



Dr. Shahida Begum¹

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Shah Abdul Latif University, Khairpur, Sindh, Pakistan

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Ethical Leadership, Hur Movement; Pir Sibghatullah Shah II; Sooreh Badshah; Pir Pagaro; Sindh; British colonialism; anti-colonial resistance; colonial governance; historical memory; source criticism	This Study investigate the Hur Movement of Pir Sibghatullah Shah II (Sooreh Badshah) under the British rule in South Asia. It discusses the linkage between spiritual leadership, community mobilization, political power and armed resistance, and the evolving dynamics of the Hur community and British colonial administration. It is a qualitative historical and source-critical study, and uses mainly the secondary scholarship and documented historical information and sources, distinguishing contemporary information, later historical interpretations and commemorative history. The analysis examines the earlier growth of the Hur Movement, their connection to the Pir Pagaro lineage, how they developed under Pir Sibghatullah Shah II, the colonial reaction and the legacy of his arrest and execution. Special focus on social and religious networks that facilitated the construction of collective identity and mobilization as well as the policing, detention and administrative management of colonialism. The study proposes that the Hur Movement should be viewed as a regional episode of armed resistance, rather than a movement shaped by and for the interaction of religious authority, local social relationships, community networks, political mobilization and colonial governance. The analysis also illustrates differences in accounts regarding the goals and objectives of the movement, its evolution and growth, the size of the movement, and the political dynamics of the movement. Therefore, statements about independence, communal relations, casualties, arrests, any particular military incidents, and relations with other political organization's need to be compared and corroborated among sources. The article makes a significant contribution to the study of anti-colonial resistance in Sindh through offering the source-critical interpretation which differentiates documented historical events from the later interpretations of scholars, commemorative narratives and nationalist perspectives. It also stresses the need for analysis of the development of the movement and how it has been represented in regional historical memory in the subsequent years, especially in relation to the Hur Movement and Pir Sibghatullah Shah II.
ARTICLE HISTORY Date of Submission: 04-08-2026 Date of Acceptance: 19-09-2026 Date of Publication: 25-09-2026	 2026 Journal of Social Sciences Development
Corresponding Author	Dr. Shahida Begum
Email:	shahida.chandio@salu.edu.pk
DOI	https://doi.org/10.59075/jssd.v5i7.309
Volume/Issue	5(7), 2026, 418-431

Introduction

British colonial rule in the Indian subcontinent generated diverse forms of opposition, ranging from constitutional politics and political organization to non-cooperation, social mobilization, and armed resistance. The uprising of 1857 became an important reference point in subsequent discussions of colonial authority, resistance, and the struggle for independence. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, resistance developed through different political and social strategies, reflecting differences in regional conditions, leadership structures, ideological orientations, and relationships with colonial institutions. Recent historical scholarship emphasises that anti-colonial resistance should be examined within its specific social and regional contexts rather than treated as a single, uniform movement (Ahmed, 2026; Jaffar et al., 2026).

Within Sindh, the Hur Movement represents an important and contested episode in the history of resistance to British colonial rule. The movement was closely associated with the spiritual authority of the Pir Pagaro lineage and developed through several phases of resistance. Its later phase is particularly associated with Pir Sibghatullah Shah II, popularly remembered as Sooreh Badshah, whose leadership has received considerable attention in historical and regional scholarship. Studies of the movement have examined the relationship between religious authority, collective identity, rural society, and resistance to colonial administration (Sodhar, Shaikh, & Sodhar, 2015; Sodhar, Laghari, & Kabooro, 2019; Ahmed, 2026). Recent scholarship has further interpreted Hur resistance through the concept of collective solidarity (*al-asabiyah*), arguing that shared religious commitment, organisational discipline, loyalty to leadership, and collective identity contributed to the movement's endurance (Ahmed, 2026).

The relationship between the Hur community and the British colonial state also involved extensive administrative, legal, and coercive measures. Research has documented the use of policing, surveillance, military operations, detention, and special legal arrangements in attempts to control Hur resistance. The establishment and administration of detention or concentration camps forms an important part of this history and illustrates the extent to which colonial authorities treated the movement as a security and public-order problem (Keerio, Rasool, & Ahmed, 2024). Contemporary British parliamentary records likewise demonstrate that colonial officials represented the Hurs primarily through the categories of violence, criminality, and public security, including their classification under colonial legislation (Hansard, 1942). Such records are valuable historical evidence but must be read critically because they reflect the institutional perspective of the colonial state.

The historiography of the Hur Movement therefore contains different interpretations of its objectives, organization, social composition, and relationship with the wider anti-colonial struggle. Some scholarship presents the movement principally as a religiously grounded resistance movement, whereas other studies emphasise its socio-political dimensions, collective identity, regional significance, and opposition to colonial authority (Sodhar, Shaikh, & Sodhar, 2015; Jaffar et al., 2026). The representation of the Hurs in colonial records also differs substantially from accounts that emerge from local histories, community traditions, and later

commemorative writings. This divergence makes source criticism particularly important when reconstructing the movement's history.

The role attributed to Pir Sibghatullah Shah II requires similar historical scrutiny. Scholarship generally associates his leadership with the final and most prominent phase of Hur resistance and with the intensified confrontation between the movement and the British administration during the 1930s and early 1940s (Keerio, Rasool, & Ahmed, 2024; Ahmed, 2026). His execution following a British military-law process in 1943 subsequently became an important element of the movement's historical memory. At the same time, interpretations of his leadership and the objectives of the movement vary across colonial documents, academic studies, and regional commemorative narratives (Scott, 2009; Sodhar, Laghari, & Kabooro, 2019).

Against this background, the present article examines the historical development of the Hur Movement, the role attributed to Pir Sibghatullah Shah II, and the responses of the British colonial administration. It distinguishes documented historical events from later interpretations and considers the limitations and perspectives of different categories of sources. Particular attention is given to the ways in which colonial records, scholarly studies, and regional memory have represented the Hurs and their resistance. By bringing these perspectives into critical comparison, the study seeks to contribute to a more historically grounded understanding of the Hur Movement within the wider history of colonial Sindh and anti-colonial resistance in South Asia.

Research Objectives

1. To examine the historical development of the Hur Movement and the leadership role attributed to Pir Sibghatullah Shah II.
2. To analyze the relationship between colonial policies, local social structures, and the development of Hur resistance.
3. To assess the movement's historical significance and identify differences between contemporary accounts and later interpretations.

Research Questions

1. How did the Hur Movement develop under Pir Pagaro?
2. How did British colonial policies and local social relationships shape the movement and the state's response?
3. How has the movement's significance been interpreted in historical and commemorative accounts?

Literature Review

Historical Scholarship on the Hur Movement

In the recent years there has been a considerable amount of scholarship dedicated to the Hur Movement in various aspects of colonial control, religious control, rural society and resistance to

colonial rule in the province of Sindh. In *Policing Insurgency: The Hurs of Sindh* Nabi has focused on the relationship between the Hur community and the colonial policing system as well as the administrative steps taken by the British police to quell resistance. The study is important to comprehend the perception and response of colonial institutions towards Hur mobilization (Nabi, 2020).

In their study, Nabi and Mangrio (2020) analyze the court martial and execution of Pir Sibghatullah Shah II, and also recount the legal and political history of the last years of his rule. Their research is useful to the literature because of its targeted research on the colonial state's treatment of Pir Sibghatullah Shah II and the historical significance that has been given to his execution (Nabi & Mangrio, 2020).

Other recent studies have studied certain facets of colonial reaction. Keerio et al. (2024) explore concentration camps connected to the repression of the Hur Movement, in which they maintain that 'concentration' and 'administrative control' were an important aspect of British policy with regards to the Hurs. This study extends the existing body of literature on armed conflict beyond attempts to control the movement through armed confrontation to the institutional frameworks which the colonial authorities used to do so.

Colonial Administration and Repression

No account of the Hur Movement's history can be complete without considering the relationship with the British administration, as such. Responses to Hur resistance by the colonial administration, such as policing, surveillance, detention and other administrative actions targeted at individuals and communities, were common practices (Nabi, 2020; Keerio et al., 2024).

Keerio et al. (2024) especially stress the importance of the concentration camps in the comprehension of coercive aspects of colonialism in Sindh. Their study reveals that, in addition to individuals who are engaged in armed activities, other parts of the Hur community were also impacted by the colonial counter-insurgency efforts (Keerio et al., 2024).

The literature thus indicates that the idea of colonial repression be considered as a wider administrative process that includes elements in security policy, detention, surveillance and control of the local population. Meanwhile, statements on the number of detainees, the geographic location of camps, and how long detainees would be held must be verified with the administrative records of the time before a definite number of detainees is claimed as an established fact.

Religious Leadership and the Pir Pagaro Institution

Religious authority is an aspect of the Hur Movement's past. The movement was closely related to the spiritual institution, Pir Pagaro whose influence went beyond religious services into social relations of certain parts of rural Sindh.

Scholarship on the movement's ideology and the importance of religious identity in sustaining collective mobilization has emerged recently. In this paper, Jaffar, Bushra, and Atif (2026) trace the roots and ideologies of the Hur Movement, highlighting the interconnections of the Sufi religious authority, collective identity, and resistance to colonial rule (Jaffar et al., 2026).

Ahmed (2026) also analyzes the Hur resistance using the lens of al-asabiyah, emphasizing on social solidarity, collective identity, religious affiliation, and leadership as elements that could be important to the continuation of the resistance (Ahmed, 2026).

These interpretations are offered as theoretical perspectives but should not be assumed to mean formal political or military organization and spiritual allegiance. There must be documentation of the structures, recruitment, command and political agenda that lacks any supporting evidence.

Pir Sibghatullah Shah II and the Final Phase of Resistance

Pir Sibghatullah Shah II is in the middle of the narration about the late Hur Movement. Although there is no evidence of this, recent publications associate his leadership with the strengthening of resistance and the growing tension between the Hurs and the British administration in the early 1940s (Nabi, 2020; Nabi & Mangrio, 2020).

Nabi and Mangrio (2020) specifically consider the court-martial execution of Pir Sibghatullah Shah II as a reflection of the colonial state power and the suppression of Hur resistance in general. Their study offers a valuable foundation for analyzing political power and the colonial legal context and the leadership of the movement (Nabi & Mangrio, 2020).

Biographical and political assertions relating to Pir Sibghatullah Shah II, however, need to be carefully chronologically verified. Information about his birth, his succession, his political career, his arrest and his release need to be verified with credible historical evidence before it is considered as fact.

Women and the Social Dimensions of the Movement

Over the last few years, the study of the Hur Movement has been broadened beyond a focus on male leadership and armed resistance. Keerio, Ahmed and Rasool (2023) explore the role of women in the movement and its socio-political history, emphasizing that women's experience and participation is a significant aspect of its history (Keerio et al., 2023).

This view matters because colonial policies with respect to the Hurs could impact families/communities as well as individuals who are directly engaged in resistance. The colonial response to the concentration camps also suggests that its impact was far-reaching and had social implications for the Hur population (Keerio et al., 2024).

The presence of the women and non-combatant communities in this movement is thus given centrality to the examination of the movement beyond the context of an armed insurgency. Even so, statements about specific "women's roles", "community practices" or participation patterns must be backed up by specific documentary, oral-history or scholarly sources.

Hur Identity, Collective Solidarity and Resistance

Another theme in the recent scholarship is collective identity. Ahmed (2026) explains how social solidarity and collective cohesion could have helped to sustain the Hur resistance, using Ibn Khaldun's concept of *al-asabiyah* (Ahmed, 2026).

The connection between religious commitment, collective identity and opposition to colonial rule is also explored by Jaffar et al. (2026). The studies indicate that the Hur mobilization can not only be viewed in terms of individual expressions of violence or military confrontation.

Collective identity, however, should not be interpreted in such a way as to imply that all Hurs had the same political agenda. The movement may have included people and communities who had various experiences of social life and motivations for being involved in, or staying a part of, the movement. More work is thus required to uncover the common ideological components from the local political motivations.

Colonial and Post-Colonial Representations

The colonial and regional descriptions are a major historiographic problem with the Hur Movement. The administration records of the colonies are overall concerned with state issues, such as policing, security, public order, and the definition of resistance. The sacrifices, religious dedication, resistance, and the significance of Pir Sibghatullah Shah II has been highlighted more in the later regional and commemoration accounts.

However, these differences do not necessarily imply any inherent accuracy or inaccuracy of the sources. Instead, they illustrate the difference in the purposes and institutional and social locations of historical sources. When evaluating conflicting accounts, the historian should take into account the author(s), the date, the intent of the author(s), the evidence, and the author's proximity to the events.

This source-critical approach is significant when the words "rebel", "insurgent", "criminal", "freedom fighter" or "anti-colonial leader" are applied to them. This kind of language should not be automatically assumed to be the language of the source or the analytical tradition from which it comes; it should be attributed to the source and/or the analytical tradition.

Political Objectives and Relations with Other Movements

It's important to study the political aims of the Hur Movement. The recent literature associates it with the struggle against the British colonial rule and talks about the regional, religious and social aspects of it (Jaffar et al., 2026; Ahmed, 2026).

But it is necessary to have independent documentary evidence to substantiate claims of the Hurs formally seeking an independent Sindh or that they had organized political relationships with the Indian National Congress, the Forward Bloc of Subhas Chandra Bose or the Muslim League. Such claims must be substantiated by letters, memo or notes from the contemporary period, government records, newspapers, organizational records, or scholarly research, which explicitly establishes the relationship.

It is of special significance to note the difference between the regional resistance and a formally expressed constitutional programme. Resistance to colonial rule does not set an agenda for political aims. The present study, therefore, does not presume any political programme, but rather deals with these questions as issues to be explored through sources.

Research Gap

The recent scholarship on the Hur Movement has greatly enhanced knowledge of the movement, yet many gaps still exist in the integrated interpretation of the political, religious, social and administrative aspects. While colonial policing, the execution of Pir Sibghatullah Shah II, concentration camps, women's involvement and the ideology in the context of Hur resistance have been studied separately, these themes have not been explored together in the existing literature (Nabi, 2020; Nabi & Mangrio, 2020; Keerio et al., 2023, 2024; Jaffar et al., 2026).

Another deficit is that there is a lack of systematic comparison between colonial documentation and subsequent regional interpretations. Previous studies have shown that the Hurs have been depicted in a variety of ways in administrative records, scholarly writing, community histories, and commemorative literature, but there is potential for a more systematic and source-critical comparison of the different depictions.

Another research need is the issue of the spiritual leadership of the Pir Pagaro institution and the development of Hur resistance organizations. Though recent research has identified religious leadership and collective unity as key factors, more work is needed to determine the interplay among spiritual allegiance, rural social networks, local organization and armed resistance in particular historical contexts.

This research attempts to fill these voids by analysing the evolution of the Hur Movement, the role of Pir Sibghatullah Shah II and the reaction of the British colonial government. It identifies and differentiates between historical facts and later interpretations and commemorative portrayals.

The study also takes a conservative stance on issues of dates, casualties, arrests, political friendships, organizational hierarchy, and the political goals of the movement. When there is no clear evidence to substantiate a claim, the study does not assert this as a historical fact, but rather considers it a contested claim or one that needs to be further substantiated.

Discussion

The findings of this study reveal that the Hur Movement is not a movement that can be fully understood by one or either of these two perspectives, armed resistance or religious mobilization. Instead, it seems to have emerged as a product of religious authority, local social communities, colonial intrusion and evolving modes of resistance to it. The Pir Pagaro institution and Pir Sibghatullah Shah II have been linked to the later development of the movement (Jaffar, Bushra, & Atif, 2026; Ahmed, 2026) and collective identity and social solidarity also have been identified as important issues in the Hur mobilization. In analytical terms, the religious component should not just be treated as a peripheral aspect of the movement, but as a possible means of social relations and collective identity of the movement organization. Meanwhile, the presence of religious loyalty does not necessarily lead to the presence of a politically and militarily organized body. The importance of the Pir Pagaro institution must therefore be explored from two interrelated yet different perspectives: that of developing social cohesion and that of concretizing this social cohesion into organized resistance.

This is significant as the role of leadership and mobilization was unlikely to be purely top down. Local networks, personal relationships, community structures and historical events may be vital to mobilization, while legitimacy and a sense of community may be provided by a spiritual leader. The literature shows that collective unity and solidarity is essential, but it does not necessarily imply that everyone participated with a common political agenda (Ahmed, 2026; Jaffar et al., 2026). The movement should thus be seen as a potentially pluralist social organization and not as a body with similar motives. The current interpretation sheds also some light on the coexistence of religious affiliation, community identity, opposition to colonial rule, armed resistance in historical sources without conflating them.

There is a second analytical dimension provided by the colonial response. Studies of the concentration camps suggest that the British state's policy towards the Hurs was not confined to actual combat with them but also involved detention and various other acts of population control (Keerio, Rasool, & Ahmed, 2024). It's important because it implies that colonial power was not only exercised through confrontation with armed resistance, but also in an effort to control the broader social landscape in which resistance emerged. In this regard, repression can be taken as a response to resistance and as a process that might reform the social situation of resistance. Actions not only targeted at combatants but also at communities can have an impact on family structures, mobility, social relationships and the capacity to keep existing networks within communities.

Additionally, this linkage muddies the waters of a straightforward cause and effect analysis of the conflict. The available literature would make it hard to extrapolate from the evidence that only repression resulted in ongoing resistance, or resistance only in the increase of repression. A more historically conservative view, however, is that resistance and repression emerged in a dynamic interdependency where resistance affected the environment in which repression was exercised and vice versa. This interpretation is particularly significant in the context of the evidence from the concentration camps as these focus on the broader pattern of colonial governance and community control (Keerio et al., 2024). It is important to note, however, that the extent to which these policies were implemented, and what their results were, have yet to be confirmed by modern records of administration.

Analytical distinction needs to be made among other expressions of anti-colonial politics and the use of armed resistance by the Hur Movement. Unlike other mass political strategies like constitutional politics, electoral mobilization and others that emerged in the late colonial phase, it has a regional social base, and its armed tactics set it apart. But, it is not always the case that a difference in methods means a difference in ultimate political goals. Similarly, a movement against British rule does not imply a program of an independent movement for Sindh. Any assertions about relation to the Indian National Congress, the Forward Bloc, the Muslim League or other political groups, then, must be presented directly by documentary evidence—not based on the general contours of the anti-colonial movement.

This separation is of more general historical significance. While anti-colonial struggle in South Asia is frequently depicted in the context of larger political groups and through nationally known leaders, regional groups can be included in the larger narrative in a less nuanced way as "rebellions," "insurgencies" or "freedom struggles". The anti-colonial movement in South Asia is often depicted as being waged through major political groups and nationally recognized political leaders, while regional groups can be included in the larger narrative of anti-colonial struggle in an oversimplified manner, such as "rebellions" or "insurgencies" or "freedom struggles". The Hur shows the importance of contextualization of such categories. Its regional specificity, religious background, community organization and armament means that its history can not be easily analysed in terms of the organizational systems or political agendas of other anti-colonial

movements. Useful comparisons facilitate and do not assume similarities and differences; they should be supported by evidence.

An only-military interpretation is further complicated by the social aspects of the movement. Women's participation in the Hur Movement is highlighted by Keerio et al. (2023), and research on the colonial counter-insurgency (CCI) showed that communities that did not participate in armed activities were also impacted (Keerio et al., 2024). The results indicate that the historical unit of analysis can not be limited to the individual fighter. The social history of the movement can include a variety of groups, such as families, women, local communities, religious networks and populations displaced or detained. The question of resistance is not just one of an Hurs resisting, but one of resistance being a product of, and influencing, the social structures around the resistance.

Pir Sibghatullah Shah II's role is important with respect to the relationship between leadership and resistance as well as relationship between historical memory. In recent years he has been placed in the middle of the final major phase of the movement and analysed his encounters with the colonial state of Britain (Nabi & Mangrio, 2020; Jaffar et al., 2026). The tendency to study the colonial state power and the treatment of Hur leadership and his court-martial execution is evident in the study by Nabi and Mangrio (2020). He is next enshrined in a different category of analysis, however. Historical figure and remembered figure are related, but not synonymous, ways of studying. While documents of the period can tell us about his work and care of the colonial state, commemorative accounts can shed light on the ways that his leadership and sacrifice have been understood by later generations.

History and memory are always distinct, and it is crucial to recognise this difference when studying collective memory, as it can maintain aspects of historical experience that are not captured in official administrative records, and can also alter historical experience later on through political, cultural or commemorative accounts. Thus, commemorative/epideictic stories must not be ignored as 'historically insignificant' or as 'documents'. They are valuable not just in showing the ways in which the Hur Movement continues to be invested with significance in regional society. The memory of Pir Sibghatullah Shah II thus is not just a piece of the movement's history, but a reminder of the ongoing cultural and political relevance of the movement.

The variety of traditions of sources also brings up an important method problem. Colonial administrative documents were created in a state that was worried about security, public order, policing and government; subsequent historical writing related to the documents, and alternative interpretations of leadership, sacrifice, identity and resistance are found in community-based and/or commemorative accounts. These sources therefore are designed to answer different questions of history. Treatments of them as interchangeable can lead to dubious findings and interpretations, especially when colonial categories are used as neutral descriptions or

commemorative interpretations that later in time become understood as evidence of the political intentions of the time.

These various analytical focusses can be seen in the recent literature. While Keerio et al. (2024) highlight colonial coercion and concentration camps, Jaffar et al. (2026) emphasise more on the ideological, spiritual and the socio-political underpinnings of the movement. Ahmed (2026), on the other hand, goes so far as to use the idea of al-asabiyah to explain notions of collective solidarity and resistance. Not all of these are necessarily opposing strategies. Instead, they have different analytical levels – one on state practices itself, one on the ideological and religious aspects, and one on the collective cohesion. Combining these views, it seems appropriate to view the growth of the movement in relation to the interplay of structures of colonial power and social mechanisms that organized and maintained resistance.

The evidence therefore points to the Hur Movement being a complex regional resistance phenomenon over the years, and not just a political, religious or military movement. Religious authority could have granted legitimacy and collective identity; resistance could have taken place within local networks; colonial policies could have altered the social context within which resistance was staged; and armed activity was but one means of resistance. These dimensions must be considered in relation to each other and not as discrete traits.

The main analytical contribution of the present study is therefore to differentiate between the concepts of leadership, mobilization, resistance, repression and memory, and to look at the interaction between them. This separation prevents two erroneous extremes: the oversimplification of the Hur Movement to a simple military affair or the assumption of the subsequent stories of religious and nationalistic value to be fact evidence of all aspects of the historical organization of the Hur Movement. Although the evidence available indicates its significance in the history of the colonial era of Sindh, it also shows that attention should be paid to its exact political aims, its organization, its relations with other political organizations, the number of casualties, the arrests, and specific military incidents.

A source-critical interpretation is consequently not an impediment to the historical interpretation of the Hur Movement, but rather a more solid foundation for it. The study highlights the difference between the reality of the events and how they were later understood and remembered, and situates the movement in the context of colonial rule, colonial opposition, social mobilization and historical memory. Use of modern administrative records, court-martial records, newspapers, correspondence, and locally-based oral or community histories could enhance the understanding of the interactions between religious authority and other elements and armed resistance over time. This evidence would also enable future scholarship to more accurately be

able to examine the organization of the movement internally, political agendas, and relationship with other currents of anti-colonial politics.

Conclusion

The Hur Movement has a significant position in the history and historical memory of the opposition to the British Colonial rule in Sindh. The findings found in this study suggest that it is not only armed resistance that could explain how it was developed. Instead, the movement has been created by the synergy of spiritual authority of the Pir Pagaro institution, the local social networks, collective identity, transformation in the mode of mobilization, and the coercive activities of the colonial administration (Keerio et al., 2024; Jaffar et al., 2026). The dimensions were interrelated, but cannot be seen as proof of a single political programme, which was centrally defined, without further documentary support.

One of the most important aspects of such history is the leadership of Pir Sibghatullah Shah II. His struggle with the colonial state and his subsequent court-martial execution have been the themes of recent scholarship and more recent memorials have continued to link his name with the colonial struggle (Nabi & Mangrio, 2020; Jaffar et al., 2026). His historical role must be examined at two levels: one, in evidence; the other, in the process of remembrance, and this in turn by the processes by which his role has been interpreted and represented.

The evidence also shows that the history of the Hur Movement was not confined to direct armed confrontations, but was also the subject of colonial repression. Studies on concentration camps have found that British responses encompassed actions on detention and population-control that impacted larger portions of the Hur community (Keerio et al., 2024). Likewise, studies on women participation indicate that the social history of the movement can be constructed not just based on the work of the identified male leaders and fighters (Keerio et al., 2023). The results extend the analytical reach of the movement from the history of military confrontation to the community structures, family experiences, social disruption and broader implications of colonial intervention.

Meanwhile, the historical significance of the Hur Movement does not authorize the making of statements that are considered to be historical facts when they are not. Its exact political aims and its organizational structure, relations with other political organizations, casualties, arrests, and specific military events must be carefully compared with documentary evidence of the time and later interpretations of the history. The separation between documentary history and interpretation by scholars and commemorative accounts is, therefore, an important aspect of a proper reconstruction of the history of the movement. In particular, resistance to British rule need not be read as a sign of a clearly-stated political programme or certain political partnerships.

The study then reads the Hur Movement as a historically complex regional resistance phenomenon that is a product of the interaction and interplay of religious authority, social

organization, colonial authority and evolving structures of resistance. It is not just a matter of armed conflicts; it also reflects the social impact of the colonial rule and the consciousness of the movement and Pir Sibghatullah Shah II in the region's history. The following interpretation also illustrates how this movement needs to be set in the context of the anti-colonial resistance, and that its goals, organization, and tactics were not necessarily the same as those of other political forces in South Asia.

The methodological conclusion of this study is also historical: that there is a need to critically compare and contrast various categories of evidence to understand the Hur Movement, not solely because of its varied trajectory but because of the varying sources of evidence. Each of these colonial administrative documents, subsequent scholarly work, and community or commemorative histories provides a different perspective on the movement and should be considered in terms of the authorship, agenda, historical context, and source of information. A source-critical approach thus offers a better basis for reading the history of the movement as well as its representation in the local memory.

There is a need for further research on the chronology of Pir Sibghatullah Shah II's life, the process of organization of the movement, the nature of the colonial legal and administrative responses as well as his arrest and execution, and alleged connections with other political movements. More modern administrative records, court martial records, newspapers, correspondence, and other sources from the local community could be used to clarify the facts of the existing record and to better define those issues that have been disputed. This would help to add to the systematically documented and historically differentiated knowledge of the Hur Movement in colonial Sindh.

References

1. Ahmed, M. (2026). *Hur's resistance against the British Raj in the light of Khaldunian idea of Al-Asabiyah*. *Sadiq Journal of Pakistan Studies*, 6(1).
2. Hansard. (1942). The manuscript uses Hansard (1942) as a contemporary British parliamentary source concerning colonial representations of the Hurs.
3. Jaffar, S., Bushra, B., & Atif, H. (2026). The Hur Movement in Sindh: Origins, ideological foundations, and its socio-political and historical significance. *International Research Journal of Islamic Culture and Communication*, 4(1), 18–36.
4. Keerio, T. H., Ahmed, A., & Rasool, G. (2023). Reshaping socio-political history: An examination of women's influence in the Hur Movement of Sindh. *International Research Journal of Religious Studies*, 3(2), 65–77.
5. Keerio, T. H., Rasool, G., & Ahmed, A. (2024). Concentration camps of British colonialism in Sindh: A case study of Hur Movement. *Journal of Social Sciences and Media Studies*, 7(2), 47–53. <https://doi.org/10.58921/jossams.07.02.0299>.
6. Nabi, A. (2020). *Policing insurgency: The Hurs of Sindh*. Soreh Badshah Study Circle.

7. Nabi, A., & Mangrio, L. A. (2020). *Defying colonial state power: The court martial execution of Pir Sibghatullah Shah (Soreh Badshah)*. Soreh Badshah Study Circle.
8. Ansari, S. F. D. (1992). *Sufi saints and state power: The pirs of Sind, 1843–1947*. Cambridge University Press.
9. House of Commons. (1942, July 14). Sind (situation). Hansard, 381, 1081–1082.
10. Scott, J. B. (2009, January). Taming the terrorist: British responses to the Hur uprisings in Sindh, 1930–46 (Conference paper). 123rd Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association.
11. Sodhar, Z.-u. A., Shaikh, A. G., & Sodhar, K.-u.-N. (2015). The Hur Movement: A foundation for independent Muslim state. *Grassroots*, 49(2).
12. Sodhar, Z.-u.-A., Laghari, M. A., & Kabooro, N. (2019). Role of women in Hur Movement. *International Research Journal of Arts & Humanities*, 47(47).