Situated in Khyber Pukhtunkhwa province of Pakistan and part of the Provincially Administered Tribal Areas (PATA), the present-day Malakand Division comprises the districts of Chitral, Upper Dir, Lower Dir, Swat, Buner and Shangla, and the Malakand Protected Area. Although no part of the province and the PATA, the Bajawar Agency - part of the Federally Administered Tribal Areas of Pakistan (FATA) - is attached to this Division for official purposes.

Strategically significant, Malakand Division has about one-third area of the province and borders Afghanistan to the north and west, Bajawar and Mohmand agencies of FATA to the southwest, Charsada, Mardan, and Swabi districts of Khyber Pukhtunkhwa to the south, and Hazara Division of Khyber Pukhtunkhwa and Northern Areas to the east—the later two bordering Kashmir and China.

**Constitutional Status, Laws and the Judicial Mechanism**

The area of the Malakand Division has not been part of British India. The territory of the present-day Chitral District comprised:
Chitral State, that of Upper Dir and Lower Dir: Dir State, and that of Swat (excluding Kalam area but including the right bank Indus Kohistan part of the present Kohistan District), Buner, and Shangla. Swat State. Internally independent, these states were ruled by their rulers with their own administrative machinery, laws and rules. The territory of the Bajawar, Malakand Protected Area and Kalam formed part of the tribal areas, under Government of India Act, 1935. The areas’ distinctive constitutional status continued after the emergence of Pakistan.

In 1969 the states of Swat, Dir and Chitral were brought to an end but the special status of the areas was not touched. However, under the Province of West Pakistan (Dissolution) Order of 1970 (President’s Order No. 1 of 1970), the territories of the former states of Amb, Dir, Swat and Chitral as well as the Malakand Protected Area along with the tribal area adjoining the then Hazara District were incorporated in the North-West Frontier Province (now Khyber Pukhtunkhwa). Thus the area of the present-day Malakand Division (excluding Bajawar) along the territory of the former Amb State and the tribal area adjoining the then Hazara District was made part of the Frontier Province and placed under its provincial government; and was consequently mentioned as the Provincially Administered Tribal Areas (PATA)—under article 260 of the Interim Constitution of 1972. And Bajawar along with the rest of the tribal areas adjoining the province—the political agencies and Frontier Regions—were made Centrally Administered Tribal Areas. Article 261 section (1) extended the executive authority of the Federation and Provinces to the respective tribal areas; its sections (2) to (5) gave the procedures required to be adopted for the extension of laws made, and Acts passed, by the central and provincial legislatures; and the making of regulations and status of the directions of the president to the governor relating to the tribal areas.
All the aforesaid—envisaged in articles 260 and 261 of the Interim Constitution of 1972—were retained in articles 246 and 247 of the Constitution of 1973, with the difference of replacing the name ‘Centrally Administered Tribal Areas’ by ‘Federally Administered Tribal Areas’.\(^4\) Although ruler of the states of Chitral, Dir and Swat were divested of their powers on 15 August 1969, under section 3 of the ‘Dir, Chitral and Swat (Administration) Regulation, 1969’ (Regulation No. I of 1969), section 7 of this Regulation continued the old apparatus and laws including regulations, orders, rules, notifications and customs—having the force of law—to work in the former states areas ‘until altered, replaced or amended by the competent authority’.\(^5\)

To bring a gradual change, the Supreme Court of Pakistan and the Provincial High Court jurisdiction, in criminal cases, was extended to the Tribal Areas of Chitral, Dir, Kalam, Swat and Malakand Protected Area on 31 December 1970 (vide President’s Order 28 of 1970), applicable from 1 January 1971,\(^6\) and on the same day Gazette Notification of ‘Tribal Areas (Application of Laws) Regulation, 1970’ (Regulation I of 1971) was also issued which introduced Criminal Courts with the enforcement of these laws: The Police Act, 1861 (V of 1861), The Code of Criminal Procedures, 1898 (Act V of 1898), The Pakistan Penal Code (Act: XLV of 1860), The Evidence Act, 1872 (I of 1872), and the Frontier Crimes Regulation, 1901 (Regulation III of 1901).\(^7\) To administer these laws ‘The Courts of Magistrates, Civil Judges and District and Sessions Judges were set up’.\(^8\) Session Court was also created for the entire Malakand Division.

In 1973, President’s Order 28 of 1970 was repealed and jurisdiction of the Peshawar High Court and Supreme Court of Pakistan was extended to the aforesaid area through Act XXVII of 1973, 9 February 1973.\(^9\) In 1974—vide Regulation I of 1974, 17 April 1974—Civil and Revenue Courts were established by extending these laws: The Arbitration Act, 1940 (Act X of 1940), The North-West Frontier Province Tenancy Act, 1950

The major change was promulgation of Regulation No. I of 1975—The Provincially Administered Tribal Areas Criminal Law (Special Provisions) Regulation—enforced at once, and Regulation No. II of 1975—Provincially Administered Tribal Areas Civil Procedure (Special Provisions) Regulation—26 July 1975, only published, section 1, subsection (3), of which stated: ‘It shall come into force on such date as Government may, by notification in the official Gazette, appoint in this behalf.’ These Regulations were extended to Chitral, Dir, Swat (which include Kalam) and the Malakand Protected Area.

Through Regulation No. I of 1975, ‘two parallel judicial systems relating to the administration of criminal justice were set up in the Areas. The offences created by the Pakistan Penal Code were divided into two parts in accordance with the Schedule to the Regulation.’ The offences given in Part I were to be tried ‘exclusively by Tribunals to be constituted by the Deputy Commissioner’ and those given in Part II were also to be tried ‘by a Tribunal’, constituted by the Deputy Commissioner, ‘but only with the consent of all the parties concerned’. In fact ‘the Tribunal’, consisting of five members—‘one of whom was to be a Government official not below the rank of Tehsildar’—‘was merely a fact-finding body and had no power to punish an offender on its own’ and the Deputy Commissioner was also ‘not bound by the findings of the Tribunal except where the Tribunal unanimously or by a majority of four-fifths found an accused person not guilty’. In this case also the Deputy Commissioner was
authorised to ‘get over the findings of the Tribunal by recording an opinion that there had been a material irregularity or that the proceedings of the Tribunal had been conducted in a manner so as to occasion miscarriage of justice’. However, the right of appeal before the Commissioner was granted against the decision of the Deputy Commissioner and that of the Commissioner before the provincial government. A ‘salient feature of the Regulation was that serious offences like murder, robbery, dacoity and sedition were kept out of the purview of the Tribunal’.  

And through Regulation No. II of 1975, ‘the civil disputes were divided into two categories’. In Part I were the ‘disputes other than those relating to land in which the value of the claim or the subject-matter did not exceed Rs. 5,000’; and ‘the disputes not covered by Part I fell in Part II’. The disputes falling ‘in Part I, with some exceptions, were to be tried by a Tribunal consisting of three members, one of whom was to be a Government official not below the rank of Tehsildar’. And ‘the cases falling in Part II’ were also to ‘be referred to the Tribunal by the Deputy Commissioner’ subject to the consent of all the parties. The cases of the disputes falling in Part I was to be filed before the Deputy Commissioner, and if found not time-barred, ‘he was required to set up a Tribunal and refer the case to it’. Though here too ‘the Tribunal was merely a fact-finding body’ the Deputy Commissioner ‘was required to give his decision or pass a decree in terms of the opinion of the Tribunal unless he found that the Tribunal had committed some material irregularity or had conducted the proceedings in a manner as to cause miscarriage of justice’. Appeal against the decision or decree of the Deputy Commissioner was to be filed before the Commissioner and that of the Commissioner before the provincial government.  

On 9 March 1976, date of the enforcement of Regulation No. II of 1975 was given as 25 March 1976. On 29 December 1976, Regulation IV of 1976 was promulgated which was called the Provincially Administered Tribal Areas Special Provisions
It amended Regulations No. I and II of 1975; shifted most of the powers, both in the criminal and the civil cases, from the Judiciary to the Executive; extensively enlarged jurisdictions of the tribunals: now to be called jargahs; and extended these Regulations also to Kohistan District.

The classification made in the two Regulations was done away with; the Jirgas [Jargahs] were given exclusive jurisdiction in respect of all offences under the Pakistan Penal Code except offences against the State or those relating to the armed forces; elections, coins and Government stamps; similarly, the Jirgas could adjudicate on all disputes of civil nature except those which already stood exempted under Regulation No. 2 as originally framed. A Naib-Tehsildar could preside over a Jirga seized of a criminal case and, if he was also vested with the powers of Tehsildar, he could even preside over a Jirga hearing a civil dispute. The Jirgas continued to be merely fact-finding bodies and, as before, the Deputy Commissioner alone possessed the power to make effective and enforceable orders and decrees.

Regulation No. I of 1975 was further amended on 11 January 1978 through Provincially Administered Tribal Areas Criminal Law (Special Provisions) (Amendment) Regulation, 1977. By this amendment ‘offences against public tranquillity or relating to contempt of lawful authority of public servants, false evidence and public justice were excluded from the exclusive jurisdiction of the Jirgas’. And as some chapters of the Pakistan Penal Code were exempted from the change, brought about by the PATA Regulations, the cases under these chapters were tried by the judiciary. The same was the case on the civil side but only in the cases in which the government was directly a party or minor(s) or insane(s) were party or any arbitration clause was applicable. Therefore, the judiciary existed for trials of such cases; a dual system worked in the area both in the criminal and civil matters.
As detailed, under these regulations the Executive referred the cases to Tribunals/Jargahs but they did not work properly. Their fact findings and recommendations/decisions were usually not based on the merits of the cases but influenced and manipulated. Another important aspect of the new changes was that the cases were not quickly disposed off, causing great resentment. Instead of solving the problems and difficulties and redressing the grievances, these Regulations, or the apparatus thus introduced, led the situation from bad to worse. Hence disaffection and dissatisfaction prevailed, and voices for a change and extension of regular laws started.

Formation of the TNSM

In the aforesaid scenario, the provincial government formed a commission in 1981, comprised of a judge of the Peshawar High Court, Justice Allah Bakhsh Khan, so as to assess the public opinion and see into the possibility of the enforcement of the normal laws of the country in the areas in question. The commission did the required and submitted its report in 1982. On the basis of the findings, repealing Regulations No. I and II of 1975 (the commonly called PATA Regulations) and replacing them by the normal laws and bringing the entire PATA on a par, in the judicial arena, with the other parts of the country, was recommended. The government however kept the report in cold storage.  

Besides the commission recommendations, dissatisfaction over the prevailing judicial system, found already, was growing and voices for a change and the replacement of the aforesaid PATA Regulations with the normal laws was raised from different forums and segments of the society, e.g. by members of federal and provincial legislatures, Bar Associations, lawyers, and political parties.

In this backdrop, the provincial government, headed by Aftab Ahmad Khan Sherpao—of the Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP)—as
chief minister, initiated negotiations and consultation with the prominent figures and jargahs so as to ascertain their views: whether to repeal the PATA Regulations and extend the regular laws?

In this connection, a delegation (jargah) from Swat headed by Jahanzeb advocate met the chief minister and demanded implementation of regular laws in the Malakand Division. However, Nagotal Malak (a Malak and prominent figure of the PPP from Dir) passed sardonic remarks about the advocate and told the chief minister that they wish only Islamic laws implemented in the Malakand Division. He added that they neither allow PATA laws to operate nor civil laws to be implemented. He threatened that if any law save the Shariah was implemented in the Malakand Division they will sacrifice themselves and their children for the Shariah but will never allow other laws to operate.

Latter the chief minister instructed Commissioner Malakand Division, Shakeel Durani, to have a meeting with the leaders of the Malakand Division so as to seek their views of what type of laws they want in the Division. Upon this, the Commissioner arranged a meeting with the leaders from Dir at Chakdara. They included lawyers and leaders of all the political parties. The lawyers pleaded for the implementation of the regular laws in the Malakand Division and the Khans and Malaks favoured the existing PATA Regulations but with some amendments therein. However, again a prominent Malak and figure of the PPP from Dir, Mahmud Jan Khan, opposed the other viewpoints, pleaded for the Islamic laws, and refused to sign for or accept any law save Shariat-e-Muhammad. Here also, Nagotal Malak repeated his stand for the Islamic laws.

The Commissioner, later on, held a meeting in Lal Qala with leaders of all the parties from Maidan Area, wherein two lawyers were also present. The lawyers pleaded for the regular civil laws
but Mahmud Jan Khan and Nagotal Malak, belonging to the ruling PPP, pleaded for the Shariat laws. Nagotal Malak dictated to the Commissioner: they want only Shariat-e-Muhammadi. At the departure of the Commissioner, seven leaders each from Awami National Party (ANP), Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP), Jamat-e-Islami, Jamiatul Ulama-e-Islam, and Muslim League held a meeting wherein they pledged, after deliberations, that they will not rest till Shariat-e-Muhammadi is implemented in its entirety in the Malakand Division; will offer all kinds of sacrifices (physical and material) for implementation of the Shariat and will remain united, irrespective of their political differences, for this supreme cause.

For this purpose seven members each from all the political parties were nominated among whom was also Sufi Muhammad from the Jamat-e-Islami. They decided that Sufi Muhammad, being a pious, experienced and learned person among the lot, be the leader/head Nazim-e-Ala of Tahrik Nifaz-e-Shariat-e-Muhammadi (TNSM). In this way Sufi Muhammad was made head and Nazim-e-Ala of TNSM; and Gul Malak (Mandamin Khan) was made its president, Mahmud Jan Khan as vice president along with Nagotal Malak and Abdul Wahid Khan of Bandai (Maidan) and Lala Master as general secretary.

It was in this manner that the movement for the enforcement of Islamic laws in the Malakand Division took a start from and in the then Dir District (now divided into the districts of Upper Dir and Lower Dir), for which an organizing body was formed in 1989 and Sufi Muhammad was made its head. Efforts were made to extend the movement to the entire Malakand Division including Bajawar Agency, and Kohistan District.

This commonly held view, written and expressed by almost all who wrote and talked about TNSM, is unfounded that TNSM was founded by Sufi Muhammad and hence he is its founder. It is irony and a pity that a lot of spurious accounts has been reported
in the media and also written by scholars, analysts and writers of all shades regarding TNSM and the Swat Taliban, and their insurgencies, to clear the mess created by their fancies and fantasies is difficult; a Herculean task indeed.28

The organizing body of TNSM chose black turban and two flags, one white and the other black, as the organization’s symbol and flags. Its insignia or emblem was a badge upon which was inscribed: hajr-e-aswad (the black sacred stone at the Kaabah) in the centre, and the white and black flags on its sides. Besides, the words itiqaq (unity), baraat (boycott), jihad (struggle for the cause of Sharia), aman (peace), dawah (call to the righteous path), and sabar (patience; forbearance), and the slogan of the movement ‘yaa shariat yaa shahaadat’ (either Sharia or martyrdom), and the date of the formation of the organization, 28 June 1989, along with the words ‘Ibitida-e-Tanzim-e-Tahrik-e-Nifaz-e-Shariat-e-Muhammadi’ were also inscribed.29

In this scenario, some litigants challenged the validity of the PATA Regulations (Regulations No. I and II of 1975): vide Writ Petitions No. 401, 417, 442 and 495 of 1989 and Writ Petition No. 28 of 1990. The Division Bench of the Peshawar High Court declared on 24 February 1990 these Regulations ‘violative of Article 25 of the Constitution’ of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973.30 The government of North-West Frontier Province filed appeals in the Supreme Court of Pakistan against the judgement of the Peshawar High Court: vide Civil Appeals Nos. 543, 544, 545, 546 and 547 of 1990, which the Supreme Court ‘dismissed with costs’ on 13 February 1994.31

The prolonged procedures, delay, great expenditures, high bribes, misuse of riwaj, and the deterioration and complications under the aforesaid PATA Regulations had already highly aggrieved majority of the people. The judgement of the Peshawar High Court and then the Supreme Court aggrieved the Executive circle in the Malakand Division for they saw lapse of their great
powers from their hands. In an attempt to safeguard their power they gave a free run to the activities of TNSM rather approved and supported it tacitly.\textsuperscript{32} All these thus resulted in the momentum for the activities and spread of the TNSM and the demand for the enforcement of Shariat, which also caused an upsurge in 1994: in Swat.

President General Pervez Musharraf announced a ban on the TNSM (along with four other organizations) while addressing the nation on radio and television on 12 January 2002, ‘with a view to cleansing the society of terrorism, sectarian violence and intolerance’.\textsuperscript{33} But, though Sufi Muhammad was in jail, its adherents continued their activities unhindered and without changing the name. It was with this banned organization, the provincial government twice entered into agreements because of the vulnerability of the situation and exigency of the time.

**TNSM and Democracy**

TNSM was gaining ground in Dir and its activities were growing and expanding. It established its courts to adjudicate the cases of the people and asked them neither to register their cases with the police nor take them to the government courts until the government implement the Shariah. Significantly, members of the federal and provincial legislatures, belonging to Dir, assured the TNSM leaders of their full support.\textsuperscript{34}

During this time Sufi Muhammad, who was an elected member of District Council Dir and who contested the election from Jamat-e-Islami’s platform, resigned from his seat so as to spend all his energies for the Shariat cause. In the meantime the federal and provincial governments and assemblies were dissolved on 6 August 1990 and fresh elections were announced. Upon this a meeting of the leaders of all the political parties, from Dir, was convened at Timargarha (the district-headquarter), wherein boycott of the elections was decided: in support of the TNSM.
However, Jamat-e-Islami announced to contest the elections and the other parties followed suit.\textsuperscript{35}

This was the first instance that boycott of the general elections was discussed on and decided from the TNSM platform. Though due to the rift caused by Jamat-e-Islami’s decision—because Jamat-e-Islami had hold in the district, which it feared to lose in case of the boycott—followed suit by other parties, elections were held but the zealots of TNSM especially in Maidan Area did not cast their votes due to which Jamat-e-Islami got a setback. Sufi Muhammad lamented Jamat-e-Islami’s course of action because it smashed the decision of the boycott made by all the political parties and created a rupture. This proved a great setback for TNSM, at this stage, as instead of the boycott, majority of the people started political activities for their political parties. TNSM’s offices were deserted and the majority people replaced TNSM’s flags hoisted with those of the political parties.\textsuperscript{36}

Thenceforward TNSM officially disassociated itself from the democratic process, boycotted all the succeeding general elections held in 1990, 1993, 1997, 2002 and 2008, and the local governments elections held in 2001 and 2005 as well as the referendum held in 2001. During this time Sufi Muhammad and TNSM developed their perception about democracy and made their position and stand clear by officially declaring it against the clear tenets and ordains of Islam and the Glorious Quran.

It was ‘over sharp differences with his party’s [Jamat-e-Islami’s] central leadership on the issue of electoral politics’ that Sufi Muhammad ‘quit’.\textsuperscript{37} He turned intensely against democracy, and calling it un-Islamic system vehemently opposed it.\textsuperscript{38} His and TNSM’s viewpoint about democracy was known in the Malakand Division since the start. But it got worldwide coverage and alarmed the world at large, when, in the backdrop of the Swat peace deal of 15 February 2009 and fresh growing tension in Swat, Dir and Buner, he addressed a mammoth public meeting at
Grassy Ground in Swat on 19 April 2009, and said, as reported by daily The News ‘I consider Western democracy as a system imposed on us by the infidels. Islam does not allow democracy or elections’39, and as quoted by Anatol Lieven: ‘We hate democracy . . . We want Islam in the entire world. Islam does not permit democracy or election.’40 Commenting on the point, Rahimullah Yusufzai (a veteran journalist, analyst, expert of the region, and resident editor of The News at Peshawar) has stated:

Sufi Muhammad, ageing and in poor health, spoke inarticulately for about 45 minutes in Pashto and reporters faced difficulty in understanding his words. As expected, he repeated his assertions about democracy and existing courts in Pakistan being un-Islamic. It wasn't the first time that the cleric from Maidan in Lower Dir district generated controversy. He manages to do so whenever he speaks.41

Commenting on Sufi Muhammad’s assertions of 19 April 2009, in which he declared the democratic system in Pakistan un-Islamic, Saiful Haq Chakisari has contended: By speaking high controversial thing he, once more, turned the guns of his opponents towards himself.42

Although Sufi Muhammad and TNSM held this viewpoint and stand about democracy since the first election was announced after TNSM’s inception, and he and TNSM stalwarts expressed this even in public meetings, interviews and their writings, this time his contention generated the controversy on the global level because the media around the globe concentrated on this public meeting and reported it lively due to the longstanding Swat turmoil, upsurge, failure of the army operations and growing power of the Taliban since 2007. This not only created a fresh controversy but was greatly propagated against TNSM, Sufi Muhammad and the Taliban. The question arises: On what grounds TNSM’s stand regarding democracy’s being repugnant to Shariah is based, and on what basis they justify their assertion of
democracy being un-Islamic? Following is the details of their stand and arguments as having been illustrated in Sufi Muhammad, TNSM and the movement zealots' writings and books; and also their policy and course of action adopted and followed at the time of the elections and voting.

According to Sayyed Ali Shah, a prominent figure of TNSM and one of its early stalwarts, Western democracy is based on three components: asal (root), hukam (authority, power of decision), and natijah (the result, the outcome) and all the three are evidently of kufar (infidelity, paganism). To illustrate: the asal (root) of democracy is adulthood. In democracy it is not counted whether the adult is Muslim or non-Muslim, male or female, scholar or ignorant, pious or impious; their votes are equal or carry the same weight. But according to verse 282 of Surah Al-Baqarah: fa-ilam ya-kuna rajulayni fa-rajulunwwanma-taani [Translation: And if there are not two men, then a man and two women], i.e. one man is equal to two women in evidence. And in Surah An-Nisa, the Almighty Allah says that men have superiority over women. The man should be head but in Western democracy man and woman are equal in vote. And the Almighty Allah says in verse 58 of Surah Al-Mumin: Wa maa yastawil-'a'-maa wa-l-musii’ [Translation: Not equal are the blind and those who (clearly) see; nor are (equal) those who believe and work deeds of righteousness and those who do evil]; blind here means non-educated and the one who see means educated and scholar. And those who are Muslims and do pious deeds are not equal with the wrongdoers. But in Western democracy all of them are equal in voting so the voting is evidently infidelity and fighting against the Quran.

The second component of democracy is hukam meaning decision made by majority vote is authority, no matter the majority is of the wrongdoer, drinkers, murderers, and adulterers, and the minority of the pious, scholars, qaris (those
who can recite the Glorious Quran according to the phonetics), and hajis, meaning virtues and qualities has no value in this count; and majority is the authority. But verse 116 of Surah Al-An'am says: Wa 'in-tub' 'aksara nan-fil-'arzi yus-luuka 'an-Sabii-lillaah [Translation: Wert thou to follow the common run of those on earth, they will lead thee away from the Way of Allah]. Decision by majority between the people is infidelity, in support of which I have written, from Sufi Muhammad, 102 verses of the Quran. 45

Democracy's third component is natijah (the result; the outcome), viz. five years is given to the rulers during which they are allowed to do whatever dishonesty and impiety they can. Those who call themselves mullas and pious also lay in this infidelity for five years. And all those who voted, equally share the sins of those elected, viz. the electors equally share the responsibility for all the corruption, dacoity, bribery, usury and murders the elected ones do and commit. 46

Islam also has three components: asal, hukam, and natijah. The first rule (asal) of Islam is Quran and hadith47 of the Prophet (PBUH). Decision made on the basis other than the Quran, hadith, ijnma-e-ummat (unanimity of all the Muslims on a point) and ijtihad (analogy: analogical inference of solutions to the new questions and issues arises, accruing the analogy on the basis of what the Quran and ahadith contain) of the mujtahids (the Muslim scholars who qualify for analogy) is not acceptable in Islam on any count. Making decisions on other things/ basis a Muslim loses his fait. This is mentioned in the Quran at various places. 48

The second point in Islam is hukam (command; authority). Authority rests solely with one Allah, as the Almighty Allah says in verse 40 of Surah Yusuf: 'inil-Hukmu 'illaa lillaah [Translation: the command is for none but Allah]. While adjudicating disputes between the parties, Allah has even not allowed the prophets to pronounce according to their personal wishes, as in verse 109 of Surah Yunus and verse 26 of Surah Saad, the Almighty Allah has
prohibited Prophet Dawud to follow personal wish while adjudicating.  

The third point in Islam is natijah (the result; the outcome). In Islam a person is permitted to remain head if he follows the righteous path, when astray, he is not permitted to remain head for a single minute.  

The root of democracy is adulthood but the root of Shariat is Quran and hadith. Authority in democracy is abiding by majority's decision but in Shariat, authority rests with Allah and decision is made in righteousness; even if a single person is on the right side and thousands on the other side, the decision will be made in favour of that single individual. In democracy five years times is permitted to be entertained by kufar (rule under un-Islamic laws) but in Shariat even a single minute is not permitted. It thus is evident that the asal (root) of democracy is contrary to that of Shariat (Islamic law); the hukam (authority) of democracy is contrary to that of Shariat; and the natijah (the result; the outcome) of democracy is contrary to that of Shariat. Therefore, in light of both aqil (rational) and naqii (statutory) arguments, Western democracy is paganism.  

Abu Hammad Khurshid Ali, another zealot of TNSM, has also summarily made the like contention and arguments against Western democracy. He has claimed that in this age TNSM is the only movement that announced rebellion against the pagan law. Before this, no other party has termed Western democracy as paganism but have further strengthened it and have created barriers to the implementation of the Almighty’s law. And that we say this with full authority: the barrier to the implementation of Shariat-e-Muhammadi (Islamic laws) is Western democracy and the political parties. He has moreover contended that the masses have no knowledge of the poisons of Western democracy because the Islamic religious parties have presented this paganism as Islam to them, and has appealed to both Muslim religious political
parties and the masses to say good-bye to the democracy and remove this barrier to Islam.\textsuperscript{55}

And according to Sufi Muhammad's writings, democracy has four ordains contrary to Shariat, viz. in democracy decisions are made contrary to Shariah at four stages. First, in the formation of government which is formed against Quran and hadith, on the basis of the peoples' votes, despite the fact that in the Holy Quran majority has been termed, at 134 places, as wrong. This is one taaghut (devil; who negates/do not comply commands of the Almighty Allah) in democracy. Second, a woman, an ignorant, the one who does not offer prayers, a drinker, a usurer, one who does not fast, an adulterer, a murderer, a gambler, a dancer and a female dancer, an eunuch, a sweeper (churri), a scavenger (bangi), a charsi (addict of smoking charas\textsuperscript{56}), a polytheist, a heretic, a dacoit, a thief, a Jew, a Christian, a Hindu, a Sikh, a Qadiyani, and the like are equal, without any difference, in giving his opinion, to a pious practising scholar of Quran and hadith. This is order on baatil (unsound, absurd); and so is the second taaghut in democracy.\textsuperscript{57}

Third, standard or benchmark for decision making in democracy is minority and majority: in case of disagreement over an issue in the assembly between two parties, decision is made by majority vote, even if 99 members are on the right side and 100 members on the wrong side. In all the democracies—like India, Britain, America, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Jews (Israel), and so forth—decisions are made in this manner, which is hukam on baatil. This is the third taaghut in democracy.\textsuperscript{58}

Fourth, in all these democratic governments, equal opportunity or relaxation is granted for some years to the aforementioned tawaaghit (plural of taaghut), because sovereignty/authority of the majority of the masses is recognized legitimate, despite the fact that sovereignty/authority is prerogative of only and solely of the Almighty Allah. Hence, in
fact prerogative of the Almighty Allah has been granted to the majority opinion of the masses which is shirk fil-haakiniyat (pantheism in sovereignty); and obeying this sovereignty for some years is shirk fil itaa'at (pantheism in obedience). This is hukam on baatil, and hence is the fourth type of taaghut: with two types of shirk (pantheism) as well.  

In light of this detail, whosoever says that he believes and trusts in taaghut, all the Muslim ulama (scholars of Islam) and masses of the world consider him infidel. Then the question is, whosoever says that he believes and trust in democracy, and democracy possesses four tawaaghit which means he believes and trusts in four tawaaghit; on what ground that person remains Muslim and does not become infidel? Having no proof of democracy from Quran and hadith, the injunction on its prohibition (negation) holds on. Democracy is a great ill/calamity and Almighty Allah may save Muslims from it.  

Sufi Muhammad has moreover stated that considering party politics and grouping legitimate is infidelity. It is due to democracy that party politics, grouping and dissension is present and also the law of paganism. Therefore, disagreement with democracy is obligatory and unity mandatory: the upholders of democracy, in fact, are the blockers of the implementation of Shariat-e-Muhammad (Islamic law), and only those will be safe from the great punishment in the life hereafter who boycott the democracy. Besides, those who claim themselves as followers of Islam and count themselves among the offspring of Prophet Ibrahim (PBUH) but do not boycott affiliation with the pagan system, or rule according to that system, or obey that, he is out of millat-e-Ibrahimi (faith/nation of Prophet Ibrahim PBUH), and, hence, is no more among his religious offspring, and, therefore, is called nazhabi harami (religious bastard). Because, genealogically, bastard is excluded from inheritance and religious bastard is excluded from millat-e-Ibrahimi. Therefore, not boycotting the
pagan English system ousts one of millat-e-Ibrahim, of Islam and of Shariat-e-Muhammadi, as all these three have the same meaning.  

Dealing in detail with the factors/issues that obstruct implementation of Shariat-e-Muhammadi, Sufi Muhammad has said that one of them is disunity. Illustrating the disunity, he has contended: Its second type that obstructs implementation of Shariat among the masses is the prevalent democracy in Pakistan. The ulama who take part in that democracy are also counted with the masses because the prevalent democratic system is un-Islamic. It is contrary to Islam and is founded by the non-Muslim nations, and has been enforced by the English so that the Muslims may not unite, as the Muslims' unity is harmful to them. So, the essence of democracy, which keeps democracy alive and preserved, is disunity and party politics.

And the essence of Shariat-e-Muhammadi which keeps Shariat-e-Muhammadi alive and preserved, is unity among and alliance of the Muslims. Therefore, taking part in democracy so as to implement Shariat-e-Muhammadi is either testimony to ignorance from Islam or is due to ignorance of Quran and hadith, or is to deceive the masses for acquiring power, and or is not leaving the ground of paganism deserted/empty. The extreme limit of disunity in democracy is that father and son, sons of the same father, grandsons of the same grandfather, inhabitants of the same village, followers of the same imam (those who offer prayers behind the same imam), those who offer prayers in the same mosque, ulama holding sanads (certificates/degrees) from the same madrasah-darul ulum, students of the same teacher, student and the teacher, followers of the same school of thought, wife and husband are divided in different parties in opposition to each other. That is why democracy has four components in opposition to Shariat.

First contrast is in the aqidah (belief) in the way of governance. Democracy believes in governance by the mandate of
the majority of the masses; and Shariat believes in governance by obedience to Quran and Sunnah⁶⁵. Second contrast is in the aал (root). The root of democracy is adult franchise but the root of Shariat is divine revelation. Third contrast is in the hukam (authority/command), viz. in democracy yardstick for decision is majority and minority: in case of disagreement majority has the authority in spite of its having been wrong; and in Shariat the yardstick is haq (right; just) and baatil (wrong; unjust): so decision is made on the just side, even if in opposition to the entire world a single person hold it. Fourth contrast is in the natijah (result) of governance. In democracy, few years time is granted to that baatil; and in Shariat no time is granted to baatil even if it be a single minute. Therefore, democracy, due to the aforesaid reasons, is in opposition to Shariat; and each opposite is obstructer of its opposite. Therefore, the result is: democracy is obstructer of Shariat. In spite of this opposition, the ulama’s remaining part to democracy for the implementation of Shariat is wasting their life; and is synonymous with a child’s play; and is passing life in opposition to Quran and hadith, which, by way of the articles of faith, deeds and sayings, is a means of perdition, both in this world and the life hereafter.⁶⁶

Sufi Muhammad, moreover, has contended: those who struggle for Islamic laws in a way contrary to the injunctions of Quran and hadith have no promise of salvation and pardon. For example struggle for the enforcement of Islamic system in such a manner is null and void because this procedure is contrary to Quran and hadith. This is like an ablution for prayers by urine, and hence is useless and non-acceptable.⁶⁷ And that in the non-Islamic system, the ulama’s teaching (Quran and ahadith) and sermons, leading prayers etcetera and pious deeds, performing adorations and becoming part to the democracy for implementing Shariat-e-Muhammadī i is tantamount to spoil all the life.⁶⁸

In an earlier fifteen pages pamphlet, Sufi Muhammad has contended: Democracy is preventer of Shariat because it is against
the conditions required for implementation of Shariat, which are unity, boycott of the un-Islamic things and jihad with tongue, body and wealth. Therefore, demanding Shariat, while democracy functions, is useless. And considering democracy a means of implementing Shariat is proof of ignorance and is a result of partial death of heart. Almighty Allah may save Muslims of it.⁶⁹ And in a pamphlet, dated 5 July 1998, he has stated that Shariat-e-Muhammadi has two types. After explaining both the types, he has contended: therefore, the present-day Western democracy is opposite and preventer of Shariat-e-Muhammadi. And dealing with the ways and means for implementing Shariat and salvation, on the day of judgement, he has stated: and the second is abandoning Western democracy and boycott, per capacity, of every un-Islamic system.⁷⁰

Negating the arguments of those who say that it is Islamic Republic of Pakistan and the democracy in Pakistan is Islamic democracy (Islami Jamhuriat), Sayyed Ali Shah has argued: If the democracy in Pakistan is Islamic, it is prevalent in India and America as well. So they may be called Islami Jamhuri Hindustan (Islamic Republic of India) and Islami Jamhuri America (Islamic Republic of America). After dealing in some length with the point, he has asserted: In Western democracy no difference remains between the Muslims, Hindus, English, Chinese, Russians, and other non-Muslims. Lamenting the mullahs, who do politics and do not regard democracy infidelity, he appeal them to keep death and the Day of Judgement in view and repent and dissociate themselves from democracy; and that who contends it is Islamic democracy the Muslims must know that democracy is infidelity, and Islam is Islam. Islam accepts nothing else in its folds. Islam is not a mixture. If they give us democracy in the name of Islam, they might declare eating dog and pig is lawful, when slaughtered with saying Allah-u Akbar (Allah is Great).⁷¹

It, moreover, has been contended that sovereignty belong to the Almighty Allah, and only He is the law giver. And being envoy
of Almighty Allah, Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) is the yardstick for determining right and wrong. Voting has no sanction from Islam. In case of electing a head of a Muslim State or head of the Muslims only Muslim scholars of worth have the right to elect. Save this, voting is un-Islamic. Voting under an un-Islamic system is tantamount to preserving that system and hence is un-Islamic and blasphemous. For example, the constitution of Pakistan is based on Western democracy, which is blasphemy, hence voting for and in this system acquiescing in infidelity.72

Another stalwart of TNSM, Muhammad Alam alias Binaurrai and Khalil—who later went with the splinter group of Fazlullah—while negating democracy in his speeches/sermons on the Taliban’s FM radio, besides other arguments, used to quote73 the famous verse of Allama Iqbal—who is greatly reverend in Pakistan officially—which runs thus:

جوہریت اک طرز حکومت ہے کہ چھ نئین
یہدی ہاں گاہ پر قرش تھاں تو ہور نئیں کرے

Translation: Democracy is the form of government in which people are counted, not weighed

And Abu Hammad Khurshid Ali has also written a tapah74, which says:

ظلم نور دینہ نشته
چھ جمهوریت کئں د اسلام دعوہ کوینہ
t

Meaning: There can be no more injustice than to pray for Islam in democracy

Sayyad Ali Shah further says that Sufi Muhammad contends that casting vote in favour of a leader for materializing pagan law
is unlawful and forbidden for a Muslim. Because casting the vote proves that the voter is sincere in and happy with the implementation of the pagan law; or that the voter participated in implementing the pagan system. This applies to the un-Islamic law of Pakistan as well. He has elaborated on the demerits or negative results of voting and democracy as under.

(1) In Pakistan Western democracy is practised, which is pagan law, so voting for pagan law is recognizing paganism.

(2) After performing their duty, all the prophets have left three modes for the Muslims for attaining salvation, i.e. martyrdom, baraat (declaring disassociation of; boycott), and migration. None of the prophets has practised democracy for implementing religion. Voting in such a manner has found no support from the precedent of early generations of the Muslims and Islamic history. The present-day voting is contrary to the precedents of all the prophets and especially of the practice of our Prophet Muhammad (PBUH). So calling it Islamic do not suit a Muslim.

(3) Like all the prophets, boycott of the pagan law is obligatory for a Muslim, rather this boycott is precondition for his salvation. Despite this, if a Muslim, instead of the boycott, upholds the voting, it is siding with the pagan law.

(4) All the political parties in Pakistan, who practise voting make no difference of a man and a woman, but both the sexes exercise equal rights which is infidelity without any doubt, and terming this an act for the cause of Islam is absolute infidelity.
In the assemblies, members of both the sexes openly interact, laugh and gossip, which is against the Shariat and mockery of and playing on Islam, due to which terming a work an act for the cause of Islam that in itself is repugnant to Quran and hadith is infidelity.

In Western democracy, the party that comes into power by voting is to be given the chance for five years despite its un-Islamic deeds of all kinds. In this a good practising Muslim will also bear that paganism for five years. And waiting for five years in repugnancy to the law of Allah is shirk fil itaat (polytheism in obedience) and gumraahi (going astray/apostasy). Surah An'am, verse 116.

Waiting for pagan law to operate for five years is apostasy in deviation from Islam.

Voting between Islam and paganism is tantamount to considering Islam and paganism equal which is contempt of Islam and sedition against the revealed law.

In Surah Aal-e 'Imran, verse 103, the Almighty Allah has enjoined upon the Muslims to unite, to tightly hold fast the Shariah, and has forbidden disunity in the Shariah matter. But in voting, the unity of the Muslim does suffer and disunity is created; so voting is forbidden (haraam) because it is combating Allah's ordain.

According to the injunctions of both Quran and hadith, backbiting of and calumny against a Muslim and praising oneself is forbidden, but in voting all the three are resorted to abundantly. Therefore,
abandoning voting is obligatory (farz) and conducting them is forbidden (haraam).

(11) Voting renders a person hypocrite because he tells every leader that he will cast his vote in his favour. And every Muslim knows how much egregious sin hypocrisy is. So desisting from voting is farz (obligatory) because it makes one hypocrite.

(12) In voting the party leader must be praised though he be a transgressor (faasiq) and Allah has forbidden praising the transgressors. Allah dislikes praising a transgressor.

(13) Voting is a wrong and the wrong-doers vote. Therefore, the person who gets elected and then do whatever sins—e.g. drinks alcohol and commit murders, adultery, usury, theft and corruption—his voters equally share the sins.

These are but only a few of the evils of voting. Almighty Allah may protect us from the curse of the vote, forever. 77

As is evident from the preceding pages, official stand of TNSM is: Western democracy is contrary to Islamic injunctions and hence is paganism and infidelity. Sayyad Ali Shah, has even contended: The political leaders, especially those who uphold and contest elections/ voting in the Malakand Division are enemies of Islam and watchers/ guard dogs of the English laws and Western democracy. 78

However, being personally observing the movement and its activities from the start, in spite of denouncing democracy as un-Islamic and stressing for not to vote, since the inception till the last election held in 2008, TNSM has neither disrupted any election process nor has attempted a forced boycott: during the
general elections held in 1990, 1993, 1997, 2002 and 2008, and the local governments elections held in 2001 and 2005 as well as the referendum held in 2001. Its high command and the zealots have peacefully boycotted and abstained from casting their votes but the rank and file have always participated in the elections and casted their votes in favour of the candidates of their own choice. The evidences show that some of their zealots too have taken part in the election campaigns and voting, in case their family members, friends, and the likes, contested the elections. Almost all the Khans, Malaks and other political figures, who remained members of or supported the TNSM, have, directly or indirectly, contested or remained part to the democracy and elections process throughout this period.

TNSM’s naib amir (vice chief) of Dakorak village has conceded: Despite the pledges not to be part of the democratic process, because of its having been un-Islamic, about 5% of TNSM members have abstained from casting their votes and the rest remained part to the election process for the reasons stated above. But others estimate: Only about 2% (a negligible portion) of the TNSM members and supporters did not cast the votes; the rest, about 98%, cast votes. Even some of the prominent members actively remained part of the election process and in person or their family members contested the elections.

Significantly, No. 8 of the qawaid wa zawabit da parah da Tahrik Nifaz-e-Shariat-e-Muhammad (rules and regulations framed for Tahrik Nifaz-e-Shariat-e-Muhammad) enjoins: Members of all the organization bodies, from the centre to the village level, and members of the shura (consultative council) will be bound to have collectively no affiliation with any political party, save Tahrik Nifaz-e-Shariat-e-Muhammad. This evidently did not prohibit membership of or relationship with political parties, for the rank and file or the ordinary members, adherents and associates. And it, also, in other words, did not bar members of the organization
bodies and shura from having relation/links with the political parties individually or in personal capacity.

At this point, although mainly basing their arguments on the injunctions and teachings of Quran and ahadith, a weakness in the stand or arguments of TNSM enters when they subsequently jump and resort to or speak of ijma-e-ummah and ijthid of the mujtahids. Ijma-e-ummah has never been possible and attained on such points and ijthid of the mujtahids (those qualify for ijthid) vary from person to person and time to time as the analogy is made in special circumstances and different times and environments; and hence according to the rule of the game one mujtahid is not bound to abide by or agree with the analogy of another mujtahid—because a mujtahid can err in analogy or in comprehension. Similarly, the ijthid of a mujtahid in a given circumstances and time might not be agreed with at a different time and circumstances. That is why a number of Muslim scholars and ulama consider democracy compatible with Islamic injunctions and have their own arguments in support of their viewpoint. Hence the time and space/circumstances perspective is crucial in ijthid and analogy and the decisions/verdict made on their bases and hence such verdicts and decisions have neither universal value nor mandatory for all Muslims and in all times to agree with and abide by. Besides, ijthid or analogy is made and applicable when the Holy Quran and Sunnah/ahadith are silent on the issue or their clear injunctions on the subject are not available.

It is pertinent to mention that TNSM is not alone in considering and believing Western democracy contrary to the tenets of Islam. Other circles also believe and contend the same; hence other scholars and writers too have written in detail on the subject: evaluating and sifting all the aspects and dimensions of democracy and the arguments put forward in its support and have tried to prove not only from Quran, ahadith, and Islamic history the undesirability and vices of democracy but also from the writings of non-Muslim and Western writers and scholars.
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