



The Military Courts Experiment: A Double-Edge Sword in the Fight against Political Radicalization in Pakistan

Muhammad Faizan Asghar*

Abstract: *This research investigates the root causes of political radicalization in Pakistan from a scholarly perspective in order to understand the 9th May incident and examines the military court's role in curbing this radicalization. Although the establishment of military tribunals was motivated by a desire to combat terrorism, now it is the need of the hour to have complete plans that address issues like economic disparity, religious extremism, effective leadership, and the dissemination of positive narratives about diversity and tolerance that can help reduce the likelihood of people being politically radicalized (Siddiqi, 2018). To prevent people from getting radicalized and create a safe and welcoming society for all, a reasonable and open justice system controlled by civilians is essential. This paper tries to conceptualize how political radicalization can be tamed through military courts' existence by first (i) examining political radicalization in Pakistani society and then (ii) exploring military court establishment and significance in (iii) combating extreme ideas and preventing people from becoming politically radicalized in Pakistan.*

Key Words: Military Courts, Double-Edge Sword, Political Radicalization, Pakistan

Introduction

There are a number of factors that contribute to the rise and spread of political radicalism in Pakistan. A recent incident of 9th May 2023, resulted in political radicalized groups dampening state institutions by damaging property and calling out military personnel (Dawn, 2023). In order to combat this radicalized political group, the state has agreed upon their trials to be held in the military courts. This research investigates the root causes of political radicalization in Pakistan from a scholarly perspective in order to understand the 9th May incident and examines the military court's role in curbing this radicalization. Although the establishment of military tribunals was motivated by a desire to combat terrorism, now it is the need of the hour to have complete plans that address issues like economic disparity, religious extremism, effective leadership, and the dissemination of positive narratives about diversity and tolerance that can help

reduce the likelihood of people being politically radicalized (Siddiqi, 2018). To prevent people from getting radicalized and create a safe and welcoming society for all, a reasonable and open justice system controlled by civilians is essential. This paper tries to conceptualize how political radicalization can be tamed through military courts' existence by first (i) examining political radicalization in Pakistani society and then (ii) exploring military court establishment and significance in (iii) combating extreme ideas and preventing people from becoming politically radicalized in Pakistan. This paper is divided into three sections; first examines political radicalization, second explores military courts' existence and jurisdiction and the last part focuses on how military courts can be used to curb political radicalization in Pakistan. This research shall be a founding brick in understanding 9th May 2023 incidents from a constructive perspective, providing pathways on how political radicalization can

* Ph.D. Scholar, International Relations Centre for Security, Strategy and Policy Research, University of Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

be curbed and why is a military court trial need of the hour.

Examining Political Radicalization in Pakistan

Political radicalization has emerged as a major issue in Pakistan and has to be addressed immediately. To do so, we must gain a deeper understanding of its virulence factors (Karamat, Muzaffar, & Shah, 2019). This paper makes an attempt at a scholarly understanding of what drives people in Pakistan toward political extremism. The factors of poor economy, religious fanaticism, violent organizations, shifting geopolitical dynamics, and ineffective leadership will be examined. The role of military courts in the change process is also considered.

Socio-economic Aspects

Extreme poverty and joblessness can have far-reaching effects on society, including radicalizing its constituents politically (Yusuf, 2008). People in poverty frequently have limited opportunities, limited social mobility, and limited access to resources. These factors contribute to a rise in the popularity of radical ideologies by making people feel powerless and alienated. Recruiters for extremist groups often appeal to people's sense of helplessness and despair while also promising them a better life if they join (Fair, 2010). People who are struggling to provide for their fundamental needs and those of their families may be receptive to extremist beliefs that blame social or political structures for these issues. Financial incentives, social support, and a shared sense of purpose are all things that extremist groups could provide. People who have trouble fitting in might find this to be a promising choice.

People's issues are exacerbated and they are more susceptible to radicalization when they do not have access to essential services like education, healthcare, and housing. A person's worldview and ability to think critically are greatly influenced by their level of education. They may lack the critical thinking skills and ability to evaluate radical views when they lack access to or are unable to obtain an education (Siddiqui, 2017). Extremists can readily brainwash and convert uneducated individuals to their cause through propaganda and other means. In the same manner, underprivileged populations feel forgotten and abandoned when they lack adequate access to healthcare and other essential services. When people believe they have no one to turn to for help, they may become more resentful of the established order and more receptive to radical solutions.

Economic growth, job creation, social safety nets, and targeted programs to aid already struggling populations are all necessary to eradicate poverty and unemployment (Rashid, 2008). People are more capable, more resistant to radical beliefs, and more likely to come together as a society if they have access to high-quality education, healthcare, and other necessary services. These factors, both societal and economic, contribute to the growth and dissemination of extreme narratives. Poverty reduction, inclusive economic growth, and universal access to quality healthcare, education, and other essentials should be at the top of the agendas of all decision-makers and stakeholders (Rashid, 2008). The attractiveness of radical ideologies can be diminished and environments favourable to resilience, tolerance, and societal stability can be created if cultures address these underlying factors.

Extremism Factor in Religion

Radical ideologies in Pakistan twist and change religious teachings, which contributes to political radicalization there. Some people utilize their religious beliefs to rally support for radical causes and recruit new members to join radical groups (Saikal, 2003). Most of the time, the stories told by these ideologies promote extremist social constructions based on twisted interpretations of religious principles and promote violence and hatred. Many people worry that radical ideology is being taught at madrasas or religious schools. Some seminaries have been accused of spreading radical views and serving as recruitment centres for extremist groups, despite the fact that many madrasas teach about religion and are vital sites of learning. It is in these settings that certain individuals may be exposed to extremist interpretations of religion that justify violence and seek to impose their ideas on others. When coupled with social conditions and a dearth of counternarratives, this kind of exposure in the classroom can lead to radicalization.

Similarly, extremist groups take advantage of long-standing sectarian divisions in Pakistan to foment violence and spread their own extreme ideology. The Sunni and Shia groups, both of which adhere to Islam, have been at odds, leading to sectarian strife throughout the country. Those who feel marginalized or mistreated due to their religious affiliation are easy targets for extremist groups (Fair, 2010). They disseminate extreme ideologies that advocate violence against those they view as enemies, and they incite strife among various groups. Intergroup violence not only endangers national security but also radicalizes the political climate. Extremist propaganda can spread

more easily when religious groups are at odds with one another and harbour deep-seated animosities (Saigol, [2009](#)). Because of this, more people may become radicalized, and those seeking vengeance or protection within their group may be recruited. It takes more than one tactic to counter the influence of extremist ideology and sectarian strife. That calls for combating extremist narratives through education, media, and community engagement, as well as advocating inclusive interpretations of religious teachings. It is crucial to collaborate with religious scholars, community leaders, and civil society organizations to challenge radical interpretations and promote a message of tolerance, respect, and coexistence across different religious communities.

Therefore, the norms governing religious seminaries should be strengthened, the curriculum should be made explicit, and a well-rounded, comprehensive understanding of religious beliefs should be encouraged (Ahmad, [2015](#)). Making Pakistan's society more open and peaceful by lessening the impact of extremist ideas and sectarian differences will make political radicalization less tempting and effective.

Exploring Military Courts Establishment in Pakistan

The implementation of military courts for the adjudication of civilian cases, as facilitated by the 21st Amendment to the Constitution, is not a new or innovative idea. In recent decades, governmental bodies have granted military courts the power to prosecute individuals who are not members of the military (Jamal, [2020](#)). The judiciary nullified the establishment of military courts by civilian governments in April 1977 and 1998, citing the absence of legal provisions for such courts in the Constitution (Rashid, 2008). Following the 1977 elections, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto established "Summary Military Courts" in accordance with Article 245 as a means of addressing the opposition parties' protests regarding purported election tampering, which posed a potential threat to public safety and security (Yusuf, 2008). The governmental bodies of the Sindh and Punjab provinces were deemed inadequate in managing the given circumstances. The Army Act of 1952 underwent certain amendments by the government. The utilization of Article 245 to aid in governance may be interpreted as the implementation of military authority within a civilian government framework. The writ jurisdiction of the High Courts was also eliminated by Article 245 (Karamat, Muzaffar, & Shah, 2019). As a result, it can be observed that individuals have been

denied the ability to safeguard and uphold their essential rights, which are explicitly safeguarded by Article 199 of the Constitution of Pakistan, 1973 (Saikal, 2003). The legal validity of this governmental initiative was contested in the High Courts of Sindh and Punjab. The courts have ruled that the actions of the government are unconstitutional and have determined that the government is not authorized to utilize Article 245 as a means of governing through the use of armed forces. In a parallel manner, Nawaz Sharif, during his second tenure as Prime Minister, authorized the formation of Military Courts in the province of Sindh through the issuance of an Ordinance. The invocation of Article 245 by the government resulted in the deployment of armed forces to provide assistance to the civilian government. The Ordinance granted Chiefs of the Armed Forces and Brigadiers the power to establish a sufficient number of courts, including courts of appeals (Rashid, 2008). Section 3 of the Ordinance confers authorization upon Military Courts to exercise jurisdiction over civilians and prescribes a time limit of three days for the completion of the trial process. It is possible to file an appeal against the decision to the courts of appeal established under Section 3 of the Ordinance (Wilner & Duouloz, [2010](#)). The said courts are mandated to render a decision on the appeal within a period of three working days. Section 8 (5) of the Ordinance has been observed to possess an appeal-limiting effect, as it effectively precludes the jurisdiction of all other courts, including the High Courts and the Supreme Court.

The constitutionality of the Government's action was contested in the legal case of Sheikh Liaqat Hussain et al. v. Federation of Pakistan (Jamal, 2020). The Court rendered a verdict that Military Courts are unconstitutional and therefore lack legal validity. The judiciary noted that both the executive branch and the military are constrained by the boundaries and parameters set forth in the Constitution. However, it should be noted that two individuals who had been convicted and sentenced to death had already been executed by the military. The judiciary has issued a directive to refer cases related to terrorism to the Anti-Terrorism Courts (ATCs) that have been established under the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1997 (Roy, [2002](#)). The Court has instructed the Air Traffic Controllers (ATCs) to conclude the case within a period of seven days from its initiation. Paradoxically, the attempts to institute Military Courts were subsequently succeeded by military coups. A primary concern pertaining to Military Courts pertained to conflicts of jurisdiction with the ATCs. Additionally, the removal of superior courts' jurisdiction in matters of appeal constituted a significant issue. The decision to authorize military

courts at the cost of the pre-existing judicial system is deemed unsound during a democratic transition.

Subsequent to the third military intervention on October 16, 1979, General Zia implemented a range of policies and reforms that encroached upon the authority of the civilian government and the independence of the judiciary (Wirsing, 2004). The establishment of Military Courts for the trial of offences under the Martial Law Regulations was facilitated through the incorporation of Article 212A, which was made possible by the Second Amendment to the Constitution. The aforementioned courts were endowed with retrospective influence and were considered to have been implemented on July 5th, 1977 (Siddiq, 2011). In addition, the Military Courts had also exercised exclusive jurisdiction over cases that fell within their purview, thereby precluding the jurisdiction of other courts, including the High Courts. As a consequence, a total of over one hundred Military Courts were instituted, and the rulings issued by these tribunals were granted immunity from the jurisdiction of civilian courts. Similarly, the government instituted Special Courts for the adjudication of grave offences on July 28, 1991. Article 212B was introduced for a duration of three years through the Twelfth Constitutional Amendment with the aim of expediting the trial process (Stevens & Neuman, 2009). The aforementioned amendment granted the Federal Government the power to establish a variable number of specialized courts as deemed necessary, with corresponding jurisdictional limitations to be determined by the federal government (Nasr, 2000). The special courts were granted the additional power of having judges appointed by the Federal Government. The aforementioned Act granted the Federal Government the power to designate an individual as a judge to the Special Court, regardless of their legal qualifications, and ensured their job security until the Article in question became effective. The Special Courts had the authority to remove the jurisdiction of civilian courts, including those of the Superior Courts (Hashmi, 2009).

In light of the recent incident of 9th May 2023, it is pertinent to examine the current scope of military courts (Dawn, 2023). In January 2015, following a violent assault by six terrorists on the Army Public School in Peshawar on December 16th, 2014, which resulted in the loss of approximately 150 lives, the government authorized the use of military courts for the trial of suspected terrorists for a duration of two years. The All Parties Conference (APC) has agreed to amend the Army Act of 1952 in order to broaden its jurisdiction for the purpose of expediting trials

(Feldman, 1975). The 21st Constitutional Amendment, which includes a sunset clause, was passed by Parliament on January 7th, 2015. This amendment stipulates that Military Courts will no longer be in effect after two years from the date of their commencement (Jamal, 2020).

Between February 2015 and March 6th, 2017, a total of 274 individuals were convicted by Military Courts. Pakistan has established a total of eleven Military Courts, with three being located in both Punjab and KP, two in Sindh, and one in Baluchistan (Jamal, 2020). The 21st Constitutional Amendment has been implemented to incorporate several Acts into the first schedule of the Constitution. This measure has been taken to exempt and safeguard these Acts from the operation of Articles 8 (1) and (2) of the Constitution. These provisions invalidate laws and enactments of Parliament that violate the Fundamental Rights protected under the Constitution. Moreover, the amendment made to the Army Act of 1952 has granted Military Courts the authority to prosecute civilians, whether they are individuals, groups, organizations, or sects, for crimes related to acts of violence and terrorism (Karamat, Muzaffar, & Shah, 2019). The aforementioned Amendment has expanded the jurisdiction of Military Courts to encompass a wide range of offences, including but not limited to the assault on military personnel or their facilities, possession and transportation of explosives and firearms, utilization of vehicles for terrorist activities, offences resulting in death or severe injury, instilling fear and insecurity, posing a threat to national security or the general public, financing or receiving funds for any of the aforementioned purposes, engaging in anti-state warfare, or attempting to commit any of the aforementioned acts.

Furthermore, as a result of these Amendments, specific transgressions were integrated into the Protection of Pakistan Act, of 2014, and subsequently fell under the purview of Military Courts (Jamal, 2020). In the event that these offences are believed to have been carried out by an organization or terrorist group under the guise of a particular religion or sect, they may include crimes against minority groups, such as killings, kidnappings, or attacks on prominent individuals such as government officials, judicial authorities, foreign officials, media personnel, social workers, and tourists. Additionally, such offences may involve attacks on energy facilities, transportation systems, and educational institutions, as well as the crossing of territorial boundaries for any of the aforementioned purposes.

The 21st Amendment of the Constitution contains a sunset clause that specifies the cessation of military courts after a period of two years, specifically on January 6th, 2017 (Karamat, Muzaffar, & Shah, 2019). However, citing national interest and the presence of significant and unparalleled threats to the integrity of Pakistan, Parliament utilized the 23rd Constitutional Amendment to prolong the operation of these courts for an additional two-year term. The Army (Amendment) Act, 2015 (II of 2015) was subject to repeal on January 6, 2017, but was instead extended for an additional two years (Siddiqi, 2018). This legislation implemented specific procedural modifications. The accused, upon arrest under this Act, is entitled to receive the grounds of arrest within a period of twenty-four hours. Additionally, the accused has the right to engage counsel during the trial. The provisions of the QSO, 1984 have been extended to this Act. In the event of any conflict with other laws, this Act shall take precedence (Karamat, Muzaffar, & Shah, 2019).

Criticism of Military Courts

While military courts can quickly deal with terrorism cases, they may not be the greatest option for dealing with political radicalization. It's crucial to consider how their actions, including a lack of due process or apparent bias, can make others feel excluded or cause them to complain. Basic rights, including the right to a fair trial, legal representation, and the assumption of innocence, may not be adequately protected in military court proceedings due to a lack of due process (Jamal, 2020). A lack of protection for people's rights can make them feel wronged and furious, which in turn can increase their complaints and lead them to extreme beliefs as a way to fight or exact revenge.

People's faith in the judicial system can be undermined by their perceptions of prejudice in military courts. Military courts have the potential to further exacerbate social divisions and make certain individuals feel unwelcome and discriminated against if they are perceived to be unfairly targeting particular political, religious, or ethnic groups (Siddiqi, 2018). These issues can be used as fodder by radicals to establish a case for systematic injustice and the necessity of radical solutions. If we want to prevent these kinds of abuses from occurring, we must ensure that military court proceedings adhere to the highest standards of transparency, fairness, and protection of individual liberties. Civilian monitoring measures strengthened legal safeguards and access to legal counsel and appeals procedures can all help reduce public perceptions of prejudice and a lack of due process (Hashmi, 2009). One way to mitigate the

negative consequences of military courts and preserve public trust in the judicial system is to advocate for a system that adheres to the rule of law and protects fundamental rights.

However, alternatives to military courts should be explored in an effort to curb political extremism. Strengthening the civil justice system, increasing the efficiency and capacity of courts, and providing them with the necessary resources to handle cases involving terrorism are all steps that can contribute to a more just and impartial system of justice (Ahrari, 2000). This strategy can improve legitimacy and trust, decreasing the likelihood that individuals will view military court procedures as unfair and be radicalized as a result. Ultimately, military tribunals were established to combat terrorism, but their perceived bias and lack of due process might have unforeseen consequences. It is crucial to address these issues and back a legal system that protects human rights, follows due process, and is transparent and fair (Muzaffar, Khan, & Karamat, 2017). This will make it less likely that individuals will become politically radicalized out of feelings of anger or isolation. Fairness and security will improve as a result of this.

Socioeconomic factors, religious extremism, terrorist groups, geopolitical dynamics, poor government, and other factors all contribute to political radicalization in Pakistan. Unintended consequences of military courts highlight the need for comprehensive solutions that address the causes of radicalization (Saigol, 2009). Pakistan can combat political radicalization and construct a stable society in which everyone can participate by promoting socioeconomic development, combating religious extremism, fixing problems with the government, and fostering tales that involve everyone.

The Radicalizing Impact of Military Courts

- People fear that their rights to due process and a fair trial are being eroded by the proliferation of military courts, which use streamlined processes and offer little safeguards (Jamal, 2020). Anger and a sense of alienation are common outcomes of these unfair experiences. When individuals have a negative impression of the judicial system, they may be more receptive to radical ideas that promise a more equitable resolution to their problems.
- Using military courts, which are governed by the military, might convey the perception that the state is more powerful than civilian organizations, which can lead to a backlash against state actions (Siddiqi, 2018). Concerns

about power abuse and a lack of transparency, among other things, can turn the public against the government. More people may become interested in joining extreme political parties or extremist groups that publicly oppose the government and its policies as a result of this.

- Military courts are designed to bypass civilian law and give the military direct authority. This can lead to feelings of isolation. If a group is already marginalized or discriminated against, this might amplify those feelings of isolation and exclusion (Kirby, 2007). People are more inclined to become politically extreme when they feel their group is being discriminated against or ignored by the government.

Examining the Role of Military Courts in Combating Political Radicalization

The conventional legal system didn't seem equipped to deal with terrorism cases, and the threat level was rising, therefore this was done. Terrorist offenders are being tried in special courts with broad jurisdiction. The establishment of military tribunals was done with the primary purpose of speedily trying murderers. Proponents argued that it was difficult to bring terrorism cases to justice because of the civilian legal system's susceptibility to intimidation, tampering with witnesses, and excessive delays (Siddiqi, 2018). They reasoned that military tribunals could perform a better job of dispensing justice due to their streamlined procedures and increased security. The establishment of military courts, however, has caused concern among human rights advocates and other members of civil society. They were concerned about the lack of transparency, the weak legal protections, and the potential for abuse of authority. The use of military tribunals has been criticized for undermining civilian oversight, due process, and the right to a fair trial.

However, military courts have extensive experience with matters involving terrorism. With this information, one can ensure that those who engage in political radicalization or similar actions are to be held accountable. Justice systems can benefit from military personnel's expertise in acquiring intelligence, investigating complex networks, and protecting sensitive data.

Solidification of the Rule of law

To counteract the spread of political radicalism, it is crucial to strengthen the rule of law. While military tribunals may provide decisions quickly, it is essential that the civilian justice system be developed and improved to ensure that all citizens are treated fairly

and with integrity (Ispahani, 2018). Doing so promotes confidence in the judicial system and fosters a common belief that the law is applied fairly and justly. There are a number of crucial steps that must be taken to fortify the rule of law. First, it means protecting the judiciary from political meddling so that cases can be heard and decided impartially. Merit, legal expertise, and ethics, not partisanship, should determine judicial appointments.

The judicial system, likewise, must be transparent and unambiguous. This involves allowing the public to view court proceedings and decisions, conducting all legal proceedings in the open, and permitting citizens to dispute the justifications for judicial rulings. People are more likely to have faith and confidence that the judicial system is fair and effective as a result. Equal access to justice for all citizens, regardless of their socioeconomic status, political leanings, or religious convictions, is essential to fostering the rule of law (Karamat, Muzaffar, & Shah, 2019). This involves providing those on the margins of society or with less financial means with access to legal assistance and support services to ensure their participation in legal procedures and the protection of their rights.

Investing in a more robust civilian judicial system is crucial to bolstering the rule of law. This includes providing ongoing training for judges, lawyers, and court personnel to enhance their knowledge and application of the law. If we want judges to be able to handle cases well and deliver justice on time, we need to equip them with the proper resources (infrastructure, technology, and people) (Siddiqi, 2018). It is also crucial to put in place effective means of monitoring and holding the judicial system to account. All allegations of judge misconduct must be investigated completely and equitably, and appropriate disciplinary action must be taken when warranted. Judicial accountability and transparency can be maintained by the establishment of independent bodies such as judicial councils and commissions.

Societies can ensure that their citizens have faith in the fairness and impartiality of the legal system by bolstering the rule of law and the civilian judicial system. This contributes to problem-solving, mitigates the spread of radical ideology, and advances efforts to create a society based on human rights, equality, and justice.

Strengthening the Capacity of Intelligence Agencies

One of the most effective means of countering political radicalization is to strengthen the capacity for

gathering intelligence and keeping watch over suspicious activities. By bolstering these capacities, governments can identify and disrupt extremist groups before they can do any damage, hence reducing national security risks (Ahmad, 2015). The key to effectively monitoring and halting activities connected to political radicalization is close cooperation, coordination, and information sharing among security forces, intelligence agencies, and law enforcement authorities. Money should be invested in new technologies, equipment, and training for law enforcement and intelligence institutions to boost intelligence and surveillance. In order to simplify the processes of collecting, evaluating, and disseminating actionable intelligence, it is necessary to create and employ sophisticated monitoring systems, data analysis tools, and information exchange platforms.

Cooperation and coordination between agencies and law enforcement is crucial. Those who are attempting to radicalize people across borders can be located and tracked with the establishment of efficient ways and venues for sharing information, intelligence, and expertise both within and beyond the country (Ispahani, 2018). Agencies can work together and communicate more clearly with the support of joint task teams, intelligence fusion centres, and liaison officers. Investing in people's wits is just as crucial as funding technological advancements. Human intelligence networks, informants, and community connections all provide valuable insights into potential radicalization behaviours. Building trust and encouraging people to report suspicious behaviour or individuals requires close cooperation with local communities. It's important to take precautions to guarantee that intelligence activities are conducted legally and with adequate oversight. To prevent the misuse of intelligence capabilities and to safeguard individuals' freedoms and privacy, safeguards should be established.

To stay abreast of evolving dangers and emerging patterns of political radicalization, intelligence and surveillance strategies must be regularly reviewed, appraised, and updated. Information and law enforcement professionals need ongoing education and training to stay abreast of developments in data collection and analysis methods (Muzaffar, Khan, & Karamat, 2017). Governments can prevent citizens from becoming politically radicalized by enhancing their intelligence and surveillance capabilities. This preventative strategy is useful in stopping potential acts of violence, disrupting extremist networks, and safeguarding the safety and well-being of society. Only with increased cooperation, better technology, and

protection of individual rights can such endeavours succeed.

Promotion of Moderate Voices and Counter-narratives

A significant component in ending radical narrative and promoting ideals of tolerance, pluralism, and respect for differences is supporting religious leaders, academics, and other influential persons in the community who have moderate views. To disseminate alternative stories and give them a voice, there is no shortage of resources and initiatives available. One of the most effective methods to provide moderate voices a platform is through educational initiatives (Siddiqi, 2018). In other words, educators need to ensure that their teachings and resources encourage students to think critically, show tolerance, and value the perspectives of others. Schools may equip kids to think critically and examine radical views by cultivating an environment that promotes dialogue and an open mind. Students can learn compassion, cultural awareness, and diversity appreciation through classroom discussions and activities (Muzaffar, Khan, & Karamat, 2017).

Moderate perspectives are given a platform for visibility and discussion in public discussions and forums. In-depth discussions and debates on radicalization, extremism, and inclusive governance can take place at these gatherings attended by experts, intellectuals, and community leaders (Jamal, 2020). Clarifying misconceptions, disproving radical claims, and disseminating alternate perspectives based on moderation and acceptance can all result from open conversations and good debates. The use of media campaigns and online forums is also crucial in spreading more nuanced perspectives and diverse narratives. These initiatives can use various media to disseminate messages that counter radical ideology and encourage peaceful coexistence. These efforts can have a greater impact and bring about positive change if influential people are involved, such as religious leaders, celebrities, and community role models.

Participation from grassroots organizations, religious institutions, and civil society in community engagement projects increases the visibility of moderate voices. Building trust, encouraging conversation, and creating space for frank talks about delicate themes are all facilitated by collaborations that bring together people from different parts of a community. These courses can equip individuals and communities with the knowledge and skills to counter radicalization efforts.

Strengthening Counter-Terrorism Laws

For anti-terrorism legislation to be successful, fair, and in line with human rights, it must be reviewed and revised on a regular basis (Muzaffar, Khan, & Karamat, 2017). In addition to preserving people's rights and preventing abuse, strong laws should contain mechanisms for prosecuting and punishing those who support or instigate violence and terrorism. Finding a middle ground between addressing security concerns and safeguarding individual liberties is crucial if we are to strengthen anti-terrorism regulations (Siddiqi, 2018). There has to be a strict legal definition of terrorism and detailed procedures for investigating and prosecuting terrorist acts. Additionally, adequate safeguards should be established to prevent persons from being arbitrarily arrested, tortured, or otherwise having their human rights violated.

People who advocate or instigate violence and hatred are subject to prosecution and punishment under anti-terrorism laws. This includes going after those who aid in the recruitment, financing, planning, or execution of acts of violence (Ispahani, 2018). There needs to be a balance between the requirement for security and the right to privacy of each individual in the regulations for exchanging information, spying, and investigating. Guidelines for combating terrorism should include addressing radicalization and the prevention of extremist activity. Programs that help reintegrate former extremists into mainstream culture and deradicalize individuals from harmful beliefs are included below.

Make sure there are sufficient mechanisms for monitoring compliance and enforcing penalties before enacting any new anti-terrorism regulations (Jamal, 2020). One way to ensure that anti-terrorism measures are implemented effectively and without causing unintended consequences is to create impartial monitoring bodies or committees to monitor the process. The misuse of authority or going too far can be prevented through judicial scrutiny of anti-terrorism laws. Anti-terrorism legislation should be drafted and implemented in accordance with

international human rights standards and best practices. To ensure that laws are comprehensive, efficient, and consistent with international norms, it is essential to consult with legal experts, human rights groups, and members of civil society. To be effective against emerging threats, evolving technologies, and adaptive terrorist organizations, anti-terrorism regulations require ongoing review and revision (Ispahani, 2018). Laws need to evolve with the times, but it's crucial that they respect human rights and uphold the rule of law in the process.

Conclusion

A comprehensive plan that targets the causes of political radicalization in Pakistan and incorporates a wide variety of actors is required to counteract the 9th May 2023 incident. While military courts have their place in the justice system, they must be implemented as part of a comprehensive strategy that also prioritizes things like strengthening anti-terrorism laws, improving intelligence and surveillance, engaging communities, encouraging moderate voices and counter-narratives, and rehabilitating and reintegrating ex-offenders (Ispahani, 2018). Doing so in a way that upholds human rights, democracy, and the rule of law is crucial. Pakistan's reaction to political radicalization will be more sustainable and effective with this in place. In conclusion, anti-terrorism laws can be improved by periodically reviewing them, updating them, and ensuring that they are in line with human rights standards. Those who advocate for or engage in acts of violence or extremism should face legal consequences, and citizens should be able to rely on the protection of robust laws. Good methods of monitoring and holding people accountable are necessary to put an end to abuses and ensure that counter-terrorism measures are effective, reasonable, and respectful of people's rights. The rule of law can be maintained while addressing terrorism and extremism if nations strike a balance between security concerns and human rights.

References

- Ahrari, M. E. (2000). China, Pakistan, and the "Taliban syndrome." *Asian Survey*, 40(4), 658–671. <https://doi.org/10.1525/as.2000.40.4.01p0092d>
- Ahmad, B. (2015). Radicalization in Pakistan and the Spread of Radical Islam in Pakistan. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 4(8), 289–294. <http://www.ijstr.org/final-print/aug2015/Radicalization-In-Pakistan-And-The-Spread-Of-Radical-Islam-In-Pakistan.pdf>
- DAWN.COM. (2023, June 21). MAY 9 INCIDENTS. *DAWN.COM*. <https://www.dawn.com/news/1760845>
- Fair, C. C., Malhotra, N., & Shapiro, J. N. (2010). Islam, Militancy, and Politics in Pakistan: Insights from a national sample. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 22(4), 495–521. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2010.492305>
- Hashmi, S. A. (2009). Pakistan: politics, religion & extremism. *Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies*, 2(2), 58–77.
- Isphani, F. (2018). Constitutional Issues and the Treatment of Pakistan's Religious Minorities. *Asian Affairs*.
- Jamal, U. (2020, July 29). *How Pakistan's political parties spread radicalism*. The Diplomat. <https://thediplomat.com/2020/07/how-pakistans-political-parties-spread-radicalism/>
- Karamat, S., Muzaffar, M., & Shah, A. S. (2019). The Politics of Religious Extremism in Pakistan: an analysis. *Review of Economics and Development Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.26710/reads.v5i2.604>
- Kirby, A. (2007). The London Bombers as "Self-Starters": A Case Study in Indigenous Radicalization and the Emergence of Autonomous Cliques. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 30(5), 415–428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10576100701258619>
- Muzaffar, M., Khan, I., & Karamat, S. (2017). The Politics of Religious Legislation: A Case Study of Pakistan 1979–2000. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 1(2), 76–90. [http://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2017\(1-11\)01](http://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2017(1-11)01)
- Nasr, V. (2000). International Politics, Domestic Imperatives, and Identity Mobilization: Sectarianism in Pakistan 1979–1998. *Comparative Politics*, 32(2), 171–190. <https://doi.org/10.2307/422396>
- Rashid, A. (2008). *Descent into Chaos: The United States and the Failure of Nation Building in Pakistan, Afghanistan & Central Asia*. New York: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Roy, O. (2002). *The Taliban: A Strategic Tool for Pakistan*. In C. Jafferlot (Ed.), *Pakistan–Nationalism without a Nation* (pp. 149–160). New Delhi: Manohar.
- Saigol, R. (2009). Radicalization of state and society in Pakistan. Heinrich Boll Stiftung; *Publication Series on Democracy*, 16(2), 1–22. http://www.boell-pakistan.org/downloads/Chapter_Rubina_Final.pdf
- Saikal, A. (2003). *Islam and the West: Conflict Or Cooperation?* Palgrave MacMillan.
- Siddiqi, A. (2011, August 13). Rationalizing the Jihadi discourse. *The Express Tribune*. <https://tribune.com.pk/story/230632/rationalizing-jihadi-discourse>
- Siddiqi, F. H. (2018). Pakistani Elections: The radical religious right in Pakistan's electoral politics. *South Asian Voices*. <https://southasianvoices.org/pakistani-elections-the-radical-religious-right-in-pakistans-electoral-politics/>
- Siddiqui, N. (2017, December 8). What's Behind the Islamist Protests in Pakistan? *The Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/12/08/whats-behind-the-islamist-protests-in-pakistan/>
- Stevens, T., & Neuman, P. (2009). Countering Online Radicalization: A Strategy for Action. *International Centre for the Study of Radicalization and Political Violence*. *ICSR*, 10(1), 1–55. <https://icsr.info/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/ICSR-Report-The-Challenge-of-Online-Radicalisation-A-Strategy-for-Action.pdf>
- Wilner, A., & Duouloz, J. C. (2010). Homegrown terrorism and transformative learning: An interdisciplinary approach to understanding radicalization. *Global Change, Peace & Security*, 22(1), 33–51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14781150903487956>
- Wirsing, R. G. (2004). Political Islam, Pakistan, and the Geo-Politics of Religious Identity. *Growth and Governance in Asia*, ed. Yoichiro Sato (*Honolulu: APCSS, 2004*), 173.
- Yusuf, M. (2008). Prospects of youth radicalization in Pakistan: Implications for US policy. *Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution*. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/10_pakistan_yusuf.pdf