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ABSTRACT

Political development is a process driven by a dialectical dynamic that marks the relationship between demands and capacity. In more conventional terms, the struggle is one for both liberty and security. The post-world war II period had a profound effect on the development study of political development and modernization. This study aims at discussion of the dialectics of modernization and political development. It deals with theoretical origin vis-à-vis the concept of comprehensive social progress of the cohesive and specific society which grantee both participation and social justice.

The study of political development and modernization conclude that both are complimentary and supplementary processes and are not opposed to each other.
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I. INTRODUCTION

It is indeed quite a problematic task to select and offer a single universally accepted definition of modernization and political development. The subject matter is rich in its complexity and diversity, so too are the concepts and methods used to organize and managed that substance.

Clearly, no one will ever make an exhaustive, much less definitive list of all aspects of any particular context that are or will be important for the study of political development, and modernization. The same can be said about the intellectual concepts and methodological procedures used to understand these contexts.

There is still considerable ambiguity and imprecision in the use of these terms, for example, there persist several differences among the political scientists regarding the nature of change that can be identified as political development and the variables of political development. There exists no standard and agreed list of elements which can guide our way in determining the nature and levels of political development in various societies. However, despite the precise difficulties and ambiguities several political scientists have tried to define political development.

The contemporary age, however, is fundamentally different from any earlier time scientific advances and technological revolutions have wrought unprecedented changes in all systems by which men and women organize their live. Revolutionary changes and challenges metastasize across the globe. Modernization or humanity's growing control over the environment race onward and breakneck pace. The impact of this modernization on the patterns of political development has been profound. Modernization and political development must be analyzed together.

This study is about political development and the challenge of modernization is written to take into account the more recent theoretical work focusing on such concepts as civil society, democratization and political participation.

II-THE PROBLEM AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The importance of a fresh start in academic research on political development seems inevitable for five reasons:
- Modernization and political development are mutually interactive, political elites forge modernization policies that strongly affect their own decision making capacities and abilities to rule.
- Modernization is highly problematic process; the
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existence of modernization doesn't signal the presence of political development, modernization tends to run out ahead of political development. This gap, in turn, promotes instability and fragility in society.

- There is a gap between modernizations on one hand and political human, social dimension of development on the other hand has been consistently largest.

- If political development is to take place it must involve a capacity for continuous change especially with respect to these social and political issues such as, personal equality, political participation and social justice.

- No matter how much technological and economic growth may occur, there can be no political development without accompanying change in the power and authority structures.

These general hypotheses are applicable for relation between political development and modernization, out of these hypotheses many questions arose.

What is political development? What are the indicators of political development? How does it differ from modernizations? What is the relation between political modernization and political development?

Which is pre-requisite for development economic development or political development?

The answers for the above question require the search about the main themes of political development, where the human rights respect and political participation are forms its main pillars.

III-CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

At the root of development lies change. How the pre-industrial society transformed into the industrial society, its different forms and effects, constitute the basic concerns of sociology. And this sociology of change provided the basis for the study of political development.

The nineteenth – century theory of evolution has greatly impacted development studies. August Comte, Emile Durkheim, and Herbert Spencer were among the notable evolutionary social theorists. Let us mention here that Marxism is also, primarily, a theory of social change based on the idea of progress inherited from the Enlightenment. However, since Marx believed in and worked for revolutionary change, his ideas should be considered as representing a genre different from that of the evolutionists (Binder, 1971, 19-20). According to the classical evolutionary theory, social change is unidirectional – from primitive to modern, and the modern society is, to be precise, the industrial society of the West, this historical course of Weston society is not only inevitable, it is also desirable, for industrial society to is developed society (Binder, 1971, 19-20). By the same token then, pre-modern or traditional societies are underdeveloped societies the value – judgment involved here is quite explicit. In Tony Barnett's forthright admission … in Western Europe and North America, we tend to think that our system is democratic and 'best', and that this democracy is the end product of a long process of evolution (Barnett, 1981, 14).

The second theoretical influence on political development studies came from positivism. August Comte believed that the principles of natural or positive sciences could be meaningfully applied to the study of society (Binder, 19). And it could also facilitate changes toward progress. Thirdly, studies on political development borrowed considerably from Talcott Parson's functionalism. Parsons had identified the basic functions of any social system must perform in order to persist. Another major influence came from the writings of the noted German sociologist Max Weber, whose book The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism sensitized economists as well as political scientists to appreciate the role of cultural factors in development (Weber, 1930).

Therefore, with a view to pursuing the objectives of this study, it was essential to follow a rigid, but complex system of methodology, through various variables, determent, and phenomena. A recent example of efforts made to extend and clarify the analyses understanding of political development process has been the work done by Almond and Coleman where as system- function theory or the structure – functional theory played possibly the most prominent role in early development studies. This framework was first presented in 1960 by Almond and Coleman and Almond and Powell presented its modified. Version 1966 (Almond and Coleman, 1960).

In the functionalist view, politics is one social system among others like, say, the economy or the family. Any system is characterized by a distinctive function. For example, the economic system is meant to carry out production and the exchange of goods and services. Similarly, the basic functions of the political system are decision making and implementation involving the
exercise of legitimate power. Second, a system consists or certain interdependent parts or elements. Those functions, institutions, and process outside this functionally defined political system constitute its environment. The environment, therefore, is formed by other social systems. The boundary between the political system and its environment is analytical and open. In other words, the two interact with each other (James and Springboro, 7-9).

Based on this framework, Almond and his associates have identified four central concepts; Political structure, political culture, political functions, and developmental problems. The nature of relations among the four determines a country's state of political development (James and Springboro, 9).

The basic unit of a political system is 'role' not individual. A number of interacting roles constitute a structure or a subsystem. For example, legislator, speaker, etc., are roles which together from what are known as the structure of the legislature. A number of structures, such as the legislature, the executive, political parties and others combine to make a political system. According to Almond, a modern/developed political system is marked by structural differentiation. It means changes in existing roles/structures to become more specialized, or the creation of new specialized roles/structure with changes in the environment (Al-Samalotti, 150-151). Second, these structures function different political system. This is largely due to the differences in values, beliefs, and attitudes of those occupying the roles towards political objects. This is precisely what is known as political culture. Modernizing a political system needs the secularization of culture, which refers to the process of becoming increasingly rational, analytical, and empirical (Sidney, 293-294).

The structural – functionalists analyze functions at three levels. The first is how the political system performs in relation to the overall environment. Here Almond introduces the concept of the system's capability, which is of four types; extractive (mobilizing material and human resources from the society); regulative (control over the behavior and interactions of individuals and groups in the society); distributive (allocation of resources, commodities, services and status); and responsive (attending to inputs through outputs). These capabilities are related to each other and one can find an order among them (Ghai, 75). Even the simplest system, while it may not possess the others, needs some extractive capacity in order to survive. However, there cannot be regulative capacity without the extractive one. Thus, as a system develops, it graduates its capacity to the higher level. An advanced democratic system has all four capabilities.

At the second level of analyzing functions, Almond focuses on the conversion of inputs into outputs. This process involves seven functions. First, interests are articulated from within the society. In the western democracies there are separate structures to articulate the different types of interests of an individual. For example, trade unions represent the occupational demands of their members, not other aspects of their life such as their religious needs. In pre-modern societies, such specialized articulation structures do not exist. In transitional societies, on the other hand, interests are articulated by organizations representing mixed identities (Ghai, 76). The Scheduled Castes Government Employee's Association of India may be a good example.

Diverse articulated interests are then; to be sieved, combined, and aggregated into inputs to facilitate their conversion into outputs Political party – often a coalition of different interests – is the most notable interest – aggregation structure in a modern political system. In the pre-modern systems, on the other hand, the rulers themselves often interpret and combine sectional interests (A Brash, 103-104).

At the next stage lie the three functions of rule making, rule application and rule adjudication. The parliament, the executive, and the judiciary are the three respective specialized structures for these three functions in a modern system. In pre-modern systems the rulers often combine all three functions (Frank Bealy, 1999, 82-83).

Communication is essential for any political system, more so for a modern one. At the very least, the citizens/subjects must be informed of the rules/laws. The rulers also need to keep themselves abreast of the demands of the ruled. Mass media is the most important agency of communication in a modern system. It enjoys considerable autonomy in a democracy. In pre-modern societies, on the other hand, one notices the prevalence of face – to – face communication traditional social structures like family, kinship group, local community play an important role in this regard (Comparative Politics and Governments, 77).

The third set of functions is political socialization and recruitment. The process of horizontal and vertical
transmission of political values, attitudes and orientations – political culture – is called political socialization. A modern system can sustain itself when people pay allegiance to the larger political authority transcending loyalties to narrower identities like caste, ethnic group, etc. Again, with modernization, roles get differentiated and new roles are created. In the pre – modern system, ascriptive attributes are considered more important in recruitment at the political role. By contrast, modern systems lay more emphasis on achieved qualities, though personal connection and primordial ties do not lose all their significance.

The next important aspect in the study of political developmental is what Almond and his colleagues have called the 'developmental problems'. A transitional political system confronts four major problems. They are: state building, nation building, participation, and distribution. The first refers to the need for enhancing the power of the state in order to penetrate the society to regulate it more effectively (Frank Bealy, 82-83). However, a strong state may remain vulnerable if it cannot create a sufficiently cohesive nation. In many Third World Countries, national integrity is often marred by the people's allegiance to smaller identities instead of the central political system. As a society undergoes socio-economic changes, more and more people get mobilized to realize their manifold demands, including that of participation in the political process. They become increasingly assertive for the democratization of the system and try to utilize their new found rights for more material benefits, i.e. the redistribution of wealth. If the outputs of a system fail to keep pace with the rate and nature of the inputs, the political system faces the problem of maintaining persistence.

From this multidimensional analysis, Almond comes to the conclusion that political development means as the process of enabling the political system to respond effectively to the developmental problems through structural differentiation, functional, specialization, and cultural secularization. More or less in the same vein, Lucian Pye has identified equality (i.e. mass political participation), objective rules with universal applicability, and political recruitment on the basis of achieved qualities as the principal dimensions of the development syndrome (Pye, 101-106). Simple ideas can be found in James Coleman's essay Modernization: Political Aspects' (Coleman, 1968, 10-70).

Therefore, Coleman's framework forms methodological basis for analysis and understanding of the dialectical of political development.

The traditional historical method has been applied to obtain historical data and recall historical experiences in the political development especially in the Third World Countries. In keeping with the analytical requirement of this study, the work referred to has been carefully selected. Both primary and secondary sources of information have been used.

**IV REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Political development, modernization in the third world was one of the most seriously researched areas in the U.S.A. studies. The committee of competent politics of the social science research council, U.S.A. was the hub of this new project. Between 1963 and 1987, nine important books on different aspects at political development in different countries were published by social scientists under the auspice at the council: since all these books were published by the Princeton University is also known as the Princeton school. Gabriel Almond, Lucien Pye, D. Rotow, Myron Wiener, James Coleman, Sidney verba, Joseph Lapalombra are among the most well – known theorist school. In their works one finds, along with enormous country – specific empirical data, a focus on the role at different institution and processes in political development, such as communication (Pye), bureaucracy (Lapalomba) education (Coleman), political culture "Pye and verb" and political parties and interest group "Lapalomba and wiener".

The most comprehensive works to review the intellectual history and definitional issues at political development was done by Samuel, P. Huntington's excellent essay "the change to change 1971" Huntington has made a pioneering contribution towards the development of political modernization and political development. He describes policed modernization as a multifaceted process involving change in all areas of human thought and activity.

There is however, a dearth of literature on political development and modernization by Arab scholars. In general and Jordanian in particular.

The first academic work by Ali Aladin Hilal, "Towards conceptual approach to achieve political development" 1981, had provided general frameworks for political development, despite this general lack, Ammeen Bani-Hasan modernization and political stability in Jordan "1978, analytical details, Jordan's adaptation with
political turbulence over the years. It also provides valuable insight towards the relation between modernization and political stability.

"Abdullah Al – Nqrish" the problematic of political development in the Arab World 2005, give us an overview of theoretical origin vis-a-vis the concept of comprehensive social progress of the cohesive and specific society when granted both participation and social justice. Also the study indicates numerous experiment human development models such as liberal, authoritative and the socialist models.

In continuation, AL – Bursan Ahamd" international role in the political development process. 2004, deals with a whole range of issues such as the international factor behind the calls for political development, as well as China and Japan's experiments'. The present study tries to provide a comprehensive analysis for political development, from an Arab view.

V- POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT, i- MEANINGS

In development discourse the initial emphasis was almost exclusively economic. In the course of time, however, it was noticed that countries following similar strategy for economic development were coming up with widely varying performances. This strengthened the idea that economic development was also vitally dependent on non-economic factors like, for example, political leadership, bureaucratic skill, the overall cultural milieu obtaining in the country, etc. Political development studies received major inspiration from such realization.

However, 'political development' as a concept has been used in many different senses. Huntington and Dominguez have identified four major uses of the terms:

- Geographical: This refers, precisely, to any aspect of the politics of what have been the developing societies, for example the political role of the military in Pakistan would be considered a subject relating to political development. While the same problematic for Germany would not be viewed as such.
- Derivative: Sometimes political development is used to mean 'political aspects and consequences of the broader process of modernization'.
- Teleological: Political development means movement towards certain goals such as democracy, participation, institutionalization, etc.
- Functional: A modern society can function if it has certain political features like, for instance, political party. Party building, therefore, therefore, is a move towards political development.

Combining all these different uses they write: Political development has thus been variously defined as a pattern of change which occurs in a particular type of society, which is produced by a particular cause, which is directed toward particular goals, or which is functionally required by particular social and economic conditions (Huntington and Dominguez, 1975, 5).

ii- Historical Background

Political development, as Gabriel Almond wrote in an article in the 1980s was a 'growth industry' from the mid-1940s till the 1960s. How could it become so popular during that period?

The end of the Second World War was followed by the process of decolonization, facilitating the emergence of a number, of new states in Asia and Africa. Together with the formally free but generally poor states of Latin America, they have since been known collectively as the underdeveloped countries. On the other hand, many of the erstwhile "great" powers like Great Britain, France, and Germany turned considerably weak (Al-Samalotti, 145). In their stead rose the USA as the strongest power on earth with none from the Western world to challenge its domination. Placed thus, it was but "rational" for the USA to expand its influence to the farthest extent. One irritant in this globalize venture was the Soviet Union, which also emerged after the war as a superpower and the leader of the socialist forces the world over. This initiated the Cold War. The major target of expansion, in this context, was the third World. Influencing the countries of the Third World needed, first and foremost, a close understanding of them.

Against this backdrop, the western – predominantly American – political scientists came up with the concepts of modernization and political development, and engaged themselves in studying different Third World countries. This is not meant to suggest that all these political scientists were consciously working for the extension of American influence. Nevertheless, there did exist complementarities between the two. The defining features of the "modern" and the "developed" that the scholars generally highlighted were essentially drawn from the western experience. It may also be pertinent to add that modernization studies during the period were liberally sponsored by deferent agencies in the USA.
iii- The Crises of Political Development:

On the way to political modernization, every political system encounters certain problems, though not necessarily in the same order or intensity. These are often called developmental problems. Pay has identified six such major problems (Al-Niqrish, 2004, 7-9). They are: (a) legitimacy crisis, meaning thereby the problem of building a sovereign state with allegiance from all within a defined territory; (b) identity crisis, which refers to nation–building transcending narrower identities; (c) penetration crisis, i.e. effective administration through the length and breadth of the country; (d) participation crisis; (e) integration crisis which arises at three levels; and finally (f) distribution crisis. Political development, as Dodd sums it up, means a systems capacity to solve these developmental problems arising from the process of political modernization (Dodd, 1972, 14).

iv- Political Development Syndrome:

After analyzing all the above views, Lucian Pye isolates the following characteristics or themes of political development, which he refers to as the development Syndrome (The Meaning of Syndrome).

Equality. Various approaches accept that spirit or attitude of equality is an aspect of political development. Equal and popular participation in politics, active citizenship and popular rule constitute political development. It also involves the concept of equal and objective application of laws to all the citizens rich and poor and strong and weak. It also includes the concept of political recruitment based on merit and performance (Coleman, 76-77).

Capacity. It is again a theme held by most of the above approaches and it refers to the capacity of a political system to affect the social and economic life of the society. This aspect of development includes the idea of political development analyzed in terms of governmental capacity and the condition that affect such performance. It also means political development in terms of effectiveness and efficiency in the execution of public policy, rationality in administration and a secular orientation towards policy (Pye, 1973).

Differentiation and Specialization. This theme conceptualizes political development in terms of structural differentiation and specialization. This aspect of development involves first of all the differentiation and specialization of structures. Offices and agencies tend to have their distinct and limited functions and there is an equivalent of a division of labour within the realm of government. Along with differentiation, there is increased functional specialization of various roles within the system and it also involves the integration of complex structures and processes. The last aspect is very important because it clarifies that differentiation is not fragmentation, on the other hand it means specialization based on an ultimate sense of integration (Binder, 55-58).

Among these three dimensions there are present several acute tensions between the demands for equality, the requirements of capacity and the process of greater differentiation and accordingly there are, different patterns of political development. It also means that "development is clearly not unilinear nor it is governed by sharp and distinct stages, but rather by a range of problems that they may arise separately or concurrently" (Ghai, 141-143). Study of political development requires besides these three dimensions of equality, capacity and differentiation, three other related factors. As Pye observes, "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 question of differentiation touches mainly on the performance of non-authoritative structures and the general process in the society at large. This suggests that in the last analysis, the problems of development revolve around the relationships between the political culture, the authoritative structure, and the general political process (Pye, 126-130).

Along with these views of Lucian Pye, we must quote the views of Leonard Binder, who has suggested the following 5-point list of changes which have to be analyzed for analyzing political development (Ghai, 143):

1. Change of identity from religious to ethnic and from parochial to societal.
2. Change of legitimacy from transcendental to immanent sources.
3. Change in political participation from elite to mass and from family to group.
4. Change of distribution from status and privilege to achievement, and.
5. Change in the degree of administrative and legal penetration into social structure and to remote regions of the country.
v- Indicators of Political Development:

In order to measure and analyze the nature of the political development that characterizes a system, we have to gather information regarding several factors which are popularly called the indicators or indices of political development. The World Handbook of political and social indicators enumerates the following such indicators: (1) Age of national institutions, (2) education expenditure, (3) Defense expenditures, (4) Military power, (5) Internal security forces, (6) Press freedom, (7) Party fictionalization, (8) Voter turnout, (9) Electoral irregularity, (10) Protest demonstrations, (11) Riots, (12) Armed attacks, (13) Deaths from domestic violence, (14) Governmental Sanctions, (15) external intervention, (16) Renewals of executive tenure, (17) Executive adjustments and (18) Irregular executive transfers (Ghai, 144-145).

J.C. Johri gives a list of 22 positive indices which help us to analyze political development and 15 negative indices which can be used to analyze political decay or hindrances/limitations to political development (Ghai, 143).

(A) Positive Indices (Development):
- State – building or territorial integration.
- Nation- building or national integration.
- Increasing franchise and free and fair elections with large voter turn out.
- Policitization or participation of more and more people in political process.
- Popular participation in decision –making.
- Growing interest articulation by autonomous bodies.
- Growing interest aggregation by stable and democratic political parties.
- Freedom of press and growth of mass media agencies.
- Political and administrative decentralization.
- Autonomy of the units of local government.
- Expansion of educational facilities.
- Effective role of legislative bodies and constituency service by the representative.
- Effective role of quasigovernmental agencies like public under takings.
- Role of powerful organizations to oversee the working of public servants (like ombudsman) and redresses of public grievances.
- Tolerance of dissent and control over anomic movements.
- Broadening of the social base of political elites.
- Openness in the working of government and accountability of the rules to the ruled.
- Independence of judiciary and existence of rule of law.
- Apolitical character of armed forces.
- Consensual politics implying use of constitutional methods.
- Neutrality and independence of public services.
- Secularization of political culture.

(B) Negative Indices (Decay):
- Election rigging and irregularities.
- Violent protest demonstrations.
- Anomic disturbances, underground activities and armed attacks.
- Political defections for selfish gains.
- Fragmentation of political parties.
- Suppression of dissent.
- Idolization of the rules.
- Glorification of the official ideology.
- Political assassinations.
- Politicization of armed forces.
- Commitment of public services to the line of ruling party.
- Wide corruption and maladministration.
- Concentration of Powers.
- Mass arrests.
- Foreign interference in domestic matters.

In this list can include (a) coups (b) riots and (c) the number of political prisoners held by the state.

vi- Political Modernization:

A. The concept of political modernization is intimately related to the concept of political development. Many scholars conceptualize political development as synonymous with political modernization. This view is not fully correct because three exists a subtle difference between the two. Political modernization is an aspect of political development; we can also admit that it constitutes the initial stages of political development in which a nation tries to become industrialized, urbanized, and technologically developed. As such the two (political development and political modernization) are related but have different aspects of political phenomenon. We can clarify the point by first defining political modernization and then differentiating it from political development. It is indeed a problematic exercise to attempt a selection of a precise definition of political modernization. Different
scholars have defined it differently. Some conceptualize it as the process by which non-industrialized nations (New and underdeveloped nations) try to become industrialized, where as others define it as a process by which new nations try to become "Westernized", and there are still others who define it as a general process of change by which various societies respond to changes in social and physical environments. However, all the scholars accept that political modernization involves "changes" from old to modern.

Claude E. Welch Jr. defines political Modernization as "the process based upon the rational utilization of resources and aimed at the establishment of modern society" (Claude E. Welch Jr., 1971, 2).

Karl Deutsch has sought to define it in terms of participation or mobilization. It is the process by which there emerges mass political participation by the people and increased political decentralization (Deutsch, 1961, 493-502).

Benjamin Schwartz describes political modernization as "the systematic sustained and powerful application of human energies to the rational control of man's physical and social environment for various human purposes" (Ghai, 144).

Robert Ward has defined political modernization as the movement towards a modern society characterized by its far – reaching ability to control or influence the physical and social circumstances of its environment and by a value system which is fundamentally optimistic about the desirability and consequence of this ability (Ward and Rustow, 5-7).

S.P. Huntington has made a pioneering contribution towards the development of the concepts of political modernization and political development. He describes political modernization as "a multi faceted process involving change in all areas of human though and activity" (Huntington, 1971, 283-322).

Political modernization postulates changes in five key aspects of human activity and relations (Huntington, 1968, 43).

- At the psychological level, modernization involves a fundamental shift in values, attitudes and expectations.
- At the intellectual level, it involves a tremendous expansion of man's knowledge about his environment and the diffusion of knowledge throughout society through increased literacy, mass communication and education.
- Demographically, it implies a change in the pattern of life, a marked increase in health and life expectancy, greater occupational and geographical mobility and a shift of population from rural to urban areas.
- At the social level, modernization has a tendency to replace the focus of individual's loyalty from family and other primary groups to voluntarily organize secondary associations.
- Finally, in the sphere of economics, subsistence agriculture is replaced by market agriculture, agriculture itself declines in comparison to commerce, industry and other non-agricultural activities, and the scope of economic activity is widened as this Activity gets more and more centralized at the national level.

vii- Nature of Political Modernization:

After analyzing the views of these scholars it becomes possible for us to define the nature of political modernization as the process by which traditional societies try to become modern i.e. industrialized, urbanized, and educated and activity participating societies. It involves the transformation of their political cultures in response to the changes in physical and social environments. Ameen Bani-Hasan, quoting S.P. Huntington, has well summarized modernization as "a comprehensive phenomenon which brings about radical changes in the field of economic development, mainly in the direction of industrialization and material advancement, changes in the nature and content of the political systems and also changes in the social and psychological spheres of life" (Bani Hassan, 1989, 19-40). Political modernization results from (1) social mobilization, (2) economic development, (3) rationalization of authority, (4) differentiation of structures, and (5) the expansion of political participations (Claude, 2). Infact, these are the five key features of political modernization. It is the process by which a traditional society seeks to become a modern society. A modern society is, as Huntington observes "a society based on advanced technology and the spirit of science on a rational view of life, a secular approach to social relations, a feeling for justice in public affairs, and all else, on the acceptance in the political realm of the belief that the prime unit of the policy should be the nation-state" (Huntington, 1987, 20-60).
viii-The Relation between Political Modernization and Political Development:

Political modernization and political development are two intimately related processes which together constitute the political dimension of social change that continuously characterizes every society. As already stated the two are so near to each other that many scholars prefer to treat these as synonymous processes. Political modernization is an aspect of political development. The former can be described as the initial process of political development as perceived defined and accepted by the people of the political system. Samuel P. Huntington has tried to clarify the relations between the two. He is of the view that political development is a process independent of, although affected by, the process of modernization. Political development is conceptualized by him as the institutionalization of political organizations and procedures, where as political modernization is conceptualized by him basically in terms of social mobilization, economic development, rationalization of authority, exclusive attention to external factors regarding underdevelopment, the dependency school generally fails to appreciate the reality of the development that this has taken place in ex- colonies like South Korea and Taiwan.

xi- Social Change and Political Development:

Modernization, as we know, is a composite phenomenon, involving socio-economic changes as well as political development. But what exactly is the relation between changes in these two spheres? Does change in one necessarily lead to change in another? And if so, does it work both ways?

Samuel Huntington's The Goals of Development offers an excellent review of the relevant literature. He has identified five different goals of development, viz., growth, equity, democracy, stability and national autonomy. One relation among these goals, he finds three theoretical positions (Huntington, 32-33).

The first is what he calls the compatibility theory. It was prominent among the first-generation modernization thinkers, like Karl Deutsch, David Lerner, S.M. Lipset and Cyril Black. For instance, Lipset had found positive relations between economic growth and democracy (Saymou, 1963, 60-66). However, according to Huntington, compatibility theory cannot explain – neither is corroborated by – the Third World reality. Countries registering some economic growth have, in most cases, failed to build up democracy. On the other hand, many of those working with some from of a democratic system have done rather poorly in the economic front. And in most cases, Huntington Found 'negative compatibility', in the sense none of that none or the developmental goals could be achieved.

With 'development optimism' fading in the 1970s a reverse trend could be noticed. It gave rise to the conflict theory, which suggests that there is a trade – off between economic development and political democracy. Barring a few exceptional cases, most of the countries could not simultaneously proceed to all the goals. For example, Brazil's record of a high rate of economic growth, albeit short – lived, brought in its trail more inequality and resultant social disturbance and political instability. Especially form Latin American evidences, O'Donnell hypothesized that beyond a certain point democracy does not work compatibly with economic growth (O'Donnell, 50-60). Some have suggested that, compared to democratic governments, developmentally oriented authoritarian governments are better suited for economic growth. While not in full agreement with this view, Huntington also asserts that, generally speaking, democratic governments almost never achieve very high rates of economic growth. On the other hand, authoritarian governments may have extremely high, moderately high, or even abysmally low growth rates. Huntington explained this trade – off in terms of the 'rate – level paradox'. It means's condition in which a high level of Variable A is associated with a high level of Variable B. but a high rate of increase in Variable A. is associated with no increase or a negative rate of increase in Variable B., In Western Europe and North America, one finds high levels of all the goals of development. The paradox did not work in these countries because, Huntington argues, the rate of annual economic growth in these countries was much lower. In Europe. During 1870-1913 it ranged from 1.4 per cent to 2.8 percent. For the US it was more than 3 per cent per year. One the other hand, during the 1950s and 1960s, the average annual growth rate for the developing countries was above 5 per cent (Huntington, 47-53). In some countries it was even as high as 7-10 per cent. It leads Huntington to infer that rapid economic growth may be the reason for non – achievement or even negative achievement as regards other developmental goals.

From these two contrasting positions emerged the reconciliation theory. It holds that the different goals are neither necessarily compatible nor a trade – off...
inevitable. In other words. The proper sequencing of the goals may make reconciliation among them possible. With regard to political goals, Huntington observed a general tendency to place order and stability first. To be followed by democracy (Al-Samalotti, 147-148). But there is wide disagreement as to which of the two economic objectives – growth and redistribution – should come first. According to one view, redistribution becomes feasible only after growth has taken place. This is known as the ‘trickle – down’ theory. The redistributionist’s. On the other hand. Argue that exclusive initial concern for growth strengthens inequality so that later attempts at redistribution often fail. Instead of waiting for growth to take care of inequality, they assert, the proper redistribution of productive resources, especially land, would lay the ground for growth.

Another contention issue about sequencing is how to prioritize economic and political goals. Can developments in these two spheres be reconciled? Huntington, found two vicious circles – populist and technocratic – working against such reconciliation in the Third World Countries. The first starts with extensive political participation forcing more socio-economic equality, followed by decline in production, increased intensity in class struggle, military coup, and participation explosion. The technocratic cycle begins with military coup leading to loss of political rights and rapid economic growth accompanied by profound inequality instigating mass unrest and participation explosion against the regime (Huntington, 30-40).

There are examples that contest this view. In Japan, for example, democracy has contributed to stability, facilitating economic growth, as well as redistribution, which has, in the process, strengthened democracy further (Al-Bursaan, 2004, 57-58). But what occurred in Japan did not take place in most other countries. India is poor, and a democracy, Pakistan is poor, and not a democracy. Democracy has never worked comfortably in most parts of Latin America. And in African countries, generally speaking, most of the developmental goals have remained elusive. How do we explain such variations? Is development, then, primarily a cultural question? Interestingly, Huntington finally arrives at the view that culture is an autonomous and indispensable element in political and economic development.

X- In Lieu of a conclusion:

Between the 1950s and 1960s, as we have noted, was the age of liberal modernization / development theory. During the 1970s, the dependency position received considerable attention. Having emerged as primarily a challenge to the western development theory, it itself turned out to be – albeit in a limited sense – an alternative theory of Third World development. Since then diverse theoretical trend, with features both contrasting and overlapping, seen to have made political development quite a complex, if not confusing, area of study. The proponents of both globalization and localization, all their quarrels notwithstanding, seem eager to banish the state from the exercise called development. Questioning the very notion of development itself, some others characterize the present age as of post-development. Yet one big step further, Gibson- Graham and David Ruccio are busy theorizing ‘beyond post-development’ (Gibson, 2001, 1-100).

Since the Third World is extremely heterogeneous, it makes generalizations about development a risky venture. Neither the liberal modernization school nor the dependency position proved adequately attentive to it. The following observations, naturally, do not apply equally to all Third World Countries. In the dominant development discourse, the state occupies the centre; state building is not just a goal of political development. The state is regarded as the main actor for achieving other developmental goals, such as nation formation, economic growth distributive justice, extension of democracy and citizenship, and acquiring autonomy in the international society. This extreme reliance on the state has, by and large, failed to deliver in the last fifty years. Identity politics, often quite violent, has rendered nation building an incomplete project. Where the state has shied away from economic development, either productive forces have remained very low, or crushing inequality has, taken place, the tense coexistence of abysmal mass poverty and the astounding affluence of a few is a common feature of the Third World. In some cases of interventionist development, some initial success, in land reform or the creation of a base for industrialization, etc, was noticed. However, such growth could not be sustained, and its benefits did not reach those who needed them the most. But in the process, the state extended itself to a dangerous extent and became a veritable field for corruption profligacy, and irresponsible bureaucratization.

An unenviable economic scenario compounded the political crisis in many Third World states. The absence or weakness of the civil society is one of their major
problems. In Europe, civil society had appeared to preserve the autonomy of the society in the wake of the absolutist state. In a country like India, as post colonial theorists like Sudipta Kaviraj write, absolute sovereignty did not take root even during colonial rule (Kaviraj, 2001, 70-100). The nationalist movement was keen to keep society and culture out of the sphere of the state in order to limit the latter. However, the civil society that emerged during this period was essentially elitist. Neither the rural people nor the urban poor could find a place in it. Nevertheless, the nationalist movement claimed to be the representative of the whole nation – in fact its builder. The supposed inheritor of this movement, the post – colonial state, became keen to acquire total power. The elites were not too willing to expand the civil society because they themselves had captured power. In the course of time, when the politics of mass mobilization, fed by failures in the economic front. Swamped the narrow institutional, confines of elite politics, govern ability itself became a major problem. In many Africa countries, social groups capable of forming the civil society could not develop, and the state has failed to observe the most elementary duty of maintaining political order. By arrogating to themselves absolute power at the behest of a few, repressive regimes, of different sorts have robbed the state-centric political development of much of its authenticity (Hamdi, 2000, 23-63). The state has emerged as an institutional mechanism more to contract democracy than facilitate it.

Alongside pressures from within, nation-state have been facing stiff challenges from the process of globalization. Impending obliteration of territorial states is an exaggeration. Nevertheless, economic liberalization. The electronic revolution, and pressures for the global management of problems – some of them though, are not really global problems – have added to the vulnerability of the states especially those of the Third World.

If the known development paradigms have failed there is immense disagreement on the alternatives(s). Most fashionable is the neo- liberal panacea of the minimalist state. The state must restrict itself to ensuring political stability and facilitating private enterprise. The market should be left free to distribute according to efficiency. In lieu of the state, civil. Society institutions and social ties and networks may better take care of those who fall behind.

Liberals, however, differ among themselves, some of them admit that the state has failed in many crucial areas, Nevertheless, it out not to be absolved of its responsibilities. While strengthening the civil society, the state should be made to work for democracy as well as welfare. It would be also good to remember that not all civil society institutions facilitate democracy.

However, many do not share the liberal optimism that institutionalizing the civil society; it's playing a role complementary with the state, and propelling the state thereby to pro- people policies, would lead to democracy and justice. At the theoretical level. Some consider liberalism inappropriate. Premised on the atomistic individual as the unit of society, liberal theory cannot negotiate with the notion of collective right and consciousness, which is so significant in many Third World countries.

Rajni Kothari, the noted Indian Political scientists, furnished some radical ideas against liberal modernization. We may recall that in the 1960s, Kothari was optimistic about India's progress towards economic development and democracy by uniting – and not obliterating– peripheral identities with the political centre (Kothari, 1989, 1-30). However, the political deinstitutionalization, all – pervasive corruption, criminalization of politics, negation of basic rights of the people, attack on the cultural autonomy of the peripheral groups, sharp environmental decline under the pressure of top – down growth strategy from the 1970s onwards made him skeptical about the western model of development. To retrieve democracy; preserve autonomy against the onslaught of world capitalism, and to build up eco-sensitive politico – economic order based on equity and justice, he advocated non – party political process, decentralization, and development from below with grass roots participation. Presuming a sort of undifferentiated local community, vagueness about proper relations between non party grass roots politics and institutionalized democratic politics, integrating the local economy with that of the larger market are some of the weak / inadequately addressed areas in the radical Gandhi an alternative like that of Kothari. Nevertheless such powerful critiques sensitize us to the necessity of a state committed to the civil society.

With his concept of anew paradigm in comparative study, Hamdi Abdel-Rahman of Egypt has proposed another way of looking at the problem. He dose not find the concepts of state and civil society, and investing their relation, adequate to explain the post – colonial states like African political system and to indicate their future.
direction, "All theoretical frameworks that aimed at explaining African politics since independence have proved to be a complete failure. Thus there is great need to propose a new parading based on African particular vision towards its identity and culture (Hamdi, 32).

From this non – West modernity to non – modernity, so to say, may be viewed as another theoretical position. For the postmodernists, development is a culture construct, and, hence, it cannot have any universal model. The dominant development discourse, which essentially entails capitalism, nation- state and democracy as developed in the West, is sought to be universalized by the West through the colonization of mind beyond the West. It is, therefore, an exercise of power by the West over the non – West. Some of the Postmodernists, therefore, do not look for alternative development. They are for an alternative to development, which emphasizes the autonomy and self – sufficiency of the local and the community. Gone are the days, writes Gustavo Esteva, of borrowed modernity, development by the specialist, and people’, at best, as the target (Esteva, 1997, 31). Now is the time of the margins, of the common man, who can walk with one's own feet on one's own path, in order to dream one's own dreams.

But the problem still persists. Does the Third World really dream it's over dream? Is it true that modernity and development are no longer its dreams?

What really awaits the Third World? Is it going to witness struggles between or among dreams? Or, as for several centuries now, will it only keep on chasing the western mirage?

NOTES

- Class analysis: Understanding the nature of society in terms of the relationships among its social classes.
- Elite theory: A theory of political based on the assertion that all societies are divided into the ruling elite and the masses.
- Empirical theory: A based on experience and observation of facts, ostensibly free of value judgments.
- Fact: A statement generally assumed to be true.
- Interest group: Organization of individuals with a common political goal seeking to influence government.
- Marxist theory: A social and historical theory developed by Karl Marx (1818-1883) and his followers; its political perspective is based on the assertion that all societies develop out of class conflicts which are economic in origin.
- Pluralism: An application of structural-functionalism to politics which asserts that political stability is maintained by government mediation of interest-group conflicts.
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