ISSN Online : 2709-4030
ISSN Print : 2709-4022
Vol.7 No.3 2023

Analytical Study of Awami Tehreek: An Ideological Debate

Ali Qasim [1], Zunera Memon[2], Aisha Zaki[3]

Abstract

This paper discusses the foundational and theoretical basis of Awami Tehreek. Awami Tehreek is a party about which common and even religious minded people admire that it is the only political party in Sindh whose workers are well educated and well trained. They excel in the debate on the topics like philosophy, history, politics, literature, religion etc that no one could be able to defeat them. The strategy was to educate the workers of party. It inculcates the culture of study circles. when I was studying in the University of Sindh, I could be able to attend those study circles which were organized by Rosool Bux Palijo himself. This was the same culture of study circles existed in every nook and corner of Sindh where there was the branch of Awami Tehreek. Owing to this strategy, the Awami Tehreek became the symbol of education in Sindh. As far as, resistance is concerned, the party stands on many fronts where its leadership observed that there is injustice and exploitation, the party is seen there and defends oppressed people.

The present research will analyze the democratic, national, class, patriarchal questions, which paved the way for long struggle against feudalism in Sindh. Moreover, it will critically evaluate the fighting fronts, the party incorporation, politics, common people, students, intelligentsia, women and peasants etc. This research will emphasize the above questions and will try to answer the multi-dimensional approaches of resistance. This paper will also discuss that how Awami Tehreek deferred from nationalist and the leftist political parties in Sindh.

Keywords: *Awami Tehreek, Feudalism; Sindh; Leftist Politics; Nationalist Politics*

---

[1] Lecturer in Pakistan Studies, PECHS Education Foundation Govt Degree Science College , karachi (Corresponding Author: qasimali.pst@gmail.com

2 Junior Lecturer in Pakistan Studies, Dept of Basic science and Humanities, Dawood University of Engineering and Technology ,karachi, Pakisatn.: memonzunaira1@gmail.com

3 HOD Pakistan Studies , Karachi Garrison Educational System : aishahsiddiqa47@gmail.com

Background of the Study

Rasool Bux Palejo decribed his first political experiment, when Hyder Bux Jotoi contested elections against influential landlord Gheibi Khan Chandio. This experiment influenced the entire thought of Palejo. Palijo worked in this election for Haider Bux Jatoi who was representative of Sindh Hari Committee.[1] It seems to be objective that it was a very progressive act to stand for the peasants instead of feudal. This initiative of Palijo made him enlightened to stand with down-trodden class. Later on Palejo took active part in anti-One Unit movement. This movement was cruelly dealt by the state, so he started to be in the cultural activities. Cultural platform was used for the spreading the message against One Unit. Later he joined "Bazme Soofia Sindh" as its General Secretary and G.M Syed was its President. This platform was intolerable for state elites that it imposed restriction on it.[2]

He joined NAP and became president of Hyderabad. In those days, Democratic Action Committee (DAC) was formed. Jamat Islami put a condition for joining the DAC. Palejo satirically commented on Jamiat's condition. Breaking of One Unit should be replaced with the demand to allow an every Muslim a right to four wives. The NAP remained in the DAC despite

ISSN Online : 2709-4030
ISSN Print : 2709-4022
Vol.7 No.3 2023

of his reservations. Therefore he resigned from the NAP. After this, he joined "Sindh Mutahida Mahaz". This Mahaz was formed by G M Syed. It was in 1968 when Palejo got differences with G.M Syed on the question that feudals like Mohammad Ayoub Khuhro were allowed to join the party. They were not only feudals but were responsible for making One Unit. This was the reason; he resigned from Sindh Mutahida Mahaz (SMM) in 1969.[3]

Finally, comrade Palejo disassociated himself from other political parties due to biased nature and tunnel vision of those parties and alliances. He thought to form a political party which should be representative of laborers, peasants, students and women. That political party is determined to fight against the injustices incurred on people. A convention was called on in Hyderabad at Bhurgari House on March 05, 1970. More than 70 people participated in this convention. It was this convention in which Sindhi Awami Tehreek was founded. Abdul Hafeez Quraishi was elected its president and Rasool Bux Palejo and Fazul Rahu Genral secretary and senior vice president respectively.[4]

Soon after the formation of Awami Tehreek on 14 March, 1970, million acres of land of Sindh were put into auction. Awami Tehreek started *Neelaam Band Karyo* (stop the auctioning) movement. This movement was joined by peasants along with female peasants Malookan, Bhagi, Yasmeen Sarhio, Naseem Sindhi and Shamim Baloch was active in this movement. About 217 male and female peasants were arrested. This movement succeeded in stopping government to auction the lands of Sindh.[5]

Literature Review

Ideological Debate

The important question is to how could Palejoism be understood? This question gets vitality because when he presents his stand point on national question where nationalists' parties never stand. If there is talk about class question, he discloses the communist party of Pakistan a bogus socialist party. In this regards Dr Naazir Mohammad writes:

> ***Palijo was committed leftist and Marxist intellectual who left a large repertoire of his writings…, In the 1960s leftist movements across the world were divided into pro- Soviet and pro- china groups, Palijo was considered pro- China***.[6]

Another scholar on this subject, M. Alam Brohi is of the view that:

> ***I have thus far appreciated Rasool Bukhsh Palijo as a revolutionary, a Marxist and Maoist, a politician, a political scientist, an intellectual, a scholar, a political mentor, a social reformer, a nationalist and a patriotic.***[7]

Naveed Sandeelo writes about Palijo in this way:

> ***He was a prolific writer, political thinker, socialist, literary critic, distinguished lawyer and an avid scholar of great repute. He was one of the last men left in Pakistan who championed leftist politics in the country***.[8]

Jami Chandio opines that Rasool Bux Paloji is fundamentally Marxist. Therefore, it is very wrong to interpret him a nationalist in his basics.[9]

The fact is that Palijo derived his all ideology from the writings of Marx, Angel, Lenin and Mao. He used Marxism as a method not a static or fixed ideology which one has to follow as it is. But it is a method which guides him to follow and reinterpret it with respect to the specific conditions of particular society. Lenin contributed in this method to interpret it according to socio-economic conditions of Russia. Lenin put proletariat class in a role of vanguard, while Mao differred from

Russia. So Mao put the peasants in the role of vanguard for revolution. Palejo was the first person in Sindh to interpret Marxism, Leninism and Maoism in accordance with the conditions of Sindh. Another point makes Palijo fundamentally Marxist is that he derives the national question from Marxism. Therefore he calls those communists bogus who do not stand for oppressed nations. They consider by raising this question, the position of feudal could be stronger and would be more exploitative. Palejo rejects these socialists from various references quoted from the works of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. So Marxists can be both nationalist and feminist. But it is not necessary that every nationalist and feminist can be Marxist. It is the fact that some Marxist do not understand question of nations and women necessary. Palijo was mature and learned in an age which still was in its initial conditions of develop. In that society it is not aless than a miracle that Palijo identified himself Marxist, nationalist and feminist. It is still debate in the arena of leftist politics that whether national and women question should be posed or not? But it is the great intellect level of Palijo that he raised all three questions class, nation and women simultaneously in the era where there was less debate on the national, women question in the most of the leftists parties. Still various leftist do not struggle for the emancipation of women and oppressed nation. In this regard it could be a great contribution of Palijo to stand on above questions in the light of Marxism, Leninism and Maoism.

Awami Tehreek's Stances on Various Issues

On Education

Palijo is clear on the importance of education in a political movement. A movement cannot emerge and understand the difficult path and challenges before it without understanding the significance of deep knowledge. It is very necessary that a party does not understand that through a shortcut way of educating only a few leaders will solve their problem. But it deems to educate even the common workers. It also considers that along with the education, its practicality is very important. Palejo insists that at least common workers must have been educated at a level that they can understand the basics of politics.[10]

Palijo emphasises the standard of education.Quantity can be compromised but the standard cannot be. So the standard of education should be an international level. Another thing which Palijo deems significant that is of the discourse of political movement. On this element of education, when I read Palijos' stance it reminds me of French educationist who changes the criteria of education for the oppressed people. Paulo Frieris' book "Pedodogy of Oppressed" is very basic book on discourse. Palijo understands that as the discourse is easy, simple and vivid that could be helpful for workers in comprehending its meaning and message. Workers should be taught through this simple method and would bring results in the development of cadre of party.[11]

Palijo maintained above principles of education in his party by inculcating weekly study circles and lectures. This trend prevailed in the every branch and wing of the AT. The creation of this type of culture is the contribution of Palijo and this culture not only enlightened workers of party but also left great influence on Sindhi people. This trend has everlasting impacts on Sindh society.

Feudalism and Nationalism in Sindh

There is a conflict of political interests between the rural and urban population of Sindh. Rural people are dwelling their lives under the clutches of feudal, while the urban educated have

different social system. Urban people do not represent the interests of rural peasants and they just only favor nationalist question, while peasants are not attracted to nationalism due to their constant suffering in the hands of landlords.

The stand of leadership of Awami Tehreek is analyzed by Palijo as rural people mostly complain of the cruelties of the feudals. They understand that feudals are their real enemies. It is, therefore, they attempt to fight against them. This oppressed class is the obsolete majority of Sindh, constitute roughly ninety percent of population. Urban educated people do not stand with them firmly in their struggle against feudalism. Albeit they do their struggle for national cause without taking the question of peasants. The war can only be won either it is of nationalism or against feudalism when both classes will understand the significant role of opponent group in their struggle. Their unity can resolve their problems.[12]

Palijo calls one of the worst evils of Sindhi society is feudalism. So the struggle against it is not only the class problem but it is also the pivotal and integral part of nationalist movement. It is nearly impossible for Jeay Sindh's nationalist movement to strengthen itself and could continue to sustain their struggle without supporting the people's resistance against feudalism.[13] Owing to the tunnel vision of Sindhi nationalists, they fail to understand that Panahgir- Punjabi (Muhajir-Punjabi) is only successful in oppressing the Sindhis because feudal lords of Sindh are their old allies. If history is looked into retrospect, internal schism and conflict between Sindhi Hindu and Muslim, and Sindhi landlord and Hindu merchants paved the way for the exploitation of resources of Sindh in the hands of leaders of UP and Punjab. Imposing of One Unit and separation of Karachi from Sindh are examples which fit completely in the above assumption.[14]

Nationalism in Sindh was introduced by G M Syed after his long struggle for the making of Pakistan. G.M Syed understood in 1930s that Pakistan was panacea of all problems of Sindh. He embarked his journey in the boat of Muslim League. He organized the Sindh Muslim League. It was mid of the 1940s that acute differences had surfaced between G.M Syed and M.A Jinnah. The membership of G.M Syed was cancelled at the decisive period of India. After the independence of Pakistan, all hopes turned into despair and Pakistan soon got the authoritative character. It was over centralized and the principle of provincial autonomy was violated. He parted his way and founded a new idea that freedom of Sindh from Pakistan is the panacea for Sindhi people.

Jami Chandio applauds G.M Syed's contribution in establishing the foundational basis of nationalism in Sindh by writing the books like *Religion and Reality*, *Sindhu ji Sanjah*, *Sindh ja Soorma*, and *Paigham e Latif*. These books enlightened Sindhi people with nationalism. Jami also criticizes his strategy of addressing the national question in Sindh. According to Jami, the nature of polities of G.M Syed was feudalistic and he rejected the class and democratic aspects of nationalism. He deemed class and democratic struggle during his freedom movement against the national interests of Sindh.[15]

While Mr. Palijo's stance was that without raising the class and democratic question, the national question does not serve the interests of people rather it would serve the illegal interests of feudal lords in Sindh. National freedom is not possible without the emancipation of oppressed class, and it is not in the people's intests. Therefore, national and class questions are pivotal and integral part of each other. After the fifty years of this write up of Palijo, results are clear, leadership of Awami Tehreek predicted correctly.[16]

There was another populous political figure of Sindh who was Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto a contemporary politician of Syed and Palijo. He was called as a Quaid-i-Awam. Unlike G.M Syed he stood for the cause of democracy in Pakistan but he rejected the significance of national question. He did his politics while standing for peoples' cause and he called himself an Islamic socialist. Pakistan is a multi- national country. So it could be impossible bringing democracy in it without addressing national question of oppressed nations. The practical example is of the Constitution of 1973 which refused to accept the nations dwelling in Pakistan.[17] This was the hypocratic and paradoxical nature of politics in Sindh. No party wanted to lose its allies even if were a despotic for the interest of Sindhi people. Awami Tehreek that time exposed the nationalists, feudals, and socialists and so called democratic leaders. It bravely started its struggle for cause of democracy, socialism and nationalism simultaneously.

Left and National Question

There has been schism in leftist political parties about right to self determination. Some regards national question an integral part of Marxism and while others do not understand it as much importance to struggle for. But the question of nation's subjugation even was raised by Karl Marx. Poland was the largest of the subjugated nations of Europe. Marx had given his unconditional support to demands for Polish independence.[18] However, Lenin criticized the Polish Socialist Party for unconditionally demanding the independence of their country. But this is not to say that national question was minor one for Lenin. He expressed himself more forcibly in favor of the principle of national self determination than almost any other social democratic leader of the time.[19]

Mr. Palijo understands, Lenin was champion of addressing the national question during his party's movement of class struggle. Lenin participated in the second International and disclosed the hypocrisy of socialists of Germany, France, and England who had their hegemony in that arena. They have similarities with the Pakistani, Panahgir- Punjabi socialists on the national question. They refused to accept the existence of nations and avoid admitting the fact that they were oppressed and exploited nations.[20]

Mr. Palijo outlined the problems of Left in Pakistan which were totally based on their opportunism. Panahigir -Punjabi were so-called socialists and followed their ideological path which was contrary to the ideology of Lenin. They call national question futile, conservative, illegal and against the vested interests of common people. They think that national struggle would strengthen the feudals and capitalists. If National question is raised, the class question would be compromised. The bogus progressive leaders make many excuses to avoid raising nation question.[21]

Jami Chandio criticizes the Left on the two grounds, therefore Palijo calls them pseudo-progressives. The criticism on Left is analyzed by Jami on two counts:

1. One faction of leftist political parties in Sindh was only emphasizing on the class question. To stand on the national question was like blasphemy for them and they think with the resolution of class question, national question will be resolved automatically. Before rising for national question is only to strengthen the feudals. Comrade Palejo and his party Awami Tehreek disclosed the socialist's strategy and their deception. Palijo put into those progressive leaders pseudo leaders.

2. At that time, trend of leftist was only to focus on the imperialist who are the major enemies. However, the struggle for democratic and national rights was secondary for them. Comrade Palijo stood hard against the imperialists. But he rejected and condemned the position of pseudo leftists on national and democratic question.[22]

It is not right to observe the ideology of Awami Tehreek in one dimension but it is the composite formula and multi-dimensional. It is not a single idea but it is a complete 'ism'. So, it should be called Palejoism. Its different aspects should be carefully studied and researched. Comrade Palejo is one step forward from nationalists on the questions of democracy, feudalism and it is also progressive from socialists on the question of nation and democracy. Professor Aziz ud Din credits Palijo on his fight against pseudo and bogus progressive leaders. He calls this effort of Palijo a great and historical task of sanctifying the politics from those pseudo and reactionary politicians.[23]

Professor Aziz ud Din calls Palejo an "internationalist". For the rights of nation in Sindh, he invites the alliance of entire oppressed nations and oppressed people. Palijo did not want to limit his alliance to Sindh, Baloch and Pashtoons but he extends it to the oppressed people of the Punjab as well. This is an internationalist perspective of Palejoism.[24]

While observing the stance of one of the senior leaders of leftist party regarding the national question in left, it is something like to target the total left politics if any single faction does not stand for national operation. Communist party had long struggled on the national question in history. It also can be criticised on its few dimensions but name calling it like "Naqwi, Saazshi, to" (It is the group of conspirators) is not right stance. He further views that communist were not less spared to Palijo and Awami Tehreek.They also had a harsh and rigid opinion for him. He blames the conditions of the decade of 1970s.Political leaders of that period used to accuse one another on some minor differences. But now time and conditions are different.He further opined that it is not a revolutionary norm to attack one another. The material conditions of this era suggest us to adopt a new and creative path. Leaders should mend their ways and embark on new journey.[25]

Another interview with leftist leader about the ideology of Awami Tehreek happened, who praised Palijo on his contribution to disclose the faction of communist party in eschewing from the national question.Most of those socialists belonged to the Urdu speaking community who thought that national question and national movement was of the feudal not of the proletariat and peasants in Sindh. This fact was also stated by Jamal Naqvi, President of Communist Party of Pakistan. Still today men like those pseudo communist are available who do not stand with nationalists on the rights of self-determination of nation. But as far as criticism of Palijo on all communist is concerned, it is his personal opinion. He should not call them salaried of government. It is his personal angels on all communist.

It can be concluded that even the leftist leaders agreed with Palijo that there were leftists political parties which were pseudo progressive and did not stand with nationalists on the exploitation of Sindhi people at the hands of Panahgir-Punjabi rulers. Its clear examples are separation of Karachi and formation of One Unit. So, as Marxist, he did very well to disclose them.

Awami Tehreek and Democracy

ISSN Online : 2709-4030
ISSN Print : 2709-4022
Vol.7 No.3 2023

Democracy is a political system which empowers people to have their say in the decision making process of government. It developed in the Europe by replacing the monarchical form of government in consequence of French revolution 1789. Dicey define democracy as

> ***"It is a form of government in which the governing body is a comparatively large fraction of the entire nation."***[26]

While Mazhar ul Haq states that modern democracy is product of historical events. One of great events behind that was French Revolution which gave the popular slogan like liberty, equality, and fraternity. However other icebreaking event was English parliamentary system.[27] Later on it spread in the twentieth century in the decolonialization process in Asia and Africa. But the system evolved in Afro-Asian society unlike Europe. One can call quasi-democratic society. Pakistan after the 70 years of its inception still is authoritative and security state rather than welfare state.

It is also the great contribution of Awami Tehreek to struggle for democracy. It successfully deviated from the readymade solution in a single question. As socialist thought envisages that once there is a socialist revolution all questions such as of democracy and nationalism will be solved automatically. While Sindhi nationalists viewed that once Sindh liberated, feudalism would be demolished and democracy will be strengthened. In the case of Pakistan it is wrong. Even after independence, neither feudalism was eradicated nor democracy solidified. Jami Chandio analyses that nationalists politics in Sindh was under the hegemony of G. M Syed and he rejected to raise the democratic and class question. But he only stressed on the national question. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto did populist politics and denied to stand with peasants against feudals. His political behavior empowered feudal class. Some factions of leftist considered the democratic question secondary.[28] So the demerits of the Left and nationalists parties were improved by Awami Tehreek. It stood for people in every era whether they were facing the feudals, dictators, or capitalists. The contribution of Awami Tehreek will never be forgotten in the history.

Naseer Memon elucidates vividly the concept of nationalism and democracy of Awami Tehreek. He writes:

> ***"Palijo wanted Sindh to be politically and administratively autonomous having all rights over its natural resources and socially free of clutches of feudal class within the constitutional frame work of Pakistan. He wanted oppressed classes in every province to get politically empowered through a people-lead democratic process. His political ideology was for a democratic system in Pakistan where peasants and labors had key role in decision making at all levels. He was abundantly clear that unless led by peasants and laborers, democracy will be a mere ruse and a musical chair game of feudal".***[29]

Mr. Palijo explains his position on this question very effectively. It is very necessary to end the slavery of feudals. It would be pragmatic when people will destroy the pseudo democracy which, in fact, is the dictatorship of capitalists and feudals. After the eradication of so-called democracy, the people's democracy will be established.[30] So it is very clear from the literature of Awami Tehreek that it rejects the authoritative democracy influenced by capitalists and feudal class. It has no representation of common people in decision making process. The party has included in its manifesto to struggle for true democracy in which workers, laborers and peasants can

influence the decision making. Along with other questions, the struggle for true democracy is significant for the leadership of the Awami Tehreek.

Awami Tehreek and Women

Women are more than fifty percent part of our society. Any movement which ignores the role of women in political movement will be hardly a successful movement. A party can not strengthen its roots in society and it can not be sustain for long period of time if it ignores women and does not give any role in the party. In a country like Pakistan, feudalism never let women even breathe. Honor killing and physical violence are common practices in our society. Women face innumerous problems and discrimination in the Pakistan.

Awami Tehreek established its women wing on November 26, 1982. This movement became powerful and organized, not only playing its part in uniting the oppressed, lower class and workers women but also stood firmly with the party in its struggle for democratic, national liberation and class question. It stood against the obsolete feudalism which is responsible for the slavery of women. Sindhyani Tehreek had a long history of struggle against patriarchical form of society.[31]

Naseer Memon calls Sindhyani Tehreek an inspiration for women in Sindh. It played significant role in reshaping the rural Sindhi society. Sindhyani Tehreek enlightened the women in Sindh. Its result was that thousands of young girls joined colleges and universities. They became part of wide range of professions as working women. It completely changed social outlook of Sindhi society during recent decades.[32] Apart from its role in awareness and empowerment of women, this movement was also a symbol against feudalism. It was a time when society was captive in the clutches of feudal.[33]

Sheema Kermani writes about the revolutionary task of Sindhyani Tehreek. She is of the opinion that in a society so highly patriarchal and misogynist, where feudal anti-women practices and values are prevalent, and the work of mobilizing organizing peasant women onto a revolutionary step is taken by Palijo.[34]

Farzana Bari distinguishes Palijo from other leftist political parties, as a Marxist, no one in Pakistan understood women's potential to play a role in the socialist revolution as did Palijo. Palijo was the only leftist politician in Pakistan who brought women and family as an integrated whole in the party fold of Awami Tehreek. Sindhyani Tehreek was the most powerful and resilient face of Awami Tehreek. Its role for democratic rights and resisted Zia-ul-Haq's repression was also unprecedented.[35]

Rubina Sehgal writes about the Sindhyani Tehreek's historical role in restoration of democracy. She calls it a women peasant movement and it was started in Sindh. The demand of Sindhyani Tehreek was an amazing movement which resisted the military and state during Zia dictatorship period. The fundamental demand was for the restoration of democracy and the rights of people should be given which previously were snatched by dictator Zia-ul-Haq.[36] The role of Sindhyani Tehreek is unforgettable in the shaping of Sindhi society.

Methodology

The method of qualitative research has been adopted in my reseach plan because it mainly suits my research design. Both primary and secondary sources have been put under study in this research. Although primar sources would be important and valuable to understand the nature of the politics of Awami Tehreek, however, secondary sources of research are also been used in this

research to intrepret primary sources. In this connection I have visited various liabraries. Analysis of documents , books, journals, magzines,Newspapers etc, has been made for this reseach.

Results and Conclusion

In conclusion, it may be said that Awami Tehreek introduced new dimensions in politics; either it was the politics of left, nationalists, democratic etc. After the in-depth study of Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism, Maoism and other socialists from Asia and Latin America, comrade Palijo inovated a new theory of science of revolution which covers all aspects of progressive politics. It is another miracle of Palijo that he utilized his innovated theory according to the socio-political conditions of Sindh.

It fought against the dictatorial policies of federal government since its inception. It also drastically challenged the existing obsolete socio-political system. The worst evils of our socio-political system are authoritativeness, Punjab-Panahgir dominated state institutes, highly centrist federal structure of the state. Constant exploitation of common people on the hand of feudals as well as capitalists. Typical nature of patriarchal society prevails in Pakistan. There is the least representation of women in any institution in the land of pure. AT fought against all above mentioned evils of this socio-political system. Being a Leftist and Socialist Political Party, it initiated many fronts to resist the challenges generated from this outdated system.

AT differed itself from other Leftists and Sindhi nationalists political parties in its ideology, manifesto and on the account of the practical politics of resistance. The Left in Pakistan had a tunnel vision to identify the exploitation of nations in Pakistan. The Leftist political parties bonded its ideology to only popular slogan of Marxism against class system. However they fail to understand the Marxism in its true sense and they did not succeed in studying the ground realities of this Asiatic particular nature of contradictions. It is the consensus fact among progressive political parties that class exploitation is the primary contradiction in our society to stand against it and wage a severe war against this capitalist class. But progressive leaders have obsessed themselves with the class question fail to stand by firmly with exploited nations in Pakistan. AT ideologically call those so-called progressive and Leftist political parties pseudo and bogus because they never stand with the marginalized nations. AT on the contrary considers class question and national questions fundamental challenges before the progressives. AT initiates its long struggle on these both fronts class and national.

AT's ideology was also different from the Nationalist movement of Sindh as well as Democratic movement so-called led by the Peoples Party. Nationalist Movement finds no solution other than the separation of Sindh from Pakistan. However AT severely criticises this approach of Sindhi nationalists. AT finds solution for the problems of Sindh beside with the other smaller nations of Pakistan i.e. Baluchistan and Khyber Pakhtunkhuwa in the maximum provincial autonomy. It argues that it is very necessary for smaller nations to remain in the federation of Pakistan for its securities reasons i,e, defence. Another plank of AT's stance against complete freedom of smaller provinces is that these provinces would be under the clutches of feudals and tribal lords once they would get complete freedom. Therefore AT understands the disastrous impacts of separatists' movement however it is in the extreme favour and one of the protagonist in the movement for maximum provincial autonomy in Pakistan. AT's ideology is very clear on the democratic question. The democracy in its true form will never come in

Pakistan unless the feudalism and the tribalism is not uprooted from Pakistani society. Meanwhile Peoples Party so-called understands itself the champion for bringing in democracy in Pakistan. AT consider PPP's claim false because it never strives hard for the eradication of feudalism. A dynastic and feudalistic party cannot stand for democracy in Pakistan. AT therefore mobilises a movement of peasants and lower middle class people against feudalism for the strengthening the democracy in Pakistan.

AT empowered with its ideology of Peoples', Nationalist and Democratic revolution differed itself from the other Leftist and nationalist political parties resisted the conservative state sponsored policies. From One-Unit to the harsh dictatorial era, AT successfully mobilized the downtrodden classes of society such as peasants, labourers, students and women played leading role. AT started Paidal long marches on the environment issues such as making of big dams on the Indus River. It stood for the rights of lower riparian rights of on River Indus and unearthed the desires of ruling elite make KalaBagh Dam and Greater Thal Canal. AT's leadership stand hand in hand with lawyers when the Chief Justice Iftikhar Mohammad Chaudry was removed from his post.

References:

[1] Laal Jarwar, *Awami Tehreek ji Sargarmian aen Jidojahadan ji Mukhtasir Tehreekh*, (Hyderabad; Awami Kitab Ghar, 2018), p. 16
[2] Ibid, 17
[3] Ibid,
[4] Ibid, p. 32
[5] Ibid,
[6] Naazir Mahmood, "An Enlightened Mind", *Rasool Bux Palijo: An Icon of Relentless Struggle*, edited, Kalavanti Raja, (Karachi; Peacock, 2019), p. 82
[7] M. Alam Brohi, *"A Soldier of Sindh and Sindhu" in Rasool Bux Palijo: An Icon of Relentless Struggle* (Karachi; Peacock, 2019) p. 45
[8] Naveed Sandeelo, *The Veteran Politician: Rasool Bux Palijo, in Rasool Bux Palijo:* An Icon of Relentless… Op. cit. p. 65
[9] Jami Chandio, *Ke Manho Tarikh Thiyan Tha*, in Siasi adad, Vol. 2, Part. 1 (Hyderabad: CPCS, 2007). p. 18
[10] Palijo, Rasool Bux, *Subuh Theendo*, in Siasi Adab, Vol. 3, Part. 1 (Hyderabad: CPCS, 2007), p. 128-129
[11] Ibid, 129
[12] Ibid,132
[13] Ibid, 133
[14] Ibid, p. 134

[15] Jami Chandio, *Ke Manhon Tareekh Thyan Tha*, Op. Cit. p-219-20
[16] Ibid, p. 20
[17] Ibid, p. 20
[18] David Mc Lellan, *Marxism After Marx: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. (London: Maclmillan Press Ltd. 1998), p. 110
[19] Ibid, p. 111
[20] Rasool Bux Palijo, *Subuh Theendo*, Op. cit. p. 184
[21] Ibid, p. 180
[22] Jami Chandio, Ke manhon tarekh thyan tha, Op. cit. p. 21
[23] Azziz-ud-Din, "Rasool Bux Palijo: A Historical Personality", in *Rasool Bux Palijo: Nishan-i-Jahad Muslsil* (Karachi: Peacoc Printers and Publishers,
[24] Ibid
[25] Interview with leader of AWP, 20-08-2020
[26] Interview with leftist leader, 18-08-2020

[27] Mazher-ul-Haq, *Political Science: Theory and Practice*, 8th ed. (Lahore: Book land, 2009), p. 363
[28] Ibid,
[29] *Naseer Memon, Palijo: A larger Than Life Icon of Sindh, in Rasool Bux Palijo: an Icon of Relentless Struggle*, Op. cit. p. 62
[30] Palijo, Rasool Bux, Subuh Theendo, Siyesi Adab, Vol. 3, Part 1, p. 97-98

[31] Jarwar, Laal, Awami Tehreek ji Sargarmian ae Jido-Jahdinji Mukhtari Taarikh, Hyderabad: Awami Kitab Ghar, 2018, p. 126
[32] Naseer Memon, "Palijo: A larger than life of Icon of Sindh", Op. cit. p. 63

[33] Ibid, p. 63
[34] Sheema Kermani, Foreword in *Rasool Bux Palijo: An Icon of Relentless Struggle* edited by Kalavanti Raja, (Karachi: Peacock, 2019) p. 10
[35] Farzana Bari, Preface in *Rasool Bux Palijo: An Icon of Relentless Struggle* Op. cit. p.15
[36] Saigol, Rubina, *Aurat aur Mazahimet:Mehnat Kash Aurton se Makala* (Lahore: Mashal, 1999), p. 88