CHAPTER – 2

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Conceptualization must precede operationalization. Before we proceed to operationalize the concept of political development in the context of Southeast Asia in general and Malaysia in particular, its meaning, dimensions and implications should be clear to us. Despite its abundant usage and relevance, the concept of political development has long been in a state of confusion and defies general agreement over its meaning. No doubt, any value-loaded term will lack commonly agreed definition but what makes this concept unique is its innumerable applications by the political scientists to suit the different, often diverse objectives. Sometimes, it is identified with its causes, sometimes with its consequences, at others with the correlates or even some peripheral aspects of the general process of development. Is the concept grounded in normative reasoning or just empirical, or both? Whether political development is dependent or independent variable, viz., is it upon development in some other spheres of society or having some momentum of its own? Can some definable universal patterns or stages of the process be identified? Is it unilinear or multilinear process?

The state of confusion was so high and agreement elusive that it led to call for an abandonment of the concept of political development by Huntington, one of the best known authorities in the field. He argued that the concept neither integrated a body of related concepts nor distinguished one aspect of political reality from another.¹ His recent work, Understanding Political Development² begins with an

---

acknowledgement of the variety of definitions of political development, which have confused the state of affairs. However, he himself fails to attempt a precise definition of political development. Eckstein, while unable develop the refined framework himself, admits that the present literature on political development simply does not represent "developmental inquiry properly." Ann Ruth Willner argues that political development studies have failed to throw a clear light on the nature of traditional polities and these also fail to relate the theories of politics in the third world to the established traditions of scholarship in comparative government in the west. Therefore, the concept of political development is in a state of underdevelopment. However, the confusion and the difficulties associated with the diversity of definitions and applications and the underdevelopment of the 'development' framework do not call for abandonment, but the refinement of the concept. Even the best known authority on the concept, Lucian Pye, before evolving the characteristics of political development, which came to occupy a central place in the succeeding literature on political development, surveyed a number of definitions and pointed out their deficiencies to clear the confusion and generate an agreement behind his conceptualization. He surveyed the following themes with which the concept is occasionally identified: Political development as the prerequisite of economic development; political development as the politics typical of industrial societies;

political development as political modernization; as the operations of a nation-state; as administrative and legal development; as mass mobilization and participation; as the building of democracy; as stability and orderly change; as mobilization and power; and, as one aspect of a multidimensional process of social change.\(^6\)

The difficulty in conceptualizing development is partly due to the obsession of the western scholars with fact-value dichotomy to circumvent or disguise the normative aspects of political development. The failure to recognize adequately its normative grounding has only blurred the proper understanding of the concept and stifled its growth. As “development” itself is a value-loaded term, the social scientists disagree over what development is or what does it entail. Is it economic development in terms of growth of output per head of population or economic development in terms of reduction in inequalities and benefits to the marginal and dispossessed? Is it growth first or equity first? Is it merely the application of modern technology or adoption of essentially rational and secular ways of thought and action?

Before studying development in any human sphere in its empirical aspects, there should be some clear-cut conception of what development entails in that field, how is it related with the idea of “good” and “progress” in that field? While considering “good” or “progress,” the criteria of relevance and judgement necessarily creep in, which emanates from the values of the researcher viz. what he holds as morally more desirable under the given set of circumstances. Such idea of “good” or “progress” may be arrived at through the empirical generalizations, too. However, it still involves the preference of certain values over others. Whether we mean by development higher energy consumption levels or higher per-capita income growth or

reduction in inequalities or the satisfaction of basic needs or increase in choice, it is clear that we prefer some values as more desirable over others and we do it in accordance with our conception of "good" viz. what is morally desirable or relevant in a given set of circumstances. Any concept of development necessarily involves some normative choice.

Any change occurring in a polity can be considered political development only when we add some idea of increase in value accompanying that change. Now, increase in value towards what? This brings us to the question of goals of political development. Without having some conception of the goals toward which the political system is supposed to move, how can we relate the direction of change or rate of change to the political development? Still, the concept of political development as a process is distinguishable from its goals. Here we do not confuse goals with some absolute end-state or fixed-state or a fully developed state towards which the political system should move. By doing so, we hereby clear the concept of political development – as it has been used for specific and limited purpose and scope in the western empirical traditions of last four decades – from the philosophical traditions in search for ideal types. The scope of present study is limited and it is theoretically untenable, too, as it focuses upon political change in its empirical aspects.

By goals we mean just the operation and realization of certain principles or values that have been found to be conducive to the ends of collective life or organized human living, such as order, liberty, equity, stability, justice, harmony, unity etc. The
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8. The philosophers like Plato, Rousseau etc. were not concerned with the process in its empirical aspects. They constructed the blueprints of 'models' on the basis of deductive reasoning which may be classified as 'politically developed' by applying relevant standards, but the concept of political development, as a tool to study the process of positive or desired change, can’t be applied to these models.
concept of political development in its application must be able to locate precisely the
development of some conceptually specific thing, which for analytic purposes we
identify as goals of political development in the present study. Thus, it can be
conclusively said that political development as a concept is normative as well as
empirical. It is normative in answering the question as to ‘what should develop?’ The
concept is empirical in the sense of dealing with the question ‘Is it developing?’ or
‘How/why is it developing?’

**Western bias**

By taking the position of value-neutrality, the western scholars either eschew
values or put a premium on the practices and culture of the western democracies as
those models provide an immediate background to select, focus and judge upon the
relevant variables. Under the influence of the systems analysis, they do not take
position on values, thus, fail to develop some notion of goals before undertaking the
study of change.\(^9\) While justification and advocacy of the formal governmental
processes and institutions of the west is implicit in their writings, they remain,
sometimes, oblivious of the significance and efficacy of traditional or local
institutions and values associated with developing countries in pursuit of creative
realization of their developmental goals. We have to keep into account the peculiar
cultural and historical traditions of each country along with its stage of development
and its capacity for absorption, while looking at its developmental process under a
normative framework.
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When ‘area specialization studies’ were undertaken by some political scientists, those were not grounded well enough in normative theorizing on the basis of which the direction and the pattern of change could be suggested for transitional societies. Instead the efforts were concentrated on the stabilization of the governmental processes in these countries so as to keep them safe from radical threats, like communism. Political development came to mean as Robert Packenham puts it, an “anti-communist pro-American political stability.” Wiarda argues that political development approach was set forth to counter the Marxist appeal to the developing countries. They were even prepared to accept the authoritarian ways of the government and curtailment of freedoms, if strong governments were needed to maintain stability and order, and stave off communism.

The concept of political development is extremely useful and holds great promise. Not only it is capable of bringing normative political theory into closer relation with empirical political theory, but also opening up new vistas which have perplexed the minds of political thinkers from Plato and Aristotle to Pye and Huntington. However, no denying the fact that the concept has been generally used for narrow objectives.

13. The authoritarian regimes in southeast Asia except Indo-China were tacitly supported by the United States and the West just because they proclaimed to be fighting against the communists on their home turfs. The authoritarian regimes in Thailand, Philippines and Indonesia which had usurped political power after scuttling the democratic process were supported on this count. In Indonesia, even the massacre of nearly half a million communists and their allies by the Armed Forces under Suharto’s de facto rule was alleged to be carried with the diplomatic support of the United States.
Confusion between Political Development and Economic Development

As we scan through the literature, we find that political development is often confused with economic development. It is interesting that frequent references are found as to the criteria by which a politically developed system can be identified but not enough consideration of the process or the stages by which a traditional or transitional society can achieve the conditions necessary for a fairly developed polity. The literature does not throw enough light on the dynamics of political change from less to more developed polity. And when the efforts to identify such dynamics or stages were made, they pointed in the direction of economic development, not political development.

W.W. Rostow made one of the earliest efforts in this direction. He identified three stages of economic growth and certain political preconditions in terms of institutions as well as culture for the economy to take off.14 J.J. Spengler talked about the political preconditions of economic development and then showed their interrelations by extending his analysis to the political consequences of economic development.15 He identified what he regarded as the minimum political preconditions of economic development and proceeded to show the changes that take place in these preconditions as economic development occurs. Later, Ward and Rustow dealt with the problem of stages of political development. What is required, according to them, is

...a large measure of understanding of how societies which are, in a relative sense at least, considered advanced came to achieve their present levels of economic social and political "development." Are there regularities to be found among their

several developmental experiences? Are there discernible stages or sequences of change through which all or some tend to pass? Or at least do they face similar problems or crises and do these occur in some regular sort of sequence?\(^1\)

Ward & Rustow delineated the sequence of political modernization in Japan and Turkey but did not conceptualize the process nor did they try to understand their developmental sequence under some conceptual framework. How it could be applied to the other polities. At the most, they specified some of the crises, which these countries overcame and which other countries also have to overcome in the process of development. Pye describes these crises as crises of identity, legitimacy, penetration, participation, integration and distribution.\(^2\) He suggests that in England these crises occurred in the sequence of their listing above, but that in other countries, they may occur in a different order. These crises are easier to solve if they come one at a time, but become more difficult to cope with if several come together as being experienced by the developing countries.

The argument is further advanced by Kenneth Organski’s book, *Stages of Political Development*.\(^3\) Despite the promise of its title, Organski fails to provide a foolproof theory of stages in political development as he is concerned with a set of economic problems (crises) faced by developing polities. Starting with a theory of stages of economic growth, drawn from the work of Rostow, Organski focuses upon political preconditions that are required for the solution of the problems that occur at each of the stages of *political unification, industrialization, national welfare,* and *abundance*. During the first stage, national government gains effective political and
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administrative control over its population and resources. Without such control, economic development on modern lines is impossible. Organski argues that all policies designed to encourage economic growth through industrialization are bound to fail in the absence of adequate level of integration and penetration in the polity.19 Pre-modern European states were able to achieve such unification, but contemporary non-western plural societies are still struggling with this stage of development. It, thus, appears that the first three crises discussed by Pye also involve this stage of political unification, namely the crises of identity, legitimacy, and penetration.

During the second stage of development, according to Organski, the governments have to make possible the accumulation of capital, which may involve great social cost. He believes that historically speaking three different patterns of government have proved successful in solving the problems of industrialization: the bourgeois (i.e., Western democratic), the Stalinist (i.e., communist rule in the USSR in 1930s), and the “syncratic” (i.e., fascist polities, as in Germany, Italy and Spain).20 Organski suggests that quite different political systems may be able to solve a crucial economic crisis of development. Therefore, his analysis appears to show his concern towards economic development, not towards political development. The stage of national welfare arises only after the industrial revolution, and involves problems of wider distribution of power as well as consumer goods and services. The crisis of distribution and welfare in Organski’s scheme have corresponding relation with the crises of participation, integration, and distribution as listed by Pye. However, by linking political development with industrialization and national welfare, he shows his western bias and scant disregard for the resilience and capacity of the developing

polities in chalking out their independent course of political development. Organski’s final stage is that of abundance where people begin to achieve high standards of material affluence. This is the standard towards which the western societies are ushering in.

No doubt, political development and economic development are mutually reinforcing in most cases. Political development is precursor as well as consequence of economic development. Both the processes are required to sustain each other in the long run. However, at initial stage political development may take place with low level of economic development or economic development may take place without political development. It must be pointed out that political development is not entirely a dependent variable and it can take its own course irrespective of the level of the changes occurring in other spheres of society but in the long run the processes of socio-economic development certainly go a long way in sustaining the process of political development. For example, in the United States in a single stroke, the polity was democratized and changes in other spheres followed in a gradual manner but later both the processes of political and economic development supported and reinforced each other. While in the Western European countries, particularly in England, the political changes were primarily induced by the socio-economic development, which took place in the wake of industrial revolution. Still, for analytical purposes, at least, the two are independent variables to an extent, and distinguishable from each other.

21. As the research will prove later particularly in case of Southeast Asia that economic development may take place in the absence of political development. On the other hand the United States is the classic case of political development preceding economic development, while India in nearer the case of political development preceding economic development.
Political Modernization

Writers like Rustow, Ward and Organski also confuse political modernization with political development. Even refined writers like Pye, Almond and Huntington have contributed to this confusion. And modernization by them is easily identified with Westernization or the application of technology. When Ward and Rustow\(^\text{22}\) enumerate the features like differentiated and specific system of government, high degree of integration with governmental system; rational and secular procedures for making political decisions; popular identification with national identity of state; mass participation etc., these characteristics can be associated with any modernized polity but not exhaustively with politically developed system. Organski does not have any conception of the goals of political development still he uses the concept non-discriminately to account for pursuing goals of economic development. He should have instead use the term political modernization if he was just merely concerned about certain political preconditions necessary to achieve the tasks of economic development.

Before we proceed further, let us get a clear picture of what we mean by political modernization. As modernization is a process of directing and controlling the social consequences of change, utilization of resources on a large scale, increased role differentiation and organizational complexity in a society, political modernization would stand for transformation and adaptation of political institutions, processes and roles in response to the changes in socio-economic and physical environment. Or we can say that the political system is just tuned or adapted to the changes in society. Modernization, in its historical sense is, in the words of Eisenstadt, “the process of
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\(^{22}\) Ward and Rustow, \textit{op.cit.} pp. 6-7.
change towards those types of social, economic and political systems that have
developed in Western Europe and North America from the seventeenth century to the
nineteenth and twentieth centuries to the South American, Asian and African
continents. Cyril Black would regard a society as modern when it is capable of
adapting its “historically evolved institutions to the rapidly changing functions that
reflect the unprecedented increase in man’s knowledge, permitting control over his
environment that accompanied the scientific revolution.”

The advanced industrial nations of the West have set the pace and pattern of
modernization and for many the goal before the developing societies is just to emulate
the West. As Pye puts it,

...almost all conscious attempts to further political development have focused on strengthening the formal organs of government. Under colonization the common test of political development centred on precisely the advancement of administrative rule, and since the end of the colonial period American foreign aid assistance has also largely concentrated on this same aspect of political development.

David Apter presents a complex but intriguing theory of stages and alternate paths of political development in the larger framework of modernization. In the West, modernization occurred as a result of the twin processes of industrialization and commercialization, but in many non-western areas modernization has been a result of commercialization and bureaucracy, rather than industrialization.

Political modernization is a relatively technical process. The political scientists commit error in using the two concepts interchangeably and often they use the
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27 Ibid, pp. 43-44.
concept of political development for political change without first conceiving properly the goals in direction of which change should be measured. They should instead use the term ‘political modernization’ in such case. This argument is simply suggested as a plea for more conscious as well as cautious use and application of the concept of political development.

Capabilities Approach

Another narrow conceptualization of political development can be discerned in its identification with the capabilities or the performance of specific functions by the political system and therefore with the effectiveness and the dominance of the ruling elite and mechanisms. Some writers are just content with illustrating a list of functions, which a political system has to perform satisfactorily to be considered as developed. This kind of model is useless from the point of view application of the concept of political development to the transitional societies. To what degree and rate, a transitional society should perform these functions the model is unable to answer. Political development can’t be defined in terms of functions of the state, which any well-functioning polity, otherwise also will perform. Our concern is with change, the process of positive change – its rate, pace, stages, patterns, dimensions, direction and goals. Mehden listed thirteen criteria of a developed political system but quite reasonably rejected this line of argument as a useful basis for the study of development politics.29

28 Howard Wriggins in a paper presented at a conference on the theme “Research Needs for Development Assistance Programmes,” undertook to spell out some of the functions performed by governments in the more developed polities. He suggested that to the extent that any state was unable to fulfill these functions, it was politically underdeveloped. The paper entitled “Foreign Assistance and Political Development” was published in Robert E. Asher et al., Development of the Emerging Countries: An Agenda for Research, Brookings Institution, Washington, 1962, pp. 39-44; 41.
A very comprehensive and sophisticated scheme of functions and capabilities was suggested by Almond. In 1963, he proposed a new theoretical framework designed to relate the concept of political system as studied under structural-functional framework to the problems of political change. The transitional societies could not be studied fruitfully in the absence of such framework. All political systems. Almond argues, must acquire the capability to solve four sets of problems: 

1. Integrative capability – the creation of national unity and centralized bureaucracy,
2. International accommodative capability,
3. Participation capability – creation of a political culture of civic obligation and of a democratic political structure,
4. Welfare or distribution capability – widespread dissemination of welfare standards and accommodation between political and social structures.

Two years later, Almond wrote another essay in which he came out with a comprehensive developmental framework for the study of political systems, which in his opinion could sufficiently account for the changes in a political system. Almond heavily borrowed from sociology and anthropology. He talked of three types of broad categories of functions, which in a more or less degree every political system performs, namely, conversion functions (a modified version of input – output analysis of David Easton), capabilities (extractive, regulative, distributive, symbolic and responsive functions) and system-maintenance and adaptation functions. The concept of capabilities is relevant political development. Almond applies this concept as a way of characterizing the performance of the political system and of changes in

performance and of comparing political systems according to their performance.\textsuperscript{32} He hopes that it can help measure the development of a political system. To the extent that these capabilities are the functional requisites of any system i.e. to say every system has to possess these capabilities in a more or less degree to keep moving, they appear merely classification of functions. But to characterize the development of a political system, Almond makes the point,

\ldots capability refers to performance and has to be separated from the institutions and agencies involved in the performance. To relate the institutions and structures to performance is one of the central problems of political analysis, and we ought not to confuse rates of performance with the means or instruments of performance.\textsuperscript{32}

His Capabilities' analysis may be very useful from the point of view of knowing the actual working of any political system but not from the point of view of gauging full scope of political development. The analysis is very useful from the point of view of maintenance and stability of the system, but it is narrow from the angle of developmental analysis. It seems that Almond introduced Capabilities' analysis in his scheme mainly to offset the criticism of his structural-functional approach that was criticized as too static and status quoist treating political system as a dependent variable whose contours were determined by social, psychological, cultural and economic factors. It just processed inputs generated by these forces converting them into governmental outputs. Therefore some additional intrinsic capabilities were needed by the political system to meet the challenges of development.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid. pp. 182-5.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., p. 199.
The Development Syndrome

The notion of capacity of the political system is also introduced by Pye in conceptualizing political development but in a much more inclusive sense. Although Pye does not indulge in any philosophical construct, he reaches his conclusions by generalizing the different viewpoints on the subject. Nonetheless, he comes closer to the goal. Therefore, his ideas require a careful and detailed analysis. In an article in 1965 Pye articulated three themes which he concluded run across the literature on political development as (1) a general spirit or attitude towards equality which involves equality before law, achievement standards of performance and popular involvement in political activities, (2) an increase in the capacity and capability of political system to manage and control its affairs which means the magnitude, effectiveness and efficiency of the governmental performance, and (3) increased differentiation and specialization, and integration of political structures. In the Introduction to his volume on political culture, the same year, Pye elucidates.

The key elements of political development involve, first, with respect to the population as a whole, a change from widespread subject status to an increasing number of contributing citizens, with an accompanying spread of mass participation, a greater sensitivity to the principles of equality, and a wider acceptance of universalistic laws. Second, with respect to governmental and general systemic performance, political development involves an increase in the capacity of the political system to manage public affairs, control controversy, and cope with popular demands. Finally, with respect to the organization of the polity, political development implies greater structural differentiation, greater functional specificity, and greater integration of all the participating institutions and organizations.35

Pye’s advice was to search for the characteristics of equality, capacity and differentiation in a political system under study and measure the degree of advancement of these characteristics to gauge the level of political development. He recognizes the problem of harmonizing these characteristics as all three may not advance simultaneously or at the same rate. At particular stages of their realization, they may come into conflict with each other. For instance demands for equality may undermine the capacity of the system or the use of authority may impair the levels of equality. The problem is more characterized of the developing societies, particularly at their intermediate levels of development. Pye concludes.

... development is clearly not unilinear nor is it governed by sharp and distinct stages, but rather by a range of problems that may arise separately or concurrently. In seeking to pattern these different courses of development and to analyze the different types of problems it is useful to note that the problems of equality are generally related to the political culture and sentiments about legitimacy and commitment to the system; the problems of capacity are generally related to the performance of the authoritative structures of government; and the questions of differentiation touch mainly on the performance of the non-authoritative structures and the general political process in the society at large. This suggests that in the last analysis the problems of political development revolve around the relationships between the political culture, the authoritative structures, and the general political process.

Pye’s generalization had such a tremendous impact upon the later developments in the field of political development literature that his views were generally adopted by the members of the Committee on Comparative Politics of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) consisting of some prominent political scientists of the day. The committee embarked on an extensive and ambitious programme bringing together existing knowledge, researches and developments on
the problems and patterns of political development particularly with reference to the third world countries. The committee sponsored a set of nine volumes exploring various aspects of political development in developing as well as developed world. Coleman adopted the Pye’s criteria in his introduction to the volume on education, where he states that the efforts of the committee to arrive at a clearer conception of the political development process have introduced the notion of a “development syndrome” including the characteristics of differentiation, equality and capacity.

The elements suggested by Pye serve a very useful purpose but on closer analysis they appear to fail to account for full dimensions of the process of political development. Although Pye does not attempt a definition of political development but he clearly speaks as to what he mean by political development. It is an increase in the levels of these three variables of equality, capacity and differentiation. While elucidating the concept of equality, Pye appears to be holding the formal view of equality. He fails to look into the problem of equity, which can’t be dissociated from political development, as Huntington was later to include it as one of the central goals of development, though, half-heartedly. The problem of equity can be dealt within the broader concept of equality but the point is that Pye does not throw any light upon this problem. He is content with just achieving equality before law and
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39 Coleman, Education, op.cit., p. 15.

replacement of ascriptive status by achievement standards. And when he touches upon the problem of equity, it is at the very superficial and general level.\(^{41}\)

Nevertheless, the problem of equity impinges upon the capacity when the political system has to engage in the difficult tasks of redistribution and targeting socio-economic inequalities. If we associate political development with the process of democratization, then, creation of a viable democratic framework depends ultimately on achieving the conditions of equity. Major inequalities in income and wealth resulting in severe deprivations and poor control of masses over the system persist in democratic societies, particularly, of the third world. Yet equity is not discussed as one of the central problems in achieving political development. Despite the high per capita output growth in some democratic societies – the growth that is often the handiwork of state – the condition of millions of poor people is not improving.

"Higher rates of industrialization, faster increases in agricultural productivity, and higher rates of growth, all tend to shift income distribution in favour of the higher income groups and against the low income groups. The dynamics of the process of economic development tend to work relatively against the poor, the major recipients of the rewards of economic development are consistently the middle class and the highest income groups."\(^{42}\)

If growth follows in the absence of effective redistribution policies in favour of poor, the gap between the income of the rich and the poor will not just persist but increase. The economic growth will simply amount to reinforce and increase inequality instead of reducing it. The maxim of 'growth first and equity second' or


‘trickle down’ theory no longer holds ground. It appears, more the economic growth takes place in a highly unequal society, more the familiar patterns of inequality get entrenched, which necessitates affirmative action to achieve equality in some cases. If the ‘trickle down’ theory would be valid, by now the economic benefits of the Green Revolution of 60s and 70s in India could be percolating down to the poor by now, while the marginal and small farmers would not have been committing suicide forced by poverty and indebtedness. In few of the developing democratic polities high growth has been reconciled with equity to the sufficient degree. Where in some measure it was achieved like in Malaysia, South Korea, Singapore etc., we find along authoritarian strands. Reconciling the conflict between growth, equity and democracy remain the biggest challenge before the developing countries. It is the central problem of political development.

While talking about capacity of the political system, Pye is concerned about routine functions of government, like maintenance of law and order, extraction of resources, allocation of goods, management of controversies and popular demands etc. He does not relate the capacity of the political system to promote the capabilities and the choices of the citizens. He does not bring in any notion of enforcement of human rights, social security and accountability. The performance of the political system is intimately tied up with its impact upon the environment in which it performs. It does not suffice to say that government has such and such effective powers at its disposal unless we conceive those powers in relation to the ends toward which those are used. When we talk about the performance of the political system we can’t be oblivious to the goals of political development. Otherwise, even a totalitarian regime at a given point of time might possess enough capacity to manage its affairs, to mobilize the energies of the people or to carry out its tasks effectively. The notion of
capacity, as meant by Pye, is a way of characterizing the performance or the rate of change in the performance of a political system like Almond's capabilities analysis. We can't dissociate the range and the level of performance from the means and instruments of performance. It is quite probable that political system performs more with coercion and less with consensus and still achieves its tasks. The development of the capacity is just one dimension, rather a means, howsoever important, in the direction of political development. It must further lead to the increase in some other variables such as capabilities and choice of the people, legitimacy, integration and participation variables. Legitimacy generates consensus about the ends and means of the political system. And consensus is required for democratization.

The third element is differentiation. No doubt, differentiation is an essential attribute of a developed political system. The process of modernization brings in its wake increase in the human needs and demands that impinge upon the political system. These challenges can't be met by traditional type of government inherited from a pre-commercial and pre-industrial age, based on a simplistic pattern of governmental functioning. The increase in needs and demands of the people along with the increased complexity of the organizational structures in socio-economic sphere entail an increase in governmental personnel, offices, institutions, roles and processes, and their integration.

From the developmental point of view, differentiation is significant as it involves the delimitation of spheres of governmental authority, systematization and pruning of the governmental process and fixation of accountability in the system. The concept of separation of powers is meant towards achieving these goals whereby the governmental power is divided among the Executive, the Legislature and the
Judiciary. For smooth functioning and coordination in the governmental process, Pye brings in the notion of integration as differentiation presupposes integration. The concepts like ‘separation of powers,’ ‘division of powers’ and ‘decentralization’ are fully consistent with the notion of integration.

The failure to combine normative standards with the empirical inquiry may be noticed in Pye’s scheme wherein he does not include the notion of liberty and equity in explicit terms. Growth has to be accelerated, institutions have to be strengthened, stability has to be preserved, integration has to be achieved, bureaucracy has to be modernized, elites have to be trained, people have to be mobilized, national autonomy has to be realized – but what about the autonomy and the capabilities of the people? Liberty is not included probably because of three reasons – (1) liberty is an extremely value-loaded concept, therefore, indicates value-preference, which western political scientists trained in behaviouralism, structural-functional analysis and empirical traditions of fact-value dichotomy would not undertake, (2) The element of liberty stands in conflictual relationship with the elements of stability and capacity and some writers even challenge the efficacy of liberal-capitalistic framework for its realization, and (3) as an indicator of political development, it is not easily identifiable, nor amenable to accurate measurement.

It is very important to know as how the balance is maintained between the authority of the government and the freedom of the people. In transitional societies, where the resources are scarce, stability uncertain, and integration incomplete, the government needs authority. However, the predicament is that we can have more of authority at the cost of liberty and vice-versa. And both are central goals of political development. Without improving the choices and the capabilities of the people, the
government can’t increase its capacity. In essence, both the goals are mutually reinforcing. Authority is needed by the government to establish order, however, it can also be misused by the government. “There can be integrated, perfectly functional systems of tyranny or inequality or exploitation.”

Problem of Irreconcilability of Goals

Huntington does not include liberty in his list of five goals of development. There is no reason why order should precede liberty or why authority should be allowed to consolidate sufficiently before we talk about liberty? In fact the problem of political development has always been that of maintaining a precarious balance between the two and of finding the ways and means to increase both simultaneously, particularly, in the context of third world countries. Huntington would argue in favour of capacity over liberty with the logic that authority should exist before it can be curtailed. In one of his earlier works, he defined political development as “the institutionalization of political organizations and procedures.” It is characterized by the increasing levels of, adaptability, marked by leadership adapting successfully to new challenges; complexity, marked by a large number of institutions performing specialized functions; autonomy, indicative of external independence and territorial jurisdiction; and coherence, entailing consensus and unity in the system. As long as the political system is moving towards these variables, it is developing. However, if it is moving towards the opposite poles of rigidity simplicity, subordination and disunity, it is

under political decay. These variables suggest the preference he accords to authority and order over liberty and redistributive justice.

However, in his later work Huntington attempts the analysis of the problems, challenges and goals of political development at much more sophisticated level. He includes democracy as a goal wherein liberty can be considered as one of the components. The problem is that many scholars including Huntington are just content with the elitist conception of democracy. Huntington states five goals of development: growth, equity, democracy, stability and autonomy. The former two pertain to economic development in fact, while the latter three he means as goals of political development. However, for comprehensive development of the system to take place, all these five goals need to be satisfied, either simultaneously or sequentially. According to Huntington, acute conflictual relationship prevails among these five goals. The reconciliation among these goals appears more difficult for developing countries as they are faced with the challenge of achieving them more or less concurrently and within a short span of time. The West took two centuries to overcome this challenge. However, he hopes that the conflicts are resolvable and the goals are achievable. But, how? He doesn’t have firm answers or strategies. He raises very important questions and issues concerning the problems involved in the process of development,

If simultaneous progress toward several development goals is difficult or impossible, conceivably progress could be made toward them sequentially by first emphasizing one goal and then another. ...Beyond this, however, there is the question from a developmental viewpoint as to whether progress toward all goals will be affected by the sequence in which goals are pursued. Some sequences, conceivably, may be more productive than others and,

---
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conversely, giving early priority to one goal could conceivably preclude subsequent progress toward other goals.\textsuperscript{48}

He doesn’t have enough clue as to under a given set of circumstances what type of sequence or pattern of development is fruitful? Why can’t all goals be pursued simultaneously with the equal intensity? Does the conflict between growth and equity or equity and democracy pertains to the goals, or the governmental strategies preferring one goal above another? Isn’t the problem related to the system failure rather than incompatibility between the goals? Huntington would not look into these aspects.

Political development can’t be conceived in terms of merely selected aspects of political development. When Huntington defines political development as ‘institutionalization of political organizations and procedure,’ he is emphasizing technical aspects of capacity and state building, not substantive aspects like liberty and equality. Later, when he conceives development in terms of goals, he is concerned with the general process of development. It is true that political development should be conceived within the context of the overall process of development, at the same time, we should be able to conceptualize political development and also answer as how the different goals can be reconciled to account for political development.

Defining Political Development

Apter is merely interested in the problems of modernization and how the developing countries overcome these problems. He is merely talking about the causes and the consequences of development not of development itself. Organski is interested in securing some political preconditions needed for economic development.\textsuperscript{48}  

\textit{Ibid.} p. 18.
Some would just talk about the functions of a well-developed polity but not about how developing societies reach that stage. Almond is too preoccupied with the capabilities of government to talk about the changes in the secular and rational orientations of people towards the political process. Karl Deutsch would define political development in terms of increased social mobilization, and social mobilization as "the process in which major clusters of old social, economic and psychological commitments are eroded or broken and people become available for new patterns of socialization and behaviour." Social mobilization may be a correlate or even a cause as well as a consequence of political development, but it is not political development. Political development as a process has to be located in the political sphere, and that too in terms of certain clear-cut objectives.

Alfred Diamant defines political development as "a process by which a political system acquires an increased capacity to sustain successfully and continuously new types of goals and demands and the creation of new types of organizations." What are those new types of goals and organizations? The definition appears to be very accurate one of political modernization but not of political development. Goulet defines political development as "a crucial means of obtaining a good life." Of course, true, but what is political development, indeed? What are its constituents or variables? It can't be defined in so general terms. It must be clearly defined as distinct from its causes, consequences or co-relates.

On the whole, the variables suggested by Pye appear to be most closely related with the concept of political development. Political development, indeed, means the increase in the variables of equality, capacity and differentiation. However, as we have earlier shown the inadequacy of these variables – as Pye has used them in a very confined manner – we would enlarge their meaning and scope. The concept of political development must clearly show how citizenship building and institution building should go together in the process of development. The political culture and the political process should be oriented towards increased levels of popular participation and popular control. The change should occur at the level of individual as well as institutions in pursuit of overall development of the society.

We expand the list to four variables viz. equality, liberty, capacity and differentiation. By equality, we mean substantive equality and we include the notions of equity and social security in it. Incorporating these notions in the variable of equality points a shift from elite democracy towards social democracy. By liberty, we mean the maintenance of a comprehensive system of civil liberties including Free Press and Right to Information, effective enforcement and adjudication of human rights, decentralization of powers and the refined means of accountability. By capacity, we mean the capabilities of the political system, including the notions of integration, autonomy, social mobilization and legitimacy. By differentiation, we mean institution-building, functional specialization and means of coordination and integration.

If the development is taking place in all these variables, albeit in a spiral form, we can say that the political development is ensuing. The increase in these variables leads to the rationalization, secularization and democratization of political institutions.
and political culture. It can be identified with the process of democratization but not in the narrow context of western elitist models of democracy.

We define political development as a process by which a political system moves towards increased levels of equality, liberty, capacity and differentiation.