, so now the CPP leadership decided to

make an alliance with some other political party. In this regard, CPP made an alliance with Awami (People's) League. But, after introducing the one-unit scheme by government of Pakistan, CPP leadership realized that Awami League was not sincere with them. Because, Suhrawardi, the leader of AL not only accepted the proposal of becoming Prime Minister of Pakistan, but also he agreed to impose one-unit scheme. The one unit formula gave an opportunity to the West Pakistani authorities to create a parity between two wings, and at the same time, Bengalis were rewarded some benefits like Suhrawardi became the Prime Minister of country and the Bengali language was given status as one of national languages of Pakistan. Therefore, Awami League chose to support one unit scheme.

Because of this realization that Suhrawardi and his party betrayed Communist Party, CPP left the alliance. This was a period and onwards that the leadership of CPP from Sindh, was actually leading the party. In this period, the government of Pakistan also joined SEATO and SENTO pacts with USA, which both pacts were anti-communism.

After signing these anti-communism pacts and announcing one-unit scheme, the state of Pakistan applied a harsh policy against communists, nationalists and democrats of Pakistan. One-unit scheme on the one hand, denied the status of provinces and declared only two wings i.e. East Pakistan and West Pakistan, but on the other hand, this scheme united the political forces of Sindh. In these circumstances, Sindhi nationalists including G.M Syed challenged this scheme. Later, many progressives like Comrade Hyder Bux Jatoi, Comrade Jam Saqi, Comrade Sobho Giyanchandani, Rasool Bux Palijo and many others participated in mobilizing people of Sindh against One-Unit scheme. The nationalists and Leftists formed an alliance called 'Sindh Anti-One Unit Front' to launch a collective movement against One Unit scheme.

Like the anti-one unit movement, many other political apprising and movements also took place during 1954-1991. The famous movements amongst those were; anti-one unit movement, student uprising of 4<sup>th</sup> of March 1967, movement for getting voter lists published in Sindhi, Labour movement of SITE area Karachi (1972), and Movement for the Restoration of Democracy (1981-83). These movements were led by Leftists and nationalists together. The major Leftist parties involved in these movements were; Sindh Hari Committee (SHC), Communist Party of Pakistan (CPP), Sindhi Awami Tehrik (Later Awami Tehrik), National Awami Party (NAP), Awami National Party (ANP), Democratic Students Federation (DSF), Sindh National Students Federation (SNSF) and National Students Federation (NSF).

Although, Pakistan People's Party (PPP) also had played a vital role in anti-Ayub movement and MRD, and also Bhutto chanted a slogan of Roti, Kapra aur Makan (Bread, Cloths and Shelter), which was considered a slogan of Left oriented political parties. Likewise, Bhutto advocated socialism but he added Islamic before Socialism i.e. 'Islamic Socialism'. Therefore, it is debatable point here that whether PPP was a Left leaning party or Bhutto just exploited the slogan of socialism? This question will be dealt in one of coming chapters.

In this whole discussion, it could be understood that Left was very active since the imposition of One-Unit Scheme until the downfall of Soviet Union. But, after collapse of Soviet Union, Left became almost non-existent entity in Sindh. Therefore, the two major aspects on which this study is focused, are:

- a) The comparative study of Left of Sindh and PPP. First of all, looking at PPP's ideology through looking into ideological debate, manifesto and organizational structure that whether it was formed on Left line, and had it followed the socialist line in practical, or it

had just exploited the socialist elements in the name of socialism? Then, this study focuses on comparative study of PPP and other Left oriented parties that what were causes behind PPP's popularity among masses, and the unsuccessfulness of Left in gaining the support of masses?

The reason behind choosing this aspect is to address the debate about PPP especially Bhutto's attitude towards socialism. Because, he was a person in this country, who nationalized some industries, he introduced land reforms, labour reforms, he got included the point 'Socialism is our economy' in People's Party manifesto, and also he chanted the slogan of socialism. Therefore, this debate about Bhutto's socialist stance is still going on. One school of thought during Bhutto's contemporary period was of this opinion that PPP was a real socialist force of Pakistan, so a huge number of Leftists joined the party. But, there is also a point of view that Bhutto was not a socialist, but he was just inspired by socialism, and being a socialist, and become inspired by socialism are two different things.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, this aspect is very important to take in this study. There was also need to conduct comparative study of some political parties with clear socialist manifesto and PPP, that what were reasons behind their unpopularity and popularity among the masses respectively. Hence, this study can fill a gap of this aspect, and addresses the aspect in detail.

- b) The second major aspect of this study is to address the internal divisions in the ranks of Left which were one of major causes of downfall of Left of Sindh. These divisions in the shape of Pro-Beijing and Pro-Moscow and also the issue of Sindhi-Urdu speaking conflicts within the ranks of Left.

---

<sup>1</sup> Interview with Jami Chandio, February 5, 2016

The conflict over the China or Moscow line, was not just a matter of Sindh or Pakistan but it was a general phenomenon of the World, which bitterly affected the Left specifically those parties who were a part of a wider alliance of Left i.e. National Awami Party (NAP) during 1960s. The Sindhi-Urdu controversy within Left of Sindh was also one of great causes behind the weaknesses of Sindh based Left movements.

This debate of Sindhi v/s Urdu speaking Left basically based on 'national question'. According to some Sindhi Left leadership and the intellectuals especially Rasool Bux Palijo and Rasheed Bhatti; Urdu speaking leadership of Communist Party of Pakistan was not clear on the nationalities question. On the other hand, the CPP leadership whether it was Urdu speaking like Professor Jamal Naqvi and Imam Ali Nazish, or Sindhi speaking like Jam Saqi, Sohail Sangi, Badar Abro and Imdad Qazi. They were of this opinion that CPP was clearly supporting the 'nationalities question' along with 'class question.' However, there was a need to address this aspect of Left politics of Sindh, so this aspect is being taken in this study.

I believe, these aspects help to contribute in writing the Left historiography in the sense that on the hand, the first aspect helps to look into the history of Left during the time period of this study i.e. 1954-1991. Because of this effort, this study focuses the historiography of the Left movements. It also helps to analyze the PPP's stance over socialism, and Bhutto's policies regarding socialism. This is also highly helpful to understand the causes behind PPP's success in a very short time period, but on the hand, the causes behind Left's unpopularity among masses, can also be addressed in looking at this aspect of the study.

The second aspect is also very beneficial in collecting historiography of Left in the sense that it focuses on the conflict between Sindhi and Urdu speaking Left. It is not possible to understand

this aspect without going through the history of the Left of Sindh. This aspect also relates to the debate about the division in Left on the lines of Pro-China and Pro-Moscow and Sindhi v/s Urdu speaking Left. Therefore, it is clear that both the aspects contribute to Left historiography in general.

## **Significance of Study**

This study will be beneficial to know history of Left of Sindh and its role in famous political movements. Likewise, this study is good account to understand the PPP's stance on socialism, which is better source to understand how much the claim of PPP as a Leftist party, is true. According to available material on Left politics, still there is no any collected works on Left politics of Sindh, available. It is available only in pieces which is also incomplete. Therefore, this study fulfils the need of a research oriented document on Left politics. This study is more helpful to understand the Left of Sindh as compare to some other works on this topic in the sense that, this study is not based only on secondary sources, but it is also based on in depth conversational interviews with some famous Leftists of Sindh who were leading these major movements.

On the one hand, this study provides an account of the history of Left movements in the light of secondary sources and experiences shared by leaders of above movements. On the other hand, this study also deals with the Sindhi-Mohajir tussle within the ranks of Left. The debate over this tussle is not taken by researchers in proper way yet. Although, it is highlighted by the Sindhi leadership of Awami Tehrik led by Rasool Bux Palijo and some Sindhi intellectuals like Rasheed Bhatti and Shaikh Ayaz. In the response of Rasool Bux Palijo and some other Sindhi intellectuals' point of view, the leadership of Communist Party of Pakistan both Sindhi and Urdu speaking, opposed their point of view. But, both the parties' point of view seem one sided, just

opposing one and other. Therefore, there was need to see this conflict from the eye of a researcher. Hence, this study can be fruitful to understand the issue.

## **Key Research Question (s)**

This study will answer three following questions in the coming chapters.

1. First question is about the failure of Left of Sindh in becoming a mainstream political force of Sindh. The question states, “What were causes that being a leading force in political uprisings during 1954-91, Left could not become Political-Mainstream in Sindh?” This study will answer this question by addressing the Leftists party policies, state response to Leftists and conflicts within the ranks of Left like Pro-China and Pro-Moscow.
2. The second question relates the first one that “how conflict between Sindhi and Urdu speaking Left over national question, affected the Left of Sindh?” The study will investigate the causes of this conflict, and also its affects over the politics of Left in Sindh.
3. Third question will address the socialist claim and stance of Bhutto’s Pakistan People’s Party that “what was the stance of PPP on question of Socialism, and what were the causes behind the popularity of PPP in Sindh in comparison with Left?” To answer this question, the study will focus the PPP’s stance on socialism first through addressing another question in this context that, “whether PPP was a socialist party or it was just exploiting the slogan of socialism?”



## Literature Review

### Books and Research Articles

Although, there is not much literature available directly on the Left of Sindh, but there is plenty of material on the Left of Pakistan, which addresses the Sindhi Left as well. In this regard, most of literature is based on autobiographies and jail diaries of Leftist leaders and workers. But, there is also some scholarly work done on Left of Pakistan. The available literature on this topic is mainly in Sindhi language. Because, as this study is focusing the Sindhi Left, so the literature on this was almost produced in Sindhi in order to spread the literature among workers of the party and also among masses, whether they were peasants or educated one. I tried to my best to find literature in English as well, but I was unsuccessful to find much literature in English. But the Sindhi literature mentioned here is also a well recognized literature on this topic, written by Leftists workers and intellectuals of Sindh.

However, some Urdu and English literature is also available which I am going to mention in the literature review section of this study. The literature relevant to this study which is highly important to understand the topic in proper way is as follows:

**Ali, Kamran Asdar, (2015), *Communist Politics and Class Activism in Pakistan 1947-1972*.<sup>2</sup>**

The book traces the history of communist politics especially the role of Communist Party of Pakistan. In his book, Kamran also discusses the role of members of CPP from Sindh who remained actively participants of Left movements. The author also discusses the incident of

---

<sup>2</sup>Kamran Asdar Ali, *Communist Politics and Class Activism in Pakistan 1947-1972* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2015).

labourers' killing in SITE area in Karachi in 1972 during Bhutto regime. The author highlights a contradictory point that the Left was introduced and strengthened in Pakistan by Urdu speaking middle class migrated from India.

This is a point which is not only debatable but contradictory as well, which helps somehow to understand the Sindhi-Mohajir conflict within the ranks of Left. This claim is discussed in coming chapters in the light of claims of Sindhi leadership that how they respond this kind of claim by any Urdu speaking political worker or intellectual. However, this book is an important and scholarly work about the formation of CPP, to understand the Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case, and also to understand the Bhutto's role in undermining the trade union movements during his first regime.

**Abro, Badar, (2014), *Jail Jee Diary (Sindhi)*.<sup>3</sup>**

The author was arrested along with some other leaders of CPP in 1980 by Zia regime. They were charged with the famous case i.e. "Jam Saqi Case." He gives a reasonable account of Communist leaders' activities in jail. He discusses the 'Jam Saqi Case' which was also known as 'Communist Case' that how it got popularity not only in Pakistan, but it was focused by international media as well. It is basically a jail diary which shows the military's attitude towards communists in Zia period.

This jail diary is also good document to understand the role of captivities of Jam Saqi Case in revival of Movement for Restoration of Democracy (MRD). As Badar Abro is not only a communist activist but at the same time he is a Sindhi adeeb (literary person) so his writing is also affected by fiction, poetry and so on. But, in spite of that, being one of main accused of

---

<sup>3</sup>BadarAbro, *Jail Jee Diary* (Kandiaro: Roshni Publication, 2014).

Communist Case/Jam Saqi Case, his jail diary is one of good sources to understand the Zia regime's attitude towards political elements specifically communists.

**Giyanchandani, Sobho, (2013), *Roshni je Pandh mein (Sindhi)*.<sup>4</sup>**

In his autobiography, Sobho highlights the role of Leftist parties and Progressive writers of Sindh before and after partition. He himself remained an active activist of CPP so his autobiography helps a lot to understand the Left of Sindh. The author also writes about Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's attitude towards him that how Bhutto ordered to arrest the author because he was a communist and was spreading the communist ideology.

**Ali, Tariq, (March 1984), *Movement for the Restoration of Democracy in Pakistan, India International Centre Quarterly*<sup>5</sup>Vol. 11, No. 1.** This article discusses the causes of launching the MRD movement and also the author discusses the role of political parties of Sindh in this movement. Tariq discusses the causes that why MRD movement was initiated from Sindh and for which reasons it became a strongest movement there?

According to his point of view, Sindh was a province which was suffering a lot during Zia period. It was because of army's involvement and oppression that people of Sindh resisted first, and they fully cooperated with the leadership of MRD. By reading his article, one can come to know about the role of political parties especially Awami Tehrik a Left oriented party as a major political party in MRD movement after PPP. Tariq Ali of this opinion, it was Awami Tehrik which introduced MRD before the masses of Sindh and also organized people.

This article is based on a talk by Tariq Ali delivered in 1984, in which he also addressed the response of great powers specifically British to MRD that the great powers were seeing all that

---

<sup>4</sup>SobhoGiyanchandani, *Roshni je Pandhmein* (Sukkur: My Publication, 2013).

<sup>5</sup> Tariq Ali, Movement for the Restoration of Democracy in Pakistan. *India International Centre Quarterly* (March 1984), 11 (1), pp. 57-69.

was happening in Sindh. But, they were silent because they needed General Zia-ul-Haq to fight against the Soviet troops in Afghanistan at that time. Because of just a talk, the article is not fully based on research but it is one of good account to understand the political scenario of Pakistan specifically Sindh, and to see the recent MRD movement that was happened a year before in 1983 when it was on its peak.

**Qureshi, Professor Aijaz Ahmed, (2013), *One Unit aien Sindh (Sindh ji Siyasi Tareekh jo hik aham Baab) (Sindhi).***<sup>6</sup>

This book provides a detailed account of Anti- One Unit Movement. The author mentioned almost all political parties and also individuals who were part of the movement. This book is most important in the sense that, it is scholarly work, based on research methods. The author addressed almost all major and minor aspects of one-unit movement. It is also one of good sources to understand the leftists' role in anti-one unit movement.

The author discusses the role of CPP leaders in this movement and also he gave a reasonable account of Student Uprising of 4<sup>th</sup> of March 1967. According to the author, the student movement was launched for restoring the then Vice Chancellor of Sindh University who was forcibly transferred from Sindh University. But, when student leaders especially Jam Saqi realized that now students were ready to fight for political cause, then the movement was turned to join anti-one unit movement which was continuing by Sindhi nationalists including G.M. Syed.

**Jatoi, Dr. Hatim, (1995), *Baba-e-Sindh Hyder Baksh Jatoi 1901-1970: Introduction and Excerpts from His Writings.***<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Professor Aijaz Ahmed Qureshi, *One Unit aien Sindh (Sindh ji Siyasi Tareekh jo hik aham Baab)*(Karachi: Peacock Printers and Publishers, 2013).

In this book, biography of Comrade Hyder Bux Jatoi is given. Also his writings about the rights of Haris (peasants) and in the defense of Sindhi language etc., are given. This compiled book gives an insight to understand the role of Sindh Hari Committee under the leadership of Hyder Bakhsh Jatoi. The famous 'Tenancy Act' is also discussed in this book. Likewise, many pamphlets published and distributed among Haris by SHC, are given in this book.

**Bhatti, Rasheed, (2014), *Aseen Lochyoon Loah Mein (Sindhi)*.<sup>8</sup>**

The author shared some memories of Left and ethno-nationalist movements in Sindh. By reading his jail diary, one can know about author's views about Urdu speaking Leftists by whom he says they were not communists but they were Mohajirs (migrants) first. In his diary, Bhatti criticizes Urdu speaking comrades that they were hostile towards Sindh and Sindhis so they could not be called communists. This diary is helpful to understand the conflict between Sindhi and Urdu speaking leftists. Bhatti also criticize Sindhi leaders especially Rasool Bux Palijo on ideological grounds.

**Palijo, Rasool Bux, (2015), *Kot Lakhpat jo Qaidi (Sindhi)*<sup>9</sup>**

The author discusses the political situation during Zia regime and also he has discussed about the movements against Zia regime in which role of Left could not be denied. It is best account to understand the initial stages of MRD and the role of Awami Tehrik in this movement. In his jail diary, Palijo analyzed the then political situation and the role of Left and democrats in MRD movement.

Palijo depicts a picture of MRD and a Plane Hijacking Case that what had happened with prisoners arrested under these two cases.

---

<sup>7</sup> Dr. HatimJatoui, *Baba-e-Sindh HyderBakshJatoui 1901-1970: Introduction and Excerpts from His Writings* (Hyderabad: Baba-e-Sindh Hyder Bakhsh Jatoui Academy, 1995).

<sup>8</sup> Rasheed Bhatti, *AseenLochyoonLoah Mein*(Sukkur: My Publication, 2014).

<sup>9</sup>Rasool Bux Palijo, *KotLakhpatjoQaidi*(Kandiaro: Roshni Publication, 2015).

**Naqvi, Syed Jamaluddin, (2014), *Leaving the Left Behind*.<sup>10</sup>**

It is an autobiography written by Syed Jamaluddin Naqvi, which provides a good account of the history of Communist Party of Pakistan and also the movements of Left. In this book, the author writes about the formation of CPP, DSF, and NSF and, discusses many incidents, state oppression against communists. The important point in this autobiography is that he has written more about the Sindh Provincial Committee of CPP, because he remained an activist in Karachi.

In his autobiography, one can understand the role of Leftists of Sindh, whether they were Sindhi or Urdu speaking. He writes about well known communist leader Sobho Giyanchandi whom he considers his (Naqvi) intellectual guru. Jamal Naqvi also writes about Jam Saqi and many other comrades like Aziz Salam Bukhari, Dr. Aizaz Nazir, Saeen Azizullah, Sharaf Ali, and Imam Ali Nazish's position in party, their role and struggle. Hence, it can be said that his (Naqvi) autobiography is a good source to understand the Leftists of Sindh.

**Leghari, Iqbal, *History of the Communist Movement in Pakistan*.<sup>11</sup>**

Although, this thesis is more about the history of Communist Party of Pakistan but it also deals with the role of other parties of Left as well. The most important point is that he (Leghari) has discussed the 'New Left' in the light of PPP. In this, the author discusses the role of PPP especially Bhutto, and he also writes about the Leftists like Tufail Abbas group, who joined PPP and declared it a big Leftist party.

The author interviewed with some leaders of the time, who were playing their leading role during PPP's first tenure. On the behalf of those interviews, the author wrote the fate of Left in PPP.

---

<sup>10</sup> Syed Jamaluddin Naqvi, *Leaving the Left Behind* (Karachi: Pakistan Study Centre, University of Karachi, 2014)

<sup>11</sup> Iqbal Leghari, *History of the communist Movements in Pakistan* (Unpublished thesis)

The author also dealt with the issue of split between NSF led by Mairaj Muhammad Khan and PPP. This unpublished work of Iqbal Leghari helps to deal with a research question about the stance of PPP regarding socialism.

**Solangi, Ashique Hussain, (2007), *Sindh Hari Committee: Tareek aien Jidojihad (1930-1970)* (Sindhi).<sup>12</sup>**

This book is based on research, and it provides a detailed account of the history and struggle of Sindh Hari Committee. While writing about the formation of SHC, the author writes that SHC was formed after the establishment of Sukkur Barrage. The motive behind the formation of SHC was to save lands of Sindh from outsiders, and to make it possible the distribution of these lands among landless Haris of Sindh.

According to his thesis, the government of Pakistan was not ready to distribute the land among peasants of Sindh, but millions of acres were granted to military personals from Punjab, and also a huge amount of land was granted to Mohajirs. In retaliation, some progressive leaders and intellectuals like G.M Syed formed SHC. The SHC leadership demanded to distribute half land in migrants who could really cultivate the land, and half in Sindhi haris.

The author mentioned about the inactiveness of SHC in a very short period, but it was again organized in a better way under the leadership of Hyder Bux Jatoi and some other leaders. This book provides lot of information about SHC's activities in order to organize the peasants of Sindh through arranging conferences and gatherings. The author also mentions the landlords' response towards those haris who were not ready to obey them any more now. The book is one of good documents to understand the role of SHC in getting 'Sindh tenancy Act' passed from

---

<sup>12</sup>Ashique Hussain Solangi, *Sindh Hari Committee: TareekaienJidojihad*(Dokri: Lab-e-Darya Historical Society, 2007).

Sindh Assembly. Although this research work is very brief but still valuable in depicting the history of Sindh Hari Committee as a major Leftist party of Sindh.

**Paliyo, Rasool Bux, (2007), *Siyasi Adab-3 (Sindhi)*.<sup>13</sup>**

In this book, a portion consists of four chapters written about the conflict between Sindhi and Urdu speaking Leftists over national question, is given. In this book, Paliyo argues that the Urdu speaking leadership of CPP was ignoring the national question, and it was just trying to keep focusing Sindhi people towards class question and Sindhi feudal system only. The author writes that the class question was also important in Sindh, but more important was national question, because on the one hand, Punjab was looting Sindh, and on the other hand, Mohajirs were also betraying Sindhis.

In those articles, Paliyo raises some questions about Mohajirs of Sindh and people of Punjab that if Urdu and Punjabi speaking progressives claim to not be a part of looting and they (Mohajir and Punjabi people) also claim that it was only Punjabi and Urdu speaking upper class which was looting the resources of Sindh, then why Punjabi and Mohajir people were not cooperating with Sindhis to fight against enemies of Sindhis?

The author mentions many writings of Karl Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao to prove his argument that national question is more important. Therefore, he emphasizes that along with the military establishment and Punjab, these so called Leftists and progressives were also real enemies of Sindhi people, so he warned the people of Sindh to be careful about those so called comrades.

**Saqi, Jam, (1987), *Qomi Sawal (Sindhi)*.<sup>14</sup>**

---

<sup>13</sup>Rasool Bux Paliyo, *Siyasi Adab-3* (Hyderabad: Centre for Peace and Civil Society, 2007).



This booklet is based on speech delivered by Jam Saqi and it is useful source to understand the CPP's stance over national question. Jam Saqi writes about the student uprising of 4<sup>th</sup> of March and mentions that the Sindh National Student Federation (SNSF) was working under CPP and it was always struggling for the cause of Sindhi people. While mentioning the struggle against one-unit, demand for getting voter lists published in Sindhi and the demand that evacuee property should be distributed among Sindhi people, he writes that it was SNSF and CPP which were leading such movements.

The author writes about the role of G.M. Syed and Rasool Bux Palijo during the movement of getting Karachi back to Sindh. According to Saqi, these were Palijo and G.M Syed who declared that Karachi was not part of Sindh, but CPP opposed their point of view and continued their struggle to save Karachi. Author also writes about the constitution of 1973, and claims that it was only CPP, which got included the clauses about provincial autonomy in the constitution.

**Naqvi, Professor Jamal, (1989), *Communist Party of Pakistan me Nazryati kashmkash ki Mukhtasir Tareek (Urdu)*.<sup>15</sup>**

Naqvi tried to sketch a picture of Communist Party's struggle since before the partition to the time of publication of this book. Naqvi highlights a reason that why CPI favoured the idea of Pakistan. In this regard, he writes that after WWII, CPI inclined towards the rights of nations/nationalities. This was a main issue that they thought Muslim League was better party than Congress, because ML was struggling for the rights of Muslims and was demanding to create a separate state.

---

<sup>14</sup>Jam Saqi, *QomiSawal* (Karachi: Purbhat Press, 1987).

<sup>15</sup>Professor Jamal Naqvi, *Communist Party of Pakistan me NazryatikashmkashkiMukhtasirTareekh*(Karachi: Maktaba-e-Roshan Khayal, 1989).

While writing about CPP's alliance with Awami League, Jamal Naqvi writes party's role after it was banned. He writes that CPP was working underground and after banned, it was merged with Awami League. But it was observed after the imposition of One-Unit scheme that AL was only sincere with one nation i-e., Bengali. Because, AL was not opposing one-unit scheme now. According to his claim, Pakistani authorities gave an open offer to AL leader Suhwardi that Bangla going to be one of official languages of Pakistan and also Suhwardi was to be made a Prime Minister of Pakistan if he and his party AL agreed on 'Parity Formula'. Suhwardi agreed then it was decided that there was to be equal representation of Bengalis and Punjabis in central legislative assembly, and there would be no any third province or wing except East Pakistan and West Pakistan. This was a reason that CPP left alliance with AL and later joined National Awami Party (NAP).

Jamal wrote about divisions in the ranks of NAP that was divided into two factions, one was supporting Moscow line and second one was supporting Chinese (Maoist line). He has discussed about the supporters of Maoist line that they were supporting Ayub Khan Government and also his One-Unit scheme. He claims that Maoists were considering Ayub regime a Communist revolution in Pakistan because China had full support to Ayub regime.

This is a good book in the sense that this provides self criticism and a way to improve CPP and avoiding mistakes of past. As he was a member of central committee at the time of writing this book, so it is possible, he might not write all the negativities or mistakes of party, but it is a good approach of self criticism which is a dire need for every revolutionary and democratic party specifically leftist one.

**Ali, Kamran Asdar, (2006), *Karachi mein 1972 ki Mazdoor Jidojihad* (Urdu).<sup>16</sup>**

This article which is published in shape of a booklet mainly focuses the great Labour Movement of 1972 launched in Karachi, capital of Sindh. This was a period of civilian and democratic government of PPP. The author writes that when Bhutto elected Prime Minister of Pakistan, he promised labourers in his many speeches that his government would give due rights to labourers and peasants, but at the same time he warned labourers to not protest against his government. Bhutto threatened labourers that if they do, they will face serious consequences. While discussing the causes behind that labour movement, author writes that laborers were not given their rights like bonus and other benefits which were to be given them promised by Bhutto.

Such issues were creating the hype and it led to protests and resistance against Bhutto regime. In retaliation, Police opened fire in which one labor was killed. On second day, on the day of his funeral, laborers gathered and chanted slogans against government. Then again police opened fire; in result ten people were killed. This was an incident because of that struggle got momentum, and then different Leftist and nationalist parties including National Awami Party and Mazdoor Kissan Party supported the cause.

However, this article is good to understand the causes and aftermath of 1972 labour movements. In this article, at least the role of PPP which had been claiming to be a major Leftist party, can be seen clearly that how it adopted the anti-labour policies.

**Saqi, Jam, (1987), *Sindh ji Shagrid Jidojihad* (Sindhi).<sup>17</sup>**

---

<sup>16</sup>Kamran Asdar Ali, *Karachi mein 1972 ki Mazdoor Jidojihad* (Karachi: Pakistan Institute of Labour Education and Research (PILER), Pakistan Study Center, Karachi, 2006).

<sup>17</sup>Jam Saqi, *Sindh ji Shagrid Jidojihad* (Kandiaro: Roshni Publication, 1987).

This book is good to understand the history of Student struggles in Sindh specifically in understanding the uprising of 4<sup>th</sup> of March 1967, in detail. Jam mentioned the incidents and struggle process according to his experiences in that struggle. He discusses about three major student uprisings in Sindh. First student movement was initiated in 1955 against One-Unit scheme but according to Saqi, it did not last long. Students recorded their grievances on One-Unit scheme once or twice, but not then. The reason behind its unsuccessfulness according to Jam Saqi's opinion is that, there was no participation of lower middle class or middle class in that movement. The movement was launched by educated upper middle class.

The second student movement launched in 1962 and there were two practical forms of this movement i.e., the formation of Sindh Students Federation (SSF), and the other one was the emerging of political consciousness against One-Unit scheme through publishing pamphlets and wall chalking. This movement was also not long last because of absence of middle class in that period.

The third great students' movement took place in 1967 especially after the students uprising of 4<sup>th</sup> of March. Writing the causes behind 4<sup>th</sup> of March uprising, Saqi tells that Commissioner Hyderabad namely Masroor blamed then VC of Sindh University namely Hassan Ali that he was involved in bribery, therefore, he decided VC's transfer. On the other hand these were students especially HST activists who opposed this decision.

This is a valuable source in order to understand the student uprising specifically Student Movement of 4<sup>th</sup> March launched in Sindh, in which the author also played an active role as a Leftist.

**Hussain, Rifat, *Trade Union Tehrik: Aik Ajmali Jaiza (Urdu)*.<sup>18</sup>**

This article mainly traces the history of Trade Union Movements in Pakistan especially Trade Union movements between 1967 and 1972 are given in detail. The author has started from the partition that how much industries were given to Pakistan, and how these were being operated by the state of Pakistan. The industries with percentage and numbers are given in this article. Author also mentioned the Labour Rules issued by government of Pakistan in different times.

He has given the picture of these movements almost apart from the movements led by CPP, KMP, NAP and other parties. He is of this opinion that, when political parties interfered in these movements, then movements were going towards their failure. He has discussed the Trade Union Movements launched in Ayub era especially since 1967 until his (Ayub) resignation. Rifat mentioned causes behind these movements briefly. He has also discussed the Bhutto's promises with working class of Pakistan, and then his government's fascist activities against these same working class people whom Bhutto was supporting in his speeches and statements. In this regard, he discusses the famous Labour movement of 1972 of Karachi, in which he quotes BBC that according to BBC reports; at least fifty labourers were killed in two days.

In the starting of the article, writer also writes short history of peasant (farmers) movements in all over Sindh including the role of Sindh Hari Committee in Sindh. However, academically this article is best to understand the history of trade union movements.

**Siddiqi, Nafees, (1991), *Bhutto Se Bhutto Tak (Urdu)*.<sup>19</sup>**

---

<sup>18</sup>Rifat Hussain, *Trade Union Tehrik: Aik Ajmali Jaiza* (Karachi: Pakistan Institute of Labour Education and Research (PILER), Pakistan Study Center, University of Karachi).

<sup>19</sup>Nafees Siddiqi, *Bhutto Se Bhutto Tak* (Jang Publishers, 1991).

The book is good source to understand the initial ideological debate within PPP's leadership. In a chapter about ideological debate, writer discusses the party policies which were announced in its first convention held in Dr. Mubshar's house on 30 Nov-1 December 1967. Z.A Bhutto was made convener of Pakistan People's Party in this convention, who announced party's first four principles which were;

1. Islam is our Religion
2. Democracy is our Politics
3. Socialism is our Economy
4. Power lies in people

As for as Socialism and rights of peasants and laborers are concerned, PPP stated in its convention that lands would be distributed among landless peasants (Haris). For the rights of industrial laborers, convention states;

1. Trade Union Act would be amended according to International Labour Ordinance (ILO).
2. The right to form a labour union and the right to strike would be recognized.
3. Child labour will be abolished.

According to author's opinion Bhutto's concept of Socialism was not same as other Leftists were defining i.e. Socialism according to Marxism. Bhutto adopted Islamic Socialism based on the principles of equality (Masawat) given in teachings of Islam. Author argues that Bhutto did not participate in 1970 election with this slogan that he would bring a revolution but with this purpose that he would spread political consciousness among the people of Pakistan. About Socialism an article titled, "Socialism ki Manzil (The destiny of Socialism)" was presented in first convention of party, in which it was stated that; it was a need of time to instinct Socialism in

Pakistan but gradually. At the same time it was also discussed that the line to instinct Socialism according to other socialist countries like USSR, China etc, will not be followed, but here in Pakistan, according to the conditions of this country, Socialist line will be formed. It was also discussed in the convention that it was impossible to impose Socialism in a very short time, but it was possible to introduce it in country as much as it is possible.

Siddiqi writes that Bhutto's concept of socialism was totally different than other countries especially Russia and China. But, he did not discuss the point that in initial documents like 'Foundation Documents' there was no mention of 'Massawat-i-Muhammandi' or 'Islamic Socialism' but it was added when Bhutto faced pressure from ulemas and religious parties in the shape of Pakistan National Alliance (PNA).

**Sheikh, Zamir, (2014), *what went wrong?*<sup>20</sup>**

This book primarily is based on interviews of Leftist workers and leaders. In this regard, it is good to understand the Left in the words of these Leftists. The author interviewed with many Leftists including Tufail Abbas, Mairaj Muhammad Khan, Jam Saqi and Sohail Sangi, who talked about the communist party and also PPP's attitude towards socialism. This book is also helpful not only to understand the role of Left in famous movements but somehow failure of Left as well.

**Abro, Badar, (2014), *1983 Jadahin Sindh me Baah bari: MRD ji Khanai (Sindhi)*<sup>21</sup>**

This book is on the history of Movement for Restoration of Democracy (MRD) and it is a recognized source to understand the matter. This text is not only based on author's personal

---

<sup>20</sup>Zamir Sheikh, *What went wrong?*(Karachi:, no publisher is mentioned, 2014).

<sup>21</sup>BadarAbro, *1983Jadahin Sindh me Baahbari: MRD jiKahani*(Karachi: Kachho Publication, 2014).

experiences in the movement, but also he gives references of different national and international media who covered the events of the movement. Author also discusses the ‘Jam Saqi’ or ‘Communist Case’ in detail that how this case supported MRD to continue its mission.

## **Reports/Papers/Documents**

### ***PAKISTAN PEOPLE’S PARTY (PPP)***<sup>22</sup>

This document/paper is a series of those documents initiated by Pakistan Democratic Forum, aiming to introduce democratic and progressive parties who were actively participating in MRD. In this document, the first page consists of People’s Democratic Demands (these demands were raised from the platform of MRD), in these demands some demands are mainly/directly explicit the progressive manifesto. PDF has given some major information about PPP in this document.

The brief historical account of PPP is given in which the formation of PPP at Dr. Mubashir Hassan’s house, and the main objectives of PPP like “egalitarian democracy” and “application to socialist ideas to realize economic and social justice”, are mentioned here. PPP’s victory in West Pakistan in 1970 elections and Bhutto’s government tenure after separation of East Pakistan, is also discussed shortly.

During Bhutto period, there was a movement against Bhutto government launched by Pakistan National Alliance (PNA) with the slogan of “Nizam-e-Mustaffa (Prophet’s preferred System). This was a slogan which was somehow attracting the people of Pakistan. In retaliation, PPP dropped “Socialism” word from its manifesto and replaced it with the slogan of “Massawat-e-Muhammadi” (Islamic egalitarianism). In this document, overthrow of NAP Baluchistan

---

<sup>22</sup>*PAKISTAN PEOPLE’S PARTY (PPP)* (Democratic Organizations Series No.2, August 1983).



government and in response, the resign of NAP-NWFP government is also discussed shortly in order to know Bhutto's centrist approach and suppressing the voice in favour of provincial autonomy.

In the subtitle of 'Political Platform & Performance', it is clearly stated that, "Amongst its (PPP) first publications was Foundation Meeting Document No. 4 which stated that "the aim of the party is the transformation of Pakistan into a socialist society". The creation of Socialist Society was a main aim of party in initial days. In this regard, it is stated in this document that "the 1970 election manifesto brought together these policies and made them the party's official program. Amongst the main areas covered by this manifesto were:

1. Nationalization of key industries and finance.
2. Agrarian Reforms.
3. Labor Reforms.
4. Social and Cultural Reforms.
5. Foreign Policy.

These areas are discussed here separately; in the section of nationalization and measures taken by Bhutto to nationalize the industries, are discussed.

**Saqi, Jam, (1981),*PAKISTAN MILITARY DICTATORSHIP EXPOSED***

*Statement in Front of Military Tribunal by Jam Saqi, Member, Central Committee, Communist Party of Pakistan.*<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Jam Saqi, *PAKISTAN MILITARY DICTATORSHIP EXPOSED: Statement in Front of Military Tribunal by Jam Saqi, Member, Central Committee, Communist Party of Pakistan*(Communist Party Publication No. 10, August 1981).

This write up is based on Jam Saqi's statement in front of Military Tribunal, where he mentioned the charge sheet imposed by military junta against him. He was charged on the allegation that he kept literature which was a source to create hatred against this country. Jam was also charged to spread hatred among people of different provinces of Pakistan. At the same time, he was alleged to work against the military of Pakistan.

By this statement, Saqi gives answers of all allegations presented in Charge Sheet. He tries to prove it that military government which was propagating Islam that was not actual one. He mentions multiple verses of Holy Quran in order to prove that government was wrong. Likewise, he mentions each and every day since very beginning of his arrest till the day when he gave that statement in front of military tribunal.

Comrade Jam Saqi tells to tribunal about his party i.e. Communist Party of Pakistan that what was its manifesto, and how it had been functioning in the country. He very briefly discusses the party role in support of masses, in support of multi-nationalities, students, intellectuals and so on. He quotes many statements given by economic experts and politicians and military junta in favour of Socialism on different concessions. He has firm belief that there is no other better way than scientific socialism.

However, his statement is best to understand the role of Communist Party of Pakistan during Ayub, Yahya, Bhutto and Zia regimes. Also one can see the reaction of Pakistani establishment and governments' attitude towards communists especially those who used to talk about the provincial autonomy along with communist and socialist ideology. Saqi also discusses the role of Pakistan National Alliance (PNA) which was formed against Bhutto government. He argues that

PNA was actually formed and backed by military junta who wanted to topple the Bhutto government.

## **Research Methodology**

The study is mainly based on qualitative methodology of data collection. The primary and secondary both sources are used in order to collect the relevant data. The major sources used in this research are; autobiographies and jail diaries of Leftist leaders and political workers, books and journal articles on the topic, party manifestos, party magazines, newspapers of selected time period, and more importantly interviews with some famous and eye witness Leftist leaders and intellectuals.

## **Sources of Data Collection**

Most of both primary and secondary data is taken from the personal libraries of Leftist leaders and workers; some material was also collected from Sindhi Language Authority, Hyderabad, and also from Sindhology, University of Sindh, Jamshoro. Interviews with some leading Leftists and intellectuals were also done face to face and on phone as well.

## **Interviews**

Some Leftist workers and intellectuals shared their experiences and point of view during holding in depth conversational interviews with them. These Leftist leaders and intellectuals whom I interviewed are; former leaders of CPP and main victims of Jam Saqi Case namely Jam Saqi, and Sohail Sangi, present Secretary General of CPP Imdad Qazi, former CPP activist Iqbal Mallah, former CPP worker and wife of Nazir Abbasi namely Hameedan Ghanghro, president Qomi Awami Tehrik Ayaz Latif Palijo, former CPP worker Wahid Bux Banglani, writer and journalist

Dastagir Bhatti, Jami Chandio, Zaib Sindhi, and Secretary General of Awami Workers Party  
namely Bakhshal Thalho.

## Chapter No. 2

### **Peasant and Class Struggles: The Case of Sindh Hari (Peasant) Committee and Communist Party of Pakistan**

When someone discusses about the Left movements in Sindh, he/she must go into history of Sindh Hari Committee and Communist Party of Pakistan. Although, the Sindh Hari Committee was more active before the creation of Pakistan until it got ‘Tenancy Act’ passed from Sindh Assembly in 1950. After that period, SHC was working as a sister organization of Communist Party of Pakistan. Likewise, Communist Party of Pakistan was formed in 1948 and it remained functional till July 1954, then it was banned. After ban imposed on CPP, it went underground and had been merged with different parties like Awami League, National Awami Party and Pakistan National Party.

In this chapter, the formation and works of SHC and CPP since 1930 to 1954 will be discussed. Even though, the time period of thesis topic is 1954-1991, but, without going through the history of SHC and CPP before 1954, it is difficult to understand the role of Left and also the causes behind unsuccessfulness of Left. It must be kept in mind that, some other Left parties also had been working in Sindh but either they were formed after 1954 or they were not as active as SHC and CPP were. Those parties functioning in this time period were working as sister organizations of CPP, as it can be seen in the case of Sindh Hari Committee as well. Likewise, Democratic Students Federation and some pockets of Trade Unions were also working under CPP. Therefore, in this chapter, only two major Left parties i.e. Sindh Hari Committee and Communist Party of Pakistan are focused. The remaining Left parties will be discussed in coming chapters.

However, this chapter provides basis to understand the question “what were causes that being leading force in political uprisings during 1954-91, Left did not become Political-Mainstream in

Sindh?” As mentioned above, this chapter deals the Left before 1954 but it is important to see, how Left evolved before selected period and what were its deficiencies and also how state responded these movements? On the one hand, this chapter provides an account to understand the Left at its initial stages, and also this chapter can prove fruitful to understand the basic causes behind unsuccessfulness of the Left of Sindh.

The major reason to focus only on these two parties is that, SHC mobilized and organized peasant class of Sindh to get their rights back from feudal lords, before the creation of Pakistan, and after partition, it was CPP which launched class struggle and demanded a classless society. In this chapter, a brief introduction and works of Sindh Hari Committee and Communist Party of Pakistan are discussed. This brief introduction of these two Leftist parties can show a picture that how Left politics emerged in Sindh, and what was its role in mobilizing people of Sindh. Likewise, state oppression against Leftists/Communists will be dealt in this chapter also.

### **Formation of Sindh Hari (Peasant) Committee**

The Sindh Hari Committee was an independent political party until it got merged in Communist Party. The SHC was formed in 1930 when a Hari (peasant) conference was called in Mirpurkhas in which it was decided to form a party named ‘Sindh Hari Association’.<sup>24</sup> It’s founding members were; Jamshed Mahta, Principal Gokle, G.M. Syed, Sheikh Abdul Majeed Sindhi, Jethmal Pursuram and Comrade Abdul Qadir.<sup>25</sup> Principal Gokle became first President of SHC. There were different motives behind formation of Sindh Hari Committee; especially conditions

---

<sup>24</sup>Ashique Hussain Solangi, Sindh Hari Committee: TareekhainJidojihad (1930-1970). Dokri, District Larkana, Lab-e-Darya Historical Society, 2007. P32.

<sup>25</sup>QaziFaiz Muhammad, Hari Committee aienAllotteeTehrik. Hyderabad, Sindhi SahatGhar, 2008. P25.

of that time provided an opportunity to some Sindhi political leaders to form a party that could fight for peasant rights.

On the one hand, great changes and revolutions were taking place in different parts of world. Amongst those changes, the founders of SHC were highly inspired by Russian Revolution<sup>26</sup> where workers united for their rights and they brought a revolution. Because of that great achievement of Russian people, some leading political leaders and political workers of Sindh decided to form a party which could advocate peasant rights. But, major causes behind formation of SHC were new developments took place in Sindh like construction of Sukkur Barrage. Because of Sukkur Barrage constructed, many lakh acres of land came under cultivation.

This was a major development which led a situation in which formation of a peasant political party was inevitable. Because the then Sindhi leadership was feeling insecure that after the construction of Sukkur Barrage, million acres of land could be cultivable and they had fear of losing the land in the hands of Punjabi military personnel.<sup>27</sup> The Sindhi political leadership was not wrong in this regard, because when Sukkur Barrage was constructed, the then government was trying to accommodate Punjabi military personnel in Sindh through granting them fertile lands of Sindh. Punjabis served British government as military soldiers so British government was giving award of that loyalty to Punjabi military personnel through granting them lands of Sindh.

Sindh was a part of Bombay presidency at that time, so Sindh Hari Committee passed a resolution in Hari conference held in Mipurkhas on 12<sup>th</sup> of July 1930. In this resolution, SHC

---

<sup>26</sup> Lock cite

<sup>27</sup> Ibid

demanding rights for local Sindhi population from Bombay government. Two points of the resolution were very important in this regard which were;

1. Bombay government was requested through this resolution to allot lands which came under cultivation because of construction of Sukkur Barrage, to local peasants on cheap rates and easy installments.
2. It was demanded in the resolution that the 'Tenancy Act' should get passed so that the peasant rights over lands can be protected.<sup>28</sup>

It is interesting to look into ideological debate of Sindh Hari Committee because in Sindh, since the inception of party till date, debate over ideological line of SHC is going on. There are two major arguments in this regard; one is of this opinion that Sindh Hari Committee was not a Left party but it was a Sindhi nationalist party, which not only fought for the rights of Sindhi Haris but at the same time, it launched movements in defense of Sindhi language and also resisted One Unit scheme.

On the other hand, according to another school of thought, Sindh Hari Committee was a Left party which launched class struggles and challenged the highly powerful feudal lords of Sindh. According to this school of thought, there were Sindhi nationalist elements within party as well, but SHC was clear on national question. Therefore, it was working for the rights of Sindhi Haris and in the defence of Sindhi language etc. However, before going further history of SHC, it is essential to look into this ideological debate about Sindh Hari Committee.

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, 33



## **Ideological Debate about Sindh Hari Committee**

The ideological debate about Sindh Hari Committee that whether it was a Leftist party or not, is not new, but still two opinions are prevailing in this regard. According to one school of thought, SHC was a Leftist party which launched movements on class question through challenging the feudal lords. But on the other hand, according to another school of thought, Sindh Hari Committee was just demanding Haris' rights, but it was not working to establish a classless society, therefore, SHC could not be considered as a Left party. Following latter opinion, famous writer of Sindh namely Jami Chandio says: "Sindh Hari Committee was just highlighting the Hari question, but it was not a proper communist party. SHT was formed by Saeen G.M Syed and some other leaders, who were demanding for Haris' rights, but SHC was not demanding stateless society."<sup>29</sup>

Answering a question "then what about slogan of 'Jo Khere so Khaye (Those who plough they should reap)'" he said: "That was Shaheed Shah Inayat's slogan which was not taken by SHC. SHC was demanding rights for Haris under the British Empire. Hyder Bux Jatoti strengthened Hari Committee in 1945 and then it got Tenancy Act passed from Assembly in 1950. It was Hari movement, not communist movement. Yes, it was somehow raising class question, but it is not necessary that every peasant movement must be a communist movement. The main motive of communist parties is to work for classless society."<sup>30</sup> On contrarily, according to a famous

---

<sup>29</sup> Interview with Jami Chandio, February 5, 2016

<sup>30</sup> Ibid

Communist namely Sobho Gianchandani, Sindh Hari Committee since its early days was affiliated with ‘All India Kissan Sabha’.<sup>31</sup>

Like Sobho, Kamran Asdar Ali also writes about SHC’s affiliation with Communist Party of India (CPI). He writes, “In Sind, as in Bengal and Punjab, some peasant-based organizations had close links to the CPI during the 1940s. One of them, the Sind Hari Committee under Haidar Bux Jatoi’s leadership, was active in certain rural districts, and G. M. Syed, a progressive Muslim League leader, supported its demands for tenancy rights among the Haris (peasants).”<sup>32</sup>

Although, Sindh Hari Committee formed in 1930 under the leadership of some leading Sindhi politicians of the time, but the party expanded and got much popularity during the leadership of Hyder Bux Jatoi who resigned from his bureaucratic position and joined party in 1945. But the debate about Comrade Jatoi that whether he was a Communist or a Sindhi nationalist, is also very interesting.

According to Dr. Azad Qazi, Comrade Jatoi was sincere with national question of Sindh and because of his sincere affiliation with national question; Communist Party did not give him membership in party.<sup>33</sup> Qazi also quotes a declaration of SHC published in ‘Haqdar’ newspaper on 20<sup>th</sup> June 1947. In this declaration it was mentioned that Sindh Hari Committee was not a branch of Communist Party, therefore, communist, non-communist, member of Congress and Muslim League whosoever was sincere with the cause of peasants, could join party.<sup>34</sup> But opposite of this opinion, according to Imdad Qazi, Secretary General of CPP in present, “Sindh

---

<sup>31</sup>SobhoGianchandani, SobhyJoon Taheroon-1.Compiled by Naz Sanai. Hyderabad, Sindhi SahatGhar, 2010.P118.

<sup>32</sup>KamranAsdar Ali, Surkh Salam Communist Politics and Class Activism in Pakistan 1947-1972. Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2015, P49.

<sup>33</sup>Comp. by Dr. Azad Qazi, Comrade Hyder Bux Jatoi (Sindhi Sarwech).Kandiaro, Roshni Publication, 2015. P13-

14

<sup>34</sup> Ibid, 15

Hari Committee was working as a sister organization of CPP so in this way Comrade Jatoi was a member of Communist Party until general elections held in Ayub period. Jatoi was expelled from Communist Party because he wanted to take part in elections held during Ayub era and in this context; he wanted to replace the name of Sindh Hari Committee by Sindh Hari Party. Therefore, he was expelled but in spite of that until his death, he remained loyal to Communist Party”.<sup>35</sup>

Likewise, a well known Communist namely Comrade Sobho Gianchandani states, Hyder Bux Jatoi proudly declared himself a communist.<sup>36</sup>

Coming back to the ideological debate about Sindh Hari Committee, senior journalist Zamir Sheikh while quoting Imdad Kazi, General Secretary of CPP, writes, “Secretary General of Communist Party Imdad Kazi said that Sindh Hari Committee had played important role in the class struggle movement of 50s when the slogans of abolish of feudal system , equal share of Hari in the agricultural produce etc were raised. The Committee had rejuvenated the slogan of Shah Inayat, “Those who plough the land should reap the land”. This slogan had strained relations between G.M Syed and Comrade Jatoi.”<sup>37</sup>

Looking into above debate, one can analyze that SHC launched class struggles like fighting against feudal lords of Sindh, and demanding rights for lower class i.e. peasants. Although, it was not working to create a stateless society, but one cannot deny that it was because of SHC that peasants came to know about their rights, their strengths, weaknesses and also art to fight against their collective enemy i.e. feudalism and landlordism. Sindh Hari Committee also raised

---

<sup>35</sup>Interview with ImdadQazi on phone, March 23, 2016

<sup>36</sup>SobhoGianchandani, SobhyJoon Tahreeroun-1, Hyderabad, Sindhi SahatGhar, 2010.P107

<sup>37</sup>Zamir Sheikh, What Went Wrong, Karachi, (no publisher is mentioned), 2014.P33.

issue of evacuee property of Hindus which supposed to be granted to new settlers (migrants), by government of Pakistan.

The Sindhi Hindus left almost two and half million acres of land, so SHC demanded to distribute the land among immigrants and local landless Sindhis. SHC demanded 50%-50% distribution of land among indigenous Sindhis and immigrants from India. Likewise, SHC played its vital role in anti-One Unit movement and also in the defense of Sindhi language. Because of these kinds of actions, SHC seemed more Sindhi nationalist rather Left party. Sindh Hari Committee was not taking labor question parallel to Hari (peasant) question. This was also one of reasons that SHC was not considered a Leftist party. However, no doubt, Sindh Hari Committee played a great role in mobilizing peasants against feudal system of Sindh.

### **SHC's Struggle for Rights of Haris (Peasants)**

Sindh Hari Committee continued its struggle through organizing peasant conferences in different cities and towns of Sindh in order to make people understand about their rights and strengths. According to former leader of Communist party namely Sohail Sangi: "In the decades of 50s and 60s, there was no unit of any political party in any village, town and city of Sindh but it was only Sindh Hari Committee which was so active in Sindh. I think, Left was popular during that time period, because it was only Left which shown complete commitment with people".<sup>38</sup> It was because of Sindh Hari Committee struggle that the issues of peasants came under debate in mainstream politics. Because of this, during the visit of Pakistan by the then Chinese Prime Minister Zhou Enlai expressed his wish to meet Comrade Hyder Bux Jatoi.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Interview with SohailSangi, January 31, 2016

<sup>39</sup>Zamir Sheikh, What Went Wrong, (no publisher is mentioned), 2014,P31

Hyder Bux Jatoi was a person, who resigned from his bureaucratic post i.e. deputy collector and joined Sindh Hari Committee in 1945, later he was elected President of Sindh Hari Committee in 1946.<sup>40</sup> Although, before Hyder Bux Jatoi's joining, SHC was working among Haris, but its strength was not as much it got momentum under the leadership of Comrade Jatoi. It was during his leadership that SHC got Sindh Tenancy Act passed from Sindh Assembly and also it succeeded to get half batai (share-crop) demand accepted from Assembly.

### **Struggle for Sindh Tenancy Act and Half Batai (share-crop)**

Sindh Tenancy Act was a great achievement for Sindh Hari Committee because SHC was continuously struggling to get this act passed from Assembly. SHC started to mobilize Haris of Sindh over this issue since the inception of party in 1930 but in spite of that neither British government before partition nor government of Pakistan after partition was considering their demand. However, in 1949, Pir Illahi Bux was replaced by new Chief Minister of Sindh namely Yousif Haroon who showed interest in this Act. On 9<sup>th</sup> of March 1949, a select committee comprised of 21 members was formed, which was asked to present report within two weeks.<sup>41</sup>

The delegate of Sindh Hari Committee also presented their views about Sindh Tenancy Act on 17 March 1949. At the same time, SHC continued its struggle through mobilizing and sensitizing people on this issue. SHC held conferences in different cities of Sindh. These conferences were held in Thatta on April 8, 1949, in Sukkur on 13 April, in Hyderabad on 15 April, in Larkana on 17 April, Mirpurkhas on 13<sup>th</sup> of August and on 5<sup>th</sup> of September in Nawabshah.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>Compiled and Edited by Dr. Hatim Jatoi, Baba-e-Sindh Hyder Bux Jatoi: Introduction and Excerpts from His Writings. Hyderabad, Baba-e-Sindh Hyderbaksh Jatoi Academy, Hyder Mehfil, Hyder Chowk, Hyderabad, 1995.P7.

<sup>41</sup>Ashique Hussain Solangi, Sindh Hari Committee: Tareekhien Jidojihad (1930-1970). Dokr, District Larkana, Lab-e-Darya Historical Society, 2007.P127

<sup>42</sup>Ibid, 129

Tenancy Act came under debate in Sindh Assembly from 1<sup>st</sup> of April 1950. On April 2, SHC workers gathered in Karachi and they decided to hold a protest in front of Assembly hall on very next day. They also decided to present a memorandum about Tenancy Act to all Assembly members, and also a Hari delegate was to be met with the then Chief Minister of Sindh.<sup>43</sup> Haris gathered in front of Assembly hall on April 3, and they raised slogans in favor of peasants. On the second day i.e. April 4, 1950, Assembly passed the 'Sindh Tenancy Act'.<sup>44</sup>

Tenancy Act was a great achievement in which the demand for half batai (share crop) was also accepted. Demand for half batai started since 1947 and this demand became a slogan of SHC since 4 and 5 March 1947. Now in Sindh Tenancy Act, Hari got right of getting half share of crop that he used to produce.

Because of Tenancy Act, Haris not only got right of half batai but they were also exempted from extra labor and also landowner was restricted to overthrow his Haris. Although, it was great achievement to get Tenancy Act passed from Assembly and because of that, now landowners and peasants were accepted as equal crop shareholders, but at the same time, peasants faced many threats and even many were killed during the process of implementation of Sindh Tenancy Act.

After the creation of Pakistan, it was Communist Party of Pakistan which led Left movements in Sindh and Pakistan. Although, Karachi was snatched from Sindh and was made a capital of Pakistan, so in remaining cities of Sindh, there were no industries as these were in Karachi. Therefore, the Trade Union movements remained functional only in Karachi but in rural areas of Sindh, it was Sindh Hari Committee which was working as a sister organization of Communist

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid, 130-131

<sup>44</sup> Ibid, 131

Party and was busy in mobilizing the Haris. Likewise, the student wings of Communist Party like National Student Federation (NSF) and Democratic Student Federation (DSF) were also working in Sindh and they were also more functional in Karachi. However, it can be said that the Communist Party provided a center or a united platform to Left parties who gathered under the banner of CPP.

### **Formation of Communist Party of Pakistan and State Response to Communists**

Although, according to some sources, politics based on Communist ideology persisted in Sindh since many year before the creation of Pakistan. But, no doubt, after the formation of CPP, Communist politics expanded. As it is discussed above that according to some sources, Sindh Hari Committee was affiliated with CPI, but it is believed that the Trade Union movements launched after partition when Urdu speaking leadership of CPP migrated to Pakistan. In opposite of this view, it is on the record that there was small Trade Union working in Sindh, before the creation of Pakistan.

In this regard Kamran Asdar Ali writes that “there were some peasant-based organizations that at the time of partition had links to the CPI. For example, the Sind Hari Committee under Haidar Bux Jatoi’s leadership was active in certain rural districts. There was also a nascent trade union movement and a small, but effective branch of the Communist Party. The trade union activities were organized mostly around dock workers, workers in the Karachi Port Trust, railways, electricity supply, and municipal workers”.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup>KamranAsdar Ali, Surkh Salam Communist Politics and Class Activism in Pakistan 1947-1972, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2015, P87.

Likewise, Secretary General of CPP namely Imdad Qazi states same about Trade Union movements in Sindh. He says, “Trade Union was already working from Karachi to Lahore before the creation of Pakistan. This Trade Union was called ‘All India Trade Union Congress’.”<sup>46</sup> In Sindh, there was a provincial committee of said Trade Union Congress called ‘Sindh Provincial Trade Union Congress’. A Sindhi Hindu namely Narain Das Bechar was a founder of Trade Union movement in Sindh. He became the leader of Sindh Provincial Trade Union Congress in 1930.<sup>47</sup>

Kamran also writes about the formation of Communist Party in 1940s in Sindh. He writes, “In the early 1940s, in addition to the trade union activity in Karachi, there was a parallel formation of the Communist Party, led by Qadir Baksh Nizamani, Abdul Qadir, and Mohammad Amin Khoso.”<sup>48</sup> He further states that “by the mid-1940s, the Communist Party had a strong following especially among *bidi* workers, carriage drivers, ginning factory workers, and some shop assistants.”<sup>49</sup>

However, India partitioned and the Communist Party of India (CPI) divided into two sections, one remained in India called Communist Party of India (CPI) and other one created for new born homeland Pakistan, i.e. Communist Party of Pakistan (CPP). Although, it was not decided at the time of partition that CPI was to be divided, but in CPI Congress held in Calcutta in 1948, it was decided to split Communist party<sup>50</sup> into two sections i.e., CPI for India and CPP for Pakistan.

---

<sup>46</sup> Interview with Imdad Qazi, January 28, 2016

<sup>47</sup> Lock cite

<sup>48</sup> Ibid

<sup>49</sup> Ibid

<sup>50</sup> Ishtiaq Ahmed, “The Rise and Fall of the Maoist Movement in Pakistan”. ISAS Insights, No. 102 (26 May 2010).



After split took place in party, it was decided that now the national capitalists were ruling both countries, therefore, CPI and CPP should organize peasants and labors in order to bring a revolution.<sup>51</sup>

If someone talks about the weaknesses and flaws of Communist Party of Pakistan, criticism starts from very initial days of party. The policies of Communist Party had been criticized on different times that the party leadership had to realize that the political and social conditions of two countries were not same. Therefore, same kind of policies for both countries was not a right decision. In this regard, according to Professor Jamal Naqvi, at the time of formation of CPP, the leadership of Communist party did not realize difference of political and social conditions between two countries.<sup>52</sup> Like Professor Jamal Naqvi was of this opinion that, in India religion was not a big issue, but on contrary in Pakistan religion was not only strong at state level but it was as important in social lives of people of Pakistan. Therefore, CPI leadership would have to think over the name of party of Pakistan that whether word 'Communist' was suitable for party for Pakistan or not.<sup>53</sup>

Likewise, critics of Communist Party of Pakistan also raise question on CPP leadership that was not local but migrated from India. Because, on the one hand, CPI leadership could not understand the problems and conditions of Pakistan and at the same time, CPI was committing a mistake that the CPI leadership especially from UP and CP was sent to lead the CPP. The migrated leadership of CPI was not aware of actual problems of this country so definitely they were unable to play an active role as the local leadership might play. The Sindhi Leftists and intellectuals are more critical in this regard.

---

<sup>51</sup> Professor Jamal Naqvi, Communist Party of Pakistan me Nazryati Kashamkashkimukhtasir Tareek. Karachi, Maktaba-e-Roshan Khayal, 1989.P15

<sup>52</sup> Ibid, 16

<sup>53</sup> Ibid

While talking about Urdu speaking leadership of CPP-Sindh, Sohail Sangi, CPP-Sindh leader and one of victims of Jam Saqi case states, “I am from Thar, so as I can understand condition of Thar, you cannot. Although CPP leaders like Comrade Aizaz Nazir and many more worked in masses of Sindh, but it is true that they could not understand condition of Sindh properly as Sindhi Communists could understand.”<sup>54</sup> Jami Chandio, an intellectual of Sindh, analyzes Communist Party in these words, “there were 3-4 problems with the Left of Pakistan: When Pakistan was created, the Communist Party of India sent Sajjad Zaheer, Aziz Sallam Bukhari and some other Communist leaders to Pakistan. Although, Sajjad Zaheer was playing active role in Taraqi Pasand Musanifeen (Progressive Writers’ Association), but these people were not aware of the actual situation of this country. They could not understand internal challenges of this country”.<sup>55</sup>

Jami Chandio continues, “When Sajjad Zaheer came out of jail, he went back to India, and the remaining party members who came from India, were not clear on national and Hari question. For example; they were not agreed to make Hyder Bux Jatoi a member of CPP. You can understand in this situation that how much they were narrow minded. Likewise, CPP was not clear on language issue. In 1948 when Jinnah Sahib declared in Bengal that only Urdu would be national language of Pakistan, what was point of view of CPP at that time? CPP’s point of view was same as it was of Jamait-i-Islami.”<sup>56</sup>

Despite all deficiencies, Communist Party of Pakistan became one of major political parties of Pakistan until a ban was imposed on party. The Muslim League was losing its popularity and a new religious party namely Jamait-i-Islami was going to replace Muslim League. But

---

<sup>54</sup> Interview with SohailSangi, January 31, 2016

<sup>55</sup> Interview with Jami Chandio, February 5, 2016

<sup>56</sup> Ibid

meanwhile, Communist Party also was gaining popularity throughout Pakistan especially in Punjab. According to General Secretary of Communist Party namely Imdad Qazi, “IG Special Branch Punjab namely Chaudhary Anwer was asked by Federal Government to make a report on the activities of CPP in Punjab. At that time, Lahore was Headquarter of CPP. Anwer’s report is published before some time. According to his report; there were CPP’s district committees in more than 80 percent districts of Punjab, and the CPP organizers were also working in remaining districts. He also stated that CPP had huge funds even ML had not as much funds as CPP had. In this regard, it was clear that CPP emerged as a counter force of ML, this was one of reasons that CPP was banned.”<sup>57</sup>

On the one hand, Communist Party was expanding and at the same time, because of Muslim League was losing its popularity among people of Pakistan, the religious forces were trying to form a new religious party i.e. Jamait-i-Islami. On the other hand, state machinery came in force and a crackdown against Communists started.

## **The Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case**

Communist Party of Pakistan in a very short time period emerged as one of major political parties of Pakistan. The Pakistan military especially then Brigadier Akbar Khan showed friendly relationship with party leadership. Because of cooperation and support between some sections of military and CPP leadership and an allegation of toppling then existing government and planned

---

<sup>57</sup> Interview with ImdadQazi, January 28, 2016

to replace it by CPP government, the famous Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case was registered against some army personals and CPP leadership.

In March 1951, Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan stated that some military personnel with the help of Communist Party were planning to kill him and then topple his government. The conflicts were going on between the then Brigadier Akbar Khan and Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan over Kashmir issue. Akbar Khan desired to go in Kashmir against India.<sup>58</sup> But, Prime Minister was not ready to accept Khan's desire. Therefore, Akbar Khan wanted to overthrow Liaquat's government and in this connection, he needed assistance from Communist leaders like Sajjad Zaheer, Sibte Hassan, Faiz Ahmed Faiz and Muhammad Hussain Ata.<sup>59</sup>

Syed Jamaluddin writes in his autobiography about the plan that "According to the plan, Khan was to form new government which was to organize general elections in the country. The new government was to allow the Communist Party to take part in the political process and, in return, the CPP was to welcome and provide support to the new government. The plan leaked out and all the accused were tried in a special tribunal in the compound of Hyderabad Jail."<sup>60</sup> Although, this is not clear yet that whether Communist party was involved in that conspiracy or not, but at least it was clear that meetings held between Akbar Khan and Communist Party leadership.

Kamran Asdar Ali quotes Tufail Abbas's interview with him who states, "The CPP leadership in the Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case showed haste. He argued that people were in a hurry to bring about the revolution and could not wait for the Party to develop its roots among the masses.

---

<sup>58</sup> Syed Jamaluddin Naqvi with HumairIshtiaq, Leaving Left Behind, Karachi, Pakistan Study Center, university of Karachi, 2014.P027

<sup>59</sup> Ibid

<sup>60</sup> Ibid

Whether this is a serious analysis or not, it does seem that the CPP leadership in the early 1950s had decided to keep open all options for capturing state power”.<sup>61</sup>

On contrary, another senior member of Communist Party namely Professor Jamal Naqvi argues that CPP was not involved in Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case. Even government also not alleged the party leadership’s involvement in conspiracy, but government alleged party to not let the government know about conspiracy.<sup>62</sup> But in his autobiography, Syed Jamaluddin contradicts with his own above statement and he writes, “The case was not false as the meeting had indeed taken place. However, the meeting had ended without any accord after a prolonged session spanning eight hours of intense debate. The CPP was not too interested in any aggressive posture as it felt it did not have the means to sustain any so-called revolution”.<sup>63</sup>

However, question arises here that why CPP was inclined towards Brigadier Akbar Khan and his team, even party knew it that Akbar Khan wanted to make Liaquat government compelled to allow the military forces to go at Kashmir? Did CPP realize that military action could be proved one of causes of making India-Pak relations more strained? Although, in many countries, Leftists came in power through military coup but the case of Pakistan was different in this regard, because military personnel including Brigadier Akbar Khan were not revolutionary. It was quite possible that because of no other option available for army other than Communist Party at that time, military tried to exploit CPP for their personal or institutional gains.

---

<sup>61</sup>Kamran Asdar Ali, *Surkh Salam Communist Politics and Class Activism in Pakistan 1947-1972*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2015, P201.

<sup>62</sup> Professor Jamal Naqvi, *Communist Party of Pakistan me Nazryati Kashamkashkimukhtasir Tareek*, Karachi, Maktaba-e-Roshan Khayal, 1989. P19

<sup>63</sup> Syed Jamaluddin Naqvi with Humair Ishtiaq, *Leaving Left Behind*, Karachi, Pakistan Study Center, university of Karachi, 2014. P027

On 9<sup>th</sup> March 1951, Akbar Khan and eleven other military personnel were arrested on charge of conspiracy, and later on Communist Party was also charged in this case.<sup>64</sup> Communist Party leadership consisted of Sajjad Zaheer, Faiz Ahmed Faiz and Muhammad Hussain Ata, was arrested and they were sentenced four year and Rs. 500 fine.<sup>65</sup> Although charges against Communist Party leadership were not proved but government was successful in getting rid of anti-imperialist elements in military and progressive elements in Trade Unions<sup>66</sup> through detaining some military personnel and leading Communist leadership. Because of Conspiracy Case registered against CPP and Juguto Front's (United Front) success in 1954 elections held in East Pakistan, a ban was imposed on CPP.

### **CPP banned and went underground**

The action of Communist party charged under Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case, weakened party because a crackdown against Communists took place in Pakistan. Because of state oppression against Communists, the central leadership of party either left country or left party after getting release from jail. Sajjad Zaheer, Secretary General of party left Pakistan and returned to India, and Muhammad Hussain Ata left the party.<sup>67</sup>

Communist Party of Pakistan after banned, almost became a non-existent entity in West Pakistan. Although right after ban on party, some party members from Punjab tried to revive

---

<sup>64</sup> Comrade Imam Ali Nazish, compiled by Comrade Wahid Bux Banglani and Zarqa Inqlabi, Communist of Pakistan ki Tareekh, 2012. P31.

<sup>65</sup> Ishtiaq Ahmed, "The Rise and Fall of the Maoist Movement in Pakistan". ISAS Insights, No. 102 (26 May 2010). P3.

<sup>66</sup> Lock, cite, P31

<sup>67</sup> Kamaran Asdar Ali, Surkh Salam Communist Politics and Class Activism in Pakistan 1947-1972, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2015, P201-202.

CPP, but it was difficult now. Because, on the one hand, state tactics against Communists was in force and on the other hand, division within the party ranks emerged.

In this regard Kaman writes, “During this disarray, the Sind provincial committee was not willing to submit to the Punjab party as it had severe reservations about the ‘adventurist’ line followed by the Central Committee and the Punjab colleagues. The Sind party hence became more independent and called itself the new CPP”.<sup>68</sup> However, still Communist Party had mass support in East Pakistan which can be seen by going through the provincial election results, and it should be noted here that after Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case, these election results were one of major causes of imposing ban on Communist party.

Ishtiaq Ahmed writes about provincial elections of East Bengal and ban imposed on CPP, “In the provincial elections held in East Bengal in March 1954, a united front constituted by a number of parties opposed to West Pakistani domination won 223 seats out of a total of 237 seats reserved for Muslims. These developments created panic among the ruling Muslim League government. It retaliated by alleging that the United Front and the CPP were involved in a conspiracy to undo the unity of Pakistan by supporting secessionist movements. Consequently, a ban was imposed on the CPP in July 1954”.<sup>69</sup> Despite ban imposed on Communist Party, the Sindh and East Pakistan committees not only existed but they continued their work. But, in Punjab committee, opportunist elements dominated, so Punjab committee could not exist in a way as Sindh and East Pakistan committees existed and continued their work.<sup>70</sup>

Hence, it can be concluded that on the one side, state apparatus was active against Communist party because it was Communist party which was replacing Muslim League as a major party of

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid, 202-203

<sup>69</sup> Ishtiaq Ahmed, “The Rise and Fall of the Maoist Movement in Pakistan”. ISAS Insights, No. 102 (26 May 2010). P3.

<sup>70</sup> Comrade Imam Ali Nazish, compiled by Comrade Wahid Bux Banglani and Zarqa Inqlabi, Communist of Pakistan ki Tareekh, 2012. P34

Pakistan. At the same time, Liaquat government was more inclined towards America than Soviet Union. There was also America's wish behind a ban imposed on Communist party because in provincial elections, Communist Party emerged as one of big and major parties of East Bengal, and definitely, it was neither acceptable for the then Pakistani government nor America. Therefore, state came in motion against Communists. Before that, Communist Party leadership made a great mistake during secrete plan made for overthrowing Liaquat government which gave government an excuse to restrict party work.

Although, Communist Party's involvement was not proved in conspiracy case but CPP leadership was in contact with Brigadier Akbar Khan and his team, which was not right decision at that time, because, CPP leadership had to analyze Pakistani conditions before taking any decision. However, state succeeded in her counter policy and the Communist party went underground. After that time, CPP never emerged as a major political force of Pakistan again.

The Pakistani government somehow got rid of Communists and the government signed mutual defense agreements with United States. This kind of development further created difficulties for Leftist elements in Pakistan.

Therefore, it can be argued that some causes discussed in this chapter like; CPP leadership's unawareness about then prevailing political condition of Pakistan, somehow cooperating with Pakistani military in order to overthrow the Liaquat regime, and also the state oppression against Left, were some major causes behind the unsuccessfulness and weakness of the Left. These causes surely affected the Left movement in Sindh and Pakistan.

Apart from these some causes, there were some other causes as well which contributed in failure of Sindhi and Pakistani Left too, which are discussed in coming chapters.



## **Chapter No. 3**

### **The Role of Left in Anti-One Unit and Movement for Restoration of Democracy (MRD)**

The Left of Sindh had played a vital and leading role in many political movements especially in two very famous movements i.e. Anti-One Unit Movement, and the other one is ‘Movement for Restoration of Democracy (MRD)’. Although, the Sindhi nationalist parties were aligned with the Left of Sindh and they were also very active in these movements, but some Leftist parties like Communist Party of Pakistan, Sindh Hari Committee, Sindh National Students Federation and Awami Tehrik were on forefront in these movements.

In this chapter, the logic behind imposing One-Unit and the causes behind launching Anti-One movement will be discussed. Likewise, the role of students of Sindh especially the activists of Hyderabad Student Federation (HSF), Sindh National Students Federation (SNSF) and Sindh Student Federation (SSF), in Anti-One Unit movement are also highlighted. Apart from Anti-One Unit movement, the Movement for Restoration of Democracy (MRD) was also a great political movement. Although, it was expanded throughout Pakistan but Sindh was leading the MRD. In this movement, two major Leftist parties i.e. Communist Party of Pakistan and Awami Tehrik were on forefront.

It is believed by political thinkers and intellectuals of Sindh and Pakistan that Awami Tehrik was actual political party which mobilized people of Sindh against Zia Martial law. Likewise, the role of Communist Case popularly known as ‘Jam Saqi Case’ played an important role in order to strengthen the movement. However, this chapter is divided into different sub-titles to understand the anti-people policies of state and the then government, and also the role of Left in creating

resistance against those government and state policies. More importantly, this chapter helps to understand that how Left of Sindh played a leading role in these famous movements? Although, in this chapter, the question “What were causes that being leading force in political uprisings during 1954-91, Left could not become Political-Mainstream in Sindh?” is not answered completely but this chapter helps to understand the leading role played by Left in political uprisings launched in Sindh. This chapter helps to create a sense of the question and Left policies in these movements, and it is very clear that without understanding the Left role in political movements, one cannot answer the question that what were causes behind the unsuccessfulness of Left in becoming a mainstream political force in Sindh. This question linking this chapter which states the role of Left, will be answered in Chater No. 5, that what were causes behind the unsuccessfulness of Left in becoming a mainstream political force in Sindh?

However, this chapter provides a good account to understand the major political uprisings and Left involvement as a major element behind launching and leading these movements.

### **One-Unit Formula: Parity or Greater Punjab?**

Although resisting the One Unit formula comes in the domain of national question on which ethnic nationalists have remained very clear. But, at the same time, the Left not only in Pakistan but all over the world, remained in conflict within its ranks that whether class question was more important or national question? In Pakistan, the Left of Punjab seemed more inclined towards class question than national question. In this regard, the Punjabi Left point of view about One Unit formula could provide logic to understand the Left of Punjab. The Left of Punjab point of view on One Unit scheme will be discussed later in this chapter. But, on the other hand, the Left

of Sindh, Baluchistan, NWFP (now KPK) and East Pakistan were very clear on national question.

It is true that in provinces other than Punjab, there were also some severe conflicts within Left on national question. If one talks about Sindh, there some ethno-nationalist parties and also a Marxist oriented party i.e. Awami Tehrik was in conflict with Communist Party of Pakistan. The CPP was blamed by Awami Tehrik leadership and some Sindhi intellectuals that the party was not clear on national question because of Urdu speaking migrant hegemony over party. But, on the other hand, the CPP leadership including the CPP Sindhi leadership had claimed that they were clearer on national question than Awami Tehrik and Sindhi nationalist parties. However, this debate is discussed in detail in Chapter no. 5, which was one of major causes behind Sindhi-Mohajir enmity within Left. In order to know the stance of Left on national question particularly on the issue of One Unit, one has to look into the history of these two famous movements through analyzing the role played by Leftist elements against One Unit scheme.

If someone looks at the history of Pakistan since its creation to the formation of One-unit scheme, it could be observed that the people of Pakistan except Punjab were kept deprived from their basic rights. But in comparison, the One-Unit scheme was most dangerous for provinces of West Pakistan especially for Sindh. Because, this scheme not only deprived people of Sindh, Baluchistan and NWFP from their due rights but it also neglected the existence of these provinces through these provinces were amalgamated into one province and that was West Pakistan. Sindh had faced much loss in the shape of land, demographic changes, losing status of Sindhi language and so on.

The One-Unit scheme was considered a big threat for provinces of West Pakistan and some political parties declared it as 'Greater Punjab' and they declared it a formula according to Iqbal's concept of Pakistan stated during his Allahabad address in 1930. In his address, Allama Iqbal stated:

"I would like to see Punjab, North West Frontier Province, Sindh and Baluchistan amalgamated in to a single state. Self-governing within British Empire, the formation of the consolidated North-West Indian Muslim state appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India".<sup>71</sup> In 1954-55 One Unit scheme was similar to Iqbal's concept of Pakistan.<sup>72</sup> Because as he used term 'amalgamation' of different Muslim majority provinces to create a single state, likewise, now the all provinces of West Pakistan were amalgamated into single province i.e. West Pakistan. Even Iqbal did not talk about Muslim majority areas of Bengal to amalgamate into a single state for Muslims, because one possible reason behind it could be the majority position of Bengalis which was not suitable for Punjab.

In this connection Professor Aijaz Qureshi quotes Allen McGrath who wrote in his book titled 'Destruction of Democracy in Pakistan' that "By means of this One Unit plan Ghulam Muhammad would have further increased Punjabi power at the expense of East Pakistan".<sup>73</sup> However, let's see what was logic of then government behind this plan?

In order to prove this plan as most beneficial for people of Pakistan, government tried her best to prove it at any cost. Government gave many reasons to impose the plan like; because of the plan, the administrative problems would decrease and according to government logic, hatred between

---

<sup>71</sup>Professor Aijaz Ahmed Qureshi, One Unit aien Sindh (Sindh jiSiyasiTareekjohikAhamBaab). Karachi, Peacock Printers & Publishers, 2013. P22

<sup>72</sup> Ibid

<sup>73</sup> Ibid, 42

provinces of Pakistan was to be eliminated because of One Unit formula and so on.<sup>74</sup> But on the other hand, the actual motives of government behind this plan were not the same which were being repeatedly told by government.

It was administration from West Pakistan especially from Punjab and Karachi who was involved in loot and plunders of the resources of East Pakistan, therefore, the authorities of Pakistan who were suppressing the people of East Bengal, were facing resistance from Bengalis. Bengalis were in a majority and they constituted more than fifty four percent of total population of the country. In spite of that, the authorities of Pakistan kept deprived Bengalis from their basic rights. Hence, the Bengali people were supporting the nationalists and Leftists of East Pakistan especially Awami League.

After imposing One Unit, it was national question which got high importance and along with nationalist parties, the Left of Pakistan was also inclined to this national question. Therefore, the Left of Pakistan specifically Communist Party of Pakistan was in alliance with Awami League and some other parties called 'Jugtu Front (United Front)' in the then East Pakistan. This was a very strong alliance which had full support of masses in East Pakistan.

In 1954 election in East Pakistan, Muslim League was defeated by a United Front of which some Bengali nationalists and Leftists parties were a part. This sudden defeat was unacceptable for the West Pakistani authorities so now the West Pakistani authorities were thinking to overcome the issue. They had a fear that Sindh, Baluchistan and NWFP also could align with East Pakistan against Punjab. Therefore, the concerned authorities from Punjab had decided to amalgamate

---

<sup>74</sup>Sibt-e-Hassan, Pakistan ke Tehzeebi-w-Siyasi Masail. Karachi, Maktaba-e-Danyal, 2002. P100

provinces of West Pakistan into single province i.e. West Pakistan in order to create “parity” between two wings.<sup>75</sup>

Although “parity” formula was somehow beneficial for the people of East Pakistan because now in this way, they were able to gain something, but on the other hand, the people of other provinces other than East Pakistan and Punjab, came in more state suppression.

The personalities on forefront in making One-Unit, were; the then Governor General Malik Ghulam Muhammad and some leading political figures from Punjab especially Mumtaz Muhammad Daultana. But at the same time, Iskander Mirza and Ayub Khan were also fully supporting the concerned persons who were supporting the idea.<sup>76</sup> But still it was not possible to impose One Unit plan without any consultation of provincial assemblies. In this regard, on 11<sup>th</sup> of December 1954, the resolution in favor of plan, was got passed from Punjab, Sindh and NWFP assemblies.<sup>77</sup>

In Sindh, the national question was being considered most important at that time because on the one hand, due to migration from India and separating Karachi from Sindh and making it a capital of Pakistan, Sindhi population had fear to be converted into minority. At the same time, the Sindhi Left including Communist Party and its sister organizations, were busy in supporting the national question thorough launching movements in favour of Sindhi language, for the rights of landless Sindhi peasants and so on. The Urdu speaking Left leadership was busy in mobilizing laborers and was focusing more on class question than national question. But, as Left was out of assemblies so definitely they had no power to veto any decision taken by federal government.

---

<sup>75</sup> Lock cite, 125

<sup>76</sup> Ibid

<sup>77</sup> Ibid

Initially, Sindh Assembly resisted this plan and passed a resolution against One Unit scheme, but later on, because of tactics used by federal government, resolution in favor of One Unit was passed. In this context Professor Aijaz Qureshi quotes Professor Khalid Bin Saeed who writes in his book titled, 'Pakistan: The Nature and Direction of Change' that "In Sindh, the Chief Minister, Pirzada was able to produce a statement opposing One Unit scheme signed by 74 of 110 members of Sindh Assembly. He was dismissed and replaced by Muhammad Ayub Khuhro".<sup>78</sup> This was a tragic that the same person Muhammad Ayub Khuhro who opposed the idea of separation of Karachi from Sindh in 1948, was dismissed from his position as a Chief Minister of Sindh, now he was openly supporting the idea of One Unit scheme which was a threat for the integrity of Sindh. Therefore, in reward, he was made Chief Minister of Sindh. However, on 14<sup>th</sup> of October 1955, the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan passed a resolution in favor of the plan and One Unit was imposed.<sup>79</sup>

The actual logic behind this plan was to create parity between East Pakistan and West Pakistan, and in retaliation, the Bengalis were given some benefits like the Bengali language declared one of national languages of Pakistan and the leader of Awami League, Suharwardi was made Prime Minister of Pakistan. This was a major reason that resistance against One Unit plan from East Pakistan as it was observed from Sindh, Baluchistan and NWFP (KPK), was not observed. Even Awami League and Communist Party of East Pakistan accepted parity formula and did not resist the plan.<sup>80</sup> Likewise, Punjab was a major beneficiary of this plan so definitely people of Punjab did not resist the plan. Even the Communist Party, Punjab did not resist One Unit formula. The party leadership of Punjab argued in this regard that a magazine 'New Time' of

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid, 49

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, 125

<sup>80</sup> Professor Jamal Naqvi, Communist Party of Pakistan mein Nazryati Kashamkashki Mukhtasir Tareek. Karachi, Maktaba-e-Roshan Khayal, 1989. P23

Soviet Union published articles in favor of One Unit scheme<sup>81</sup>, so there was no any reasonable logic to resist the plan. However, the One Unit plan was highly resisted in other provinces especially in Sindh.

### **Resistance against One-Unit Scheme and Formation of Anti-One Unit Front**

The One-Unit and Ayub's martial law period was the period of suppression and oppression against all Leftist and ethno-nationalist parties of Pakistan. The parties were banned and party leadership sent to prison. Likewise, the print media was also censored in this period.

The Baloch guerrilla leader named Nauroz Khan sentenced life imprisonment and his sons and nephews were hanged in Hyderabad and Sukkur jails. At the same time, the resources of Sindh, Baluchistan and the NWFP (now KPK) were also looted. In this regard, G.M. Syed writes about what Sindh had lost during One-Unit time period. Professor Aiaz Qureshi quotes G.M. Syed who mentioned injustices with Sindh during this period, he states;

1. The Kotri Barrage was built because of Sindh spent eighty crore rupees and the lands of Tando Muhammad Khan came under cultivation, which were distributed among non-Sindhis.
2. In Sindh, Sindhi people deprived from jobs and many junior officers from Punjab were appointed in high ranking positions in Sindh.
3. The different places like Hospitals, Railway Stations, Roads, and Colleges etc were named with anti-Sindh and non-Sindhi personalities, which was a great loss for Sindhi culture and tradition.

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid



4. Urdu was made a national language and the usage of Sindhi language in Karachi municipality and University of Karachi restricted.
5. All the state machinery used against Sindhi, Baloch and Pakhtun nations, and in the name of Islam, Pakistan and Muslim nationalism, all nations of Pakistan forcibly merged into Punjabi-Mohajir imperialism.<sup>82</sup>

Sindh had lost much during One Unit plan time period but the major loss Sindh faced, was its lands distribution among non-Sindhis and the demographic changes occurred because of migration from Punjab and India to Sindh. Kotri Barrage built in 1955-56 about which Professor Aziz-ud-din Ahmed writes who is quoted by Professor Aijaz Ahmed Qureshi in his book that, Kotri barrage was second largest barrage of Sindh which made more than one and half million acre land cultivable. In June 1958 a committee 'Land Utilization Committee' was appointed to look into the matter of land allotment. This committee consisted of the members of federal government and also some military members, but there was no representation of local Sindhis at all in this committee.<sup>83</sup> Because of no representation of Sindhis, almost all lands were distributed among non-Sindhis as it happened before in the case of Sukkur barrage as well.

After Kotri barrage, the construction of Guddu barrage also completed in 1962. The same kind of injustice had happened with local Sindhis once again. According to a leading Leftist leader named Hyder Bux Jatui, only ten percent land of Guddu allotted to Sindhis but the remaining ninety percent was allotted to Punjabis.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Professor Aijaz Ahmed Qureshi, *One Unit aien Sindh (Sindh jiSiyasiTareekjohikAhamBaab)*. Karachi, Peacock Printers & Publishers, 2013. P90- 93

<sup>83</sup> Ibid, 212

<sup>84</sup> Ibid, 219

Because of these and many other anti-people developments, the resistance against One Unit plan, was inevitable. As mentioned above, the Leftists of Punjab did not resist this plan and they argued that Soviet was also supporting the idea, so Communists must not resist the plan. But, the Left of Sindh not only resisted One Unit plan but at the same time, the Soviet magazine's stance on this issue, was also condemned.<sup>85</sup> Despite, condemnation of Soviet magazine by Communist Party Sindh, the nationalist parties still were not sure that whether they (Communists) were sincere with them on national question or not,<sup>86</sup> because some Urdu chauvinist group of CPP-Sindh was supporting the One Unit formula.<sup>87</sup> This stance of some Urdu speaking chauvinists' on One Unit formula was supporting the division within Left in the shape of conflict between Sindhi and Urdu speaking Left.

As resistance by Left and nationalist forces of Sindh against One Unit formula, was going on. In retaliation, the state machinery was also active against any voice raised against One Unit plan. Whosoever talked against this plan was declared disloyal, enemy of Pakistan, and the agent or spy of foreign forces etc.<sup>88</sup> G.M Syed, the leader of Sindh Awami Mahaz, demanded from then government to get opinion of people of West Pakistan through a referendum that whether people were willing to accept One Unit plan or not. This demand got much popularity in Sindh, but government rejected this demand.<sup>89</sup> On 12<sup>th</sup> of November 1954, G.M Syed was arrested.<sup>90</sup>

As after imposition of One-Unit plan, the importance of national question increased in West Pakistan. Therefore, during time period 1955-1969, the CPP remained busy in creating balance

---

<sup>85</sup> Professor Jamal Naqvi, Communist Party of Pakistan mein Nazryati Kashamkashki Mukhtasir Tareek. Karachi, Maktaba-e-Roshan Khayal, 1989. P24

<sup>86</sup> Ibid

<sup>87</sup> Ibid

<sup>88</sup> Sibte-e-Hassan, Pakistan ke Tehzeebi-w-Siyasi Masail. Karachi, Maktaba-e-Danyal, 2002. P100

<sup>89</sup> Professor Aijaz Ahmed Qureshi, One Unit aien Sindh (Sindh ji Siyasi Tareek johik Aham Baab). Karachi, Peacock Printers & Publishers, 2013. P142

<sup>90</sup> Ibid

approach between national and class question.<sup>91</sup> Meantime, the literature on national question produced in all provinces, but Sindh was leading and producing lots of literature on national question during One Unit period.<sup>92</sup> Although the people of Sindh had faced so much injustice done by Sindhi landlords, Sindhi Hindu bannias and the feudal lords, but at the same time, people of Sindh had faced attacks from outsiders since the Arab invasion of Sindh in 712 AD to British Annexation in 1843. Therefore, the national question has been remaining more important than class question. The Sindh Hari Committee was a first organized party which mobilized people on both class and national question before the creation of Pakistan, but, after the creation of Pakistan and migration from India to Sindh took place, now again the national question became a locus of political attention for political parties of Sindh. Now the CPP was somehow working to reorganize the class struggles but the CPP kept itself limited at factory laborers. It's sister organization Sindh Hari Committee was working in peasants in rural Sindh but also it was no more functional as it was until Sindh Tenancy Act was passed from Sindh Assembly in 1951. However, Communist Party-Sindh highly resisted One-Unit plan and then the students, laborers, peasants and some democratic political parties also got involved in opposing the plan. Sindh Awami Mahaz, Sindh Hari Committee and Awami League-Sindh were aligned with Communist Party which launched campaign against One Unit plan.<sup>93</sup>

In Sindh, almost all political parties including Awami League-Sindh were busy in mobilizing the people of Sindh against one Unit scheme. If someone sees historically that it was also Sindh province which took step to form an Anti-One Unit Front. In this regard, a meeting held by

---

<sup>91</sup> Professor Jamal Naqvi, Communist Party of Pakistan mein Nazryati Kashamkashki Mukhtasir Tareek. Karachi, Maktaba-e-Roshan Khayal, 1989. P27

<sup>92</sup> Ibid, 28

<sup>93</sup> Comrade Imam Ali Nazish, compiled by Comrade Wahid Bux Banglani and Zarqa Inqlabi, Communist of Pakistan ki Tareekh, 2012. P37

Sindh Awami Mahaz, Sindh Hari Committee, Old Khaksaar Worker, Sindh Youth Front and the opposition group of Parliamentary party in Sindh Assembly, in August 1955 in Hyderabad, is on the record.<sup>94</sup> In this meeting, the 'Anti-One Unit Movement Front was formed and later this Anti-One Unit Front merged in Mian Iftikhar Hussain's party 'Aazad Pakistan Party' and on December 2, 1956 a new party named 'Pakistan National Party (PNP)' comprised of parties of Anti-One Unit Front, formed.<sup>95</sup>

In this context, it can be seen that like Mian Iftikhar Hussain who was a famous Leftist from Punjab, the PNP was led by Mir Ghous Bakhsh Bizenjo who was also a well known Leftist from Baluchistan. It meant, it was actually the Left who was leading the movement launched against One Unit formula. Later on this same alliance was a major force behind forming a wider alliance of Leftists and ethno-nationalist elements of West and East Pakistan.

Anti-One Unit Front later became Pakistan National Party was working only in West Pakistan; therefore, it was necessary to expand it at East Pakistan wing as well. Hence, a convention held on 25<sup>th</sup> of July 1957 in Dhakka, where Moulana Abdul Hameed Bhashani parted his affiliation with Awami League. In this convention, a new party consisted of parties which were a part of PNP, formed another party called National Awami Party (NAP). Now, Bhashani also joined these West Pakistan parties and he was elected president and Sheikh Abdul Majeed Sindhi elected Vice President of NAP.<sup>96</sup> Meanwhile, the Sindh Anti-One Unit Front was also formed by some leading Sindhi politicians like Sheikh Abdul Majeed Sindhi, G.M Syed, Hyder Bux Jatoi, Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, Abdul Hameed Jatoi, Qazi Faiz Muhammad and Ghulam Mustaffa Bhurgri. This Front came into existence in a convention of Sindhi politicians held in Karachi on 29-30

---

<sup>94</sup> Professor Aijaz Ahmed Qureshi, One Unit aien Sindh (Sindh jiSiyasiTareekjohikAhamBaab). Karachi, Peacock Printers & Publishers, 2013. P276

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, 281

<sup>96</sup> Ibid, 283

October, 1955. Hyder Bux Jatoi, a well known Leftist leader of Sindh was elected as Secretary of the Front.<sup>97</sup> Like political leadership and political workers of Sindh, Sindhi writers from the platform of Sindhi Adabi Sangat (Sindhi literary Front) were also very active in Anti-One Unit Movement.

Although, the Anti-One Unit Movement launched by Leftist and ethno-nationalists together but it is interesting that now the Left adopted clearer stance on national question than before. Even though, the debate over national and class question was going on yet but the alliance between Left and Nationalist forces on national question was positive sign in politics of Pakistan.

One Unit scheme on the one hand, was a very dangerous plan for provinces of West Pakistan especially for Sindh, but at the same time, it was positive sign that almost all small and big political parties resisted it together and an Anti-One Unit Front also formed which later converted into a political party i.e. National Awami Party (NAP). It was because of NAP that the Left of Pakistan and the nationalist elements came on one ground through forming a single party. The Anti-One Unit Movement also produced many student leaders who played their great role in this movement. Some leading student political parties including Sindh Students Federation (SSF), Hyderabad Student Federation (HSF), Sindh Students Cultural organization (SSCO) and Sindh National Students Federation (SNSF) were on forefront in resisting the One Unit plan.

### **Students' Role in Anti-One Unit Movement and Student Uprising of 4<sup>th</sup> of March 1967**

Anti-One Unit elements were very active throughout Sindh and among these elements Sindhi students had also played their vital role. On different times, some student movements were

---

<sup>97</sup> Ibid, 281

launched for different purposes but the central agenda of these movements was the opposition of One Unit formula. The leading student political party which was a real force behind major political movements specifically the 'student uprising of 4<sup>th</sup> of March', was Hyderabad Student Federation (HSF) and later on Sindh National Student Federation (SNSF) led by famous Communist leader Jam Saqi.

Although, student movements were also launched before March 4, 1967 but they could not succeed and sustain because of untrained and immature party workers and also due to opportunism of elitist student leaders, but when some middle and lower class Leftist and Sindhi nationalist students started to lead the movement, it got popularity and it also created political consciousness among students and masses of Sindh.

The first student movement launched in 1955, failed due to different reasons, and according to the then student leader Jam Saqi, one of these reasons was that the struggle was being led by some upper middle class students. They (student leaders) just recorded protest against One Unit once or twice and then left the movement.<sup>98</sup> The second struggle was better than before one, which started in 1962. The first struggle started without any political party platform, but the second struggle adopted the shape of a political party i.e. Sindh Students' Federation (SSF). Another great and positive aspect of this movement was that because of this struggle, the consciousness about the dangers of One Unit through distributing the anti-one unit pamphlets in many towns of Sindh, was spread.<sup>99</sup> But, this student struggle also could not last long because of some reasons.

---

<sup>98</sup> Jam Saqi, Sindh jiShagridJidojihad. Kandiaro, Roshni Publication, 1987. P19

<sup>99</sup> Ibid

According to Jam Saqi, there were three major reasons behind the unsuccessfulness of this struggle:

1. At that time, student movement against Ayub was going on throughout country. Therefore, there was an opportunity to get aligned SSF struggle with the countrywide struggle but unfortunately SSF could not do that.
2. This struggle was under control of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto who was minister of Ayub cabinet at that time. He used Sindh Student Federation for the sake of just arranging and inviting him for dinners.
3. The SSF leadership was afraid and Bhutto also asked them to disown themselves from the anti-one unit stance, so they disowned slogans which they wrote on the walls against one unit.<sup>100</sup>

Although there were different student political parties behind anti-One Unit movement, but the leading student political party which played a great role specifically in great student movement of 4<sup>th</sup> of March 1967, was Hyderabad Student Federation (HSF).

### **Hyderabad Student Federation (HSF)**

After the failure of the movement launched by Sindh Student Federation, some students of Sindh University, Jamshoro continued to mobilize students against One Unit plan without any party platform. This was time period of 1963-1964 when students were distributing pamphlets in order to propagate the disadvantages of One Unit.<sup>101</sup> During this time period, the active students who

---

<sup>100</sup> Ibid, 20

<sup>101</sup> Ibid, 21

were trying to create opponent sentiments for One Unit, realized to form a political party which could protect the rights of students and also which could work against One Unit.

Hence, the Hyderabad Students' Federation (HSF) was formed in October 1964 which played a great role in famous students' movement of March 4, 1967. This was a party consisted of Sindhi nationalists and Leftist elements together, and as it was a student political party, so it focused more on student rights. But, later on, because of resistance against One Unit movement and the movement in the defence of Sindhi language, were going on, the HSF leadership diverted its focus from student rights to anti-one unit and in the defence of Sindhi language movement.

### **Student Uprising of March 4, 1967**

Initially this movement was launched against the intervention of the then Commissioner of Hyderabad in administrative affairs of Sindh University, Jamshoro.<sup>102</sup> Commissioner Hyderabad alleged the then Vice Chancellor of University of Sindh, Jamshoro that VC was involved in corruption and he (VC) was involved in misuse of university funds. Therefore, the Commissioner decided to transfer Vice Chancellor Hassan Ali Abdul Rahman.<sup>103</sup> This commissioner's act was condemned by Sindhi students especially by workers of Hyderabad Student Federation. Masroor Hassan, the Commissioner Hyderabad was considered as hostile towards Sindhi students, because he was interfering in the administrative affairs of university, and the VC did not like his (commissioner's) involvement in university affairs. However, Commissioner transferred VC forcibly.<sup>104</sup> This was a matter of Vice Chancellor's transfer but the

---

<sup>102</sup>Zamir Sheikh, What Went Wrong?Karachi, (no publisher is mentioned), 2014. P131

<sup>103</sup> Lock cite, 36

<sup>104</sup> Professor Aijaz Ahmed Qureshi, One Unit aien Sindh (Sindh jiSiyasiTareekjohikAhamBaab). Karachi, Peacock Printers & Publishers, 2013. P298



students especially the activists of Hyderabad Student Federation got involved in this matter because they considered Commissioner's this act as oppressing the VC because he was a Sindhi.

While stating the reasons behind initiating the movement of 4<sup>th</sup> of March, Advocate Yousif Laghari who still is being considered a hero of student uprising of 4<sup>th</sup> of March and he was also the then president of Hyderabad Students' Federation writes; the students went on strike and they boycotted of all educational activities in university because they were demanding the restoration of VC Hassan Ali Abdul Rahman. On March 3, the caretaker Vice Chancellor Muhammad Hussain Turk came to meet him. Caretaker Vice Chancellor forced him to meet and talk to Commissioner Masroor. Yousif with some of his party workers met the commissioner, who apologized with students and said that he was not behind the transfer of Vice Chancellor Hassan Ali Abdul Rahman. The student delegate asked commissioner to not apologize with them only but to all students of university, then they would end the strike.<sup>105</sup>

The commissioner promised them that he would apologize to all students next day i.e. March 4. But on the very next day, he denied to make apology to students. This was considered an insult of students so students protested against the commissioner.<sup>106</sup>

The students decided to show their strength and they decided to hold a protest in Hyderabad in the evening of same day. It was decided that the students living in Hyderabad would gather and then the hostellers would join them in the evening.<sup>107</sup> According to Yousif Laghari, when busses from university were coming from Jamshoro to Hyderabad on March 4, the students saw that the

---

<sup>105</sup> Sheikh Ayaz, Rasool Bux Paliyo, Yousif Laghari and Masood Noorani, 4 March aien Sindhi Jodha. Hyderabad, New Fields Publication, 1978. P48

<sup>106</sup> Ibid, 48-49

<sup>107</sup> Jam Saqi, Sindh ji Shagrid Jidojihad. Kandiaro, Roshni Publication, 1987. P40

huge number of police force was waiting for them at the Jamshoro Bridge.<sup>108</sup> The police tortured students and used abusive language for student leaders. According to Jam Saqi, after this brutal act of police, he and some of his friends suggested party other leadership to expand the movement and get it aligned with anti-One Unit movement.<sup>109</sup>

After the incident of 4<sup>th</sup> of March, this struggle expanded and now the students were not demanding the restoration of VC Hassan Ali Abdul Rahman only but at the same time, they were also propagating against One Unit and also they were defending Sindhi language. In summer vacations, students mobilized people of their towns and villages on the issues of anti-One Unit and in defense of Sindhi language.<sup>110</sup> Although, Yousif Laghari was president of Hyderabad Student Federation and he believed in Sindhi nationalist ideology but at the same time Jam Saqi was also leading the party and movement who joined Communist Party in June 1964, and at the same time, he was a leader of HSF.

The Hyderabad Students' Federation played an active role in the movement but the movement could not last long. According to Rasool Bux Paliyo, there were some reasons behind it:

1. The national struggle of Sindh was still under the control of feudal class who just exploited the struggle for their interests.
2. There was also lack of a great revolutionary party at that time which could represent the students.

---

<sup>108</sup> Lock cite, P49

<sup>109</sup> Jam Saqi, QomiSawal. Mehar, BakhFuti Publication, n.d. P7

<sup>110</sup> Professor Aijaz Ahmed Qureshi, One Unit aien Sindh (Sindh jiSiyasiTareekjohikAhamBaab). Karachi, Peacock Printers & Publishers, 2013. P300

3. Sindhi students were not well literate; they did not read sufficient political literature.<sup>111</sup>

However, after this struggle launched by Hyderabad Students' Federation, another student political party was formed by a famous Communist leader Jam Saqi.

### **Sindh National Students' Federation (SNSF)**

Jam Saqi states in an interview conducted by Zamir Shaeikh, "We founded National Students Federation (SNSF) on November 3, 1968. I was the founder president, Nadeem Akhter as the founding vice president and Mir Thebo as general secretary of the organization. The SNSF played a vital role in the democratic upsurge of 1968-69".<sup>112</sup> This student party was founded by leading Leftists of Sindh who later led the Communist Party of Pakistan. SNSF played a great role in anti-Ayub movement during 1968-69.

However, the students' role in anti-One Unit movement cannot be ignored because students are conscious class of society, so if they launch movement against any anti-people development then the chances of positive results are high. Therefore, the student uprising of 4<sup>th</sup> of March is considered a great student struggle which provided basis to student politics and because of this uprising, the positive image of student politics emerged among the people of Sindh. Like many other political movements, movement of 4 Mach was also led by Leftist elements of Sindh. But, in spite of that, the student movements under the banner of Left could not sustain more. However, it was positive sign that the student wings like NSF and DSF had also been working in educational institutions of Karachi.

---

<sup>111</sup>Sheikh Ayaz, Rasool Bux Palijo, YousifLaghari and Masood Noorani, 4 March aien Sindhi Jodha. Hyderabad, New Fields Publication, 1978. P26-27

<sup>112</sup>Zamir Sheikh, What Went Wrong?Karachi, ..., 2014. P132

The anti-One Unit movement was a great movement in the sense that the people of Sindh came out of political turmoil and they came on roads and streets in order to resist not only One Unit formula but later on, like people all over Pakistan, people of Sindh also resisted Ayub dictatorship.

Like anti-One Unit movement, Movement for Restoration of Democracy (MRD) was another great movement which also mobilized masses specifically people of rural areas of Sindh who were under military oppression during Zia regime. In MRD, the Left of Sindh was on forefront who had been leading the movement.

### **MRD and the Left of Sindh**

Movement for Restoration of Democracy (MRD) is one of the great movements led by Sindh. Although, almost all leading political parties of Pakistan were a part of this great movement but the base of the movement was Sindh, because the Pakistan People's Party and Sindhi Awami Tehrik were on forefront which both parties were led by Sindhi politicians. Another reason behind starting of this movement from Sindh was the political conditions of that time and also brutal military oppression was going on in Sindh.

In Pakistan, the military interference in political and democratic process came in practice openly during General Ayub Khan Period who ruled the country in despotic method. During Ayub Khan Period, the East Pakistan and the small provinces of West Pakistan were under the suppression of military dictatorship. Later, during the first elected Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto regime, the same military were involved in military oppression against Baloch political workers. Now in Zia regime, the military junta diverted its attention and controlled over Sindh, because now Sindh was more politically aware than before and also some so called separatist

groups were also functioning which were providing an excuse to military for launching a military oppression in Sindh.

The famous scholar of Pakistan Tariq Ali states about then condition of Sindh in these words, “There are villages where an army officer slaps a Sindhi in the face if he doesn't salaam him. There were instances of Sindhi women students in rural colleges being raped”.<sup>113</sup> Likewise, people of Sindh felt completely deprived after execution of Bhutto. Because Bhutto was a Sindhi Prime Minister and already people of Sindh were kept deprived from their basic rights. Therefore, this kind of situation was actually creating hatred for Zia-ul-Haq and the then military janta, in the minds of people. This kind of hatred for military dictatorship in Sindh was not aroused because of MRD but due to autocratic rule of Zia which had suppressed the people. In this regard Tariq Ali is of this opinion that the MRD was not behind arousing a mutiny among Sindhi people, but Sindhi people started movement against Zia regime very before MRD was launched.

In this regard Tariq states, “Actually, this Sindhi national upsurge erupted of its own accord. It was not a plan decided upon by the movement for the restoration of democracy. They of course backed it—and that gave them the biggest strength they have had in that country since the movement was launched”.<sup>114</sup> It is also believed that Pakistan People’s Party was a real force behind this movement. Yes of course, it became possible only because of Pakistan People’s Party’s efforts to convince the leading political parties of Pakistan especially parties those were a part of Pakistan National Alliance (PNA), to become a part of MRD. But according to Tariq, the masses of Sindh were not mobilized by PPP but it was a socialist party i.e. Sindhi Awami Tehrik

---

<sup>113</sup> Tariq Ali, “Movement for Restoration of Democracy in Pakistan”. India International Centre Quarterly, Vol. 11, No. 1 (MARCH 1984) P60

<sup>114</sup> Ibid

behind it which worked among masses of Sindh. He explains it in these words, “The cadres who were strong in building the movement were people who had been trained and developed by the Sindhi Awami Tehrik, a group of socialists aware of the national question, in the interior of Sind. If you want a sociological characterisation of the movement, it was essentially a very unique alliance between poor peasants and students in the interior of Sind. This then grew and developed and embraced some of the smaller towns and then spread to some of the bigger towns”.<sup>115</sup>

General Zia-ul-Haq regime was not alone in oppressing the people of Pakistan especially of Sindh but he was supporting United States against Russian troops in Afghanistan; therefore, the Capitalist forces were fully supporting Zia’s Martial law in Pakistan. Likewise, the national and international Media were also supporting Zia for his unholy interests. It was only BBC which was out of military monopoly. According to a famous poet of Sindh, Sheikh Ayaz who writes in preface of Badar Abro’s jail diary that the famous magazines of America like ‘Time’ and ‘News Week’ were in favor of Zia Martial law.<sup>116</sup> Likewise, the British Foreign Office was also supporting Zia-ul-Haq in this regard. Tariq Ali quotes the British Foreign Office briefing to journalists, “The situation in Sind is very serious, but we don't want this regime to fall because of the Russians in Afghanistan, and we are backing this regime.”<sup>117</sup>

The period of Zia-ul-Haq regime was a darkest in the history of Pakistan. All the political parties except Muslim League of Pir Pagara and Jamait-i-Islami were under crackdown. Even the Pakistan National Alliance which was made in order to counter the Bhutto government and this alliance fully supported Zia-ul-Haq during army coup, was also came against Zia. They (PNA)

---

<sup>115</sup> Ibid

<sup>116</sup> Badar Abro, Jail ji Diary. Kandiaro, Roshni Publication, 2014. P13

<sup>117</sup> Lock Cite, P61

also accepted ministries given by Zia-ul-Haq, but after Bhutto hanged, Zia did not need PNA more. So, he kicked out them and he banned all political parties including those were in PNA.<sup>118</sup>

## **Movement Begins**

Now except Jamait-i-Islami and Muslim League of Pagara group, many other parties including parties those were a part of PNA also started to oppose Zia regime. Now, it was suitable time to be united against Zia regime. Therefore, the dialogue in order to form an alliance started since November or December 1980. Jamait-i-Islamai was only party of Pakistan which was thinking that he was only Zia-ul-Haq who could lead them towards ‘Sirat-e-Mustaqeem’ so JI supported Zia till the end.<sup>119</sup> During the initial stage of launching the movement, the biggest problem for PPP and PNA was to sit together because PPP leadership especially Begam Nusrat Bhutto, widow of Z.A Bhutto was considering PNA as not only sympathizers of Zia during Bhutto trial but at the same time they supported Zia-ul-Haq against Bhutto in all illegal steps Zia had taken.

This was an alliance which could sustain against Zia regime because of this harsh reality, PPP leadership had to accept it and had to sit with the parties consisted of Pakistan National Alliance (PNA). Likewise, the Left of Pakistan was working against the Martial law but they were not powerful as the rightwing was, so definitely PPP could not rely fully on Left. In this condition, it was need of time to make an alliance in which all parties whether Leftwing or rightwing, all must be a part of that wider alliance. The common agenda of this alliance was just to oppose the Zia Martial law and his unconstitutional and undemocratic steps and launching movement for the restoration of democracy. Although, the Pakistan People’s Party was demanding the restoration of democracy according to the constitution of 1973, but on the other hand, the parties were going

---

<sup>118</sup>FaizKhosro, KareKakarHeth Moon JherendeChadya (TareekhiHalchal MRD). Sukkur, My Publication, 2013. P25

<sup>119</sup>BadarAbro, 1983 Jadhahin Sindh me Baahbari: MRD jiKahani. Karachi, Kachho Publication, 2014. P55

to be a part of MRD, had serious reservations over constitution of 1973. But, it was time when both sides had to compromise on some points.

Badar Abro quotes Benazir Bhutto who wrote about this situation in her book 'Daughter of the East' that; "although, it was politically good step to form MRD but I felt difficulty to make an alliance with enemies of my father. Likewise, the former opposition parties felt difficulties to talk to PPP. It is hard to believe anything for opposition leaders and also they talk to opponent party by their messengers, but not themselves directly".<sup>120</sup> It was really a challenging task for PPP leadership to take a decision whether they should sit in alliance with PNA or not. In this regard, the dialogue within PPP was going on.

A secrete meeting of banned political parties held at Clifton 70 Karachi. In this meeting, the leaders of PPP from Baluchistan and NWFP (KPK) were also present. The huge majority of PPP leaders were not in favor of sitting with PNA. At the moment an old socialist leader of PPP said, "When Japan attacked China, Mao made an alliance with Chiang Kai-Shek. So, if PNA cooperate in national cause then we must make an alliance with them".<sup>121</sup>

The Movement for Restoration of Democracy (MRD) founded on 6<sup>th</sup> of February 1981. The students and lawyers were first actively participants of this movement. Then the movement expanded and the teachers and doctors also joined the movement.<sup>122</sup> MRD announced to hold a countrywide MRD meeting on February 27 in Lahore. In retaliation, General Zia-ul-Haq banned the movement of political personalities from one province to other. Despite a ban on movement of political personalities from one province to another, PPP chairperson Begam Nusrat Bhutto succeeded to reach Lahore. She veiled her face and lay down in the dicky of a car and then she

---

<sup>120</sup> Ibid, P31

<sup>121</sup> Ibid, P32

<sup>122</sup> Ibid, P36



left for Lahore in a train with an eleven year old child.<sup>123</sup> According to a plan, the MRD leadership held meeting a day before to due date, and they were successful in doing that. It was really shocking news for government so in retaliation, many arrests took place. Begam Nusrat Bhutto was also sent back to Sindh after that meeting.

This was a great achievement for MRD that now MRD was moving on, but the movements had also faced some ups and downs as suddenly a shocking incident had happened which proved a great attack for MRD movement.

## **Plane Hijacking**

On 3<sup>rd</sup> of March 1981, BBC broadcasted news that the PIA Boeing-720 flied from Karachi airport was hijacked and taken off in Kabul, Afghanistan. According to the news reports, 142 passengers were in plane.<sup>124</sup> The hijackers demanded from Pakistani government to release political prisoners then plane with kidnapped passengers would be sent back. Government of Pakistan alleged Al-Zulfiqar organization that the Al-Zulfiqar was behind the plane hijacking and stated that the mentioned organization was operated by Meer Murtaza Bhutto.

Immediately, Meer Murtaza Bhutto denied to accept responsibility of plane hijacking and said, he even came to know about incident after it happened.<sup>125</sup> But then again in a radio interview, he accepted that hijacking was done by Al-Zulfiqar and he was operating that organization.<sup>126</sup> This was a golden opportunity for Zia regime that Meer Murtaza Bhutto had accepted the responsibility of plane hijacking which provided an excuse to Zia dictatorship in order to

---

<sup>123</sup>FaizKhosro, KareKakarHeth Moon JherendeChadya (TareekhiHalchal MRD). Sukkur, My Publication, 2013. P31-32

<sup>124</sup>BadarAbro, Jail ji Diary. Kandiaro, Roshni Publication, 2014.P87

<sup>125</sup> Lock Cite, P36

<sup>126</sup> Ibid

suppress the political activities launched by MRD. Now the military junta came in action in a more organized way. More than six thousand political workers were arrested in a month of March only. Hijackers gave a list of political prisoners in which many prisoners of Communist Case were also included in the list, but they denied their release and going in exile. Then hijackers gave another list of 55 prisoners.

Hijackers killed Major Tariq Rahim in plane and thrown him down. In this way, they got their fifty five prisoners released from jail, and these prisoners were sent to Karachi airport on the midnight of 12 and 13 March.<sup>127</sup> However, this was a great loss for MRD because now not only crackdown against political activists was at high scale, but at the same time, the people of Pakistan were angry to listen that Meer Murtaza was involved in such a terrorist activity of plane hijacking. This surely helped military junta in order to counter MRD. Because of plane hijacking incident, the MRD movement could not remain active but it was Left of Pakistan especially of Sindh which once again aroused the enthusiasm of MRD.

### **Role of Left in MRD**

Although, MRD was a countrywide alliance of almost all political parties whether they were religious, Leftist or nationalists, and every political element who kept anti-Zia sentiments, became a part of MRD. But, in Sindh, the political parties were divided on this issue. On the one hand, it was very disappointing that a famous nationalist leader of Sindh i.e. G.M. Syed did not support the movement. G.M Syed clearly stated his point of view about MRD on 27 June 1983. He stated, “MRD alliance was organized for democracy and democracy was not beneficial for Sindhis, because if democracy comes in Pakistan, Sindhis would have been converted in

---

<sup>127</sup>BadarAbro, 1983 *Jadahin Sindh me Baahbari: MRD jiKahani*. Karachi, Kachho Publication, 2014. P80

minority”.<sup>128</sup> G.M Syed was also of this opinion that the purpose behind launching MRD movement was to save Pakistan, so he would not join it at any cost.

On the other hand, the two Leftist parties were active participants of the movement which were Awami Tehrik and Communist Party of Pakistan. Awami Tehrik played a key role in mobilizing the people of Sindh especially people in rural areas. Likewise, Communist Party also played a great role through Jam Saqi Case. Although, Awami Tehrik and CPP had no mass support as much as PPP had in Sindh, but, because these both the parties were ideologically and practically sound, so these parties had ability to mobilize people in a very organized way.

The Left entry in the movement was very difficult in initial stage because of presence of religious parties in the alliance. Although, religious parties had no such mass base as the Left parties had. Therefore, Left entry in MRD was very necessary which Benazir Bhutto was realizing. But, she was unable to instill Left elements in MRD without consent of other parties of alliance especially those were with religious orientation. So, she had to coordinate with other parties in this regard.

The religious parties which come in the domain of rightwing which were totally opponent from Leftwing parties, had fear that the Left parties might hijack the movement. Because, Left parties were more oriented in order to mobilize people, so the religious forces were not in favour of Left join the movement. He was Sardar Abdul Qayum, the leader of Jamoon Kashmir Muslim Congress who completely opposed the entry of Leftist parties in alliance. These Leftist parties were; Pakistan National Party of Mir Gous Bakhsh Bezenjo in which Communist Party was merged at that time, Awami Tehrik led by Fazil Raho and Rasool Bux Palijo, Mazdoor Kissan

---

<sup>128</sup> Ibid, P323-324

Party led by Fatehyab Ali Khan, Qomi Mahaz Azadi led by Mairaj Muhammad Khan, NDP and ANP.<sup>129</sup> On the second day of movement, a meeting was to be held at Sher Baaz Mazari house but on that day none of member of religious parties was present at the meeting time. These members sat in Mushtaq Mirza's house and they demanded to expel all small Leftist parties from alliance.<sup>130</sup>

However, on 19 February 1981, first press conference of MRD was called at Mushtaq Mirza's house in which, while answering the journalists questions, Ghulam Mustaffa Jatoi, Abid Zuberi and Moulana Muhammad Shah Amroti said, "Pakistan National Party (PNP) was not a part of MRD yet but the doors were opened for it".<sup>131</sup> MRD leaders hoped that Mir Gous Bakhsh Bezenjo would join alliance. Although, Bezenjo wanted to join but because of Left opposition was going on by religious parties, Mir Gous Bakhsh did not become a part of alliance.

The Movement for Restoration of Democracy (MRD) was started since February 1981 but it could not become popular among masses until a Left party i.e. Awami Tehrik joined the alliance and mobilized the students and peasants of rural Sindh.

After two and half year, on 9 August 1983, Pakistan National Party and Awami Tehrik were invited to participate in a meeting as commentators. In this meeting, it was announced that Awami Tehrik would participate as a full member of MRD. In this way, the Communist Party also became a part of MRD because it was a part of PNP at that time.<sup>132</sup> According to Badar Abro, former leader of Communist Party, "The Leftists were aware that MRD of which religious parties were also a part, after succeeded in movement; they would not coordinate with Left more.

---

<sup>129</sup> Ibid, P66-67

<sup>130</sup> Ibid, P68-69

<sup>131</sup> Ibid, P70

<sup>132</sup> Ibid, P164

But, it was compulsion for Left to be a part of alliance in order to get rid of Martial law”.<sup>133</sup> It is interesting to note here that it was Left who resisted every kind of suppression and oppression whether it was by military or civilian governments, but in spite of that Left could not become a mainstream political force of Sindh.

However, Awami Tehrik became a major organ of MRD and it decided to participate in civil disobedience movement which was going to start from August 14, 1983. No doubt, it was Awami Tehrik which played an active role after PPP in MRD and the jails of Pakistan were full of political prisoners of PPP and Awami Tehrik. According to a renowned journalist of Sindh namely Faiz Khoso who interviewed Rasool Bux Palijo who (Palijo) claimed that, he (Palijo) was behind the formation of Movement for Restoration of Democracy. According to Palijo, “he convinced Begam Nusrat Bhutto to make an alliance with political parties of PNA”.<sup>134</sup>

Faiz Khoso also interviewed with President Awami Tehrik Ayaz Latif Palijo who stated, “When an alliance of MRD was going to be formed, the delegate of Awami Tehrik comprised of Syed Alam Shah, Gul Hassan Kerano, Lakha Dino Behrani and Hakeem Halepoto, met Begam Nusrat Bhutto. Abdul Qayum, leader of Jamoon and Kashmir Muslim Conference had an objection on Awami Tehrik’s entry as a full member of alliance. So, Awami Tehrik was accepted in alliance as a commentator. When plane hijacking incident took place, Jamoon and Kashmir Muslim Conference left MRD then Awami Tehrik was accepted as a full member in MRD”.<sup>135</sup>

The movement was not remained active like before because of plane hijacking in 1981 but now it was again getting momentum after civil disobedience movement launched since August 14, 1983. The crackdown against political parties was on its peak and approximately within a month

---

<sup>133</sup> Ibid, P169

<sup>134</sup> Faiz Khoso, KareKakarHeth Moon JherendeChadya (TareekhiHalchal MRD). Sukkur, My Publication, 2013. P58

<sup>135</sup> Ibid, P58-59

more than ten to twelve thousand people were arrested.<sup>136</sup> However, it was because of Left entry, the movement got much support among masses. The people of Sindh were already ready to resist because of military operation was going on in Sindh. The MRD leadership especially PPP and religious parties who were against of Left entry in MRD, now realized importance of Left. Before launching civil disobedience movement planned on 14 August 1983, a pamphlet was published on which 31 points of alliance were written.

It was great recognition of Left in MRD that many out of these 31 points of the alliance, were clearly stated the demands of Leftists parties. These Left oriented points were;

- The restoration of Trade Unions for the rights of laborers and strike guaranty for these trade unions.
- Equal social and economic rights for women.
- An end of injustice with factory laborers, peasants, and political activists and equal rights to all citizens through introducing reforms.
- Agricultural reforms and the distribution of state owned land among landless haris.
- All facilities to be provided to people living in Kachi Aabadis.
- Making Pakistan's economy independent and save country from loot and plunder of multinational companies.
- Withdrawal of all military pacts and parting ways from great powers and assurance of neutral position of Pakistan in these matters.<sup>137</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup>BadarAbro, Jail ji Diary. Kandiaro, Roshni Publication, 2014. P226

<sup>137</sup>FaizKhosro, KareKakarHeth Moon JherendeChadya (TareekhiHalchal MRD). Sukkur, My Publication, 2013. P68-71

The role of Left in Movement for Restoration of Democracy cannot be ignored. Because these were Awami Tehrik and Communist Party of Pakistan which contributed great to revive the movement after plane hijacking incident. The great contribution of Awami Tehrik cadres was to mobilize people of Sindh against Martial law of Zia-ul-Haq. At the same time, Sindh Hari Committee's some pockets were also working in mobilizing Haris (peasants) of Sindh. But, the role played by Communist Case popularly known as Jam Saqi, in reviving movement was remarkable.

### **Contribution of Jam Saqi/Communist Case in MRD**

Although, Jam Saqi case started before the formation of MRD alliance and it was totally different case in early stage, but later on it linked with MRD. This was a Communist Case in which some members of Communist Party of Pakistan were charged with anti-Pakistan conspiracy. In an interview with Comrade Sohail Sangi who was arrested with Jam Saqi and he was one of captivities under this case. He stated about Jam Saqi Case in these words, "In Pakistan, two major cases are highlighted with regards to Communists. These cases stated that Communists were trying to overthrow existing governments, and wanted to replace it with a Communist government. These two cases were; Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case and the other one was Jam Saqi Case. It is interesting point that both cases were registered in a period when Pakistan was signing pacts with America".<sup>138</sup>

"During Pindi Case, Pakistan signed SEATO and SENTO pacts with America. And during Jam Saqi Case, Pakistan was aligned with USA against Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Therefore, in both cases, America was backing Pakistani governments to suppress Communists in

---

<sup>138</sup>Interview with SohailSangi, January 31, 2016.

Pakistan”.<sup>139</sup> The Capitalist Block was led by United States and the only hindrance in a way of capitalist block was Communist Block. The US and also the government of Pakistan were aware that the Left of Pakistan could resist the policies adopted by capitalist block. Therefore, it was very necessary to capture the Left political forces so that they could not raise their voice against the pacts being signed between Pakistan and United States at that time. In the initial days of Pakistan, the Pakistani government was more inclined towards capitalist block than socialist block. It was major reason that despite invited by Soviet, the then Prime Minister of Pakistan Liaquat Ali Khan instead visiting Soviet, he visited US. The Left of Pakistan was a major hindrance in Prime Minister’s way because the Communist Party of Pakistan was getting popularity all over Pakistan especially in Punjab which was not acceptable for the military establishment of Pakistan at any cost, so Pakistani establishment had to capture the Left. At last in 1954, the CPP was banned under the charge of Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case.

Likewise, in 1979 when Soviet invaded Afghanistan, that was a positive sign for Left of Pakistan as well because Afghanistan was a neighboring country of Pakistan so there was possibility that Left of Pakistan might support Communist government in Afghanistan. Even it was quite possible at that time that the Left of Pakistan could come ahead and with the help of Soviet, it could also make government in Pakistan. Therefore, again it was necessary for the then government of Pakistan to suppress the Left of Pakistan and the military dictatorship did it through arresting the leaders of Communist Party of Pakistan who later were charged under Jam Saqi Case.

According to newspaper reports on 3<sup>rd</sup> September 1980 which are quoted by Badar Abro, one of victims of Jam Saqi Case, that some members of Communist Party were arrested under the

---

<sup>139</sup>Ibid



allegation of producing communist literature which was found from their houses and according to military junta, the literature was totally against of 'Ideology of Pakistan'.<sup>140</sup> Government authorities claimed that Communists were supported by some foreign countries in order to destabilize the country. According to a newspaper report, Sindh police found Cyclo style machines, type writer, secrete newspapers, and papers of Surukh Parcham and Halchal from houses of those alleged Communists.<sup>141</sup> Those Communists charged under the allegation that they were involved ina conspiracy against the ideology of Pakistan, were; Jam Saqi, Badar Abro, Amar Lal, Ghulam Shabir Shar, Ahmed Kamal Warsi, Professor Jamal Naqvi, Nazir Abbasi and Sohail Sangi.

Nazir Abbasi was brutally tortured and killed in jail on 9 August 1980. The remaining party members were charged with Communist Case. This case initiated since 15 December 1981 in a military court. Badar Abro writes in his jail diary, "This case started from December 15, 1981 and the captivities of the case received a charge sheet against them and that was Martial law Regulation 4, 13, 18, 36, Article 124-A and 149. The conclusion of these regulation simply was; 1. Publishing and distributing the objectionable literature, 2. Creating hatred between people of lower class and upper class, 3. Creating hatred for military in people's minds, 4. Working against Islam, 5. Creating hatred and conflicts among provinces, 6. Rebellion against legal government, and 7. Disloyalty with country."<sup>142</sup>

During initial days this case called 'Communist Case' then it replaced by 'Nazir Abbasi and Jam Saqi Case'. But, in international media, it was famous with the name of 'Seven Communist Trial'. Faiz Khoso while quoting Badar Abro writes, "The actual purpose of Zia-ul-Haq was to

---

<sup>140</sup>BadarAbro, Jail ji Diary. Kandiaro, Roshni Publication, 2014. P21

<sup>141</sup> Ibid

<sup>142</sup>BadarAbro, Jail ji Diary. Kandiaro, Roshni Publication, 2014. P99

present this case as a 'Communist Threat' so that he could get much benefit from United States in relation to oppression in Afghanistan was going on. And in this regard he succeeded".<sup>143</sup>

On the other hand, the military court was trying to avoid use words like 'Communism', 'Communist' and 'Communist Party' but the international media was quoting it as 'Seven Communist Case'. Therefore, later on this case was called 'Jam Saqi Case'.<sup>144</sup> The objections against captivities of Jam Saqi Case raised by government witnesses were very childish and laughable.

According to a witness named Aslam Noor from government side, two booklets were highly objectionable which were found from alleged persons' houses. These booklets were; 'Moscow Olympic ja Program (Programmes of Moscow Olympics)' and the other one was 'Soviet Union Ke Musalman (Muslims of Soviet Union)'. The objection on first booklet which was about Olympic programmes was that, it was published in Moscow so it must be condemned. And objection rose by Aslam Noor on second book was that, it was written in book that the condition of Muslims in Soviet Union was better than the Muslims of Pakistan.<sup>145</sup> Because of such kind of childish statements of witnesses from government side, media was disallowed to report the court proceedings.<sup>146</sup>

Jam Saqi writes in preface of Badar Abro's jail diary that "all government witnesses, lawyer and military court failed to tell the actual definition of 'Ideology of Pakistan'. In spite of that they kept us in jail on the charges that we were working against the Ideology of Pakistan".<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>143</sup>FaizKhosro, KareKakarHeth Moon JherendeChadya (TareekhiHalchal MRD). Sukkur, My Publication, 2013. P39-40

<sup>144</sup> Lock cite, P109

<sup>145</sup> Ibid, P112

<sup>146</sup> Ibid, P113

<sup>147</sup> Ibid, P19

The court asked captivities of Jam Saqi case to give names of their defense witnesses. Jam Saqi and his companions submitted a list of 120 witnesses in the court. The court ordered to call only fifteen out of one hundred and twenty.<sup>148</sup> In those 15 names, Benazir Bhutto's name was missing. So, the captivities under this case protested and demanded to add Benazir Bhutto's name in the list and invite her in court as their defence witness. Therefore, court accepted the name of Benazir Bhutto as a witness.<sup>149</sup>

This was a great opportunity to launch MRD movement through this case. Because now the leading political figures of Pakistan who were also a part of MRD, were invited to present as defense witnesses of captivities of Jam Saqi Case. After plane hijacking case, MRD could not remain active as it was before the hijacking incident. But now the leadership of MRD again got a chance to overcome and resist against Martial law. The process of giving statements as defense witnesses in court started from 12 January 1983 and lasted till 29 March 1983.<sup>150</sup>

The then government of Zia-ul-Haq was considering Jam Saqi as a very dangerous man who could even harm the integrity of Pakistan. While giving his statement in court, Mir Gous Bakhsh Bezenjo had said, "Jam Saqi is a patriotic person and I never seen him in any anti-Pakistan activity".<sup>151</sup> Despite being a religious leader of a religious party, Moulana Muhammad Shah Amroti was also demanded as a defence witness. After listening Moulana Muhammad Shah Amroti's statement, the court and government officials were shocked because he said, "Socialism was not against Islam".<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup>FaizKhosro, KareKakarHeth Moon JherendeChadya (TareekhiHalchal MRD). Sukkur, My Publication, 2013. P43-44

<sup>149</sup> Ibid, P44

<sup>150</sup> Ibid, P47

<sup>151</sup> Ibid, P48

<sup>152</sup> Ibid

Benazir Bhutto also supported communists by saying, “It was birth right of every individual to criticism, and keeping opposite opinion, is as old as human civilization is. There is no place of Martial law in Islam. Freedom of opinion is present in Islam, but the Martial law compels to obey military commanders at any cost”.<sup>153</sup>

Benazir Bhutto’s statement given in court got much concentration in media especially BBC gave much coverage to Benazir Bhutto’s statement and also Jam Saqi Case. Meanwhile, Benazir Bhutto’s statement was published and distributed among people. These both media coverage and distribution of published statement of Benazir Bhutto contributed a lot to give much strength to MRD again. It was because of Jam Saqi Case that MRD came in a position to organize itself once again. So, MRD leadership decided to launch civil disobedience movement from August 14, 1983.<sup>154</sup> Now the movement launched in very organized manner which compelled Zia-ul-Haq to make Muhammad Khan Junejo as a civilian Prime Minister of Pakistan. However, allegations against captivities of Jam Saqi Case were not proved so they were released from jail on 27 July 1984.<sup>155</sup>

In this whole debate, it is very clear that it was Left in the shape of Communist Party, Sindh Hari Committee, Sindh National Student Federation and Awami Tehrik which made it possible to involve the peasants, laborers, students and people of different walk of life to participate in great movements like Anti-One Unit Movement, Student Uprising of 4 March and the Movement for Restoration of Democracy. But, in spite of that, the Left could not become a mainstream political force in Sindh. On the other hand, Pakistan People’s Party was formed by Z.A. Bhutto in 1967 which attracted the major political parties of Left which were on forefront during Anti-Ayub

---

<sup>153</sup> Ibid, P53

<sup>154</sup> Ibid, P64

<sup>155</sup> BadarAbro, Jail ji Diary. Kandiaro, Roshni Publication, 2014. P251

movement and also many of Leftist parties merged in PPP. In the result, PPP succeeded to win the 1970 elections in West Pakistan. Likewise, during 1980s, Awami Tehrik, a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party played a vital role in mobilizing the masses of Sindh in MRD, but in spite of that, the then president of Awami Tehrik namely Rassol Bux Palijo could not win election of 1988 against a candidate fielded by PPP. However, in this chapter, just the great role played by Left of Sindh in great movements, was discussed, and as some causes behind unsuccessfulness of Left were discussed in chapter no. 2 and remaining will be discussed in Chapter No.5.

The causes behind the unsuccessfulness of Left cannot be understood without going through the history of great movements and also the role of Left in these movements. Therefore, this chapter provided a clear picture in which one can see the role of Left in great political uprisings. This chapter will be linked to Chapter No. 4 and Chapter No. 5 in order to understand the causes behind popularity of Pakistan People's Party among masses of Sindh and the failure of Left of Sindh.

## Chapter No. 4

### **Pakistan People's Party: Socialist or Populist?**

The debate prevailing yet about the political ideology of Pakistan People's Party especially the ideology adopted under the leadership of its founding father Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. There are different schools of thought in this regard. According to one school of thought, Mr. Bhutto was a socialist who tried hard to bring egalitarian changes in Pakistan but because of some hindrances, he could not succeed completely. But, on the other hand, another school of thought totally rejects this idea. According to this school of thought, Bhutto was a populist leader who just exploited socialist slogan for his personal and party interests.

However, in this chapter, the initial documents of PPP i.e. Foundation Documents and its first election manifesto of 1970 will be analyzed that how much the socialist ideas were incorporated in these documents of party. At the same time, Bhutto's personal stance on socialist ideas will also be dealt.

The major aspect of Bhutto's claim that he was a socialist attracted the Left of Pakistan towards PPP. Still the question is to be answered that what were causes that Left of Pakistan trusted Bhutto and many of them joined PPP? Were they (Leftists) betrayed by Bhutto or they achieved their goals through merging themselves with PPP?

This chapter tries to answer the above questions and more importantly to address the question i.e. what was the stance of PPP on question of Socialism, and what were the causes behind the

popularity of PPP in Sindh in comparison with Left? Another question links to the question of PPP's stance on socialism i.e. whether PPP was a socialist party or it was just exploiting the slogan of socialism? These all questions will be dealt through looking at the party manifestos, reforms introduced by Bhutto and also looking that how Bhutto government responded the labour movement of 1972 launched at SITE and Landhi areas of Karachi?

### **Concept of Socialism in PPP Manifesto**

The founding convention of party was held on 30<sup>th</sup> November to December 1, 1967 at Lahore. The Pakistan People's Party launched after highly motivated discussions held in convention. The Foundation Documents were party policies source until its first manifesto was written in early 1970. The famous four principles were set for party policies in 1970 manifesto which were; "a) Islam is our faith; b) Democracy is our polity; c) Socialism is our economy and d) All power to the people."<sup>156</sup> Although, PPP manifesto stated many things but the major debate over this initiated that 'Socialism' was advocated in the manifesto, which was not acceptable for the state and especially rightwing of Pakistan at that time.

M. Rafique Afzal writes about the socialist stance of PPP stated in Foundation Documents that; "According to Document 5, the PPP aimed at the transformation of Pakistan into 'a socialist society', because it was considered to be the only mechanism 'conducive to rapid progresses'."<sup>157</sup> PPP leadership not only declared its socialist stance in Foundation Documents only, but the manifesto issued in 1970, was also a repetition and elaboration of Foundation

---

<sup>156</sup> M. Rafique Afzal, Political Parties in Pakistan 1969-1971 (Vol. III). Islamabad, National institute of Historical and Cultural Research, 1998. P124

<sup>157</sup> Ibid

Documents in which socialist stance of party was also vivid. Even, Bhutto was of this thought that the constitution for country was not fruitful until the economic system was changed.

M. Rafique Afzal writes in this regard that, “The PPP did not focus on the future constitution because, according to Bhutto, it could not solve the problems of the people unless the prevailing economic system was radically changed”.<sup>158</sup> The first party manifesto even clearly stated the formation of a ‘classless society’ was one of party’s major goals. The manifesto states, “At the Convention in December 1967 in Lahore, the Pakistan People’s Party announced the principles for the practical realization of which it was founded. The ultimate objective of the Party’s policy is the attainment of a classless society, which is possible only through socialism in our time”.<sup>159</sup> On the one hand, party was advocating socialism and at the same time, the 1970 manifesto talked about the mixed economy.

The sub-section of the section ‘Industrial Measures’ the ‘Mixed Economy’ was advocated in its first manifesto. The manifesto stated, “The party accepts the possibility of a mixed economy – the existence of a private alongside a nationalized sector, sources of the production of wealth will be replaced. The private sector will offer opportunities for individual initiative in the areas of production where small enterprises can be efficient. Monopoly conditions will be abolished, so that private enterprise will function according to the rules of competition”.<sup>160</sup>

In the first convention held in Lahore, a resolution was passed in which it was clearly mentioned that, “This convention believes that the exploitation by landlord and capitalist classes must come to an end and it is only possible through bringing socialist principles in practice”.<sup>161</sup> But, when PPP came into power, the landlord class was more strengthened and was given key positions in

---

<sup>158</sup> Ibid, P126

<sup>159</sup> Manifestos of Pakistan Peoples Party 1970 & 1977, Reproduced by Sani Hussain Panhwar Member Sindh Council, PPP, P9

<sup>160</sup> Ibid, P12-13

<sup>161</sup> Nafees Siddiqi, Bhutto Se Bhutto Tak. Jang Publishers, 1991. P30



party. Likewise, party resolution demanded to make an amendment in Trade Union Unit according to standard of ILO, and the right of forming Labor Union including granting right to strike, was also demanded in the resolution.<sup>162</sup> But, again, the trade union movements were crushed by Bhutto government which will be discussed in detail in this chapter later.

On the one hand, PPP was declaring itself a socialist party in its initial stages of formation, but on the other hand, after coming into power, the definition of socialism was changed for PPP. Now the party leadership instead using the term 'socialism' was advocating the 'Islamic Socialism' or 'Massawat-i-Muhammadi' and so on. Therefore, one must see Bhutto's turning point from Socialism to Massawat-i-Muhammadi that what were reasons behind it? Either it was Bhutto's strategy or compulsion to raise a slogan of Islamic Socialism?

### **Bhutto's Concept of Socialism**

Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto remained a foreign minister in Ayub cabinet, but because of differences created between Ayub and Bhutto on Tashkent Declaration, he resigned from Ayub cabinet and he entered in mass politics. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto was a founder of Pakistan People's Party so definitely the important party documents like 'Foundation Documents' and the 'Election Manifestos' of 1970 and 1977 were also his production with the help of some other leading political figures of party. Therefore, the party ideology and policies give light to Bhutto's personal inclination towards socialism.

Although, Bhutto at initial stage talked about democracy, basic rights to people and so on, but above all, his major contribution was that he advocated Socialism openly and publically. In this regard, different opinions prevailing today; some are of this opinion that he was just inspired by socialism but he was not a socialist in practice. Many Leftist political workers are also of this

---

<sup>162</sup> Ibid

thought that, Bhutto exploited the slogan of Socialism and also he exploited the Left of Pakistan because, he raised slogan of socialism for just sack of his personal interests. However, this is an interesting debate which will be dealt in this chapter later. But, at this stage, it is must to look at Bhutto's stance on socialism.

As it is mentioned above that the initial stance of PPP was very clear about Socialism because, in Foundation Documents and also in Election Manifesto of 1970, 'classless society' and 'socialist economy' were mentioned. But, when PPP came into power, same Bhutto inclined towards feudal lords of Sindh and the upper class of Punjab. According to a senior worker of PPP namely Nafees Siddiqi, when Bhutto came into power, he thought that if party leadership tried to opportunist elements replaced by progressive elements in party that would be good, but it would have taken long time and party had no time at the moment. This would also affect the expanding process of party, so Bhutto decided to run party as a multi class party.<sup>163</sup> Siddiqi further states that, Bhutto adopted a progressive and populist strategy which was stated by Lenin and Mao Zedong but he never taken it in a same manner as Lenin and Mao took because, the conditions of Pakistan were different from Russia and China respectively.<sup>164</sup>

On the other hand, some leading Leftists and intellectuals of Sindh keep totally different point of view in this regard. They do not consider Bhutto as a socialist leader but they consider him a populist leader who just exploited the socialist ideology in Pakistan. The present Secretary General of Communist party of Pakistan namely Imdad Qazi even is of this opinion that Bhutto did not left Ayub cabinet by his own wish but America backed him in this regard. Qazi says, "Bhutto was not a socialist; he just exploited the slogan of socialism for his personal interests. Bhutto started his political career from Ayub's cabinet. At that time, there were two major

---

<sup>163</sup>NafeesSiddiqi, Bhutto Se Bhutto Tak. Jang Publishers, 1991. P33-34

<sup>164</sup> Ibid, P37-38

political forces in Pakistan. These were Jamait-i-Islami and Communist Party. Bhutto was Pro-America; he was brought by America against Ayub Khan. Because, Ayub Khan secretly had sent one of his cabinet members to Soviet so that with the help of Soviet, Pak-India war could be ended and ceasefire could be possible. It was unacceptable for America so she brought Bhutto against Ayub”.<sup>165</sup>

It is being accepted by both Bhutto’s supporters and opponents that Bhutto was a wise man who knew the art of attracting the people towards him. Therefore, it was quite possible that because of contemporary circumstances, he knew that was a socialist ideology which could attract people at that time. At the same time, the Left parties were working among masses so it was right time for him to invite some leading Leftists in his party. According to a well known Communist leader, Jam Saqi, “At that time, it was a need for PPP to chant a slogan of socialism because of circumstances of the time. It was a reason that PPP survived, otherwise, without chanting the slogan of socialism, it could not survive, if it would have survived, and then definitely, there had been no difference between PPP and Muslim League”.<sup>166</sup>

Although, Bhutto never fulfilled all promises he made with people of Pakistan but he took some measures like get industries nationalized and introducing land reforms which were his positive steps. At the same time, if someone judges him on the basis of his student life, he seemed inspired by Karl Marx. As notable intellectual of Sindh namely Jami Chandio says, “According to Bhutto’s biographers like Stanely Volpert say that, when Bhutto was a student of Berkeley, his favorite ideals were Napoleon and Marx, he used to study them. These were his college days, when it seems that he was bit inspired by socialism”.<sup>167</sup> Jami Chandio further states that “Bhutto had not struggled a much time, and he wanted to come into power by a short cut. Therefore, he

---

<sup>165</sup> Interview with ImdadQazi, January 28, 2016

<sup>166</sup> Interview with Jam Saqi, January 30, 2016

<sup>167</sup> Interview with Jami Chandio, February 5, 2016

started his political career from the cabinet of Iskander Mirza and Ayub Khan. But, it seems that he at least tried to accommodate socialism in a democratic framework of this country. On the other hand, Pakistan was an Islamic Republic, so he was also nervous. Therefore, he took many steps for convincing religious forces of this country. However, Bhutto tried to introduce the spirit of socialism. For example, getting industries nationalized and introducing land reforms were his socialist steps”.<sup>168</sup>

Another well known intellectual of Sindh namely Dastagir Bhatti is of this opinion that Bhutto did not try to get support of middle class and he also undermined them. He states that “Bhutto did not let the middle class evolve and he broke their backbone. He nationalized almost all small cotton and other factories, which were run by middle class. Therefore, they (middle class) became anti-Bhutto. Later on, Bhutto appointed bureaucrats to look after these nationalized institutions, and in result, bureaucrats involved in corruption. Therefore, it can be said that Bhutto was not sincere with socialist cause and also his party PPP was not a socialist and even it was not a democratic party. He himself did not like democracy, and also he censored the press, which was opposing some of his policies”.<sup>169</sup>

Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto had much experience of politics and he knew the political scenario of the country. If someone notices his speeches and statements, it can be analyzed in these speeches and statements that Bhutto applied different tactics in different provinces in order to get support of people. His party did not get much support of people of Baluchistan and the NWFP in 1970 elections as he also could not succeed in East Pakistan. But, he was quite successful to attract people of Punjab and Sindh towards his political stance.

---

<sup>168</sup> Ibid

<sup>169</sup> Interview with Dastagir Bhatti, February 3, 2016

Bhutto knew that in Punjab, the anti-India and pro-military and pro-China policies were suitable, therefore, he adopted this policy in Punjab. But in Sindh, the case was not the same. In Sindh, on the one hand, he aligned with waderas (feudal lords) and pirs (religious leaders), and on the other hand, he provided employment to people of Sindh which they did not get in a way before Bhutto's period. In these types of tactics, he got support of people of both provinces. Although, Bhutto openly talked to eliminate feudalism in first convention in which PPP was formed, but during 1970 election campaign, Makhdoom Zaman, Pir of Hala helped Bhutto to make an alliance and keep waderas and pirs of Sindh with him because, without support of feudal lords and religious leaders, it was not possible for PPP to win election from Sindh.<sup>170</sup>

Likewise, Bhutto adopted such type of tactics to align leading political forces with him. In this regard, on the one hand, he adopted socialist ideology, because of his this kind of policy, Bhutto got much support of Left of Pakistan, but when his socialist advocating policy was resisted by religious forces of Pakistan, he named it as 'Islamic Socialism' or 'Massawat-i-Muhammadi'. His policy of Islamic Socialism not only helped him to respond religious parties' propaganda, but at the same time, because of majority of people's inclination towards Islam, he got the mass support as well.

### **Bhutto's logic behind advocating Islamic Socialism**

If Pakistan People's Party manifesto of 1970 be analyzed that there only 'Socialism' term is mentioned but later when PPP concept of socialism was highly criticized by religious parties of Pakistan especially during 1977 election campaign when an alliance consisted of rightwing

---

<sup>170</sup> Khalid B. Sayeed, "How Radical is the Pakistan People's Party"? Pacific Affairs, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Spring, 1975) P45

parties, was formed against PPP, that alliance propagated against socialism throughout country. Therefore, Bhutto replaced term 'Socialism' with 'Masawat-i-Muhammadi'.<sup>171</sup>

The well known writer Khalid B. Sayeed writes, "Bhutto presented himself as a Socialist but was aware that Socialism as a doctrine might not be able to withstand the charge of his opponents that it was foreign and not Islamic. Therefore, he constantly emphasized the fact that the Socialism that he espoused was Islamic Socialism and that this was exactly the same as Masawat-i-Muhammadi".<sup>172</sup> Bhutto faced many ideological attacks from religious parties and over a hundred ulamas issued a fatwa against socialism that socialism was a 'kufr (infidelity).' In response of this fatwa he said, "I respect the Ulama, but those who give fatwas after receiving money have served the kafirs. Islam is not in danger. Those who are in danger are the capitalists and the landlords and their puppets who cannot sleep at night and who can only sleep with the help of sleeping pills and, God willing, we shall transform the present social order. Islamic masawat is called socialism in English. Just as people's rule is called democracy. What is wrong in calling Islamic masawat Islamic socialism, which removes the miseries of the poor?"<sup>173</sup>

Although, his socialist stance was criticized by Pakistan National Alliance (PNA) during 1977 election campaign, but socialism was criticized and was declared as anti-Islam in 1970. In February 1970, 113 Pakistani ulamas and 43 ulamas of Saudi Arabia issued fatwas against socialism.<sup>174</sup> Because of these fatawas issued by ulamas, Bhutto used terms like Islamic Socialism and Masawat-i-Muhammadi.

---

<sup>171</sup> Pakistan Democratic Forum, "Pakistan People's Party". Democratic Organizations Series No.2 (August 1983) P2

<sup>172</sup> Khalid B. Sayeed, "How Radical is the Pakistan People's Party"? Pacific Affairs, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Spring, 1975) P54

<sup>173</sup> Ibid, P53

<sup>174</sup> M. Rafique Afzal, Political Parties in Pakistan 1969-1971 (Vol. III). Islamabad, National institute of Historical and Cultural Research, 1998. P127

Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto defended his socialist stance and opposed fatwas issued by Pakistani and Saudi ulamas, in a speech delivered in a public meeting in Gujrat on March 1, 1970. In his speech, he said, “If some people do not regard the followers of socialism in the country as Muslims, they are damaging the cause of Islam. These are only a few people. They are the lackeys of imperialism. Many of them are people who called Quaid-i-Azam a ‘kafir’. I am not against all of them. Some of them are my friends. They have also supported us and want us to succeed. I am talking of the few who are the agents of capitalists. They issued *fatwas* against King Amanullah Khan in Afghanistan, against Ataturk in Turkey, against Nasser in Egypt and against Soekarno in Indonesia and above all against the Quaid-i-Azam and Quaid-i-Millat. They never wanted to serve Pakistan. Their efforts are directed towards weakening Pakistan, but the people of Pakistan have awakened now, and their designs are bound to be frustrated”.<sup>175</sup>

He further stated, “The question is what is socialism? My dear friends, it is nothing but Islamic equality. I am not the first to raise the slogan of Islamic Socialism. Quaid-i-Azam was the first to use this term and remember that he was the one who founded this country. My dear brothers and friends, it was the Quaid-i-Azam who declared in his speeches that Islamic Socialism would be enforced in Pakistan. He said it in Chittagong”.<sup>176</sup>

It is clear in this whole debate that Bhutto used terms like ‘Islamic Socialism’ and ‘Massawat-i-Muhammandi’ after he faced severe criticism from ulamas and religious parties, but it must be understood that the majority population of Pakistan was Muslim and the religious factor was highly supported in this country. Communism and Socialism were declared as anti-Islamic and anti-Pakistan ideology even right after Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case, so it was not easy to

---

<sup>175</sup> Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, *Marching Towards Democracy: A collection of articles, statements and speeches*. Edited by Hamid Jalal and Khalid Hassan. Rawalpindi, Pakistan Publications, P30

<sup>176</sup> Ibid

propagate communist ideology openly. But, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto somehow tried to create some space for socialism if not practically at least in debate.

Bhutto's socialist policy which he stated in his speeches that what were benefits of this system, highly attracted people of Pakistan and definitely it was anti-capitalist and anti-feudalism so people's attraction towards this system was inevitable. At the same time, an addition of 'Islamic' with the term of 'Socialism' also supported PPP to get support of masses. Khalid B. Sayeed analyzes PPP's socialist stance and Bhutto's charismatic leadership during 1970 election campaign, in these words, "If the Islamic Socialism and hastily organized party structure were the independent variables and the electoral success of the PPP was the dependent variable, a crucial intervening variable was the leadership of Bhutto".<sup>177</sup>

However, with the passage of time, Bhutto's attitude towards Leftists of Pakistan and the Socialist ideology was worsening. But, the major loss faced by Left parties of Pakistan who hastily inspired by Bhutto and trusted him. Because of anti-socialist policies of Bhutto, many Leftists who joined PPP, soon left or were kicked out of party. Because of Bhutto's such kind of attitude, the notable Leftists and Left parties considered it as they were betrayed by Bhutto. But the question arises here that how Left inclined towards Bhutto and his party PPP?

### **Left Inclination towards PPP**

It is discussed in chapter no. 2 that, the Left was under state repression right after Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case and later when Jugutu Front (United Front) won election from East Pakistan in 1954. These were major causes that the ban imposed on Communist Party of Pakistan. Likewise,

---

<sup>177</sup> Khalid B. Sayeed, "How Radical is the Pakistan People's Party"? Pacific Affairs, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Spring, 1975) P44-45



some other Left parties of Sindh and of other provinces were under watch of state machinery. Because of such kind of circumstances, Left especially CPP was working underground. But, there was a 'New Left' which emerged after 1965 war and played a vital role in anti-Ayub movement. This new left was attracted by National Student Federation (NSF) and it got aligned itself with NSF Tufail Abbas group.<sup>178</sup>

Later, when Pakistan People's Party emerged, the new Left was attracted towards it and Tufail Abbas group joined PPP. Although PPP had adopted the Left orientation in its formative phases during its first convention held in Lahore, but now, because of addition of new Left, PPP got a Left character.<sup>179</sup> It was also NSF which gave a heroic welcome to Bhutto after he resigned from Ayub cabinet, and it was same NSF which gave him a title i.e. 'Quaid-i-Awam'.<sup>180</sup> NSF was being considered as a student front of PPP until differences between NSF (Mairaj) and PPP took place.

The major cause behind differences created between PPP and NSF was the military oppression against people of East Pakistan. He was Bhutto who openly supported military action in East Pakistan but on the other hand, NSF vividly opposed it. Therefore, not only difference between PPP and NSF created but at the same time, a break between Tufail Abbas and NSF also marked because, Tufail Abbas group also supported military action against East Pakistan.<sup>181</sup>

The best source to know about Left inclination towards PPP is the interviews of those Leftist leaders and workers of the time who joined PPP or at least they were inspired by Bhutto and his party. In an interview conducted by Zamir Sheikh, Tufail Abbas states, "Z.A. Bhutto met us in

---

<sup>178</sup> Iqbal Laghari, History of the Communist Movement in Pakistan. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. P156

<sup>179</sup> Ibid, P157

<sup>180</sup> Ibid, P161

<sup>181</sup> Ibid, P170

the circumstances when the people had risen in revolt against the 11-year-old dictatorship of General Ayub Khan. Students, labourers, peasants and even common man stood up against the dictator. We felt that it was the right moment to push the dictator so we provided full support to Bhutto”.<sup>182</sup>

Tufail Abbas further says, “We had no other option but to support Bhutto and strengthen him against the religious and conservative forces which were supporting the sinking ship of the dictator”.<sup>183</sup>

But in contradiction, Iqbal Laghari mentions in an interview with one of Tufail Abbas group party members, held in 1975, who wished to not disclose his name. He says, “Tufail Abbas wanted Bhutto to engage some party men as whole timers for PPP, in return Bhutto would pay handsomely for their services. Tufail Abbas would use that money for party-building. This was what Tufail Abbas had argued before the party. It was a strange case where Tufail Abbas had put “revolutionaries” on sale”.<sup>184</sup>

Like Tufail Abbas, the former president of NSF, Dr. Rasheed Hassan Khan tells that how they were betrayed and exploited by Bhutto for his (Bhutto’s) personal interests. He says, “Bhutto shrewdly framed the manifesto of PPP on Left programme and slogans. He presented himself as Left of the Left, at least in the formative stage of the PPP and during the Movement against the Ayub Regime in 1968. He exploited the Leftist and progressive forces to enter the corridor of power on their shoulders”.<sup>185</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup>Zamir Sheikh, What Went Wrong, Karachi,(no publisher is mentioned), 2014. P40-41

<sup>183</sup> Ibid, P41

<sup>184</sup> Lock Cite, P162

<sup>185</sup>Zamir Sheikh, What Went Wrong, Karachi,(no publisher is mentioned), 2014. P78

When Bhutto left Ayub Khan, this was time period when the students, labourers and peasants were on the roads against Ayub Khan. This period was most important for Bhutto and he tried to cash the movement in his favour. A former leader of CPP namely Sohail Sangi states in an interview conducted by author about the contemporary conditions of Sindh at that time and Bhutto's stance in order to attract or exploit the Left, he says, "When One-Unit movement was launched, two things had happened in Sindh. These were:

1. Sindhi nationalism arose.
2. Left and Intellectual class also expanded.

When Bhutto chanted socialist slogan, he hijacked movement. I think, in this condition, CPP was on wrong direction because despite focusing on socialism directly, CPP tried to prove it to be a nationalist of the nationalists. In result, Bhutto controlled intellectual cadre of CPP. The pro-China section of Left directly and indirectly joined PPP. Likewise, Mairaj Muhammad Khan and senior Sheikh Rasheed Sahib of Punjab were of this thought that PPP was a popular party; therefore, Left could expand its ideology from PPP platform. Because of Left inclination towards PPP, Bhutto got flavor of Left".<sup>186</sup>

Although Bhutto belonged to an upper and feudal class and on contrary, the Leftists were highly ideologically oriented but in spite of that, Bhutto took such measures that attracted Left of Pakistan to support him. He knew it very well that it was not possible for him to go among masses and getting their support without getting support of Left first. Because it was Left who despite state repression, was still involved in mass based politics. One of reasons to support Bhutto by Left could be his open stance in favour of socialism because, the Left was not allowed

---

<sup>186</sup> Interview with SohailSangi, January 31, 2016

to explicit their program openly and publically but it was possible now in the shape of Bhutto and his party PPP. But, still the Left of Pakistan including Left of Sindh was not ready to trust Bhutto easily and hastily.

Syed Jamaluddin Naqvi writes about the Bhutto's tactics to attract Left towards him. He writes, "Less than a week after the shameful surrender in December 1971, Bhutto assumed power and one of the first things he did was to remove the ban on NAP that had been clamped by his predecessor General Yahya Khan".<sup>187</sup> He further writes, "Not much later, he appointed Akbar Khan, the main accused in the 1951 Conspiracy Case, as the chief of national security. Faiz Saheb was also appointed to the National Council for Arts. All these were steps that went in the favor of Pakistani Left".<sup>188</sup>

The Left was happy by Bhutto's efforts and steps like advocating socialism, announcing nationalization and establishing NAP governments in Baluchistan and NWFP but still a collective suggestion of Leftists of country was that, Bhutto could not be trusted easily.<sup>189</sup> But the Left had also pressure from Soviet to support Bhutto.<sup>190</sup> However, Bhutto got support of Left in a very short period. But, after he came into power, he started to change his policies and now he was not agreed to fulfill promises he made with people of Pakistan especially with Pakistani Left. Although, he took some measures like his nationalization process and introducing land reforms but at the same time, he crushed labour movement launched in Karachi in 1972, he overthrown NAP-Baluchistan government and the crackdown against Left specifically NAP started.

---

<sup>187</sup>Syed Jamaluddin Naqvi with HumairIshtiaq, Leaving the Left Behind.Karachi, Pakistan Study Center, University of Karachi, 2014. P070

<sup>188</sup> Ibid

<sup>189</sup> Ibid, P071

<sup>190</sup> Ibid, P072

Syed Jamaluddin Naqvi writes in this regard, “As the crackdown continued, I once again found myself behind the bars for having allegedly stolen a buffalo. Of all the things, a buffalo!”<sup>191</sup> These kinds of measures and many others, taken by Bhutto, were major reasons that Left realized that was exploited by Bhutto.

### **State Repression against Karachi SITE and Landhi Labor Movement**

It was after crushing the labor movement launched at SITE and Landhi in Karachi that now the some sections of Left were not ready to trust Bhutto more. Although, Sindh had been relying more on agriculture but because of mass migration to Karachi from India and other parts, the industries were established in Karachi so emergence of trade union in Karachi was inevitable.

After partition, Pakistan was given only nine percent of industries of British period but, within a short period of 1947-1955, 744 new factories and mills were established in Karachi which was half of the industries of all Pakistan.<sup>192</sup> Therefore, Karachi became an industrial center of not only Sindh but of Pakistan also at that time. Bhutto who emerged with a Left oriented slogan so people of Pakistan specifically Left was expecting more from his government.

Z.A. Bhutto made many promises during 1970 election campaign that he would bring reforms for the betterment of peasants and laborers of country. He also promised to restore those laborers who were kicked out by factory owners, after coming into power.<sup>193</sup> Zamir Sheikh quotes Professor Khalid Mahmud who summarizes the laborers relations with PPP in three phases. According to Professor Khalid Mahmud; during first phase, after coming into power, PPP made many concessions for laborers like formation of trade unions were facilitated and so on. Because

---

<sup>191</sup> Ibid, P073

<sup>192</sup> Kamaran Asdar Ali, Karachi me, 1972 ki Mazdoor Jidojihad. Karachi, Pakistan Study center, University of Karachi & Pakistan Institute of Labour Education and Research (PILER), 2006. P8

<sup>193</sup> Ibid, P16

of such measures taken by Bhutto government, laborers realized that they were come in power in the shape of Bhutto.<sup>194</sup> Now the workers were making more demands and they were pressurizing mill owners to accept their demands. In this regard, Professor Mahmud suggests looking into three points; that “(1) Workers were very militant; (2) Owners had been frightened and were unsure about the Bhutto regime, so they did not put up any resistant; (3) PPP government had not stabilized itself yet and it left the workers alone”.<sup>195</sup>

In phase two started in spring 1972, PPP government was stabilized now and it assured mill-owners for full protection. Because of government assurance, the mill-owners started to react against workers.<sup>196</sup> During phase three started in summer-fall 1972, government issued warnings to the laborers and police also appeared on behalf of government.<sup>197</sup>

As Bhutto promised with laborers that after coming into power, he would restore laborers but he did not do so till half of 1972. Therefore, laborers came on roads and demanded to restore laborers who were deprived from employment during Martial law. The protests of small scale were going on since early 1972 but the critical situation created on 7<sup>th</sup> of June 1972 when the administration of Feroz Sultan Textile Mill denied giving remaining amount of salary of previous month to laborers, and also administration was not ready to give worker fund. The mill was also closed by mill administration. In retaliation, laborers resisted and the police arrested fourteen workers.<sup>198</sup>

Because of this act of police, more than five thousand workers gathered outside mill and they demanded to release arrested workers and also mill-administration was asked to accept their

---

<sup>194</sup> Iqbal Laghari, History of the Communist Movement in Pakistan. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. P180

<sup>195</sup> Ibid, P180-81

<sup>196</sup> Ibid, P181

<sup>197</sup> Ibid, P181

<sup>198</sup> KamaranAsdar Ali, Karachi me, 1972 kiMazdoorJidojihad. P19-20

demands. In response to this protest, police fired on workers and in result three workers were killed.<sup>199</sup> On the very next day when workers were crossing from Banaras Chowk near Mazddor Basti (labor colony) with one of death bodies, police stopped them. The workers shouted and raised slogans. Police again opened fire and in result, ten people were killed and many were injured.<sup>200</sup> This kind of anti-labor actions taken during Bhutto regime had been criticized yet.

According to Dr. Rasheed Hassan Khan, former president NSF, “In a short span of six months, Bhutto showed his true colour when police resorted to firing on labourers, who had launched a movement in favour of their demands, in Karachi SITE and Landhi. The mill owners were ready to accept the charter of demands of the workers, but Bhutto threatened them of dire consequences, if they accepted the demands of workers, since he wanted to crush the trade union movement and the progressive forces”.<sup>201</sup> Likewise, a famous Leftist and former NSF president Mairaj Muhammad Khan who was a federal minister when this incident had happened, also allege Bhutto government that was behind crushing the labor movement.

Mairaj states in an interview with Zamir Sheikh, “When I came to know as to what would happen, I tendered my resignation on October 10, 1972 and firing incident on labours took place on October 17 and 18 and Bhutto had accepted my resignation on October 22”.<sup>202</sup> If someone analyzes Mairaj Muhammad Khan’s statement then it is clear that Bhutto government already had planned to crush movement through brutal tactics.

However, if someone looks at this chapter carefully that it can be analyzed and concluded that Bhutto seemed inspired by socialism and because of somehow this inspiration and also some

---

<sup>199</sup> Ibid, P20

<sup>200</sup> Ibid

<sup>201</sup> Zamir Sheikh, What Went Wrong, Karachi,(no publisher is mentioned), 2014. P78

<sup>202</sup> Ibid, P96

tactics, he framed Foundation Documents and Party Manifesto on socialist lines. Bhutto could not prove himself a revolutionary leader, but he was a populist leader. He knew that how to attract people towards him. He on the one hand, was advocating socialism but at the same time, he did not ignore the religious factor because, Bhutto knew that the religious sentiments were strong in Pakistan. Therefore, addition of 'Islamic' term with the term of 'Socialism' helped him to defend his stance of socialism. Because, state propagated negatively about the communism and socialism that these ideologies were 'kufr (infidelity)', so Bhutto introduced socialism with the mixture of 'Massawat-i-Muhammandi' so that people of Pakistan and the religious forces could accept the ideology. At the same time, because of his claim to be a socialist leader, he succeeded to attract some Leftist elements towards him.

In short, there were many factors behind successfulness of PPP especially in Sindh and Punjab. On the one hand, Ayub Khan became useless for America so definitely America needed a leader who had charisma like Bhutto who was expert to motivate people towards him. No doubt Bhutto used socialist stance because of getting mass support which was impossible without getting support of Left. It was clear that Bhutto was not a revolutionary leader and that could be analyzed by his election campaign. Bhutto on the one hand was opposing feudal class but at the same time, he invited feudal lords and religious leaders of Sindh to join PPP. In this way, he won election from Sindh. Likewise, in Punjab, he adopted anti-Indian, pro-military and pro-China policy which was suitable for people of Punjab, therefore, he won election from Punjab with clear majority.

As for as question "what was the stance of PPP on question of Socialism and what were the causes behind the popularity of PPP in Sindh in comparison with Left"? is concerned, this question can be answered simply in this way that the stance of PPP on the question of socialism



was not clear. Although, in initial documents, socialist line was adopted but at the same time, on the one hand, the 1970 manifesto stated a 'classless society' and on the other hand, it advocated 'mixed economy'. Therefore, it can be argued that Bhutto was inspired by socialism but he was not a socialist in true sense. But, because of rise of socialism all over world, he advocated socialist line. Likewise, in this way, he successfully got support of Left of Pakistan. Later, when he came into power, definitely he might face many dictations from America and the military establishment of Pakistan that was organizing itself after a shameful defeat in Pak-India war of 1971, slowly and gradually. But in spite of that, he took some measures like introducing land reforms, labor reforms and nationalization process.

Bhutto was a wise man; he knew that if he would ignore the Left of Pakistan completely, they could stand against him. Therefore, he had to take such measures cautiously. As for as Bhutto's popularity in Sindh is concerned, on the one hand, he kept feudal class and religious leaders with him who had support base among people of Sindh and at the same time, he aligned with Left of Sindh who was busy in mobilizing masses especially peasants and laborers. These factors supported him to get much support in Sindh and at the same time, he was benefited by being a Sindhi because, Sindhis remained marginalized since the very inception of this country. Now, as people saw a Sindhi in a key power position, they inevitably supported him. In retaliation, Bhutto was a first ruler who gave employment to a great number of people of Sindh which also attracted people and he was considered as a people's leader. Bhutto also re-introduced quota system of 1949 with some addition of quota system on the basis of 'rural' and 'urban' division which directly favoured Sindhi population in Sindh.

Sindhis were less literate as compare to Urdu speaking population migrated from India, so Sindhi could not get their due share in jobs because of low literacy rate. But, now, because of 'rural and

urban' difference, Sindhis were getting a great share in jobs in public sector. This Bhutto's step on the one hand, created an opportunity for Pakistan people's Party to gain much support of rural population of Sindh. But, on the other hand, Urdu speaking residents of Sindh were not in favour of this system because of losing their big share in public sector jobs. Therefore, a huge majority of Urdu speaking population resisted Bhutto's policy of restoring quota system.

The Sindhi Left remained very weak always, because, it had neither support of feudal and religious leaders nor they came into power. At the same time, they were facing state oppression and working under ground. These all factors affected Left of Sindh who could not proved to be a real people's force. At the same time, tussle and conflict within Left, and state propaganda against the Left were some causes which restrained Left to become a mainstream political force. But, Bhutto tactically succeeded to get entered in the minds and hearts of people which led him to come into power. Bhutto also adopted every tactic to get support of people and come into power, in which he succeeded.

## **Chapter No. 5**

### **Causes and Consequences of Ideological Split and Ethnic rifts within the Left**

As it is mentioned in the introduction of thesis that despite Left played a leading role in many political uprisings of Sindh, it could not get as much popularity as some other parliamentary and feudal parties got. There are many causes behind the unsuccessfulness of Left. The ideological split (pro-China and pro-Moscow) and ethnic rifts (Sindhi v/s Urdu speaking Left) were one of those major causes, which highly affected the strength of Left in Sindh.

In this chapter, the causes behind these splits and ethnic conflicts will be discussed and also the consequences of this scenario that how it affected the Left of Sindh, will also be highlighted. In this way, a question i.e. what were causes that being leading force in political uprisings during 1954-91, Left could not become Political-Mainstream in Sindh? will be answered partially; partially in the sense that only these factors were not behind the unsuccessfulness of Left but there were some more which were discussed in previous chapters.

To understand the ideological differences, one has to look into the history of National Awami Party (NAP) because these differences and splits occurred when the Left of Pakistan was gathered on single wide platform of NAP.

## **Formation of National Awami Party (NAP)**

The ban imposed on Communist Party of Pakistan in result of Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case, was a great loss for Pakistani Left. Because, now even none of Leftist party was using the term ‘socialism’ directly, and this kind of situation was showing that the downfall of Left was started. But, in July 1957, a wider alliance consisted of Leftist and Nationalist elements of Pakistan became possible under the banner of National Awami Party (NAP). At that time, still the term ‘socialism’ remained a taboo and the NAP also was using ‘social welfare’ and ‘welfare state’ instead ‘socialist revolution’ or ‘communist state’ in its manifesto and the constitution.<sup>203</sup> Later on in 1965, NAP used term ‘socialism’ as party’s economic program.<sup>204</sup>

As NAP was an alliance of political parties with different ideological motives but one thing was common between all these political forces that they were challenging the status-quo. Jam Saqi, a famous Communist leader talks about the formation of NAP in these words, “NAP was a multi-class alliance of Leftist, Nationalist and Democratic parties and all were a part of the alliance, which was made on 1<sup>st</sup> of July 1957. You should know that the policy of making united front not only in Pakistan but overall the world, had been adopted by Communists to mobilize oppressed people of world, and got them united on a single platform or united front”.<sup>205</sup> Although before military takeover in 1958, the NAP was not organized in a way as it revived itself later so there were differences between allied parties on some respects. In this regard, M. Rafique Afzal writes,

---

<sup>203</sup> M. Rafique Afzal, Political Parties in Pakistan 1969-1971 (Vol.III). Islamabad, National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research Islamabad, 1998. P76

<sup>204</sup> Ibid

<sup>205</sup> Interview with Jam Saqi, January 30, 2016

“Before October 1958, the NAP, a loose organization of autonomists and leftists, was committed to the dissolution of one unit, regional autonomy, radical economic reforms and a non-aligned foreign policy. Different groups in the party felt more strongly about one or the other item of its programme, which often led to serious internal tensions”.<sup>206</sup>

The idea of socialism got popularity in Pakistan again when anti-Ayub movement started. At this time, it was NAP which propagated this concept throughout the country. This concept of socialism again was openly expanded by Z.A. Bhutto which was discussed in Chapter No.4. However, in initial stage, NAP was active for very short period of (July 1957 to October 1958).<sup>207</sup> But after the military takeover by Ayub Khan in October 1958, NAP became inactive because of military actions against Left.

National Awami Party (NAP) revived itself in 1964 but now the problem was that, the socialist movement was divided into two ideological camps internationally i.e. Pro-China and Pro-Moscow. The NAP was not divided soon, even the differences prevailed in the party but it was intact until 1967 when it was divided between two camps popularly known as NAP (Bhashani) following pro-China and the NAP (Wali Khan) inclined towards pro-Moscow line.

### **Pro-China and Pro-Moscow division in NAP**

The division within a party or an ideology is very harmful because it affects the party and ideological cadre and divides them into different camps. The initial division goes ahead and makes more division. In this context, the ideological division within NAP not only weakened the party but at the same time, it affected the Left of Pakistan all over. Although, this kind of

---

<sup>206</sup> M. Rafique Afzal, Political Parties in Pakistan 1958-1969 (Vol. II).Islamabad, National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research Islamabad 2012. P175

<sup>207</sup> Lock Cite, P77

division did not occur in Pakistan only but it was general phenomenon in international socialist movement in 1960s. In Pakistan, on the one hand, this division bitterly affected the Left movements and on the other hand, Bhutto attracted pro-China or Maoist cadre of Pakistani Left who joined his (Bhutto's) party Pakistan People's Party (PPP).

Before formation of PPP, National Awami Party (NAP) was only party which had mass support so it could challenge then military dictator Ayub Khan. This was one of major reasons that Bhutto also wanted to join NAP. In an interview conducted by Zamir Sheikh, Mairaj Muhammad Khan one of founding members of PPP, says, "Mr. Bhutto wanted to join the NAP on the condition that he should be given the slot of General Secretary NAP which the party declined".<sup>208</sup>

However, socialism is an international ideological phenomenon so definitely the changes or problems occurred in the ideology affects the movements all over the world. The split in Communist movement is described by famous writer namely Ishtiq Ahmed in these words, "The 1960s was also a period when the Sino-Soviet political and ideological animosity (which had been brewing for a long time) came to a head. It culminated in an irrevocable split in the international Communist movement in the early 1960s. In almost all countries outside the Soviet bloc, the Communists split up into pro-Moscow and pro-Beijing parties. While the pro-Moscow parties advocated peaceful strategies for advancing the socialist cause, their pro-Peking counterparts stood for militant armed struggle".<sup>209</sup>

---

<sup>208</sup>Zamir Sheikh, What Went Wrong. Karachi, (no publisher is mentioned), 2014. P91

<sup>209</sup>Ishtiq Ahmed, "The Rise and Fall of the Maoist Movement in Pakistan". ISAS Insights, No. 102-26 (May 2010) P4

Due to international division within Communist Movement, the internal conflicts within NAP continued which in 1967 led a split up into two factions who were; pro-China led by Bhashani called NAP (Bhashani Group) and the other one was pro-Moscow led by Wali Khan called NAP (Wali Khan Group). The NAP (B) was more active in East Pakistan because of Bhashani's ethnic identify as a Bengali but at the same time, it had some pockets in West Pakistan as well.

The NAP (B) followed the pro-China ideological line, was somehow acceptable for government of Pakistan because of cordial relations between two countries. At the same time, China stood against India since Sino-India war in 1962. Therefore, China's this kind of stance was suiting the Punjab who was ruling the country through military establishment of Pakistan. Because of China v/s India phenomenon, in Pakistan the pro-Moscow were not considered as patriotic as pro-China were being considered. But in India, the situation was reverse where pro-China was considered unpatriotic while pro-Soviet was considered patriotic.<sup>210</sup>

In 1967 when PPP formed, it also adopted the Maoist line. According to Ishtiaq Ahmed, "The ideology of the PPP was a blend of radical rhetoric borrowed from Maoist jargon, nationalist fervour directed against India, democracy and Islamic socialism".<sup>211</sup> But as Maoist elements believed in militant way so when Bhutto came into power, these were Maoists who resisted some policies of Bhutto and they adopted militant tactics in some areas of Sindh and Punjab. In retaliation, Bhutto government ordered to take harsh action against those Maoist elements.<sup>212</sup>

The Maoist elements were also getting stronger in trade union and educational institutions, as Ishtiaq Ahmed writes, "The Pakistan International Airlines trade union was firmly with Maoists and their student wing, the Nationalist Students Federation (NSF), emerged as a powerful force

---

<sup>210</sup> Ibid, P4

<sup>211</sup> Ibid, P5

<sup>212</sup> Ibid, P5

on the Karachi University Campus”.<sup>213</sup> According to Professor Jamal Naqvi, the migrants from India to Punjab and Karachi were more hostile towards India; therefore, Maoists elements were prevailing specifically in Punjab and Karachi.<sup>214</sup> Naqvi also states that the CPP-Sindh was playing leading role because of less impact of Maoist elements in Sindh party.<sup>215</sup> This ideological debate comes into the domain of national question.

Communist party of Pakistan which was a part of NAP after it was banned in 1954, it was being alleged by some Leftist elements of Sindh out of CPP that CPP point of view on national question was not clear. But, the former leader of CPP namely Jam Saqi denies this opinion and he had delivered a speech on the issue of national question which later published in a booklet shape. According to him, in 1952 when the language issue was raised, it was CPP who clearly stated that there were five national languages of Pakistan i.e. Bengali, Sindhi, Punjabi, Pashto and Balochi. The Urdu could be declared just as a language of communication.<sup>216</sup> As for as NAP point of view on national question was concerned, Jam Saqi talks about the NAP stance before it divided into two separate factions. According to him, it was NAP in which CPP was also present that resisted One-Unit scheme and in 1958, NAP got passed a resolution against One-Unit formula, from East Pakistan Assembly.<sup>217</sup>

Talking about the debate over national question, Bakhshal Thalho, General Secretary of Awami Workers Party-Sindh states, “The communists of Punjab are of this opinion that, because of taking national question more seriously as compare to class question, the communist movement became weak in Pakistan, but, in Sindh, Baluchistan and in some extent in KPK as well, the

---

<sup>213</sup> Ibid

<sup>214</sup> Professor Jamal Naqvi, Communist Party of Pakistan mein Nazryati Kashamkashki Mukhtasir Tareek. Karachi, Maktaba-e-Roshan Khayal, 1989. P37

<sup>215</sup> Ibid, P34

<sup>216</sup> Jam Saqi, Qomi Sawal. Karachi, Pirbhat Publication, 1987. P4-5

<sup>217</sup> Ibid, P6



reverse point of view prevailing that, because of ignoring national question, problems were created for Left”.<sup>218</sup>

NAP (W) following the pro-Soviet line was under those Leftist elements who believed in socialism but at the same time, they were emphasizing the ethnic identity.<sup>219</sup> The NAP (W) on the one hand was opposing the One Unit and at the same time, it was demanding for creation of more provinces based on linguistic and cultural identity in Pakistan.<sup>220</sup> This NAP (W) stance led internal conflicts within NAP (W) of Baluchistan when Achakzai, a Pakhtun leader of NAP (W) demanded a separate province for Pakhtuns called Pakhtunistan with merging some areas of Baluchistan dominated by Pashtun population.<sup>221</sup> Achakzai’s this demand created heat in NAP (W) and finally split into NAP (W) was occurred in the shape of Baloch group and Pakhtun group. The Baloch group led by Khair Bakhsh Mari and Pakhtun group was led by Achakzai. The central committee of NAP (W) recognized Mari group as its official group so Achakzai created a separate group called NAP (Pakhtunkhwa).<sup>222</sup> But, in Sindh, situation was different.

In Sindh, as Jamal Naqi claims, the Maoist or pro-China elements were found only in Karachi because of migrated population presence in the city. But, on the other hand, the Left out of Communist Party especially in the shape of Awami Tehrik led by Rasool Bux Palijo was following the pro-China line and was more inclined towards national question. Likewise, after the formation of PPP which also adopted the Maoist line, attracted the Left of Sindh so now the pro-China line was more popular in Sindh as compare to pro-Moscow.

---

<sup>218</sup> Interview with BakhshalThalho, February 2, 2016

<sup>219</sup> M. Rafique Afzal, *Political Parties in Pakistan 1969-1971 (Vol.III)*. Islamabad, National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research Islamabad, 1998. P87

<sup>220</sup> Ibid, P89-90

<sup>221</sup> Ibid, P91

<sup>222</sup> Ibid, P91-92

However, this pro-China and pro-Moscow division bitterly affected the Left and it can be considered one of causes of failure of Communist movement in Sindh and Pakistan. In this regard, former president of National Student Federation (NSF) namely Chaudhri Latif Ahmed says in an interview conducted by Zamir Sheikh that, “In my opinion the division between Moscow-Peking was one of the reasons left failure in Pakistan otherwise we had our own serious shortcomings which contributed to us becoming irrelevant in today’s politics. We had accepted that division with blind eyes though some of people had refused to accept that division which was probably was not wrong”.<sup>223</sup>

While these ideological rifts and division was going on, at the same time, ethnic conflicts within Left especially between CPP and Awami Tehrik and also some Sindhi intellectuals were also a part of this debate, was going on as well. This Sindhi-Mohajir conflict within Left of Sindh, like pro-China and pro-Moscow division, was also another cause of Left weakness.

### **Sindhi V/S Urdu Speaking Communists and the National Question**

The ethnic tensions were created right after the partition when exodus came from India. Although, the Left existed before the creation of Pakistan but it was Communist Party of Pakistan under the leadership of Sajjad Zaheer, Sibte-Hassan and some other Urdu speaking comrades who were sent from India to lead CPP. There were some Sindhi comrades in central committee of CPP, but comparatively they were very few.

For this thesis, mostly secondary data was studied but at the same time as a primary data, interviews of some senior Sindhi members of Communist party were also conducted. According to interviews conducted with former and present CPP members, there were no any ethnic

---

<sup>223</sup>Zamir Sheikh, What Went Wrong. Karachi, (no publisher is mentioned), 2014. P137

conflicts between Sindhi and Urdu speaking workers of CPP. But, on the other hand, some Sindhi politicians like Rasool Bux Palijo and also some intellectuals like Rasheed Bhatti kept opposite opinion and they considered Urdu speaking Leftists as anti-Sindh and anti-Sindhi. In this sub-title of this chapter, it will be analyzed through secondary data and also through looking into interviews that why these conflicts were prevailing in Left of Sindh? And also it will be analyzed that how this phenomenon affected or weakened the Left of Sindh?

This whole debate revolves around the issue of ‘national question’ because according to some Sindhi politicians and intellectuals, Communist Party was not clear on national question. As Rasool Bux Palijo writes about six anti-Sindh forces, in his book titles, ‘Syasi Adab-3 (Political Literature-3), these six forces in Rasool Bux Palijo’s opinion were; 1) the group of Sindhi landlord and bureaucrats, 2) Military and bureaucracy which had been controlling all system of country, 3) the landlord and capitalist class of Punjab and Karachi, 4) the Mullahs in the shape of Moulana Maududi, 5) the so called progressive class of Punjab and UP which had been exploiting people of Pakistan in the name of socialism and revolution and 6) Imperialist forces in the shape of America.<sup>224</sup> Palijo considers progressive elements of UP and Punjab as most dangerous force among six anti-Sindh forces mentioned above. According to him, the Urdu speaking progressives talk against the exploitation by Punjab and they also talk about the rights of small nations of Pakistan but when the matter of Sindhi people’s exploitation in the hands of Urdu speaking population living in Sindh, comes, the Urdu speaking progressives suddenly start to talk about the internationalism and they talk against ethnic nationalism and so on.<sup>225</sup> Palijo further writes that despite helping Sindhi oppressed people who were being exploited by Punjabi and Mohajir elite, the Punjabi-Mohajir progressive elements had been suggesting Sindhi people

---

<sup>224</sup>Rasool Bux Palijo, SyasiAdab. Hyderabad, Center for Peace and Civil Society (CPCS), 2007. P158-159

<sup>225</sup> Ibid, P159-160

to fight against landlord and capitalist class of Sindh. In this way, they were trying to divert attention of Sindhi people so that they could not fight against Punjabi-Mohajir lobby.<sup>226</sup>

According to Rasool Bux Palijo, the purpose and interests of so called progressive elements of UP and Punjab were same. They both were denying the existence of small nations of Pakistan; they were working against nationalist movements.<sup>227</sup> But on the other hand, another Sindhi Leftist leader namely Jam Saqi who was member of Communist Party, kept totally different view in this regard. He claims that CPP was aware of the importance of national question and the party had adopted many such kind of strategies by which the issue of national question could be resolved.

He delivered speech on 'national question' which later published in a booklet shape. In this speech, Saqi tells that, in every movement like the movement in the defense of Sindhi language and opposing Urdu language as national language of Pakistan, was launched by CPP in 1952 right after the language issue was raised.<sup>228</sup> He gives an example of Sindh Hari Committee which was working as a sister organization of CPP that was fighting for the rights of Sindhi landless Haris to distribute land among Sindhi haris.<sup>229</sup> Jam Saqi further states that Communist Party was first political party which resisted insufficient provincial autonomy in the constitution of 1973.<sup>230</sup>

On the issue of Sindhi-Urdu speaking Communist conflict, Jam Saqi states in an interview with author that, "I believe, if Sindhis were in more number in CPP, they would have worked more among Haris. But, the Urdu speaking comrades mobilized factory labourers and they worked among laborers well. I don't think so that Urdu speaking members of CPP were hostile to

---

<sup>226</sup> Ibid, P162

<sup>227</sup> Ibid, P169

<sup>228</sup> Jam Saqi, QomiSawal. Karachi, Pirbhat Publication, 1987. P4-5

<sup>229</sup> Ibid, P5

<sup>230</sup> Ibid, P11

Sindhis. But, you should also keep in mind that our Sindhi nationalists were against Urdu speaking students. During the period of 1960s, some of our Sindhi nationalist students used to slap Urdu speaking students and they used to chant a slogan of Jeay Sindh!”<sup>231</sup>

One of former Communist Party leaders namely Ms. Hameeda Ghanghro who is wife of Nazir Abbasi, states that the Sindhi v/s Urdu speaking phenomenon was created by secret agencies and the military establishment in order to weaken the Left movements, and they did it.<sup>232</sup> She further says that the leader of Awami Tehrik Rasool Bux Palijo blamed that the CPP was not clear on national question but his party was clear on this question. If it was so, then why still Rasool Bux Palijo and his party is unable to win a single seat in election? Why the nationalists of Sindh who claim to fight for the rights of Sindh, are being rejected by people of Sindh and they are still out of assemblies?<sup>233</sup>

Like Jam Saqi, almost all Sindhi workers of CPP whom author interviewed, were of this opinion that there was no such kind of hostility in the minds of Urdu speaking communists against Sindh and Sindhi people. Senior journalist and former CPP member Iqbal Mallah talks about the solidarity between Sindhi and Urdu speaking comrades during the time when Sindhi-Mohajir riots were going on. He says, “I do not think that there was any Sindhi v/s Urdu speaking conflict in CPP. I remember, when Sindhi-Mohajir riots were going on, at that time, we attended study circles in Latifabad (areain Hyderabad dominated by Urdu speaking population). Likewise, in Sindhi majority areas of Hyderabad, we saved lives of many Urdu speakers”.<sup>234</sup> In this condition, one must think over the issue that if the Sindhi and Urdu speaking CPP members are this opinion

---

<sup>231</sup> Interview with Jam Saqi, January 30, 2016

<sup>232</sup> Interview with HameedaGhanghro, May 15, 2016

<sup>233</sup> Interview with HameedaGhanghro, May 15, 2016

<sup>234</sup> Interview with Iqbal Mallah, January 30, 2016

that the Urdu speaking Leftists were not hostile towards Sindhi then why Rasool Bux Palijo and Rasheed Bhatti etc condemned the Urdu speaking Left?

Professor Jamal Naqvi, an Urdu speaking Leftist and member of Communist Party also somehow talks about the chauvinistic approach of some Urdu speaking Leftists who later left the party. Naqvi writes about the CPP demand that Bengali should be made national language of Pakistan and at the same time, CPP was raising the issue of other languages of Pakistan as well. According to him, this demand of CPP was unacceptable for some Urdu chauvinists who resisted and then left party. Naqvi also talks about Ahmed Nadeem Qasmi who was one of those Urdu chauvinists who later became a Pakistani nationalist and raised a slogan of conquering the Kashmir.<sup>235</sup>

This debate is very interesting but it is quite clear that because of this conflict, the Left was divided in urban and rural factions. The Communist Party was more active in urban areas of Sindh specifically Karachi because of industrialization. Although Sindh Hari Committee as a sister organization of CPP was working among Haris but it could not sustain as an active mobilizing force after 1970s. Then since 70s, Awami Tehrik was more active in rural areas of Sindh which was mobilizing peasants, students and women of Sindh and at the same time, it was opposing the CPP specifically Urdu speaking leadership of CPP and declared them as anti-Sindh and opportunist elements within Left.

Rasheed Bhatti, a well known writer and an active member of Awami League-West Pakistan, writes in his jail diary, “Despite being a Communist, Mohajir is first Mohajir then Communist. He (Mohajir) tried his best to weaken the Sindhi nationalist movement. The Mohajir

---

<sup>235</sup>Professor Jamal Naqvi, Communist Party of Pakistan mein Nazryati Kashamkashki Mukhtasir Tareek. Karachi, Maktaba-e-Roshan Khayal, 1989. P23

Communists had been claimed that they became Sindhi but actually they were not. Despite living in Sindh since previous twenty two years, they were unable to speak a single word of Sindhi language”.<sup>236</sup> In contradiction to Rasool Bux Palijo and Rasheed Bhatti’s point of view, Bakhshal Thalho, General Secretary Awami Workers Party Sindh says, “ In Pakistan, the national question had been remained very popular among Leftist elements. As for as Rasool Bux Palijo is concerned, as he used term “Naqvi-Nazshi-Sazshi Tolo”, on the one hand, he was bitterly critical towards communists and on the other hand, he was also criticizing nationalist elements of Sindh. In this way, Palijo harmed both the politics of Left and the nationalistic politics as well. Rassol Bux Palijo’s this kind of stance was also harmful for his party which can be seen in the shape of Ayaz Latif Palijo’s leadership today. Ayaz is not more anti-establishment as Awami Tehrik was in past, and Qomi Awami Tehrik is going to be a part of status-quo”.<sup>237</sup>

Likewise, Sohail Sangi, former CPP activist and one of victims of Jam Saqi Case, admits that Urdu speaking leadership of CPP was unaware of political condition of Pakistan but they were not hostile towards Sindhis. He says, “I don’t have any doubt on their sincerity. I was in jail with Professor Jamal Naqvi and also I lived very close to him, but I never realized that he was anti-Sindh and anti-Sindhi. As for as Palijo Sahib is concerned, he declared himself a Pro-China, so he directly went in a conflict with Pro-Moscow. Yes, we can say that CPP could not understand problems and conditions of Pakistan as it made a mistake by making an alliance with Bhutto in the end of 60s”.<sup>238</sup>

However, despite Sindhi leadership of CPP’s denial of conflicts between Sindhi and Urdu speaking Left, such kind of conflicts persisted in the Left of Sindh. Because of such kind of

---

<sup>236</sup> Rasheed Bhatti, AseenLochyoonLoh Mein (Jail Diary). Sukkur, My Publication, 2014. P28

<sup>237</sup> Interview with BakhshalThalho, February 2, 2016

<sup>238</sup> Interview with SohailSangi, January 31, 2016

division, the Urdu speaking Left confined itself in trade union movement and the Sindhi leadership outside CPP confined itself in mobilizing peasants at rural areas. The conflict over mobilizing masses like laborers and peasants was also going on. Communist Party believed that it was labour class which could be a major source of revolution but the Maoists in the shape of Rasool Bux Paliyo, were keeping opposite view and tried to mobilize the peasants because according to this school of thought, Sindh relied on agriculture sector whose largest population linked to agriculture so these were peasants which could be very helpful force in order to bring a revolution in country.

However, like sectarian battle in Islam, these kinds of divisions as pro-China and pro-Moscow, and Sindhi v/s Urdu speaking proved very harmful for Left. This division was very beneficial for anti-Left forces especially rightwing which tried to get as much benefit as it could. At the same time, it was Bhutto who very wisely got benefit of the situation, because the pro-China and pro-Moscow division was very beneficial for his party. Bhutto himself declared his party as pro-China so definitely he had attracted the Maoist elements of Pakistan towards him. In this way, the national question was somehow raised but the class question was going in background. Because, he was same Bhutto, who was on the one hand, was advocating the Left ideology and claiming to strive for a classless society but at the same time, he was inviting elitists of Sindh in his party.

On the other hand, because of state oppression against Communists before and during Bhutto period, and the division within the Left, the Left of Sindh became very weak so in result despite being a leading force in political movements, the Left of Sindh could not become mainstream political force. In a result, PPP succeeded to get support of people of Sindh and became the representative party of Sindhi population. Like this same had happened in urban areas of Sindh



specifically Karachi and Hyderabad that in 80s MQM became a representative party of Urdu speaking population living in Sindh.



## Conclusions

Although it is clear that the Sindhi and even Pakistani Left could not become a part of mainstream politics and could not succeed in coming into parliament. But, it was a positive sign that like the Left of other countries, Pakistani and Sindhi Left also worked among masses in order to mobilize them so that they (masses) could fight for their rights. In this regard, it was a tragic that despite working in masses, the Left could not get support of people with respect of vote in elections. But, on the other hand, Pakistan People's Party founded by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in 1967, succeeded in getting highest votes from Punjab and Sindh in the elections of 1970. PPP succeeded to get masses support in very short period of only three years, and on the other, the Left specifically Communist Party of Pakistan, and Sindh Hari Committee which was an independent party before partition and after it has been working as a sister organization of CPP, could not get any support throughout its history. Even Hyder Bux Jatoi who organized SHT, was defeated by a feudal lord in elections of 1965.

This study mainly focused on the role of the Left in political uprisings launched in Sindh since 1954 to 1991. The purpose to select this time period simply was that, during this period some great movements took place, which were led by the Left. There were mainly three questions which were answered in this study through dividing this study into five chapters.

The first question of the study i.e. "What were causes that being a leading force in political uprisings during 1954-91, Left could not become Political-Mainstream in Sindh?" was answered through looking into the history of Left movements. There were many causes behind the unsuccessfulness of the Left which are discussed in detail in this study already, but in short, before partition, the first great Leftist party namely Sindh Hari Committee faced many threats

from feudal lords of Sindh, even some SHC leaders and peasants were killed and many were severely beaten by landlords and feudal lords.

The Communist Party of Pakistan emerged as a major Left party after the creation of Pakistan, which had gotten much support in Punjab, and also in Sindh through merger of Sindh Hari Committee with CPP. Also, Urdu speaking migrants from India joined CPP who organized labour movements in Karachi. But, the problem was that, on the one hand, CPP leadership came from India who did not know proper political conditions of new born country that was a multi ethno national country with different cultures and different political orientations of the nations were part of Pakistan. Secondly, the same CPP leadership committed a great mistake that it had cooperated with military in planning a coup in order to overthrow the government. Because of this military and CPP nexus, CPP leadership was charged under Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case. Now, state took an advantage of this conspiracy case, and had banned CPP.

Apart from Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case, the Left also faced internal factions in the name of Pro-China and Pro-Soviet division in National Awami Party (NAP), a wider alliance of Left, autonomists and ethno nationalist parties of Pakistan. This division had happened in 1960s, and Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto took great benefit of that division in order to invite Pro-China faction of Left to join his party i.e. Pakistan People's Party. Like, this division within the ranks of Left, another division and conflict occurred in the Left of Sindh and that was Sindhi v/s Urdu speaking Left.

It is interesting to notice here that in Communist Party, according to secondary data and also interviews conducted with some former senior Sindhi CPP leadership, it is quite clear that there was no any Sindhi v/s Urdu speaking conflict in CPP. But, out of CPP, there conflict between Sindhi and Urdu speaking Leftists on the issue of national question, prevailed. Now, the question

arises here which is also discussed in previous chapters that “how conflict between Sindhi and Urdu speaking Left over national question, affected the Left of Sindh?” This conflict like Pro-China and Pro-Moscow division highly affected and weakened the Left of Sindh. Because, the Awami Tehrik led by Fazil Raho and Rasool Bux Palijo was a mass movement out of CPP in Sindh, the AT was also following the Marxist-Leninist-Moist line, but, because of tussle created on national question, about which Awami Tehrik leadership was of this opinion that the Urdu speaking leadership of Communist Party was silent on exploitation of oppressed Sindhis in the hands of Urdu speaking capitalist. Because, CPP Urdu speaking leadership was neglecting the national question so that resisting against exploitation of Sindhis could be avoided. But, the CPP leadership was/is of this opinion that the Communist Party including Urdu speaking leadership and workers resisted against all injustices which had been happening Sindhi population at that time. However, it would have been great if all the Left elements would have joined hands with each other in order to fight against landlord and capitalist class of Sindh.

At the same time, state machinery was also very active against the Left of Sindh and Pakistan. The state firstly propagated that socialism and communism was anti-Islam and it was a doctrine relating to atheism. These all were some causes which restricted the Left to become a mainstream political force in Sindh.

The last question of the study is “what was the stance of PPP on question of Socialism, and what were the causes behind the popularity of PPP in Sindh in comparison with Left?”

In initial days of PPP, it presented itself a great Left party of Pakistan. On the one hand, Bhutto had recently left Ayub cabinet and launched a mass movement against his (Ayub) regime, and on the other hand, at the time, Pro-China and Pro-Moscow divide was occurred in international and

Pakistani Left too. Bhutto inclined towards Pro-China that was somehow acceptable for the military establishment as well because of Pakistan-China friendship. But, how Bhutto's PPP got popularity among people in very short period? Bhutto's stance on socialism and PPP's success is already discussed in this study. Bhutto was a populist leader who knew that how to attract people and get their support.

Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto was aware of this thing that the doctrine of Socialism was becoming very popular and it was spreading all over world at that time, and the Left elements of Pakistan were also very active in working among the masses. Therefore, he chanted a slogan of socialism based on Chinese line. Bhutto's this stance was welcomed by Pro-China socialist elements and some even joined or merged their parties with PPP. At the same time, Bhutto was using different tactics to get support from different provinces. In East Pakistan, Awami League led by Sheikh Mujib-ur-Rehman was so active and in Balochistan and NWFP, NAP and Jamiat Ulema-i-Islam(JUI) had support of people. But, Punjab and Sindh were open grounds for PPP, so Bhutto adopted Pro-China, Pro-Military Establishment and Anti-India stance in Punjab, and in Sindh, he invited feudal lords and pirs to join his party.

In this way, Bhutto got support of people of Punjab and Sindh. Likewise, the Left also supported him because he publically raised the slogan of socialism and made many promises to bring an egalitarian change in Pakistan. Bhutto's socialist stance was also criticized by religious clergy of Pakistan. The ulemas of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia even issued fatwas against him that he was a kafir (infidel) because he was talking about socialism. The Pakistan National Alliance was on roads against Bhutto's claims to be a socialist. Hence, he added 'Islamic' term with 'Socialism' and called 'Islamic Socialism' or 'Massawat-i-Muhammandi'. Later on, when Bhutto came into

power, he adopted many harsh policies against laborers and the Leftist elements of Sindh and Pakistan. Therefore, the Left also became anti-Bhutto.

In nutshell, there were different tactics used by state to suppress the Left of Sindh and Pakistan, but at the same time, Left had some flaws within its ranks as well. The internal conflicts on national question and ethnic tussles were also responsible for the Left weaknesses and unsuccessfulness. On the other, Bhutto was very sharp minded politicians, who knew an art to attract the people because he was a populist leader but not a socialist one. Even, before the emergence of PPP, the Left was not strong enough but the PPP really contributed to weaken the Left more. On the other, the Soviet downfall was one of major causes. In result, after downfall of Soviet bloc, the Sindhi and Pakistani Left just became a non-existent entity.

## Bibliography

Abro, Badar. 2014. *Jail jee Diary*. Kandiaro: Roshni Publication.

Abro, Badar. 2014. *1983Jadahin Sindh me Baah bari: MRD ji Kahani*. Karachi: Kachho Publication.

Afzal, M. Rafique. 1998. *Political Parties in Pakistan 1969-1971 (Vol. III)*. Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.

Afzal, M. Rafique. 2012. *Political Parties in Pakistan 1958-1969 (Vol. II)*. Islamabad: National institute of Historical and Cultural Research.

Ahmed, Ishtiaq. 2010. *The Rise and Fall of the Maoist Movement in Pakistan*. ISAS Insights, No. 102 (26 May): 1-7.

Akhter, Aasim Sajjad. 2010. *The Oil and Gas Bridge: Fragmented Responses to Capitalist Penetration in Pakistan's Sindh Province*. LABOUR, Capital and Society, 43: 1. 1-26.

Ali, Babar. 1987. *One Year of Left Unity in Pakistan*. Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 22, No. 30 (July): 1235-1236.

Ali, Babar. 1989. *Pakistan: Dilemma of the Left*. Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 24, No. 31 (August): 1759-1760.

Ali, Tariq. 1984. *Movement for the Restoration of Democracy in Pakistan*. India International Centre Quarterly 11, (1) (March): 57-69.

Ali, Kamran Asdar. 2015. *Communist Politics and Class Activism in Pakistan 1947-1972*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.



Ali, Kamran Asdar. 2006. *Karachi mein 1972 ki Mazdoor Jidojihad*. Karachi: Pakistan Institute of Labour Education and Research (PILER), Pakistan Study Center, Karachi.

Ayaz, Sheikh, Rasool Bux Palijo, Yousif Laghari and Masood Noorani. 1978. *4 March aien Sindhi Jodha*. Hyderabad: New Fields Publication.

Bhutto, Zulfiqar Ali. *Marching Towards Democracy: A collection of articles, statements and speeches*. Edited by Hamid Jalal and Khalid Hassan. Rawalpindi: Pakistan Publications.

Bhatti, Rasheed. 2014. *Aseen Lochyoon Loah Mein*. Sukkur: My Publication.

Chandio, Amir Ali, Mughis Ahmed and Fouzia Naseem. 2011. *Struggle for Democracy in Sindh: A Case Study of Movement for Restoration of Democracy (1983)*. Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 1, No. 1 (January): 1-14.

Ghanghro, Hamida. 2006. *Peera jo Safar (Aatam Katha)*. Karachi: Shaheed Nazeer Abbasi Foundation.

Giyanchandani, Sobho. 2013. *Roshni je Pandh Main (Aatam Kahani)*. Sukkur: My Publication.

Giyanchandani, Sobho. *Sobhy Joon Tahreeron-1*. Compiled by Naz Sanai. Hyderabad: Sindhi Sahat Ghar, 2010.

Hassan, Sibte-. 2002. *Pakistan ke Tehzeebi-w-Siyasi Masail*. Karachi: Maktaba-e-Danyal.

Hussain, Rifat. N.d. *Trade Union Tehrik: Aik Ajmali Jaiza*. Karachi: Pakistan Institute of Labour Education and Research (PILER), Pakistan Study Center, University of Karachi.

Jatoi, Dr. Hatim, ed. *Baba-e-Sindh Hyder Baksh Jatoi 1901-1970: Introduction and Excerpts from His Writings*. Hyderabad: Baba-e-Sindh Hyder Bakhsh Jatoi Academy, 1995.

Khoso, Faiz. 2013. *Kare Kakar Heth Moon Jherende Chadya (Tareekhi Halchal MRD)*. Sukkur: My Publication.

Leghari, Iqbal. *History of the communist Movements in Pakistan* (Unpublished thesis).

Muhammad, Qazi Faiz. 2008. *Hari Committee aien Allottee Tehrik*. Hyderabad: Sindhi Sahat Ghar.

Naqvi, Syed Jamaluddin. 2014. *Leaving the Left Behind*. Karachi: Pakistan Study Centre, University of Karachi.

Naqvi, Professor Jamal. 1989. *Communist Party of Pakistan me Nazryati kashmkash ki Mukhtasir Tareekh*. Karachi: Maktaba-e-Roshan Khayal.

Nazish, Comrade Imam Ali. *Communist Party of Pakistan ki Tareekh*. Compiled by Comrade Wahid Bux Banglani and Zarqa Inqlabi. (no location & publisher is mentioned), 2012.

Paliyo, Rasool Bux. 2015. *Kot Lakhpat jo Qaidi*. Kandiaro: Roshni Publication.

Paliyo, Rassol Bux. 2007. *Siyasi Adab-3*. Hyderabad: Centre for Peace and Civil Society.

Qazi, Dr. Azad, "Muqadmo." In *Comrade Hyder Bux Jatoi (Sindhi Sarwech)*, compiled by Dr. Azad Qazi, Kandiaro: Roshni Publication, 2015.

Qureshi, Professor Aijaz Ahmed. 2013. *One Unit aien Sindh (Sindh ji Siyasi Tareekh jo hik aham Baab)*. Karachi: Peacock Printers and Publishers.

Saqi, Jam. 1987. *Qomi Sawal*. Karachi: Pirbhat Press.

Saqi, Jam. 1987. *Sindh ji Shagrid Jidojihad*. Kandiaro: Roshni Publication.

Sayeed, Khalid B. 1975. *How Radical is the Pakistan People's Party?* Pacific Affairs, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Spring, 1975): 42-59.

Shaam, Mahmood. 2009. *Larkana to Peking*. Islamabad: National Book Foundation.

Sheikh, Zamir. 2014. *What went wrong?* Karachi: (publisher is not given).

Siddiqi, Nafees. 1991. *Bhutto Se Bhutto Tak*. Jang Publishers.

Solangi, Ashique Hussain. 2007. *Sindh Hari Committee: Tareek aien Jidojihad*. Dokri: Lab-e-Darya Historical Society.