

**RESEARCH PAPER****Colonialism and Hybrid Political System: A Case of Pakistan****Dr. Muhammad Younis**

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Forman Christian College University, Lahore, Pakistan, Punjab, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author**

muhammadyounis@fccollege.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of military and bureaucracy on Pakistan's politics by using politics of memory and colonialism as theoretical frameworks to interpret both historical as well as contemporary trajectories. This research seeks to discover how colonial legacies continue to influence contemporary practices of democracy by examining the effects of electoral rigging and military interventions on political stability. Pakistan, despite having some features of democracy, can best be declared a hybrid state where the core institutions like armed forces and bureaucracy predominantly shape and reshape the political and democratic discourse of both the state and the society. On the problems and challenges of hybrid democracy in Pakistan, this research is of the view that the Pakistani political system and democracy have not been decolonized since its inception in 1947. It is therefore strongly recommended that Pakistan should decolonize its political system to establish effective democratic infrastructure.

KEYWORDS Colonialism, Democracy, Hybrid Democracy and Pakistan, Memory Studies**Introduction:**

Pakistan, despite having some trappings of procedural democracy, can best be declared a hybrid state where the core institutions like armed forces, intelligence agencies and bureaucracy predominantly shape and reshape the political and democratic discourse of both the state and the society. Though, constitutionally, elections for the national and provincial governments are to be held regularly after every five years, the election process is marred by the allegations of rigging and foul play, mainly, due to intervention of military- bureaucratic oligarchy, resulting in perpetual political instability and struggling democracy. Political parties, benefiting from rigid elections, in turn, become junior partner with the powerful P military establishment and its intelligence apparatus to maintain an influence on parliamentary politics. This tacit engagement of military establishment in democracy through its political partners, both religious and feudal- a legacy of colonial politics - is later paid off through increased defense budgets, control over foreign policy and the estimation of national security threats. As a result, every democratically elected government in Pakistan faces strategic competition from its own armed forces organizations, feudal and religious politicians and political parties and fails miserably to take over foreign policy, national security policy and international relations. Therefore, hybrid democracy in Pakistan is creating economic instability, economic recession, and poverty, it has already polarized the society on an ethnic and identity basis and the state is facing a continuous national security threat of religiously inspired terrorism. On the problems and challenges of hybrid democracy in Pakistan, this research is of the view that the Pakistani political system and democracy have not been decolonized since its inception in 1947. The state, its political system and political parties are maintaining the colonial politics of British India on ethnic, identity and religious grounds while ignoring the context of an independent Pakistani state and its role in the region and global politics.

The current state of democracy in Pakistan is inspired by the politics of British India and Pakistani politics and constitution have roots in the British colonialism of the Indian subcontinent. Thus, to examine the current state of democracy in Pakistan, the research aims to apply the theoretical frames of politics of memory and colonialism to understand the domestic and global political reasons and conditions that are not allowing the Pakistani state and its society to move ahead towards democracy, the welfare state and human capital development of masses.

Literature Review

The common perception that lies in the notion of hybrid democracy is the coexistence of representative democracy with the dominant authoritarian tendencies, as in the case of Pakistan where democratic tendencies are subordinate to dominant authoritarian culture- a clear manifestation of hybrid political system (Bowler and Glazer 2008). This form of hybrid democracy is the one that gives rise to several opportunities for the state having a healthy integration of both these types, but again it holds negative consequences as well: It can result in the power imbalance, contradictions and resistance between the institutional structures of the state (Garrett 2006).

Democracy in Pakistan constantly experiences direct as well as indirect influence from non-democratic institutions. Theoretically, the power alternation takes place between different political parties, yet it actually revolves around the same non democratic institutions. Over the last two decades or so there has been an inverse relationship between civilian control and civilian liberties (Adeney 2015). Pakistan being on the path of democratic consolidation will be a threat to the power structures, so their tactics to prevent it from happening are gaining strengths day by day, an idea presented by Eqbal Ahmed in his paper many years back, seems relevant to the present situation of Pakistan(Ahmad 1981).

Politics of Memory

This is a theory which has inherent significance in the field of sociology, history,

Anthropology, and political science. This theory considers the usage of the historical concepts a driving instrument of present politics. Collective remembrance is the force underlying the politics of memory. For the purpose of manipulation, those in power draw the past and manipulate it in a way to legitimize their actions or their intensions. They form a relation of it with the events that have occurred developing it into the collective consciousness of the community and further creating credibility for it being added in to the working of the political system. This theory is based on the construction, contestation and transmission of the past. The substantive memories that are conveyed and accepted are the ones carried on and expressed in the state institutions and their own channels that are interactive. Cultural aspects also have a pivotal role in this process of politics of memory. This collective memory can be narrowed down as selective remembering. This notion is deeply intertwined with the power dynamics of a country. They have the power to control and form narratives and justify the system as it suits the power elite. There can be a contestation of several memories that exist and this competition of memories is what forms the social and political conflicts (Verovšek 2016).

Colonialism

This theory is based on the notion of a dominating party taking over a weaker one, which is then followed by the change or adjustment of social, political, economic, and

cultural ideals like that of the ideals opted by the dominating party. This foreign power then has a control over these domains that can have long lasting effect. It is the rule by outsiders over a territory, but not an annexation. It is a long control by the foreign powers like the British Empire. The locals, once a majority there after being colonized turn in to a minority whose mindset is shaped by the foreign powers. There is a direct relationship between the foreign control/power and their scope of settlement in the colony. The larger the control and scope would be; the more entrenched impact it would have. Colonial subjects being limited to menial jobs are deeply entrenched within the system. Another pattern of colonialism is of internal colonialism where there is a commonality between outsiders and locals of the colony, and the dominant and subordinate within a state. It's a new type of oppression carried on through the basis of legitimacy. This can be applicable to USA too (with blacks' discrimination) (Schaefer 2015)

Experts of psychology and culture have also pondered upon the long lasting impact of colonialism (Okazaki, David, and Abelmann 2008). The legacy of colonialism has said to have a greater impact over the wider populations who have encountered colonialism in their past. There have been two types of engagements of colonialism, i) impact on individuals, ii) impact on practice of system of formerly colonized states and their psychology. This has led to the western hegemony in the field.

Material and Methods

This research utilizes secondary sources based on a comprehensive literature review to understand the dynamics of hybrid democracy in Pakistan. The article applies theoretical frameworks of politics of memory and colonialism to analyze how historical legacies impact contemporary political practices. Case study method has also been applied to analyze the electoral rigging and military interventions which provide detailed insights into the mechanisms of political instability. Moreover, comparative analysis with other hybrid democracies highlights common patterns and unique challenges in Pakistan. Document analysis and qualitative data synthesis further explores the understanding of the interplay between political actors and institutions.

Results and Discussion

Synthesis of politics of memory with colonialism (case study of Pakistan): Analysis and discussion:

In terms of the formerly colonized states there is a complex interplay between power dynamics and historical colonial narratives in terms of politics of memory and colonialism impact over the political practices of the state. These two frameworks offer insights into how the memory of colonialism shapes the socio-political landscape of post-colonial nations and influences their economic, cultural, and political trajectories. The synthesis of the politics of memory and colonialism in the context of Pakistan, specifically focusing on the intervention of military and bureaucratic institutions, reveals a multifaceted interplay that has significantly shaped the country's political landscape and collective memory. The colonial legacy in Pakistan has had a lasting impact on power structures and institutions. The bureaucratic machinery established during British colonial rule continues to influence governance and decision-making processes. Military institutions, originally established by the British, have played a significant role in shaping political dynamics. Military's interventions in Pakistan's political affairs have resulted in the creation of counter-memories that challenge the dominant narrative of democratic progress. Coups, martial law, and military rule have left a mark on the collective memory, leading to conflicting interpretations of Pakistan's political history. And it has in a way

legitimized the intervention of these state institutions. The presence of non-democratic actors and their interventions can contribute to political polarization, which was a means of the British control to be deeply entrenched within the subcontinent too. The memory of economic exploitation during colonial times informs economic policies aimed at self-reliance and development this is then filled in by the political and military elite of Pakistan. The bureaucratic military nexus reveals a complex narrative that shapes the country's identity, governance, foreign relations, and socio-economic development. The selective remembering of colonial struggles, along with the memory of military rule and democratic aspirations, contributes to an ongoing contestation of narratives that influence political dynamics and collective memory in the country.

Post-structuralism challenges the idea that language, culture, and society can be understood through fixed and stable structures, and instead emphasizes the fluidity, and complexity of these phenomena. Post-structuralism employs deconstruction as a method of analysis. It aims to expose the underlying power dynamics and complexities that are often concealed by traditional structures. Post-structuralists explore the relationship between power and knowledge. They argue that knowledge is not neutral or objective but is influenced by power structures. Knowledge production is examined for how it can be used to legitimize certain perspectives while marginalizing others, also a concept of Foucault (Rouse n.d.). While post-structuralism highlights the ways in which power operates, it also emphasizes the potential for agency and resistance. Individuals and groups can challenge dominant discourses and meanings, leading to social change(Lämmert 2001).

Decolonization Failure (Internal Colonialism)

Many of the colonies that failed to achieve statehood were of limited territorial significance within the colonial empires. Their smaller size and strategic location made them vulnerable to being merged or incorporated into larger entities. Some amalgamations aimed at restoring or reconstituting earlier national or colonial entities. These attempts often sought to reunify territories that had been divided under colonial rule, reflecting the challenges of creating cohesive states out of historically separated or sectioned regions. Colonies that were incorporated into the administrative structures of the colonial powers faced a continuation of their subordinate status. This incorporation recognized the evolving national relationships of the late colonial era and extended them into the post-colonial period. Separatist movements that arose within merged or incorporated entities were frequently put down by the incorporating state using coercive force. This use of force hampered efforts to create truly independent states. In general terms, the international community opposed changes to post-independence borders and frequently opposed separatist efforts. Even when formal colonial rule came to an end, some areas continued to fight for independence. Aspirations for more autonomy or independence were further stoked by the revival of democracy and the awareness of social and economic inequalities. In a nutshell, internal colonialism persisted as a result of the failure of decolonization in some circumstances, when areas continued to be subject to or merged into larger political formations. This failure was caused by the decisions taken by colonial powers and the international community, as well as a complex interaction of historical, geopolitical, and social circumstances. Internal colonialism continues to provide difficulties, highlighting the complexity of post-colonial state building and the effects of colonial-era divisions (Christopher 2002).

The growth of democratic welfare states and the development of human capital may be significantly impacted if decolonization in some areas fails. This is particularly evident in the context of South Asia (Sengupta 2019). Uneven development between

different regions within a newly decolonized state, as seen in the case of East and West Pakistan, can hinder the establishment of a democratic welfare state. When one region experiences faster economic growth and infrastructure development than another, it can lead to disparities in access to education, healthcare, and other essential services. This inequality undermines the principles of a welfare state, which aims to provide social and economic well-being to all citizens. Decolonization can create new minority groups and identities, as demonstrated by the emergence of "Bihari Muslims" in Bangladesh. Identity-based conflicts and struggles for recognition can divert resources and attention away from human capital development and the establishment of a functioning welfare state. Social divisions and conflicts can cause hindrance in terms of cooperation and consensus-building needed for democratic governance. Continuities of colonial-era institutions and bureaucratic structures in the newly independent states have influenced the trajectory of democratic development in Pakistan. If these institutions perpetuate inequalities or lack mechanisms for citizen participation, they may hinder the establishment of a responsive and accountable democratic welfare state.

The failure to fully decolonizing the political system in Pakistan has hindered the country's progress towards becoming a democratic welfare state and achieving comprehensive human capital development. This can be observed through various aspects of Pakistan's history and governance, including its military and bureaucracy. Ayesha Jalal's analysis suggests that the creation of Pakistan was driven by strategic motives rather than solely serving the interests of Indian Muslims (Daechsel 2017)

. This perspective implies that the decolonization process did not lead to a clear and principled formulation of the state's goals. The resulting ambiguity and strategic assumptions may have contributed to an incomplete transition towards a democratic welfare state. Political instability has been worsened by frequent changes in power brought on by military interventions as well as democratic transitions. The continuation of programs to create human capital and build a robust welfare state has been hampered by this transitory way (Bose 2017)

British Politics in the Subcontinent

Spodek et al. (1979) describe British politics in the Indian subcontinent as a complex administrative and political matrix imposed by the British colonial rulers. The British expansion into various regions, such as Madras, Calcutta, and Bombay, led to the establishment of an administrative system that gradually incorporated upper India, South India, and western India. The British initially encouraged Indian participation in the lower ranks of the civil service, but higher-level decision-making remained under British control. While some viceroys, like Lord Ripon, started involving Indians in the formal decision-making process and local elected government after the 1858 revolt, many continued to view educated Indians with skepticism and employed them primarily to save costs. The British maintained control over critical areas such as defense, foreign affairs, and the treasury from their New Delhi enclave. The policy of devolution of power in the 20th century, due to external pressures from world wars and economic depression, granted greater power to provincial administrations governed by Indian officials. However, ultimate control still rested with the imperial government.

In analyzing British politics in the Indian subcontinent, it is evident that the British introduced a hierarchical administrative structure that aimed to consolidate their control. They selectively involved Indians in governance at lower levels while retaining decisive authority over crucial matters. The British employed Indians in administrative roles, often for economic reasons, and controlled the central aspects of power. This pattern of British

politics in the subcontinent shares some similarities with how power was wielded and decisions were made in Pakistan's early years after independence. In Pakistan, the military played a significant role in politics and governance, often overshadowing civilian governments. Just as the British initially allowed Indian participation in the lower ranks of the civil service, the military in Pakistan held substantial

Complex interplay in Pakistan: A theoretical approach

Ray (1989) examines the complex relationships between Pakistani politics, politics of memory, colonialism, and democracy and the post-structuralist paradigm. He explores the historical details that shaped Pakistan's political structure, the role of the military-bureaucratic elite or nexus, and the difficulties civilian administrations have in establishing political power. The governing elite's historical recollections of battles with India and the army's hegemony are also emphasized in terms of determining their strength by posing a war threat from the neighbors,

The study by (Ahmed and Tamoor 2021) shows how traditionalists and modernists interact within Pakistan's elite, reflecting a binary conflict. This dichotomy would be deconstructed by post-structuralism, which emphasizes that these categories are variable and dependent on historical, cultural, and discursive contexts rather than being rigid or stable. The categories of "traditionalists" and "modernists" are constructed through discourse and may overlap or shift over time. It discusses the "two nation-theory" as the basis for Pakistan's demand for a separate state. Post-structuralism would emphasize the role of language in constructing identities and meanings. The concept of the "two nation-theory" is not an inherent truth but a discursive construct that has been shaped and interpreted by various scholars and actors. Different interpretations of this theory lead to diverse understandings of Pakistan's formation. A post-structuralist analysis would highlight how colonialism produced fluid and shifting identities, where the interaction between colonizers and colonized led to hybrid identities and cultural entanglements. The power dynamics between colonizers and colonized were not fixed but evolved over time, influencing the formation of the postcolonial state. Post-structuralism would analyze how the politics of memory and identity are constructed and contested in Pakistan. The text mentions the struggle to establish a unified national identity and the clash of religious ideas. Applying the principles of Post-structuralism it would emphasize how memory is selective and subject to manipulation, and how different groups compete for control over historical narratives to legitimize their positions as seen in the politics of Pakistan too.

Coming towards the analysis of the above articles and relating to our RQ2, applying a post-structuralist approach to analyze the complex interplay of politics of memory, colonialism, and democracy in Pakistan requires examining how these concepts are constructed, contested, and negotiated/tested within discourses and power relations. Post-structuralism emphasizes the fluidity of meaning, the role of language, and the ways in which knowledge is produced.

Post-structuralism challenges the notion of a fixed, stable historical memory. In the context of Pakistan, the politics of memory involves the contestation of historical narratives, especially related to the partition and the creation of the state. Different actors, such as the state, non-democratic actors, religious groups, and marginalized communities, engage in a struggle to construct and control historical memory to legitimize their positions.

Post-structuralism as explained in the section of theoretical framework highlights that memory is not a neutral representation of the past but is constructed through

discourses and power relations. In Pakistan, conflicting narratives, such as the state's insistence on a single national identity versus the varied experiences and memories of distinct communities, impact how people remember the separation. These disagreements demonstrate how memory is a source of political conflict rather than an objective reality.

Through an examination of the discourses and ideas that resulted from colonial interactions, post-structuralism seeks to understand how colonialism has shaped the present. In post-colonial cultures, the effects of colonialism on identity, knowledge creation, and governance are still felt, influencing social hierarchies and power relations.

Post-structural analysis demonstrates that colonialism's remains are still present in Pakistan in a number of ways, such as the bureaucratic-military nexus and the hybridity of institutions. Present-day power dynamics are influenced by the establishment of hierarchies and the elevation of specific cultural and political norms throughout colonialism. The negotiation of colonial and indigenous aspects led to Pakistan's hybrid state structure and identity.

The essentialist view of democracy is called into question by post-structuralism, which also emphasizes how democracy is intertwined with discourses of power and exclusion. Democracy is a fluid idea that is frequently used to reinforce existing hierarchies through manipulation, interpretation, and debate.

In Pakistan, a post-structuralist analysis of democracy reveals that its practice is shaped by underlying power dynamics and historical context. The tension between democratic ideals and the intervention of non-elected institutions (military, bureaucracy) exemplifies how democracy is navigated within complex power relations. The interpretation of democracy is not universal; it varies across different social groups and political actors, so it is contextualized.

Complex Interplay: Applying a post-structuralist approach, the interplay between politics of memory, colonialism, and democracy in Pakistan becomes a dynamic process of decision-making, negotiation, and contestation. The politics of memory are deeply entwined with colonial legacies, influencing the construction of national identity and the practice of democracy. Colonialism's impact on memory and governance shapes the very understanding of democracy, leading to a complex and multifaceted interplay.

Stagnated Political and Economic System of Pakistan

The theoretical frameworks of politics of memory and colonialism are relevant when exploring the reasons behind the stagnated and complex economic and political system of Pakistan (Croissant 2004)

Understanding how colonial institutions and policies have influenced Pakistan's socio-political landscape requires a post-colonial perspective that is mentioned/stated by colonialism theory. Colonial control is responsible for the persistence of authoritarianism, hybrid state architectures, and the entrenchment of military and bureaucratic elites. Certain political institutions and power relationships that were introduced during the colonial era still have an impact on how Pakistan's democracy operates. When examining the problems Pakistan's democracy is facing, the idea of politics of memory is relevant. The article addresses the rise of extreme Islamist organizations as well as racial and religious problems. The complexity of social cohesion and identity can be appreciated by looking at these challenges through the lens of contested memory and identity, where historical narratives, collective memories, and cultural narratives all play a role. The concept of a

defective democracy is highlighted in the article, when formal democratic practices coexist with autocratic traits. Here, a post-structuralist strategy emphasizing hybridity is appropriate. A hybrid political and institutional landscape has been influenced by the colonial legacy, which is characterized by a fusion of Western and indigenous ideas due to the hegemony in the world order and the power structure. This hybrid nature (modernity) is seen in the conflicts between various ideologies, such as secularism and Islamism. Understanding the mixed nature of political and cultural components is important in explaining the difficulties in constructing a democracy that is completely functional.

Developmental trajectories of any state (like in our case Pakistan) are still influenced by the historical memory of colonial exploitation and its effects on class relations, resource distribution, and state-building (Khan 2018). The politics of memory, encompassing historical narratives and collective memories of class struggles, colonial resistance, and social movements, shapes contemporary power dynamics. The memory of past class conflicts and struggles informs the present relationship between different social classes and their interactions with state institutions. The politics of memory framework aids in the analysis of how the historical patterns of land ownership, inequities between rural and urban areas, and class-based identities affect institutional changes and development results. By examining how different social classes remember and contest historical events like land reforms, nationalization, and changes in economic policies, a politics of memory method can give light on how these events affect future development trajectories. By including these theoretical frameworks, it is easier to see why Pakistan's political and economic structure has stalled and grown complex and multifaceted.

The research examined that Pakistan's hybrid democracy is deeply rooted in colonial legacies and sustained influence of military and bureaucratic institutions. The theoretical framework of politics of memory and colonialism provides the basis for the analysis showing how past power relations and narratives still affect present governance as well as political dynamics. While the dynamics of the alliance between classes and the nexus between core institutions of the state and their access to resources still bear a strong legacy of colonial exploitation and resistance resulting in a grounded process of internal colonies persistence. This study illustrates how the military in politics continues to prevail in complex power relations with civilian leadership which in turns hinders the establishment of a potent welfare democratic state. In sum, this research emphasizes the need to decolonize both Pakistan's society and political system and find the ways to improve them.

Conclusion

As analyzed through the theoretical frameworks of politics of memory and colonialism, Pakistan's hybrid democracy's complex and multifaceted nature gives a comprehensive view of the nation's political and economic issues. These frameworks are combined to provide insight into the complex interplay of historical narratives, power relationships, and institutional legacies that continue to influence Pakistan's course. Since the beginning of the political system, colonial-era hierarchies and power structures have persisted as a result of the failure to properly decolonize it, but it has formed a new form of internal colonialism. The dynamics between social classes and the allocation of resources are influenced by the memory of colonial exploitation and resistance, which is interlinked with modern politics. The hybrid structure of Pakistan's institutions and political beliefs demonstrate the colonial legacy's impact on identity and governance, which adds to the difficulties in constructing a coherent and inclusive democratic government. The military's historical involvement and continued impact on Pakistani politics serve as an example of the complicated power relations that exist within the hybrid democracy. The post-

structuralist paradigm emphasizes how language shapes identities and political narratives and how meaning can change over time. A stable democratic welfare state cannot be established because of the contestation of historical memory and the conflict of opposing views.

The need to investigate the dynamic link between institutions and social classes is emphasized by the synthesis of theoretical frameworks. This interaction affects how development proceeds and strengthens the notion that no one element alone can adequately be held accountable for the complexity of Pakistan's hybrid democracy. To conclude, the application of the colonialism and politics of memory frameworks deepens our understanding of the causes of Pakistan's complex political and economic issues, laying the groundwork for thoughtful analysis and offering potential avenues for progress.

Recommendations

To address the complexities of Pakistan's hybrid democracy, it is crucial to strengthen the autonomy and integrity of democratic institutions by reducing military and bureaucratic interference in the politics. Implementing decolonization efforts to dismantle colonial-era hierarchies can foster a more inclusive political system. In addition, promoting historical reconciliation through dialogues and educational reforms can help harmonize conflicting narratives. Empowering civil society to actively participate in governance and focusing on equitable resource distribution will mitigate internal colonialism effects and promote social cohesion.

References

- Adeney, Katharine. (2015). "How to Understand Pakistan's Hybrid Regime: The Importance of a Multidimensional Continuum." *Democratization* 24 (1): 119-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2015.1110574>.
- Ahmad, Eqbal. (1981). "The Neo-Fascist State: Notes on the Pathology of Power in the Third World." *Arab Studies Quarterly* 3 (2): 170-80. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41854902>.
- Ahmed, Raja Qaiser, and Maryum Tamoor. (2021). "State Formation and the Postcolonial Decay in Pakistan." *Asian Journal of Social Science* 49 (1): 9-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajss.2020.10.002>.
- Bose, Neilesh. (2017). "Decolonization and South Asian Studies: Pakistan, 'Failure,' and the Promise of Area Studies." *South Asian Review* 38 (3): 43-49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02759527.2017.12023345>.
- Bowler, Shaun, and Amihai Glazer. (2008). "'Hybrid Democracy' and Its Consequences." *Direct Democracy's Impact on American Political Institutions*, 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230612020_1.
- Christopher, A.J. (2002). "Decolonisation without Independence." *GeoJournal* 56 (3): 213-24. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41147687>.
- Croissant, Aurel. (2004). "From Transition to Defective Democracy: Mapping Asian Democratization." *Democratization* 11 (5): 156-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510340412331304633>.
- Daechsel, Markus. (2017). "Ayesha Jalal. The Struggle for Pakistan: A Muslim Homeland and Global Politics. Aqil Shah. The Army and Democracy: Military Politics in Pakistan." *The American Historical Review* 122 (1): 155-57. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/122.1.155>.
- Garrett, Elizabeth. (2006). "Oklahoma Law Review Oklahoma Law Review Fifth Annual Henry Lecture: The Promise and Perils of Hybrid Democracy Democracy." *Oklahoma Law Review* 59 (1): 1-15.
- Khan, Danish. (2018). "Re-Conceptualizing Processes of Post-Colonial Development in Pakistan: The Interplay of Institutions and Class WORKINGPAPER SERIES Number 447 Updated from an Earlier Version."
- Lämmert, Eberhard. (2001). "Structuralism, Post-Structuralism and New Hermeneutics." *MANUSYA* 4 (1): 53-67. <https://doi.org/10.1163/26659077-00401005>.
- Okazaki, Sumie, E. J. R. David, and Nancy Abelmann. (2008). "Colonialism and Psychology of Culture." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2 (1): 90-106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00046.x>.
- Ray, Aswini K. (1989). "Pakistan's Post-Colonial Democracy: Implications for Indo-Pak Relations." *Economic and Political Weekly* 24 (16): 866-68. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4394701>.

- Schaefer, Richard T. (2015). "Minorities." Edited by James D. Wright. ScienceDirect. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Sengupta, Anwesha. (2019). "Decolonization in South Asia." *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Imperialism and Anti-Imperialism*,
- Spodek, Howard, Christopher John Baker, C. A. Bayly, Judith M. Brown, John Gallagher, Gordon Johnson, Anil Seal, et al. (1979). "Pluralist Politics in British India: The Cambridge Cluster of Historians of Modern India." *The American Historical Review* 84 (3): 688. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1855403>.
- Verovšek, Peter J. (2016). "Collective Memory, Politics, and the Influence of the Past: The Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4 (3): 529-43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2016.1167094>.