DEFINING POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT
By
Paris Arnopoulos

This study constructs a formal conceptualization and systematic elucidation of *political development*. That phrase combines two different terms, each of which has its own separate meaning. When put together, the question arises as to their combined sense: is there such a thing as political development? Or is this combination nonsensical?

It is such questions that largely belong to metapolitics, so our discussion here may be properly called metapolitical. On that basis, we consider the deeper meaning of politics, both in its etymological and epistemological sense. Once this is done, one can then apply that meaning in either its conceptual or contextual aspects.

As the bibliography at the end indicates, political development has been used extensively in recent literature of political and social sciences. Yet, a perusal of these sources shows that its meaning still remains moot. Each author uses the term in his own way which suits a particular purpose. No one has presented a rigorous definition of this complex concept; therefore it means different things to different people. So much so, that this situation of so many disparate and contradictory definitions has led some critics to call for the demise of political development as a useful concept.

That would indeed be one solution by elimination. Yet, we live in an era in which the process of "development" dominates the thoughts, if not the actions, of most people. Moreover, one of the two principal axes of international politics revolves around the so-called North-South gap. The well-known dichotomy of the contemporary world into more and less developed countries (MDCs and LDCs) is a case in point which underlines the importance placed on this concept.

In general, "development" is used in the sense of "economic". This implied qualification of development restricts the concept to a process akin with industrialization. In this sense, "economic development" means a very specific thing, but the various interrelations with this process could not avoid a certain spillover into other areas.

Thereby, we have social, technical, cultural, human, as well as political development, being discussed as real phenomena. Whether we like it or not then, we are forced into the current usage of these terms, so the least one can do is make sure that he knows what those terms mean, in order to improve communication and understanding. That is precisely what we are trying to do here in defining the concept of political development.

Definitions are somewhat arbitrary and artificial constructs. It seems that the human mind has a limited capacity to understand and deal with complex phenomena, such as those involving politics or development. Our use of definitions is a way of getting hold of these events by reducing them to simpler ideas. This conceptualization of "reality" requires the selection and abstraction of certain facets, while ignoring the rest. For that reason, no definition is complete and can never correspond exactly to the reality it describes.

Through ideal concepts, we try to discern some order in whatever is going on out there. As scientists, we seek patterns and regularities with recurring characteristics that identify and discriminate things, at the same time as we relate them to each other. In the attempt to find such

characteristics in "political development", we have constructed a conceptual framework to help organize our thoughts. We believe that this method clarifies things to the reader, as it has to the author.

The framework utilizes the well-known elements of *systems* analysis: structure, function, process, inputs and outputs. We take these elements as the main foci around which to build our case. In order to specify these elements as accurately as possible, we pose the six questions, whose answers usually describe any fact or idea quite reasonably: what? where? who? when? how? why? Accordingly, the conceptual definition of any term should involve six parameters, grouped in three dyads:

1. **Content**: nature or essence of what is to be defined;
2. **Context**: structure or arena where it takes place;
3. **Actors**: units or participants who engage in it;
4. **Action**: factors or conditions when it occurs;
5. **Means**: process or method of how it is performed;
6. **Ends**: purpose it serves or reason why it is necessary or desirable.

Together, these six facets describe as completely as possible anything one wishes. On the strength of the answers to these questions, we build the multidimensional definition of our subject matter.

Since our subject is political development, we first break down the phrase in its two components and then define each separately. After this analysis, we synthesize the two and define them as a whole. Thus, the chapter is divided into three sections: Politics; Development; and Political Development. In each one, we go through the same six steps for a comparable definition of politics and development, finally combining the two for a holistic conceptualization of political development. The resulting eighteen items are thus this product of cross cutting or cross fertilization the three concepts with their six aspects**.**

Interactions

To begin with, we conceptualize *politics* by looking at this term as a *phenomenon*: something which we perceive going on out there. From this point of view, politics is seen as an activity, taking place in reality. Therefore, it appears to be an action or a complex of events happening in what we experience to be the real world.

Politics is a hoary notion and as such has been defined by many people in many ways. In its broadest, politics has been called "the art of the possible" or "the master science". Whether it is an art or a science, politics is a manifold activity that involves a variety of things going on at the same time. As a dynamic and multifaceted phenomenon, politics has been likened to a process of "creative disorder", because it is almost impossible to say what is going on exactly. Nevertheless, it does go on, so people who are fascinated by it try to grapple with its many elusive aspects.

Some of the more significant of these aspects have to do with "power" and "government". From this, more specific, point of view, politics has been defined as "the way to rule people", or "the competition for leadership". Another way of looking at it is to say that politics is a method by which society distributes its values, or "who gets what, when and how". Politics may be all of these things and more; so no single definition does it full justice. All of them focus on one thing that happens to interest whoever does the defining based on little more than subjective and impressionistic opinions; all the way from those that see politics as "handmaiden of business" to those that look upon it as "king of the performing arts."

Our approach will be somewhat different. Although one cannot avoid a certain focus and partiality, we shall try to approach politics from many sides and then strip it of its superficial traits to find its essential core. All we have said so far is that politics is an *activity*. But, obviously, it is not just any activity. Politics is a particular activity displaying distinctive patterns. At the center of these we can discern some behavioral interaction or transaction in space and time. Let us then begin with this basic notion and elucidate it as we go along.

The Political System

If politics is seen as a patterned interaction, then it takes place in a network of interrelations. We cannot conceive of politics in chaos or vacuum, but only within the context of a *system*. This system is not merely conceptual but spatial. The total of these relations and activities included in the political system exist in a well-defined arena: the *polity* or etymologically the *polis*. Thus, politics is simply something that goes on in the polis.

Although, many things were going on in the original Greek polis, other than politics, it was politics that was its necessary and sufficient activity. It was politics that made the polis more than a mere society. As we would put it now: the political system can only exist within the social system, or society serves as the environment of politics. Of course, the social system need not be a city-state; it could also be as small as a family or as large as the world. Politics take place in many levels and arenas, throughout this broad range from the *micro* to the *macro*.

Whether it is in the agora of old or the United Nations of today, political activity always has a common denominator. It is this underlying trait that distinguishes it from all the other actions going on at the same time in these places. We might say that this distinctive activity is whatever concerns everybody. No matter what one chooses to define everybody, politics is the activity relevant to the things that are common to the whole society: *res publica,* as the Romans said, "public affairs," as we translate it now.

Politics is whatever falls within everyone's business in public view. It is thereby the opposite of private business, which etymologically is *economics*. Whereas politics or *civics* is of interest all the members of society, economics is the private activity of a household and none of the business of a state.

Of course, when we speak of family-politics, we have chosen the family as the relevant arena of action, so politics is whatever pertains to all its members and is not privy to any particular one. Although politics is a common activity, all common activities are not political. As we shall see later on, politics is a special kind of public event, which happens under certain conditions and serves certain functions.

Citizenship

So far, we defined politics as a common activity or public affair. This is not sufficient, since we would want to exclude from it circuses and other public spectacles that are not necessarily or primarily political. From our etymological origins, a further delimitation of politics should be made by specifying its participants. In this sense, politics is an activity performed by a collection of actors. It takes more than one participant to play the game, since politics is not a solitary pursuit.

To this quantitative restriction, we must add a qualitative one: the actors in question must be *human beings*. With this postulate, we explicitly limit politics to human societies. As

Aristotle said, *anthropos* is a *zoon politikon*. Not only is man a political animal, he is the only political animal.

Although he is not the only social animal, man has the unique distinction of being the sole performer of political acts. Ants and bees are social, but apolitical; hence politics can only take place in human societies and not in anthills or beehives. We cannot conceive of politics going on in other animal societies, though it is very difficult to conceive of any human society in which no politics takes place at all. Ideally, one can create a utopia (Plato's *Republic*!?) where politics is excluded by definition or intention, but precisely for that reason, a Platonic polis would resemble rather a beehive or anthill than any real life human community.

Of course, some societies are relatively more political than others. We will not go so far as the Greeks to claim that only they were political, but we affirm that by its very nature mankind can only thrive within a polity and not just any society. It is the political *agora* that requires and defines its essence by its constituent units who are the *citizens*. In this sense, citizens are those who partake of public affairs. Only in this capacity as a participant in political activities is a person a citizen or *polites*. In so far as one does not play that game, he is merely a private person or *idiotes*, hence inconsiderable and contemptible as an idiot.

This derivation shows quite clearly the high esteem that the ancients had for politics and citizenship. So much so that the only civilized person was the citizen and politics was synonymous with civilization or *politismos*. Politics, therefore, is a civilized and civilizing activity because it takes place in a polis or *civis* by citizens.

Public Issues

As mentioned, politics is a uniquely human activity because it demands certain peculiarly human attributes. At the center of these attributes is *controversy*. This condition is the *sine qua non* of politics, so we must add "controversial" to the "public human interactions" in the ongoing definition of politics. This new qualifier brings us one step closer to the essential conditions for political activity and thus to an understanding of this interesting phenomenon.

By controversy, we mean the existence of a difference of opinions, volitions and interests within the social system. That means the existence of "public issues" which characterize "public affairs" in human societies. This trait differentiates human from other kinds of social system. As far as we know, such controversies are to be found only among people and nowhere else. It is on this fertile ground of controversy where politics functions and flourishes.

Although certain *conflicts* do exist among all animals, conflicts are articulated as issues only among humans. It is herein where clashes of opinion and contradictions of position surface as verbal rather than physical conflicts. Of course, evolutionary relativity does not allow for clear-cut distinctions among various aspects of animal ethology and human psychology, but we cannot really speak of public issues in anything but a human context.

Be that as it may, politics assumes a *confrontation* of opposing points of view. If there are any societies in which everyone is in agreement with everyone else, there cannot be any political activity. Politics abhors harmony. In this sense, utopias tend to be apolitical. But, so are eutopias and dystopias or any other perfect system.

Although politics thrives on controversy, it requires an underlying consensus provided by a social system. Without it, politics becomes merely physics. Absolutes or extremes of any kind, orderly or chaotic, good or evil, do not allow politics. As Aristotle concluded, only gods are above politics and beasts below it, humans in between are condemned to engage in it.

In this vein, we also conclude that politics is the primordial human or artificial activity, to be found nowhere else on earth, heaven or hell. Politics, thereby, is a civic art or craft that evolved along with culture as a quintessential human activity.

Power Dialectics

Although controversy is a necessary, it is not a sufficient cause of politics. We still have to add another quality pertaining to political activity: the process in which politics handles public issues. All human disagreements are not political; many involve fights, games or debates. Unlike these, politics is the particular way of dealing with public issues by the judicious manipulation of *power,* rather than violence or intelligence.

Power has been traditionally tied to politics, yet it is still an ambiguous concept in the social sciences. We will not here attempt another definition of power, but simply borrow that of physics as it tersely equates power (P) to the rate of doing work (W). Since work is done whenever a force (F) accelerates (a) an object (m) some distance (s) over a time (t); the greater the object and the distance, the more work is done and the more power is needed. Hence: $P = W/t = Fs/t = mas/t$.

This physical concept can be translated into political by replacing the objects of physics with the subjects of politics. Thus, political power is the capacity to move people or get them to behave in a certain way. The greater the human masses one has to move and the further one wants to get them to go in a certain time, the more power one needs. Figuratively speaking, power becomes *influence*, when one tries to make people change their minds rather than their behavior; when one tries to move thoughts rather than things.

Now, political interactions may be looked upon as an exchange of power or influence: people trying to get each other to think or act in a certain way. But the difference between physics and politics is that the former modifies inanimate motion by the application of physical force, whereas the latter affects human action by dialectical talk, in searching for a synthesis of a thesis and its antithesis. In politics one does not get physical but rhetorical. The pressure applied in politics is more subtle than in physics, even if it may not be as effective. Physical force is thus anti-political and whenever violence is used, politics has abstained or failed.

The way of politics is a complex play of debate, negotiation, exhortation, bargaining and other non-violent methods, where two opposing sides try to resolve their differences by dialogue. Form, in politics, then is more important than content: it is not so much what one does but how he does it that defines an act as political. And that "how" must be "civil" or "polite" in the etymological sense, not barbaric, whereby people are persuaded by other means.

Policy-Making

We complete the definition of politics by adding a final point to those already mentioned. This point relates to the function of politics and directs all political activity towards a particular goal. Even if it is often its own reward, politics is a purposive or teleological act; because it is normally undertaken in order to reach some end: i.e. public *policy*. The function of politics, therefore, is policy-making.

Politics is supposed to begin in controversy and end in harmony. As such, politics is a way of converting social problems into policy solutions by means of power dialectics. Of the many ways by which differences may be eliminated, politics provides the one based on

compromise. It does so, not by eliminating one party in the confrontation, but by accommodating both to each other. In politics, there are no complete winners or losers, rights or wrongs, but various degrees of in-betweens. The give and take of politics does not allow for extreme or exclusive solutions; rather, its dialectics converge opposites into similarities.

In systemic terms, the inputs of politics are various clashing forces that are accommodated into common outputs through a power algorithm. Politics is a process of *conflict-resolution* by collective *decision-making*. Although it is neither the only way of resolving conflicts, nor making decisions, politics is a particular combination of factors, reconciling contradictions to arrive at a united position. In order to do so, there must be a potential choice and willingness to make it work. In this case, politics provides a procedure of opting between alternatives by calculating the power behind each.

One might say that politics is a social *problem-solving* process, using dialogical, rather than logical or corporal means. In that, it differs from either mathematics or physics, being situated somewhere between reason and coercion. Because of that, in its extremes, politics interfaces both *logos* and *chaos.* As long as human actions span these two opposing tendencies, politics provide the golden mean for solving their collective problems. Through politics, people are able to orient their collective activities, set their social goals and direct their cultural values with a modicum of civility and common sense.

DEVELOPMENT

Directed Change

Development is another complex concept that admits of many interpretations. Moreover, this term has now become heavily weighted with value connotations, so that it can be used to mean just about anything. To avoid these pitfalls, we begin the investigation of "development" by stripping it down to the bare essentials and then adding necessary nuances as we go along.

Apart from its qualitative or subjective aspects, the first thing that development implies is *change*. Whatever else it may mean, development primarily involves some kind of change. In turn, change means a temporal succession of differences within a persisting identity. Change, therefore, combines variability within constancy, and as such it pervades "reality".

All around us, we are continuously reminded of this stay and change. The argument whether one remains or another prevails is at least as old as Parmenides and Heraclitus, so we will not revive it here. All we can say is that in different historical eras the balance between conservation and revolution shifts from one to the other. It does seem that we now live in one of these periods when the magnitude of change has taken unprecedented proportions. It is for this reason that the topic of social change has become such a fascinating one.

However, development is not just change but a particular kind. The particularity that characterizes development might be attributed to its *direction*. By adding direction to motion, we get a *vector* quality that can measure both rate and aim of change.

In the following few pages, we try to discover where that orientation leads; keeping in mind that development implies an *evolution* or *anaptixis*; as an unfolding or opening. This etymological meaning can serve as the basic definition that we develop presently.

Meanwhile, we understand development as a purposive or *teleonomic* movement, closely related to the Aristotelian "becoming". As such, developmental change is imbued with some *patterned* alteration or *diachronic* regularity. It is this temporal pattern that people have always sought, because finding it would give meaning to the past and planning to the future.

Social Systems

Development always happens within a context. Let us postulate the context of development as a *system*. The term is by now sufficiently known not to require a great explanation here. In its simplest form a system is an identifiable aggregate of individuals and their relations. In more formal terms, it is described as a state vector and a set of connections. If the system is dynamic, the relations are also interactions, which if irreversible, make for a developmental system.

Anything identified as such could be a system: from atomic to cosmic. For our purposes, we could identify two crosscutting dyads (organic-inorganic and natural-artificial) as the four basic classes of systems which will be discussed here. Different permutations of these give various mixes, two of which are the *ecosystem* and *sociosystem*. The latter, which is of particular interest here, exists within the former. The ecosystem forms the environment of the sociosystem, just as the sociosystem is the environment of the political system.

Natural scientists have studied systems much more than social scientists have. If certain analogies hold, the latter stand to learn a lot from the former, particularly in the field of system development. To the natural scientist, development is not such a difficult concept since his

teleonomies are rather clear: the acorn develops into an oak and the child into an adult. In all these cases, development involves *growth*, both in quantitative and qualitative terms. The system becomes bigger, more complex and stable, as well as better functioning. In other words, it increases its organization and capability and by doing so fulfills its potential.

The question is to what extent can we adopt and adapt the concept of natural development into social. There is no doubt that all systems have certain isomorphisms; the question is to know whether development is one of them. Fortunately, we do not have to answer this completely in order to proceed with the investigation. So long as we can agree at this point that sociodevelopment could share with ecodevelopment certain points of increasing order and improved efficiency.

Human Growth

In the last section, development was seen from the macrosystemic point of view. Let us now do the same from the micro, which for our purposes is the individual. Trying to find some correspondence between human and social development is similar to looking for the analogy between natural and social systems. The question that has often been asked in this context is to what extent should society be considered as "man writ large."

Although this is not the place to engage in this controversy, we shall make a minimum of assumptions, as in the previous comparison. Humans are natural-cultural beings, therefore their development is largely prescribed in their inherent and ambient givens. Per definition, human development is the road to full maturity of the individual or the actualization of the *human potential*. But apart from the obvious physical characteristics of the grown adult, what is the human potential? Is it something that certain people have already attained or is it more of an ideal for the human race. Finally, is that potential fixed and immutable or does it develop itself in time?

Even if an ideal model for humanity did exist, it is not known for sure; one cannot say what is the final goal of human development, without fear of contradiction. It seems, however, that mankind is always in the process of becoming, so that human needs or wants are ultimately insatiable. It may be that some motive drives mankind to an everlasting search for an elusive fulfillment. Whether one looks upon this process from the perspective of an entire specie's evolution or a single individual's lifetime, man is a developing animal: a *homo anaptictus*.

People do not develop in isolation. Their social nature requires that even individual development is a collective enterprise. Society provides at least the infrastructure for human development, so it is indispensable to the process. The way social systems persist and change has a direct impact on the form and substance in which individual development takes place. This relationship between the micro content and macro context indicates that there should be some common elements in the development of both. Whether one considers nature, nurture or culture, the road to development presents certain parallels to be elucidated presently.

Potential Synergy

Development can only take place in open, dynamic or living-systems. The reason is that development requires change and change can only come about if there is some flow of matter or energy. Such inputs and outputs, in turn, presuppose certain potential differential between which matter or energy may be upgraded or downgraded. On that assumption, it may be postulated at

this point that development corresponds to a process leading from lower to higher potentials.

Since energy is the capacity to do work, the higher the energy of a system the more capable it is to perform its functions. Open systems draw energy from their environment and then utilize it to maintain their identity and if possible grow. Development occurs in the latter phase of a system's attempt to increase its vitality and viability. In the process of exchanging matter and energy with its environment, a system will tend to store whatever it saves beyond its immediate needs, so as to acquire a margin of safety for is survival. It is this excess which creates the disequilibrium leading to development.

It is the innate drive of all organisms to reach out and affect their environment by assimilating its free matter-energy and reforming it into extension of themselves. This process of development, however, cannot go on indefinitely. The scarcity of available resources and the second law of thermodynamics eventually reverse the developmental process. Either by reaching maturity or attaining the limits of provisions, a system may maintain a steady-state plateau for a while but eventually will begin to decay and ultimately die. Whether by the cycles of their own programming or by the implacable march of *entropy*, all systems gradually break down and disintegrate into the ubiquitous environmental sink.

Development is the struggle against entropy by improving a system's synergy to control and upgrade energy, thus increasing its potency. By doing so however, the system feeds on the environment and hence degrades it. Since everything cannot develop at the same time, the life of some depends on the death of others. All one can do is prolong or extend the process and its effects as far as possible in time and space, thus creating and maintaining islands of energy in a sea of entropy; even if the whole enterprise is doomed in the long run.

Information Syntropy

In addition to matter and energy, living systems also receive and transmit information. As such, they process information, recreating or rearranging it in a multiplicity of new forms and contents. The increased capacity of life to handle and use information is another aspect of development. A system closed to the communication of information is autistic and insular.

Information is more complex a notion than either matter or energy and its many definitions are more abstract. One way of looking at it is to say that information is whatever determines the probability of occurrence for an event. In that sense, it is related to energy, causing events to occur. The greater the relevant information, the more probable is to determine if something happens; whereas the greater the available energy, the more possible it is to happen. Although some systems may maximize either one or the other, a balanced development would tend to optimize both.

Information, as the term implies, puts things in-form or increases pattern and order. Since the very nature of a system is its underlying order, increasing information develops systems in general, as education develops people in particular. The more complex a system, the more information it needs to operate, even though it may not need more matter or energy. So, the relation between matter, energy and information is not linear. Although some material and energetic resources are necessary in order to obtain information; the degradation of matter and energy need not affect information. A system may gain information, while it loses matter or energy.

Nevertheless, the syntropic nature of information should help prolong the overall developmental phase of a system. High information systems are better able to order and control

their activities, as well as manipulate their environment, thereby increasing their virility and viability. Since development is an unstable process, information cannot but help make it more efficient and effective. By increasing only materially, development produces obesity; by increasing information, it becomes *maturity*. Sustainable development requires increased control of the homeostasis between the system and its environment, hence maximizing protection from dangerous perturbations. Furthermore, information feedback provides the system with its *learning* capacity, which is the central element in education and development.

Historical Progress

Finally, let us complete the definition of development by mentioning its goals. Why develop? That is the question. From what has been said so far, it would seem that systems develop in order to increase their capacity to respond and perform, so that they may become more efficient and effective in their struggle for self-actualization and fulfillment. We could then say that the ontological reason for development is striving for state *optimization*.

Naturally, real beings can hardly reach perfection; so what is important is trying to approach it. As long as this process shows some returns, development has a meaning and a value. In the realm of human affairs, looked upon in historical perspective, this idea of meaningful change for the better is the road to *progress*. The implication here is of a movement ascending from lower to higher levels of existence.

Whether such vector exists in nature is not known, but it does exist in human ideals. Intelligent or rational systems inevitable produce teleological processes. They formulate and seek a purpose, rather than operate in random or repetitive fashion. In the case of human societies, the purpose of collective development may be to enhance the individual development of its members, rather than the organic development of society as an entity. If we accept the humanistic dictum that man is the measure of all things, social development may be justified only in so far as it contributes to human development. This is what is meant when we say that development is the process by which societies become more capable in improving the quality of life of their people.

Apart from individuals striving to satisfy idiosyncratic goals and desires, the human species may be said to have developed throughout history because it can now handle more matter, energy and information than ever before. Human capacity to create and utilize negentropy is higher than any other living system. Of course, what mankind does with this increasing ability will determine its ultimate end. Presently, it could destroy itself and the ecosystem or devise new ways of sustainable development. In any case, human development so far has increased options and choices, thus shifting the responsibility of human destiny from nature to culture.

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Legitimation

Now that the definitions of "politics" and "development" have been completed separately, they can be combined to form the definition of "political development" (p-d). But since we are here dealing with a vector, rather than a scalar phenomenon, the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. So, we can speak of p-d as the enhanced product of this union.

The first thing that such union requires is the proper identification. Per definition, politics must at some point become explicit and those who engage in it must be aware of what they are doing. Since *consciousness* is a mark of development, until politics is consciously carried out, it cannot be developed. In a state of underdevelopment, politics is haphazard and disoriented. Its activity does not have sufficient regularity and its pattern is not evident. It is only when some pattern can be identified that we become aware of its existence and can say that we know what we are doing.

This evolution from random and nebulous to aimed and conscious activity is the first characteristic of p-d. Parallel to this trait is that of acceptability. As it develops, politics becomes more adapted to its environment and fits in better to the social system, thereby attaining *legitimacy*. When underdeveloped, politics either happens spontaneously and sporadically, or forcibly and mechanically. Otherwise, politics eventually finds its ecological niche and attains sustainable development. It may then be said that p-d follows a process of legitimation.

Moreover, p-d acquires of a definite *style* that gives it a certain form and visibility, so that it attains an identity and *integrity* of its own. With p-d, society formulates traditions and codifies the rules of the game; otherwise politics remains anemic, anomic and atrophic. Once it has attained *viability*, one can say that politics has fulfilled the first condition of development. Let us see what this means in the macro and micro levels.

Institutionalization

If politics is public affairs and development is system formation, then p-d must mean the *organizing* process of the polity. In this sense, development applies to the creation and improvisation of the political system: putting public affairs in order. This evolution in general would be the contextual definition of p-d, thus setting the parameters of our subject matter.

Developing the political system means institutionalizing it: building and promoting political *structures* that can contain political activities within certain bounds. Structure gives action certain identity and visibility; it regularizes and codifies transactions so that they become more predictable and habitual. When political institutions are underdeveloped, politics spills all over the place and yet is not where it should be. Structure channels and focuses flow, thereby shaping and directing events to particular functions. Institutional development tames or modulates politics in order to make it more effective and efficient.

Institutionalization is the backbone of development in a political *culture*; so a central aspect of cultural development is its increased self-awareness. This tends to make it more *autonomous* and therefore *autarchic*. P-d moves the social system towards greater *self-determination*. As its political institutions become more structured, society is better able to govern itself. Underdeveloped states are rather externally dependent, just as overdeveloped ones extend themselves to dominate others. Between these two extremes, proper p-d provides the

optimal socio-cybernetic structure.

An important manifestation of this development is the degree of *integration* between the social and political systems. In this sense, "*laissez-faire* government" would indicate a form of political underdevelopment because of the minimal relations and interactions between the social and political spheres. On the contrary, totalitarianism goes to the other extreme of fusion of the two and thus is a type of political overdevelopment. Within these bounds, the structural aspects of p-d indicate the necessary and desirable scope or arena of public affairs within the total system of human activities.

Politicization

As institutionalization is the macro-political manifestation of development, politicization is the micro-political one. From the point of view of the citizens, p-d means the socialization of people into the political system: i.e. citizenship making. Political socialization develops the political aspects of mankind and brings out the potential of its community spirit. As humans develop, they become political animals to the extent that they fulfill their collective needs.

An apolitical person is an individual who is uninterested and unconcerned for his community. Such isolation shows itself as *apathy* towards public affairs and is usually accompanied by overindulgence in private business. Widespread individualism or *atomism* in certain societies shows their political underdevelopment; whereas a proper balance between the political, economic and cultural aspects of man indicates an overall social development.

The best index of politicization is the kind and degree of citizen *participation* in public affairs. P-d increases the number of people who participate in politics as well as it increases their depth of commitment. Wider citizen involvement makes the political system grow at least quantitatively by making it more inclusive. On the contrary, political *elitism* or exclusivity indicates political underdevelopment. In these cases, *alienation* afflicts the average person who cannot participate in social life. Isolating people from the agora privatizes or depoliticizes them, thus undermining p-d.

At the other extreme, hyperpoliticization raises the activity of people to heights of paroxysm. A feverish political action cannot be maintained for long without explosive consequences. Politics, like many other activities, become dangerous when overdone because they raise expectations that cannot be fulfilled. When people become super-political, they end up monomanic: unidimensional persons obsessed with a single aspect of existence, while ignoring all the others. Fanatics, like idiots, do not make good citizens; so a political system with too many in either extremity cannot be too developed. Rather, a "happy versatility" and *pas trop de zèle* seem to be just the right ingredients for p-d.

Mobilization

From what has been said so far, the factors which make for p-d are multiple and variable. Since public issues are conditions for politics and energy differentials are conditions for development, p-d would require some combination of these inputs to converge at the same time and place. This means that there must arise differences of interest and opinion coupled with differences of energy and potential. The interaction of these *differentials* then is the necessary, but not sufficient, cause of p-d.

Political systems effect social change when the pressures or demands made upon them

cannot be handled by established routines. The triggering of p-d, therefore, begins with increasing *challenges* to the system. A developing polity exhibits great dynamism and high level of activity because its inputs are increasing. To put it another way, if one wants p-d, he begins by the *mobilization* of various forces for change. This new energy input must be sufficient to overcome the inertia of the system and push it to a higher state of action. In these circumstances, political *agitation* may break the passivity of the system and get it to move ahead.

However, politics is a dangerous activity. It is time and energy intensive, thus highly entropic. Politics burns a lot of energy; it enervates its actors and tends to exhaust its social environment. Intensive political activity generates a lot of heat, which if not quickly absorbed or dissipated, can end up in a horrible conflagration. An underdeveloped political system cannot handle sudden jumps of such energy without short-circuiting. Sustained p-d must proceed prudently by a gradual progression in the stimulus-response spiral.

A developed political system should be able to absorb and process great amounts of public energy; so much so that it would welcome and thrive on challenging issues. For that reason, it must have good enough sensors to *anticipate* and machinery to *prepare* for these eventualities. In this way it could face crises without panic reactions which tend to extreme behavior. On the contrary, p-d leads to greater *self-control* and measured response to environmental challenges. Although social change can be brought about without p-d, it is only through it that moderation and regulation may be assured. As we shall see in the next section, these characteristics of p-d require an increased capacitation of the political system.

Capacitation

A crucial question of p-d is how to increase the community's capacity to handle heavier loads. P-d cannot begin until the machinery of the system shows some inadequacies in operating under new conditions. In this case, if the heavy pressures do not subside and if the machine does not break down, p-d would improve performance, making it equal to the challenge.

As agreed, the political process utilizes power to influence human behavior. This operation unavoidably expends energy and hence increases either the entropy of the system or its environment. On the other hand, as a syntropic process, development increases information and organization.

By combining these two complementary tendencies, p-d can prevent the excesses of hyper-politicization and maldevelopment. The agonistic spirit of man may be tempered through education, and political action may be kept within bounds by an enlightened body politic. As the Greeks understood a long time ago, politics requires a certain level of social development, including leisure and learning *(scholé* and *paidea).*

In this sense, p-d balances and increases levels of energy and information. Great asymmetries between the two may bring about other kinds of social change but not p-d. High levels of energy interactions require knowledgeable and careful operators. Increased political activity necessitates a highly sophisticated and self-restrained citizenry. Wielding great power takes talent and *prudence* that only wise and *responsible* people can handle.

This process of political *enlightenment* involves improving methods for collective articulation and deliberation, cooperation and coordination, as well as diplomacy and democracy. To develop such formidable capacities, the polity must plan and rationalize its operations. As a system becomes more complex, it becomes more vulnerable; so it has to increase its tolerance to disturbances: both internal and external. It must prepare not only more

flexible responses but also more creative initiatives. In other words, p-d contributes improved problem-solving capability and increased policy-making efficiency.

Civilization

      Finally, we complete the definition of p-d by considering its main function. Using our conceptual framework, this is a combination of political and developmental processes leading to policy-progress. This means that the output of p-d should be improved collective decision-making for the fulfillment of human aspirations. The development of public policy serves the dual attainment of social and personal ends.
      Although p-d is good in itself because it fulfills one aspect of human nature, it also promotes other human goals. P-d makes it possible for all those who are affected by public affairs to take part in shaping public policy. This enhanced opportunity to participate in decision-making makes p-d an instrumental *human-right*. Since those who participate in the making of policies are more likely to respect and implement them. Involvement in public affairs tends to civilize people.
      P-d makes men more sociable and empathetic, communicative and understanding, as well as critical and eclectic. Political maturity means easier acceptance of conflicts and contradictions, the ability to live with uncertainty and insecurity. P-d imposes self-limitations to one's claims and expectations; it serves as an internal control of one's external concerns. It is an understanding that everybody cannot have everything at the same time and that social life demands consideration of others. In this sense, p-d contributes to *moral* development by promoting the accommodation of conflicting interests.
      Both political immaturity and immorality manifest themselves in egoistic expectations, without taking into account the needs and wishes of others. Such underdevelopment leads to brutality and terrorism. On the contrary, p-d balances one's private interests with the public good, by promoting concern and commitment without fanaticism or nihilism.
      P-d can by no means solve all the problems of the human condition. Politics is no panacea for every social ill. In many cases it may exacerbate and worsen things. But, whatever the outcome, p-d brings it about through *consensus*, thereby making people responsible by attributing to them full credit or blame for their decisions.

      Having completed the defining elaborations, we are ready to summarize what has been said in more concise terms. The following, then, serves as the composite definitions of the three terms:
-*Politics* is citizen interaction in public affairs, trying to resolve conflicting issues by power dialectics, resulting in collective policies.
-*Development* is directed change, actualizing system potential by increasing energy and information capability, aiming to satisfy set values.
-*Political Development* is a process of legitimation and institutionalization of public affairs by politicization and mobilization, thus improving system capacity to attain social objectives.

      Attempting to arrive at a precise definition of complex concepts is a convoluted affair. One is forced to opt for either rigor or clarity, since the correspondence between concept and

reality always leaves something to be desired. Consequently, we have attempted for an optimal position that gives maximum understanding with minimum distortion.

As a further aid to clarification, we have constructed a *synoptic* table, containing all the key terms that we have underlined in the course of this essay. The tabulation of these terms in the following page should give an overall idea of the various elements that have gone into the definitions, along with their interrelationships. This supplements the above concepts by adding certain nuances to the terms used therein.

Moreover, the table also serves to illustrate the entire conceptual framework of this last chapter. In effect, the table is the *matrix* resulting by interposing the three subjects of the definition with the method used in defining them. The horizontal gives the three sections of the chapter, while the vertical shows the six items of each. Another elucidation is provided in the table by grouping the vertical sections into the top three representing the main system parameters (form-structure-actors) and the bottom three representing the system process (input-conversion-output). With these preliminaries, the table's contents should be self-explanatory.

We conclude with some suggestions for the logical follow-up of this work. The definition of terms is the first step in understanding concepts, so what was done here is the prolegomenon to any systematic research into a subject. An attempt at conceptualization must precede any in-depth study of a topic, so that the investigator knows what is to be done.

Having done that, the next step is to put the definition to work. This means converting the conceptual into an *operational* definition, by which different social systems can be compared and measured as to their relative, if not absolute p-d. To do so, one has to find empirical *indices* for the various elements of the definition. These indicators should be as observable and measurable as possible, so that they can test the correspondence between the concepts and reality. In this case, operationalization should not be that difficult, but testing the indicators would present many problems because of the penury of comparative political statistics.

Be that as it may, another phase of scientific study is the formulation and testing of *hypotheses*. Once concepts have been defined, a subsequent step is to find relevant correlations among them. In this case, an interesting project could try to discern any connections between political and economic development. Similarly, one could investigate the relation between political development and a host of other phenomena of particular significance to the researcher.

These and other possible studies should enhance our knowledge of political development and the place it occupies in human lives. This increased knowledge will provide the necessary feedback to improve our conceptualization of reality and thus ameliorate human capacity to set and attain collective goals. Although politics may not be the most important thing in human affairs, p-d would definitely contribute both to the means and ends or processes and policies of social progress. Further research in this area should therefore be essential to our common enterprise. Hopefully, this essay contributes to this goal.

BACKGROUND BIBLIOGRAPHY

POLITICS

Arnopoulos, P.J. (Ed). *Prospects for Peace*. Gamma Press, Montreal, 1986
Andrain, C.F. *Political Life & Social Change*. Wadsworth, Bel 1970.
Benjamin, R. *The Limits of Politics*. Chicago, 1980.
Carlsson, I. & Ramphal, S. *Our Global Neighbourhood*. Oxford, NY, 1995
Cialdini, R. B. *Influence*. Morrow, NY, 1994
Elshtain, J. B. *Real Politics*. Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, 1997
Iyer, R.N. *Parapolitics*. Oxford, N.Y. 1979.
Konrad, G. *Antipolitics*. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, N.Y. 1984
Lasswell, H. *Politics: Who gets what, when & how*. Meridian, N.Y. 1958.
Lindlom, C.E. *Politics and Markets*. Basic Books, N.Y., 1977.
Oettinger, Bearman, Read. *High & Low Politics*. Pallinger, Cambridge, 1977.
Parekh, B. and R. Berki (eds.) *The Morality of Politics*. Allen-Unwin, 1972.
Pennock, J.R. and J. W. Chapman (eds.), *Human Nature in Politics*. NYU, 1977.
Porter, G. & Brown, J. *Global Environmental Politics*. Westview, Boulder, 1991
Prugh, T. et al. *Local Politics of Global Sustainability*. Island, Washington, 2000
Rule, J. et.al. *The Politics of Privacy*. NAL (Mentor), N.Y., 1980.
Schaeffer, R. K. *Power to the People*. Westview, Boulder, 1997
Schubert, G. *Evolutionary Politics*. Southern Illinois UP, Carbondale, 1989
Secretariat, *Democratization*. IPSA, Berlin, 1994
Spiro, H.J. *Politics as the Master Science*. Harper-Row, N.Y. 1970.
Stunkel, K. R. *Ideology, Values & Technology in Politics*. UPA, Lanham, 1994
Sussman, G. *Communications, Technology & Politics*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, 1997
Switzer, J. V. *Environmental Politics*. St. Martin's Press, NY, 1994
Talmor, E. *Mind & Political Concepts*. Pergamon, N.Y. 1979.
Wheeler, M. *Politics & Mass Media*. Blackwell, Cambridge, 1997

DEVELOPMENT

Adjibolosoo, S. *Global Development*. Praeger, Westport, 1998
Appelbaum, R. *Theories of Social Change*. Markham, Chicago, 1970.
Boulding, K.E. *A Primer on Social Dynamics*. Free Press, N.Y. 1970.
Durham, W. H. *Coevolution*. Stanford UP, 1991
Goodman, A. & Leatherman, T. (Eds). *Building New Biocultural Synthesis*. Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1998
Jensen, U. & R. Harre (eds) *Philosophy of Evolution*. Harvester Brighton, 1981.
Levy, M. *Modernization*. Basic Books, N.Y. 1972.
Lasswell, H. et.al. *Values & Development*. M.I.T., Cambridge, 1976.
Montagu, A. *The Direction of Human Development*. Hawthorn, N.Y. 1970.
Mowlana, H. *Communication, Technology & Development*. UNESCO, Paris, 1998
Nisbet, R. *History of the Idea of Progress*. Basic Books, N.Y. 1979.
Nisbet, R. (ed.) *Social Change*. Harper-Torchbooks, N.Y. 1972.
Oxaal, T. et.al. *Beyond the Sociology of Development*. London, 1975.
O'Toole, J. *Energy & Social Change*. M.I.T. Cambridge, 1976.
Parsons, T. *The Evolution of Societies*. Prentice-Hall, N.Y. 1977.
Roxborough, I. *Theories of Underdevelopment*. Macmillan, London, 1979.
So, A.Y. *Social Change & Development*. Sage, N.Y. 1990
Trivers, R. L. *Social Evolution*. Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, 1985
UNDP. *Human Development Report*. Oxford, NY, 2000
World Bank. *World Development Report*. Oxford, NY, 2000
Woods, B. *Communications, Technology & Development*. Routledge, NY, 1993

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Arnopoulos, P. J. "Defining Political Development." Gamma Institute, Montreal, 1993

Adkin, L. E. *The Politics of Sustainable Development*. Black Rose, NY, 1998

Allman, P. *Revolutionary Social Transformation*. Bergin & Garvey, London, 1999

Apter, D. *Political Change*. Cass, London, 1973.

Anderson, C.W. et.al. *Issues of Political Development*. Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Auster, R.D. & M. Silver. *Economic Forces in Political Development*. Martinus Nijhoff, Boston, 1979.

Benjamin, R.W. *Patterns of Political Development* McKay, N.Y., 1972.

Beer, S.H. *Modern Political Development*. Random House, N.Y., 1974.

Brewer, G.D. *Political Development & Change*. Free Press, N.Y., 1975.

Binder, L. et.al. *Crises in Political Development*. Princeton, N.J., 1971.

Braibanti, R. (ed.) *Political & Administrative Development*. Duke U, 1969.

Clifton, S. *Defining Political Development*. Lynne Riener, Boulder, 1988.

Coleman, J.S. (ed.) *Education & Political Development*. Princeton, 1965.

Dodd, C.H. *Political Development*. Macmillan, London, 1972.

Finkle, J.L. (ed.) *Political Development & Social Change*. Wiley, N.Y., 1966.

Higgins, E., D. Ruble, W. Hartup (eds.) *Social Development*. Cambridge, N.Y. '83.

Jaguaribe, H. *Political Development*. Harper & Row, N.Y. 1973.

Krishna. *Political Development*. Oxford, London, 1980.

Koh, T. B. *The Quest for World Order*. Times Press, Singapore, 1998

Kohlberg, L. *Essays on Moral Development*. Harper & Row, S.F., 1981.

LaPalombara, J. *Bureaucracy & Political Development*. Princeton, 1963.

McGinnis, M. D. *Polycentric Governance & Development*. Michigan UP, An Arbor, 1999

Organski, A.F.K. *Stages of Political Development*. Knopf, N.Y., 1965.

Palmer, M. and L. Stern (eds.).*Political Development*. Heath, Lex., 1971.

Palmer, M. *Dilemmas in Political Development*. Peacock, Ill., 1980.
            Political Development. Peacock, Itasca, 1997

Park, H.S. *Human Needs & Political Development*. Schenkman, Cambridge, 84.

Pye, L.W. *Aspects of Political Development*. Little-Brown, Boston, 1966.

Samuels, R. *Political Generations & Political Development*. Heath, 1977.

Shils, E. *Political Development in New States*. New York, 1964.

Tsurutani, T. *The Politics of National Development*. Chandler, N.Y., 1973.

Welch, C.E. (ed.) *Political Modernization*. Belmont, California, 1967.

Wilson, R.W. & G.J. Schochet. *Moral Development & Politics*. Praeger, 1979.

Weiner, M. & S. Huntington (eds.) *Understanding Political Development*.
            Harper-Collins, N.Y., 1987.