



## RESEARCH PAPER

### Political Parties as Core Entity for Political Development: A Comparative Theoretical Analysis

<sup>1</sup>Muhammad Naveed Sial\*    <sup>2</sup> Dr. Gulshan Majeed

1. Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
<p><b>Received:</b> October 13, 2021</p> <p><b>Accepted:</b> December 29, 2021</p> <p><b>Online:</b> December 31, 2021</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Modernization Theory, National Integration, Political Development, Political Parties, Public Diplomacy</p> <p><b>*Corresponding Author:</b>  navidsyal@gmail.com</p>	<p>The paper analyzes the concept of political development comprehensively with special reference to the role of political parties in the development of the idea. Prima Facie, the concept has a prime importance in Comparative politics as its major focus is on the application of the political development in post-colonial states such as Pakistan. Most of the elements of the political development are common among the developing nations which align cases for comparative study. Hegelian dialect effects the formation of political parties, ideological narratives and reverse engineering in re-political development when and where needed. Utilization of useful index of institutionalization and impact of modernization theory on the political development in national politics is edge of the research. The paper critically discusses crises and challenges to the political development and comparative analysis has been employed to evaluate the subject of political development involving political parties. This is theoretical descriptive research identifying various pre-requisites of political development by protecting political systems from possible political decay. Strengthened political parties develop in sound politico-economic conditions to develop a vibrant democratic system turning into phrasal political development</p>

## Introduction

Political Development is relatively a new concept in Comparative Politics which originated in mid-twentieth century. The concept of political development is often associated with developing states. The present study has been done by employing Modernization Theory. Modernization theory is beneficial in assessing the conditions of a developing political system. It is most commonly associated with national self-respect and dignity in international arena because political class in developing states makes the public believe that it is the only way forward. This happens when the government in these countries failed to deliver on their promises.

Most of the post-colonial states had a common view that political development means national self-respect and dignity in international affairs and developed states brought up a view that the most common part of the post-nationalism era those nation states weren't the basic unit of political life any longer. The most fundamental and widely held themes of political development are equality, the capacity of the political system,

differentiation, and specialization. Equality means universality of the law. In other words, states should be governed by the rule of law. The capacity of any political system is related to its output. In other words, it should be capable to deliver effectively in terms of sheer magnitude, scope, and scale of political and governmental performance.

Most of the intellectual circles of social sciences were unwilling to discuss and provide knowledge (Pye, 1965). In this regard, Eckstein (1982) believes that existing literature on political development is misleading and incomplete. Milne (1972) concluded in his studies that the concept of political development is useless and misleading, and he considers it over-developed. There are a lot of different definitions of political development that put the concept into dispute and crisis. Political development has remained a theoretical concept and it has not transformed itself into a practical objective of the polity. Political development is much more than "building of authoritative structures of government" (Pye, 1965, p.8). Political development is the name of the concept that diffuses all the societies and forms a world culture. LaPalombara (1963) is of the view that political development is the administrative and legal development that revolves around bureaucratic models. Political development basically is the name of the change in almost all the spheres of society, welfare and good for general public, their social uplift and progressive political culture. Pye believes that political development is the gradual change in the attitude, beliefs and sentiments of the people about politics. Some scholars want to broaden the concept of political development to some other major aspects such as political participation and political competition among various social and political groups (Pye, 1965).

Political development is about the changing of behavior patterns of general thinking from conventional to novel thinking. Pye also describes it as about testing a particular system and its capacity to perform and to meet the heavy demands of the general public. Political development is also about the creation of a nation-state that can perform effectively in the community of states. In other words, it is the nation-building in its modern sense. Pye also introduced such dimensions such as political change and modernization into political development (Pye, 1965b). Political development may also be about the development of democratic culture and democratic norms such as greater liberty, independent and free institutions and popular sovereignty. This view is debatable as there are many states with totalitarian governments, are developed ones.

### **Evolution of the Concept**

Most of the post-colonial states had a common view that political development means national self-respect and dignity in international affairs and developed states brought up a view that most common part of the post-nationalism era that nation-states weren't the basic unit of political life any longer. The most fundamental and widely held themes of political development are equality, the capacity of a political system, differentiation and specialization. Equality means universality of the law. In other words, states should be governed by the rule of law. The capacity of any political system is related to the output. In other words, it is capacity to deliver effectively in terms of sheer magnitude, scope and scale of political and governmental performance. Pye (1965b) does not give the time frame about the origin and development of the concept of political development as according to him, politics is a universal phenomenon and therefore no concept of political science can be declared as less developed or developing.

There are various approaches exist to study the political development. In this research, Modernization theory is employed as it is instrumental in development of a polity

and it also proves beneficial to determine the relation of political parties to the political system. The concept of modernization emerged during the term of US President Kennedy. It represents a correlation between democracy and economic development (Pennock, 1966). Modernization Theory's origins are found in the writings of Durkheim, Henry Maine, Marx and Max Weber (Fukuyama, 2011). Modernization is a transformation of a traditional society into a modern one. That process is based on modern principles of social organization. Modernization theory is mostly applied to post-colonial societies. (Leys, 1982). Modernization also focuses on political participation and political institutionalization. Political party system is designed to cope and channel forces of modernization. The party system is used to measure many aspects of political development (Benjamin, Blue, & Coleman, 1971).

### **Phases of Modernization**

Huntington stresses on the control and regulation of a political system in order to protect it from decay. Huntington's study especially focuses on political decay. Political decay implies instability, corruption, political violence and authoritarianism. With the passage of time, capacity of a political system should be enhanced to make it more accommodative. (Abid, 2004). According to Lipset, economic development gives rise to the conditions which are favorable for democracy to flourish. Development also directly increases the level of education, with education a man's outlook can be broadened and it enables him to adopt a moderate attitude and tolerance is developed in a society and it ultimately results in increased capacity to make a rational choice in elections (Cheibub & Vreeland, 2018).

Black counts various phases of modernization in his study. First of all, modernity challenges the traditional society then modernizing leadership consolidate itself while traditional leadership went into decline, then transformation of agrarian economy to industrial economy occurs and finally integration occurs (Abid, 2004). From a Marxist point of view, Modernization theory is under attack for being extremely racist, being moral cover for interference and their failure to deliver results in developing nations. Modernization theory over the years has served only one purpose that is to show the neo-colonial states the superiority of western political systems because of the reason that it is deeply rooted in capitalism.

### **Elements/Components of Political Development**

There are various dimensions of political development. Milne (1972) counts three dimensions of political development such as equality, capacity and differentiation. Fukuyama (2014) suggests three components of political development that state, rule of law and accountability. The dimensions of political development include adaptation, integration and of course pattern management adaptation or regulating the processes.

### **Political Development in Pakistan**

The history of political development in Pakistan is an exhaustive process which has a cheered path. In this haphazard process, the state of Pakistan has experimented with different kinds of political systems. From parliamentary democracy to dictatorships of the military junta and from sham democracies to presidential systems, with every election and

every regime took-over with the promise to change the existing order. The political system of Pakistan is mired with conflicts. The system of conflict resolution or management is highly controversial as it always involves some extra-constitutional forces (Waseem, 1997).

Public discourse in Pakistan is hollow and the main characteristics of political development include the exhaustive constitutional activity because of the reverse effects on constitutions by years-long dictatorships in the country. Pakistan in its seventy-two years of history had three constitutions. Two of them were abrogated and the last constitution of 1973 was held in abeyance twice. Things did not stop there as the constitution of 1973 had gone through drastic changes in the form of massive amendments that used to change the fundamental structure of the constitution. Precious time of the political leadership lost in undoing those amendments in the form of thirteenth and eighteenth amendments. In the political system of Pakistan, extra-parliamentary forces have greater opportunities for themselves and therefore, rules the day. Public debate mostly revolves around Islam and undemocratic values.

State formation in Pakistan is characterized by non-representative politics, rise of ethno-national movements and the centralism of power. In Punjab, urbanization has led to insecurities. Waves of migration to Karachi has turned the city into a power-keg and hatred between ethnic communities (Waseem, 1997). No single pattern of conflict is found in Pakistan; they always exist in combinations of more than one problems. There is a tendency to make laws outside the parliament in the form of ordinances (Mehboob, 2019). The political system of Pakistan despite its limitations and shortcomings is very vibrant and functional and its major credit goes to its political parties (Mushtaq et al., 2018).

### **Stages of Political Development**

When a political system changes to an advanced form from a traditional one, it experiences many types of crisis. After these crises are resolved many new institutions are created. It is observed that most political parties of the world develop during the time of crisis. With modernization political activity becomes more and more concentrated in urban centers than in rural areas (Bates, 2018).

Pye (1966a) classified six crises while discussing the case of England. These are: Identity, legitimacy, penetration, participation, unification and distribution. They can be counted as stages of political development. Shills (1968) pointed out five stages of political development i.e. political democracy, tutelary democracy, modernizing oligarchy, totalitarian oligarchy, and traditional oligarchy. Lucian Pye's apprehension that less developed states experience low economic development when political participation is expanded. It happens due to the presumed greater efficiency and when latent feelings of distrust and hostility come to the fore (Pye, 1965b). LaPalombara & Weiner (1966) are of the view that the French Revolution happened due to the crisis in the participation. They also quote another example of a crisis in participation as happened in 1950 to the French colonial government of Algeria.

Five types of crisis are inter-related, and it thus affects each other. Crisis in participation have an effect on distribution. Legitimacy tend to affect penetration and distribution while penetration may affect identity (Binder, 1971). The above-mentioned changes in a political system can happen even without the strengthening of political institutions. Other factors that are responsible for political decay are military intervention, non-democratic attitude of political elite, its failure to connect with grass-root. Some writers consider certain other factors that directly or indirectly affects the political

development. Crises may occur due to various factors. These crises may be because of cultural differences such as race, ethnicity, casteism, regionalism. Those factors may hinder the nation building and restrict the modernization (Anderson, Mehdon, & Young, 1967).

Weiner (1965) views the problems of integration as historical process in the developing world. When old systems especially those operated under the colonial regimes were replaced with the new ones, the expectations of the masses grew. The new systems are unable to accommodate them which in turn led to the crisis in integration. Most notable crises of integration are public conflict, inter-relation between masses and authorities, difficulties in organizing the individuals for the common good. Now the term "integration" has taken an extraordinarily complex shape because now it includes a wide range of subjects of political nature (Weiner, 1965). Integration is defined as bringing closer the all kind of politically, culturally discrete and unique entities for the purpose of creating a national identity and to eliminate 'subordinate parochial loyalties' (Weiner, 1965, p.53). It is the establishment of national central authority over all the political entities. It also discusses the crisis of linking the government with the governed. In some societies, it is referred to the minimum consensus needed to maintain a social order.

In developing societies where exists a modern elite and a passive population, the gap between the two gets bigger and bigger which in turn, creates problems of political development. Thus the integration as a term covers, extensive subjects of political development such as creating a national identity, integration of diverse sub-national loyalties, bringing together of the citizens and in the end bringing together the individuals of every stratum of the society for the common good. Wiener (1965) says that developing or transitional political systems are relatively not fully integrated. As a concept, it indicates an amalgamation of various ethnic, religious, social, economic and geographic elements into one entity. The capacity of the government of any state to bind together all these groups shows political development. When a government has got allegiance from all sections of the society, it shows the peak of national integration. Kirchheimer (1966) indicated that France's national integration was achieved several centuries ago. The major difference between European and Asian political systems is that they achieved national integration long ago before the emergence of political parties, while in developing the party governments are still in the process of resolving the crisis of national integration. In these countries the governing political parties always concerned themselves with two elements of integration. Those include, the control over the state's territory and to secure loyalties of the subjects. These problems occur in those states with heterogeneous cultures such as Pakistan's.

In many nations a crisis in integration was the cause of the emergence of parties. Crisis in integration related to territorial integrity and on a bigger level to accommodate previously marginalized communities. Crisis in integration led to the formation of political parties in Germany, Italy and Belgium. It is pertinent to note that most parties in the developing, emerged out of crisis in integration but ironically most of them failed to achieve national integration. All India Muslim League Muslim League (AIML) was organized with the purpose to integrate and protect an ethnic minority i.e. Muslims. AIML expansion was the result of the crisis of British India (LaPalombara & Weiner, 1966).

In some cases, the crisis of both legitimacy and integration has given rise to political parties. The earliest form of crisis was the result of a challenge to legitimate authorities

which gave rise to crisis in participation as well. This happens when a new system replaces an old political system, the crisis in the old system results in the collapse of that system. By understanding the concept of political crisis, the formation and emergence of political parties can be traced. Political systems develop when there is a well-established system of communication is available. For example, in the case of India, when the system of rail, mail, circulation of newspaper and telegraph was properly established in the nineteenth century, then came the time in 1885 AINC was established.

Most of the Literature that exist on political parties assume that the system these parties are operating are legitimate. In other words, these parties by normal functioning gave legitimacy to that system. There are four crises that occur when we deal with political development about the political parties. These include national integration, legitimacy, political participation and conflict management. These problems before the emergence of political parties and those crises shape the future course of that political system. Thus, political parties are products of their particular environment.

### **Types of Integration**

#### **National Integration**

In post-colonial societies, the issue of national integration is one of the major problems faced by their relative governments. Colonial governments weren't simply interested in creating national cohesion by promoting national symbols like language or national culture rather they taught and promoted their languages and cultures such as British promoted English in their colonies. They were only interested in creating loyal subjects that would be helpful in their rule. Once the nations become free, the new rulers faced the crisis of cultural integration.

#### **Territorial Integration**

Problems of territorial integrity are found in those states, where nation-building precedes state-building such as Pakistan and Israel. Colonial governments used to control some areas in their territory indirectly but at the time of independence, these areas came under the direct control of the newly established states. This phenomenon created problem of integration after independence i.e. India and Pakistan

#### **Value Integration**

As the society modernizes itself it faces resistance and conflict is created. The set of procedures which are instrumental in resolving the crisis are known as value integration. Modernization changes the traditional roles of society.

#### **Elite-mass Integration**

For modern political systems, this is a necessity. Elite-mass relations can be enhanced by the development of certain infrastructures such as political parties, mass media and education. Weiner stresses on university education and every other infrastructure which provides two-way communication. In the view of Weiner, the crises of integration are relatively new and therefore it can be called as acute. The crises of political integration are as such that no single formula or method will work to solve them. They need complex mechanisms to resolve them. One of the greatest paradoxes of political development is that the least experienced governments faced with gravest of challenges.

There is a relationship between these crises as these crises usually occurs in pairs like a crisis of participation comes with the crisis of legitimacy (LaPalombara & Weiner, 1966).

Pye (1965b) articulates that in order to develop the relationship between political culture and political development, it is important to count on these values that affect the development process. The ability of political parties to resolve the conflict and to manage societal cleavages in difficult situations shows true strength and effectiveness of a political party. In mass parties that recruit openly are more prone to be torn by internal conflict. A party needs to be decentralized and it should distribute its power at the regional and local level to give itself a long life and legitimacy. i.e. Congress party of India. Pye (1965b) also rejects the notion of confusion that surrounds the concept of Political development. The importance of political development can be gauged from the fact that leaders are also interested in problems beyond economics such as many factors related to economic development. As the concept has broadened so has its understanding in the circles of political Science. It has become a subjective term as different people give different meanings to it.

A lot of different elements are required for political development to happen. Edward Shills stresses on the necessity of civilian rule through the establishment of representative institutions with the pre-requisite of public liberties. The establishment and strengthening of institutions is synonymous with political development as described by Huntington (Shills, 1968). As far as any political party is concerned its bureaucracy should not adopt a dictatorial role. The party members should be given preference as it will elevate the prestige of the party in the eyes of the people. For effective and legitimate political institutions to flourish, there should be a vibrant, coherent and responsible opposition. It should work in constitutional boundaries. It should be able to criticize the government with real-time information. It should not work to subvert the constitution. For political development, if the majority party is in an overwhelming majority, it should have the opportunity to express otherwise the spirit of democracy would be lost.

### **Political Parties and Political Development**

Political development is a universal and comprehensive process, which is commendable as political awareness has increased which in modern times has raised values of rights, human freedom rights and dignity. Pye views Political development as nation building. Political development is all about modernizing the political institutions because modernization is a multifaceted process that involves change in human thinking as well as in its practical value. There are three aspects of modernization, which are 1. Social mobilization 2. Economic development 3. Increased political participation. (Karimi, 2014)

Industrialized societies set certain standards of political development. These standards may be political behavior and performance. Political development is of the development of the bureaucratic and legal structure of the country. Most of the newly independent post-colonial states invested heavily in these sectors (Pye, 1965). Political development is a multidimensional concept that contains in itself various other factors. Western scholars describe political development in one way and non-western in another way because of the reason that there is a stark difference in the political realities of the states.

In defining, political development writers face numerous difficulties because there are certain factors that in most cases try to restrict the applicability in time and space. As it is a very difficult to apply into advanced tribal societies, or the same cannot be applied to fifth-century Athens or third century B.C. Roman Republic or second century Roman Empire. The second problem is that all the basic definitions of political development deals with those features that a modern state possesses as modernization is the principal part of political development. Third one has in it dubious and vague characteristics. As most of the writers fail to distinguish between the characteristics of political development in black and white. It is because of the dubious nature of the terms used in this field. As some of the advanced political systems which are ruled by populist leaders, there is a tendency towards the erosion of democracy, where autocratic rulers or one-party regimes thrives. Another difficulty is the massive gap in theory and practice with regard to the concepts of political development because of their "one-way" nature (Huntington, 1965, 392). He stresses that political development is the strengthening of the political institutions. This goes against the common notion that relates political development to modernization. In developing societies, tribe, religion, language and traditions of parochial leanings hinders development. The sovereignty of today's modern states in many cases exists only in the name as no other state exercise sovereignty over everything because they find themselves unable to exercise their sovereignty over their own territories.

In defining, political development writers face numerous difficulties because there are certain factors that in most cases try to restrict the applicability in time and space. As it is a very difficult to apply into advanced tribal societies, or the same cannot be applied to fifth-century Athens or third century B.C. Roman Republic or second century Roman Empire. The second problem is that all the basic definitions of political development deals with those features that a modern state possesses as modernization is the principal part of political development. Third one has in it dubious and vague characteristics. As most of the writers fail to distinguish between the characteristics of political development in black and white. It is because of the dubious nature of the terms used in this field. As some of the advanced political systems which are ruled by populist leaders, there is a tendency towards the erosion of democracy, where autocratic rulers or one-party regimes thrives. Another difficulty is the massive gap in theory and practice with regard to the concepts of political development because of their "one-way" nature (Huntington, 1965, 392). He stresses that political development is the strengthening of the political institutions. This goes against the common notion that relates political development to modernization. In developing societies, tribe, religion, language and traditions of parochial leanings hinders development. The sovereignty of today's modern states in many cases exists only in the name as no other state exercise sovereignty over everything because they find themselves unable to exercise their sovereignty over their own territories.

Modern political systems gave rise to the organization known as political parties. These parties work in unison with their members and most of them share a similar agenda irrespective of the political system in which they operate. They work for the political, social, economic well-being of the general public and strive to achieve political development. Parties form public opinion. Their other function is that they act as a bridge between people and power centers as they communicate the demands of general public to the government. A good party's followers are organized and articulated. The birth of political parties shows a certain level of maturity in the political system. When the participation increased and this huge surge of political participation was needed to be controlled, then political parties proved instrumental.



Usually, a political party consist of large number of those occupational groups is called a big tent party (Paracha, 2018). But there are various parties based on certain occupational groups such as parties of farmers but the chances of getting into power are minimal for them. Philosophy and direct political action are declared two ingredients of a party. This is one of the legal requirements of a political party. The other legal requirements include a minimum number of party candidates and a minimum success at elections. In this way that group can claim itself a party (Ribicoff & Newman, 1967).

Political parties are those institutions that represent society. The culture of political parties often is the image of the society from which they belong to. It is the struggle of political parties that brought down successive military regimes. It is almost impossible to achieve political development without political parties. They are often called as institutionalized mediators between the general public and the power centers. Huntington (1968) stresses on the strengthening of political parties in order to save the system from decay. A political party means different things to different people whether they are voters or candidates. A party may be a family enterprise extending up to generations i.e. Congress of India and PPP of Pakistan or it just work according to a certain philosophy i.e. communist party of Soviet Union. It is sometimes a label given to a bunch of politicians striving for power. A good party is like a well-knit organization that even if its voters think that they are part of that organization.

### **Political Development as Integrative Approach in Developing Countries**

A political party defined as group of people who share some "general ideas of public policy and a very specific idea of political action" and these people strive for power or in other words, they want to be elected to public offices (Ribicoff & Newman, 1967, p.43). Because of these elements, a party holds together individuals from different backgrounds, in this way political integration may be achieved. A good political party consists of two kinds of people. First are those who believe in certain ideology and the other are doers, those who make this ideology work. It also proves another point in the process of political development that the it was a start of the time when masses were being taken seriously and the feeling that they too would be considered in the making of public policy and a realization that they can choose their leadership. (LaPalombara & Weiner, 1966) That stage showed a kind of political maturity, which helps in restricting the dictatorial tendencies of individuals through working in groups.

La Palombara & Weiner (1966) holds the opinion that those complex political organizations i.e. political parties as one of the most important factors of the political development. Modern political systems have complex but flexible political structures. Modern society includes a highly advanced school system, universities with the capacity of innovating ideas with up to date knowledge, capable bureaucracy, vibrant mass media and advanced transportation and all of the above works in a smooth fashion to facilitate the flow of information. This is an ideal form of political development.

So, in order to achieve political development, a modern political party would have certain features and these parties cannot be merely cliques, small gathering of elites like of those parties of seventeenth-century England or of in France, where they started as small groups. Now the modern political parties themselves assume a complex structure. Comparative theoretical discussion reveals core relation of political stability and national

growth. Widespread political revolutions are based on the piled-up facts in development and modernization phases which in turn states that public diplomacy reached to climax of democratic politicization. Game of narratives, competition in evolutionary factors and phasal development of political entities develop the political system in developing countries.

### **Conclusion**

Political process model of Graham T. Allison while analyzing political and public policy development extracts that political narrative sand identities paly considerable part in political development of states. Political development in developed states might differ in terms and meaning from developing nations but at core both needs disciplined and modernized political parties to bring smooth revolution by evolution. Shattering of evolutionary process results into ashes which is not welcomed either by socialists' reformist, communist politicians, or democratic identity politics supporters. Weiner concept of integrating historical process of political development under the shadow of Huntington's discussion on political decay shows importance of political development with core entities, political parties.

Increase in national political unity and political participation paves way for political development in core sense. Broad vision for ensuring human rights, fundamental political rights to public and politically elected personal may create integration in state institutions. Developing countries needs to develop political parties through evolutionary process of development and internal modernization and politicization for long term political development.

## References

- Abid, M. (2004). Political Modernization: The Concept, Contours and Dynamics. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 65(4), 590–602.
- Anderson, C., Mehdon, F., & Young, C. (1967). *Issues of Political Development*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bates, R. (2018). *Political Development*. In C. Lancaster & N. Walle, *The Oxford handbook of the Politics of Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benjamin, R. W., Blue, R. N., & Coleman, S. (1971). Modernization and Political Change: A Comparative Aggregate Data Analysis of Indian Political Behavior. *Midwest Political Science*, 15(2), 219–261.
- Binder, L. (1971). *Crisis of Political Development*. In L. Binder, J. Coleman, J. LaPalombara, L. Pye, S. Verba & M. Weiner, *Crisis and Sequence in Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cheibub, J., & Vreeland, J. (2018). *Modernization Theory*. In C. Lancaster & N. Walle, *The Oxford handbook of the Politics of Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eckstein, H. (1982). The Idea of Political Development: From Dignity to Efficiency. *World Politics*, 34(4), 451–486.
- Fukuyama, F. (2011). *Samuel Huntington's Legacy*. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/01/06/samuel-huntingtons-legacy/>
- Huntington, S. P. (1965). Political Development and Political Decay. *World Politics*, 17(3), 386–393.
- Huntington, S. P. (1968). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Karimi, M. (2014). Political Development Concept by Looking Briefly at the Iran's Mohammad Reza Pahlavi Rule. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 4(4), 67–78.
- Kirchheimer, O. (1966). *The Transformation of the Western European Party Systems*. In Binder L., Chambers W., Daalder H., Emerson R., Grodzins M., Pye L. (Authors) & LaPalombara J. & Weiner M. (Eds.), *Political Parties and Political Development*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- LaPalombara, J. (1963). *Bureaucracy and Political Development*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- LaPalombara, J., & Weiner, M. (1966). The Impact of Political Parties on Political Development. In J. LaPalombara & M. Weiner, *Political Parties and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Leys C. (1982). Samuel Huntington and the End of Classical Modernization Theory. In: Alavi H., Shanin T. (eds) *Introduction to the Sociology of "Developing Societies"*. Palgrave, London
- Milne, R. S. (1972). The Overdeveloped Study of Political Development. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 5(4), 560–568.
- Mushtaq, I., Baig, F., & Mushtaq, S. (2018). The Role of Political Parties in Political Development of Pakistan. *Pakistan Vision*, 19(1), 176–190.
- Paracha, N. (2018). Smokers' Corner: Out of the Big Tent. <https://www.dawn.com/news/1438461/smokers-corner-out-of-the-big-tent?>
- Pennock, J. R. (1966). Political Development, Political Systems, and Political Goods. *World Politics*, 18(3), 415–434.
- Pye, L. (1965). *Introduction: Political Culture and Political Development*. In Levine D., Ward R., Lapalombara J., Rose R., Scott R., Verba S., (Authors) & Pye L. & Verba S. (Eds.), *Political Culture and Political Development*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Pye, L. (1965a). *The Concept of Political Development*. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 358, 1–13.
- Pye, L. (1966). *Aspects of Political Development*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Ribicoff, A., & Newman, J. (1967). *Politics: The American Way*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Shills, E. (1968). *Alternative Courses of Political Development*. In J. Finkle & R. Gable, *Political Development and Social Change*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Waseem, M. (1997). Political Development and Conflict Resolution in Pakistan [with Comments]. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 36(4), 715-742.
- Weiner, M. (1965). *India: Two Political Cultures*. In Pye L., Levine D., Ward R., Lapalombara J., Rose R., Scott R., et al. (Authors) & Pye L. & Verba S. (Eds.), *Political Culture and Political Development*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Weiner, M. (1965a). Political Integration and Political Development. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 358, 52-64.