



Journal Website:
<https://theamericanjournals.com/index.php/tajpslc>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

Research Article

AN INQUISITIVE LOOK AT THE IDEA OF POLITICAL WILL: A PARADOXICAL PAIR MODEL FOR POLITICAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Submission Date: March 11, 2023, Accepted Date: March 16, 2023,

Published Date: March 21, 2023 |

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajpslc/Volume05Issue03-02>

Professor Zaynab Ali

Department Of Political Science And International Relations, University Of Abuja-Nigeria

Abdullah Asmau

Independent Corrupt Practices And Other Related Offences Commission, Abuja-Nigeria

Mohammed Usman

Department Of Political Science And International Relations, University Of Abuja- Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Anticorruption and development participants are familiar with the concept of political will and lack of will. However, due to an error in language that fails to convey precise knowledge and fact, the term "lack of political will," which is referred to here as a misnomer, has gained considerable traction in development literature. We conducted a discursive review of political will based on perceptible reality to expose the erroneous claims made when referring to a lack of political will as a reason for failing to achieve predetermined goals. We developed the Paradoxical Pair Model (PPM) as a framework for properly reviewing the subject to avoid such poor judgment in order to practically accomplish this. The discursive reflections that led to the deductive conclusion that everything in the world of the Political Man is transcendently created in pairs, including everything that is beyond his knowledge, led to the development of this Model. We argued to a promising conclusion that our PPM was inspired by the dualism and dialectics that define human existence, which is consistent with this transcendental fact. We became convinced from this point on that will, like political will, is not only contradictory but also in pairs. In addition, political will demonstrates the dual nature of concrete existence through contemplation, motivation, action, and accountability. We came to the conclusion that what truly exists cannot lack, and that lack itself cannot be ontological. In the hope that the PPM will be a useful explanatory and predictive tool for Political Science Research, we came to the conclusion that political will cannot be deficient because it conceives and reveals paradoxes.

KEYWORDS

Insufficient political will; Dualism; Dialectics; built in pairs; Accountability; Model of a paradoxical pair; Anticorruption; Political figure.

INTRODUCTION

How come there is no political will?

In nations where development is not on the table for practical reflection and action, it is not unusual to hear the chorus illustration of "lack of political will" or "lack of data." Among other things, failure is excused and explained by a lack of political will. As willful beings, Political Man is, for the most part, caught in paradoxes. Since governments produce the most data in the formal sector, it is evident that they have full political will. Therefore, where does lack originate? Is it conceivable that something could be present in its accessible form and content while remaining lacking? We conjecture that need and lacking are procured and not inborn indications of Political Man. When cognitive ability falls short of nature's generous resources and challenges, there is a lack; As a result, there are unquestionably will-like data. That's what our inquiry is, is it substantially legitimate to communicate absence of will like absence of information regardless be obviously conceivable? Once more, as creatures of responsibility stomach muscle initio in light of the fact that Political Man are creatures of deeds which typically pave the way to responsibility, and on the off chance that deeds are information by other name, can will from which information rises up out of be deficient? For the time being, we propose that every political animal is a transcendental political being with a will, choice, action, goal, and responsibility.

We argue that because it is a rejection of both will and deeds, strictly speaking, "lack of will" may not accurately describe the actual state of being. Will is

what gives it materiality, so clearly transcendental and human condition cannot exist without it. Development literature is replete with the phrase "lack of political will," in which every glitch in government is attributed to "lack of political will" when relating performance output to outcome. And we demand: Can a government that is supposed to be elected, selected, or a combination of the two, make decisions for the public good without political will? The political world is an open field of wills, deeds, and goals, according to our limited political science knowledge. But our question is, in public and policy discourse, what idea does absence, genuine, weak, or strong political will communicate? The question of whether social relations of contemplation, contract, production, distribution, and consumption that Political Man is forever immersed in can manifest without will is a possible starting point for resolving the vague cliché of lack of political will.

However, if will is a causal variable for development and underdevelopment, is it will or lack of will that causes the latter? Or, if a determinant variable fails to fulfill a specified objective, is the variable lacking or has it failed its intended function? Even better, if the intention is not carried out and the act is accidental, is will in action or not? If this is the case, does it imply that the goal is inextricably linked to political will or will, that is, that every consciously determined decision is connected to or anticipated to lead to the goal? The primary focus of this article is on these conceptual questions. However, because prospects' illusions can be mistaken for reality, it is necessary to comprehend

the common experience of conflating expectation with reality in order to correctly answer the questions. Because of this, it is not uncommon for a prospect to not be perceived as having manifested into another reality that is in opposition to it through an existential fact known as oppositional will when it fails to manifest into the expected reality.

Using disputation reasoning, might it be appropriate to interpret a lack of commitment to fighting corruption as a lack of political will or a lack of commitment to fighting corruption as a lack of political will? Is political will relevant in this setting or not if corruption, a general reality that is generally discouraged by society, is made a substitute for anticorruption as a tool of statecraft? Once more, we ask, on the off chance that there would anything say anything is like obligation to anticorruption, could the intelligent debate at any point be obligation to defilement? Is it rational to equate a lack of political will with a low level of anticorruption commitment? Conversely, is it not conceptually dishonest to speak of a lack of political will if we cannot simultaneously relate to a lack of corruption if corruption is pervasively a generic reality in a given political economy? Crisis of value, priority, desire, etc. can occur, if political research's causality is any indication. have the power to influence political will, and if so, is it conceptually correct to assert that political will is both a determinant and a determined variable? So, is it consistent to agree with Malena that individual and collective principles, aspirations, and primacies manifest in political will?

We make this analogical assumption for the purposes of illustrative analysis due to the widespread role that will plays in determining human conditions. Because lack is not ontological, examining lack of political will as a common phrase in public discourse may be appropriate for political science research because

causal factors are useful to conceptual frameworks. We assume that cognitive competence is essential to the quality of every human circumstance; However, according to Collins and Porras, it is also defined by cognitive choice. Therefore, is it misleading to relate to a phenomenon's absence if it only obfuscates facts and trends that are essential to methodically comprehending everyday existence? Predictably, as we examine the idea of political will, we keep in mind the dual cognitive valuing of Political Man. One of such dualities is the battle between political will for normal great and voracity from the foundation of equity and political will from a higher place and beneath inside the setting of class. However, despite man's efforts to deconstruct political will from among the political strata of below and above, oppositional duality continues to exist because man's thought pairs with everything around him.

We attempt to fully comprehend the former in light of the living presumption that political will is more commonly used than lack of political will in the majority of the Geographic South. We also want to bring to light any hypothetical and conceptual flaws and determine the driving forces behind the poor conception of political will. The next step is to create a political will model and explain how it can be used as a useful analytical tool in political science research. We consider that the dual nature of political will is likely to emerge when deeds and goals are properly integrated, guided by the broad values and purpose of political theory and science. As a result, we can determine whether political will is present, absent, weak, or strong in response to performance output and outcome in political, bureaucratic, or business endeavors. This review is fundamental because so much is taken for granted without realizing that the meaning of a concept may not accurately convey experience (Abba, Hamisu, & Abdullahi; 2019). As a result, we arrive at the

exploratory conclusion that an error in language may be interpreted as a lack of political will. If this fact is not rectified, it may not be possible to establish reliable causal relationships, which could be crucial to political science research into the factors that contribute to the growth and realization of individual aspirations or even the development of nations.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Aristotelian Political Creature

Of Will, Choice, and Accountability A careful analysis of Aristotle's (1999) Politics reveals that political animals can neither avoid being political nor escape the politics loop. In order to maintain coherence with this presumption, one must rely on existing political theory to sort through a variety of ideas, perceptions, and experiences. If this effort fails, it points to a rethinking of political theory within the larger context of political will. If all life in statecraft is political and if statecraft has an integral impact on everyone, the ideas that are likely to surface may be diverse as evidence of the implicit complexity and complexities in the trajectory of manifest political life. As a result, we consider the fact that every political entity—state, society, community, or family—has, from the earliest times to the present day, had to compete with and be competed with. This includes the will that probably drives all political activities, as well as the experience that political life and development as a whole produce as a result. As a result, being politically active exemplifies decision-making. This can be unforced, forceful, independent, impulsive, intentional, or reluctant. A choice or decision made demonstrates the nature of social and political existence and society from a given political will out of these six possible scenarios.

It might be sufficient to provide a vivid illustration of the historic decision or choice made by our forebears Adam and Eve and the contradictory fallen angel. As a logical judge and advocate, we interpret that a decision or choice made by will has an outcome or accountability. If Adam and Eve were transcendently guided in their decision but ultimately rejected it, this indicates that they followed the fallen angel's decision. For the time being, we accept the idea that Political Man are transcendental beings first and then political beings. Because of this, their decisions have transcendental and political repercussions. Following our showed forebear Adam and Eve, we might recommend that decision goes before choice on the grounds that the inseparable pair was given among allowable and prohibited decision. However, our starting point is based on the question, "Does knowledge of the consequence of action guide decision?" Let's just say for the time being that the contradictory fallen angel was aware of the harm and the consequences. However, were Adam and Eve ignorant or was this the case? The most important lesson from transcendence was: eat from this large number of trees however don't contact this. We believe that the blissful instruction had an unspoken consequence or responsibility. Therefore, in their equivalent contexts, decision comes first if it is a matter of sequence. Nevertheless, we may infer that the thought of making a decision existed prior to making one, or that a decision leads to a choice; that is, there is choosing to pursue decision and decision so settled on becomes choice from will of which decision is natural for.

Because a decision or choice is subjectively methodical to achieving a goal, its worth or quality is crucial. This assists with knowing the job of will and the justification that follows given that legitimization is in no way, shape or form a unique case. An illustration of the

decision taken from the manifesto of a political party, public policy, a strategic action plan, workshop goals, the implementation of a program, etc. relates to two factors: quality of the decisions made and the choices made in the end. Conceptually, the terms "choice" and "decision" are formulations of the ideas "political" and "will" in the same context, contest, and content, but with a purpose in mind. As a result, when political is subtracted from choice and decision, the latter is likely to have a different meaning, which is why Aristotle would not have considered referring to Political Man as a political animal. This understanding is illustrated by the fact that it is plausible that the social world is left with a variety of fundamental values and competing options (Abba, Hamisu, & Abdullahi; 2019). This makes it fundamental to choose between competing and conflicting values and diverse goals as a political act. Inclination subsequently is an acknowledged truth existing stomach muscle initio in light of presence of variety of values made for Political Man that can't manage without being emotional.

Because it emphasizes power or right in the articulation of choice, the political concept emerges more strongly with the concept of preference. Priority and initiative are partly governed by judgment and capability, respectively, where political power the right begins to emerge. However, let us quickly state that once a political decision has been made, it may no longer be a matter of discretion but rather of will whether to support it or not; after all, choice is regarded as a decision made by will. Even more so, if choice is a result of a decision that has gone beyond the freedom to choose (Hansson; 1994), it's referred to as discretion. Two variables are likely to emerge from this concrete theorizing: authority and responsibility. In practice, they are almost inseparable, and purpose serves as the connecting variable in theory. By power it implies the right or obligation to showcase the blend

of prudence, drive, decision, choice, and will (DICDW). This is to achieve a goal that has always existed and will continue to exist as long as the political animal exists.

In keeping with our method, a combination of these five adaptable values makes them political because they exist in all public spheres and are accountable for their actions. We would provoke Aristotle to recognize transcendental and political accountability as one of the larger and more important responsibilities of Political Man if this presumption is true. "Man is a political animal, but to live outside the state is either to be a god or a beast," Aristotle said (1999:5). Predictable with our survey we rises above Aristotle by declaring that political creature can in any case be god and monster figuratively existing in political state as a component of the rationalistic duality in the creation of decision, all things considered, divine beings and monsters decides. Our presumption is that a mishmash of angels and beasts can exist in political society and the state if we take Aristotelian god to be angels and beast to be a monster. Simply put, Political Man's paradoxical nature necessitates the existence of angels and beasts in human form. Therefore, man is inevitably confronted with paradoxical dualism depending on what he wants out of social existence—for or against himself or others. As a result, choices that are either liberating or not as expressions of will engage and challenge man's thought process regarding accountability.

According to Schwartz, "choice is what enables us to tell the world who we are and what we care about" is consistent with this presumption. To face the reality of expressing will in all its political guises—whether formal or informal, strategic or unplanned, personal or collective, state or global—is to make a decision. We believe that Political Man is thought to have wills not because he or she lives in a political society but rather

because they are thought to be intelligent beings with a soul, will, and emotion. But do gods and beasts have wills? If so, it could mean that they also live in political society, unless Aristotle was thinking of a different kind of god or beast. If we have to argue this point of view a little, we might want to think of god and beast to see if doing so will help us understand the lack of political will. Aristotle must have used the terms "angel" and "beast," which are conversely related, or dialectical duality, to describe the dualism of social existence that existed before him and his predecessors. We conclude, overall, that the world and everything within it were created in pairs: Let's say, from the highest to the lowest form, angels and beasts, night and day rotating around the earth's orbit without coming into contact with each other, etc. according to the law of transcendence.

Every political man, bound by our conception, possesses a beastly component that voluntarily manifests for beneficial or destructive purposes. Conceptually, the Aristotelian beast exemplifies irrationality against humanity through unconscionable sadism, which elicits natural hostility due to its desire to eliminate Political Man and Society. One direct result is that the sense of accountability that directs the actions of such Political Man toward an approximate angel is blurted out because beast acts more with objectionable instinct than with wisdom. Thus, we assume that in the realm of the monster any choice is a choice as any decision is a decision since there is no self-examination or scrupulous cognizance of and an incentive for responsibility. Ideally, assuming we keep on with our Perplexing Pair Way to deal with political will what the perusing is probably going to expose is that divine beings in the Aristotelian setting are supernatural heavenly messengers with soul however most likely without will and feeling. Could this be the likely explanation Aristotle depicted the non-

political/unopinionated Man as divine beings? Let us assume for the time being that transcendental angel, unlike Political Man, do not have feelings or a will because they do not have one. However, let us agree once more that there are angels with soul, emotion, and will in political society. We could argue that political society, like Political Man, has a lot to do with emotions and will, which is characteristic and predictable, if this continues.

Once more, assuming that we accept feeling as a load animal and assuming that word related monster care less about honesty and sanity, what is expected to control it are twofold, to be specific, the will in Political Man and the desire of Political Society, or at least, the state towards a feeling of request, value and equity. Let us assume for the time being that the Aristotelian beast is likely to manifest as a force on its way to becoming a monster if emotions like greed and ambition are not controlled by these two wills and if emotions have little or no connection to reason. If this is true, we might be implying that the two wills have very little to do with irrationality and a lot to do with rationality. How valid? Without being political, monster can be locally and easily changed into a beast since it tended towards being cruel and clear out of both supernatural and political responsibility. Since the monster isn't political or will not be one it thinks often less about political not to mention supernatural responsibility. In this setting, it can become a natively altered beast full of emotions without integrity or a conscience to control itself, becoming a thorn in the side of Political Man and Society.

The choices made within the perceptible context of ignorance and knowledge, right and wrong, asceticism and hedonism, integrity and corruption, the prospect or otherwise for transcendental and political accountability, etc., most likely define the preceding

perspective. The political and spiritual aspects of will are discussed in the following section due to the fact that there is an undeniable point of convergence and most likely “crossvergence”. Political Man, like technology, cannot remain neutral because political will expresses choice and makes decisions based on preferences by nature. Protocols and values that political society chooses to internalize for the radicalization or revolutionization of progress are either preferred or opposed. In the following section, accountability is conceptualized in terms of political will to see if there is a connection between the two and if it significantly contributes to highlighting the real fallacies that are embedded in a lack of political will.

Absence of Political Will

In political theory, development discourse, governance issues, and anticorruption literature, the concepts of political will and lack of political will are pervasive and prominent. To the point where they become stereotypes, both are used without regard to geography, class, race, gender, industry, or developmental stages. As a result, the terms "political will" and "lack of it" are now part of everyday conversation and serve as a quick illustration of whether or not stakeholders in development succeed or fail. When government programs and policies are open to evaluation and analysis, it is clear whether or not there is political will. It applies to opposition political parties, among other groups, in party democracies. To say that the party in power does not have the political will to live up to its manifesto. Again, it is common to hear of a lack of political will whenever there is a significant gap between policy formulation and implementation, such as the inability to effectively sanction retaliation for process and procedure abuse.

Hopefully, political will is characterized by underlying duality, which we assumed was not fully appreciated in

Social Science and Political Science research. Will is a duality serving contradictory decisions, so this review is important. Like everything two by two, will be will and stay sound whether it prompts normal or silly or positive or negative end. To put it another way, political will does not care what goal it serves because its existence cannot be diminished. Therefore, political will can be paradoxically understood in terms of the purpose it serves, rather than necessarily as a means: positive or negative, responsibility or irresponsibility, selflessness or generosity, honesty or dishonesty, growth or undergrowth, etc. Therefore, in order to dispel the misconception associated with a lack of political will, we require a conceptualization that highlights the paradoxes inherent in political will. We hope that our assumption that political will is a duality holds true for Political Science Research because it reveals the tangible contradictory factors that enabled them.

generating outcomes that are in opposition to what is expected of society, the government, the academic community, businesses, NGOs, the diplomatic community, etc. demonstrate political will interests or goals that could result in a negative outcome, whether they are tolerated or not. Will is actionable as a whole because it is always a drive; without it, there would be no determination or ambition. Political accountability, like political will, has cyclical demand and supply sides, so it cannot be passive or inactive. Political men are endowed with free will as a vital resource, unless accountability or a decision they make is seen as a cost; However, rather than an abundance of political will, it is frequently reported that there is insufficient will. We interpret this as a fallacy due to the fact that will exists freely and cannot intelligently demonstrate its absence when it is not utilized for an agreed-upon purpose. We argue that it is misleading to deny the existence of paradox when a human condition is paradoxical. This is

due to the fact that paradox does not represent lack but rather a state of being. As a result, it is profound for political participants to acknowledge contradictions rather than the absence of contradictions, which is illusory. According to our paradoxical pair model, every living thing is contradictory in pairs and inexorable as paradoxes because they all occur at the level of desires, thought processes, policymaking, and implementation.

Political will cannot be absent, just as political accountability cannot be absent, but it is not uncommon to incorrectly refer to political accountability as lacking. First, there is accountability to a wide range of constituents or to one or more ruling establishments. This is supported by the notions of governing elites and ruling elites, which hold that until the end of time, a privileged minority will either govern or rule for the benefit of many or few. This idea goes against the Marxian illusion of a classless society because it implies that there will never be a contradiction, inequality, leadership, or accountability at some point in the world. This probably goes against the dualism of the world that existed prior to and after Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels' time. Even though they are all inexorably natural, is it really possible to imagine a world without CILA? Does this show that Marx and Engels and his supporters were not profoundly sure to know the dualistic and lopsided nature of the world? Integrity, courage, self-sacrifice, competence, discipline, and justice are just some of the positive characteristics that political accountability exemplifies. Is it possible to measure political will using these and their opposites? Can political will serve as a disincentive to these governance values while also acting as an incentive for collective conscience, wisdom, and progress?

The remaining task is to determine the political will to encourage or discourage the current review objective. This is based on the idea that political will determines all actions; As a result, considering apolitical will is pointless because it does not exist. Choice, accountability, and decision-making are never impartial; Political men will always be in positions of power and in social relationships. After all, power creates social relationships, whether they are with a family, club, community, business, nation, etc., Both the government and other social forces in society exert power over them. Again, this should serve as a reminder to the heirs of Marx and Engels that power relationships are always disproportionate, including political will, because inequality is natural. On this basis, we define political will as the driving force behind disparate development and history as well as the driving force behind political reflection, ambition, thought, and action. If properly understood, development, when used broadly, refers to the advancement and decline of human society and individuals. This is in line with the idea that political will has both positive and negative effects. Given that political will is not self-contained, what is the likely causal influence on political will if political will determines political action?

Assumption is that there are blend of elements that diversely decide given political will in given spot and condition. According to Woocher political will is determined by aspiration for, sensitivity to, and cost-benefit thoughts. These are important things to think about, but do they really control the political will? Since we frequently hesitate to accept the validity of the assumption, if they significantly do, shouldn't it be essential to know the extent? Could the findings of Abba, Abdullahi, Hamisu, and Alao, which identified social consciousness, value, determination, and a sense of accountability as factors, be correct, as Woocher

was? If we apply Hofstede's cultural factors, are we likely to accurately identify the factors? individualism versus collectivism, power distance, avoiding uncertainty, masculinity versus femininity, long-term versus short-term orientation, etc. within the framework of the culture of the nation, or are these cultural factors the result of political will? are, among other things, religion, ethnicity, location, the legal system, class, cronyism, a plentiful supply of natural resources, social justice, and a collective conscience. and the power of their opposites to influence political will? Additionally, there are the "integrity, selflessness, honesty, objectivity, accountability, openness, and leadership" Nolan Principles of Public Life, which we assume to be determinants that are obvious and useful.

Abazovic and Mujkic's "personal preferences, personal interest, personal experiences, political skills, and personal perceptions" are once again taken into consideration as determining factors. Education, family values, personal discipline, cognitive capacity, and other factors could also function as considerations of causality. Therefore, we assume that it is simpler to identify the manifestations of political will, such as corruption and anticorruption, than what determines political will. Similar to that, "easier to measure components of political will than with what determines political will". Stakeholder recognition and desertion, human capital investment and depreciation, receptivity to learning and change, reward and sanction systems, resource production and allocation, and policy choices are just a few examples. are things that can be measured. Again, in Brinkerhoff, political character, adequate resources, opposition from pressure groups, institutional obstacles, and cultural factors were identified as causal influences that preceded political will.

By introducing political can and must to explain the capability of actors and the actions that need to be taken, Malena gave political will a new dimension. Dimensional perspective is further enhanced by these new elements; notwithstanding, the components of can and should wouldn't be deducted from will in light of the fact that political will goes past simple craving as concurred with Malena. We consider cognitive competence and willingness to accept phenomena that are necessary or unnecessary in accordance with existing personal, official, subjective, or objective convictions to be part of this. Consequently, depending on the objective it aims to serve, political will may require all of its components—need, capability, enthusiasm, and conviction—to be available or taken into account as variables. From a psychological point of view, theoretical understanding of will could still be useful for conceptualizing political will. First and foremost, the unconscious formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of policies, projects, and programs is not intelligently based on reflex action, which is the consequential expression of political will. This means that a work plan template must include the necessary action steps, tasks, timelines, resources, potential obstacles, communication plan, output, outcomes/evidence of success, and evaluation process are voluntary rather than instinctual endeavors.

Assuming this point of view is downright sufficient it follows that there is natural connection between political will and public strategy advancement and examination. Interestingly, the concept of public policy is first and foremost political because the constitution of public order or disorder is determined by decisions and choices, which are essentially political acts. We therefore insist categorically that political actors' decisions are not the result of primitive emotions, even though the process and outcome may be primitive. For

instance, privatization, a neoliberal tenet of the global ruling class, generally encapsulates crude and venal cronyism and an unconscionable war of looting by primitive means (Gray and Whitfield; 2014). The nature of the outcome in terms of public policy is required to adequately conceptualize political will if this is the sure guide. When we do this, we realize that there is no one determinant of outcome that can be used as evidence of success or failure. As there are internal and external factors that allow or disallow the realization of established outcomes, which are present in political actors and thus predate political will, this probably explains the broad nature of political will and its multifaceted impact. However, the more reason universal values in their dialectical manifestation should be acknowledged even if we are unconvinced that the social fact of right and wrong taken as a universal value indicates that accountability exists prior to will.

To be clear, we adhere to the universal fact that the world in which political will plays out is made up of pairs, pairs that must interface alternately and are not only contrasting. Man and woman, beginning and end, love and resentment, and so forth. are paired. Other related categories of pairs include right and wrong, good and bad, integrity and corruption, strength and weakness, wisdom and stupidity, proposition and opposition, and so on. As beings of choice and decision, these two types of Political Man have become commonplace as being influenced by will through affirmation or denial. However, the fact that these pairs exist suggests that, like the earlier pairs, accountability exists prior to the latter, and that, insofar as they precede will, they are independent of will. On balance, will just element conspicuously during the matter of going with decision or settling on which of the matches to keep to or not. Considering nearly everything, Political Man have awareness that is

profoundly and politically alive to cost or benefit, misfortune or gain, enduring or satisfaction, disfigure or change, war or harmony, including optimism or practicality, and so on. whose efforts are expended. Because they result in the realization or failure of crafted or shared goals, wisdom and foolishness are the most fundamental of these pairs.

For example, to accomplish shared objective, Rousseau in his General Will, held forward that it requires the presence of aggregate feeling and commitment which he conceded was hard to get. In the pursuit of a solution to the problems of misery, self-love, oppression of the weak, etc., Rousseau foolishly believed that the difficulties of the elusive direct democracy or absolutism would be overcome as individuals and the state would unite into a single unit when all citizens put their entire power under the dominant direction of the General Will. Isn't this an appealing fantasy that is too straightforward? We decided to methodically examine Rousseau's political theory in light of his larger concerns in order to be fair to him. The rejection of Aristotle's conception of Man as a political animal and his probable limited knowledge of dualism, the paradox of will, and transcendental accountability bolstered his philosophy. As a result, his theory of General Will did not take into account the fact that Political Man, as well as the so-called lesser beings, are innately dualistic in terms of leadership and followership. Because of this duality, the state and its citizens' leadership and followership are both complementary and antagonistic simultaneously.

If this holds up, we contend that will cannot be transferred, contrary to what Hobbes and Rousseau imagined because leadership and following are simple. This is even more true because every individual's will, which can be put into action and has consequences, is

dependent on political and transcendental accountability, which they ought to and would desire. Therefore, from our point of view, Hobbes' absolutist monarchy was probably unaware of the certainty of the dualism and will paradox. The risk is that citizens' lack of political or willful consent serves as a driving force behind the Hobbesian Nightmare. Locke, in contrast to Hobbes and Rousseau, was the closest to dualism because he recognized two wills: pioneers and adherents. The possibility of two political wills merging or crossing over into, say, social norms of corruption without questioning each other was probably something Locke was probably unaware of. Because of this, we divided political will into state political will and citizens' political will. Political will from below and political will from above, respectively, are subject to political accountability and unaccountability, as well as transcendental accountability for everyone.

Once more, we assume that responsibility gives guidance from which political will sets the compass of its main goal, vision and values - inferred or unmitigated and afterward connected to objectives. However, in order to determine the type of effort, political will may also need to be linked to actionable effort before effort (will) is linked to goals. After all, just like effort, political will ultimately produces each pair of outcomes that are in line with priorities and progress. We argue that if we take the first to be a pragmatist and the second to be an idealist, like a doer and a preacher, respectively within the framework of competently inventing enduring but dynamic progress, then being visionary and/or visionary in both the public and private realms may not lead to the same outcome. Let's say that a pragmatist and an idealist's political will leads to a decision for change in substance and change in form (status quo), where change and status quo represent choices made by each. Because it likely determines whether a decision or outcome will be

rational or irrational, this is why choice plays such an important role in understanding political will.

We identified six likely facts that political actors are predisposed to consider and debate before making decisions in their paradoxical forms in order to maintain coherence. These are self-absorption or altruism, adhering to existing laws or breaking them, having the ability to do something or not, succeeding or failing, having a positive or negative effect on society and individuals, and the outcome for the initiator or intended beneficiary. Although deliberately ignoring these six facts before making a decision is unusual, it paradoxically demonstrates political will because denial of facts is a political illustration of interests. According to Rutberg, political failure is not inevitable but can be avoided and serves as a tool for learning and unlearning, taking into account Political Man's flaws. Therefore, decision-making is based on the interaction of political imagination quality, which is why failure is not impulsive. We take this seriously because the existence of causal factors like recklessness, indiscipline, injustice, and negligence presages failure and must have been endured over time because, paradoxically, it serves purposes that are in opposition to the goals that have been crafted.

To better comprehend political will, opportunities and challenges play a crucial role. Logical thinkers Political Man are dualistic; He transforms challenges into favorable opportunities and challenges into favorable challenges. With an idealistic political man who exaggerates everything, including opportunities and threats, this is unlikely. The problem with Political Man's idealization as a tool for political will is that it encourages artlessness, making challenges and opportunities appear to be fictional governance realities that don't need to be diagnosed. In our proposed theory, idealization is a crucial conceptual

variable for understanding progression and regression, as well as motion versus movement. "Development can be latent and manifest," as Ake puts it, "if reform can progress or regress." 1996), but with direction—forward or backward—because it involves political will. Political will, on the other hand, is not directionless because it cannot be undirected. Reform is typically a tool for progress; however, when it is implemented as an expression of political will through the intricate hands of idealization, it becomes a latent force with undeniable impact. Our model shows that reform can be sparked by political will from below or above, used to show or hide good intentions, buy legitimacy, manipulate public expectations, protect class self-absorption, find gaps, and be used as a premium for power. These are facts due to the straightforward index of human consciousness, which is why the concept of lacking political will obscures more than it clarifies.

For instance, societies throughout history have exhibited political will from above and below by demanding and supplying changes and deviations. A bad society whether entrepreneur or communist or half breed connected to the movement and development of retrogression having debasement as living standard will dismiss anticorruption as logical reason for administration. For corruption to continue, this illustration shows that political wills from below and above must come together. It is political will from below when electorates use their power to elect thieves as an expression of civic duty in political horse-trading (part of Rousseau's General Will). This was eloquently illustrated by Orwell in 1945: A people who elect imposters, thieves, traitors, corrupt politicians, and traitors are not victims; rather, they are coconspirators," and it seems likely that one must have political will to be a coconspirator. As an equitable restraint on self-absorption of political will from above,

this type of electorate's political will is not known to demand political accountability. In order for this to occur, a policy process must exist in which these two political wills interact in order for policy success or failure to occur. Hamburger, on the other hand, made the naive claim that the presence or absence of political will in turn determines policy success or failure. Okay, Hamburger is correct to say that policies won't work unless there is political will; However, it would appear that he is unaware that policies cannot fail without political will.

Overall, we assume that political will comes from below and above, in equal or opposite ways at different times, depending on political subjectivities, such as the perspective, feelings, beliefs, desires, or state of mind of citizens and elites who are governing or ruling. Political will can likewise rise out of three kinds of political agreement - agreement between residents beneath, between administering elites above, and among elites and residents. However, in situations where none of these three categories are present, a compelled consensus for development reform can originate from political levels below or above, and it may require a political will that goes against existing laws. Political will for development, or its paradoxical variant, has always come from one strong man from above and then enlist others who share the vision either out of fear or conviction or both, such as Singapore's Lee Kwan Yew, Ghana's Jerry Rawlings, Libya's Muammar Ghaddafi, Rwanda's Paul Kagame, Nigeria's Muhammadu Buhari, etc. If living experiences are any useful guide, political will for development has always come from one strong man from above. As a result, the paradoxical outcomes of decisions suggest that their dialectical reality expresses political economy if they are articulations of political will. According to our theoretical understanding, if policy changes can have both

positive and negative effects, which is consistent with the transcendental fact that everything is created in pairs, then why not political will?

Utilizing the Paradoxical Pair Model as an Analytical Tool for Political Science Research to Explore Political Will We view political will as a methodical concept that holds the modest promise of being a theoretic system for comprehending and describing how and why political conditions as observable facts came to be. Political will has the deconstructive and methodical ability to investigate disparate realities because it is universally ingrained in all human professions. Because the outcomes of formulated and implemented policies manifest in contrasting pairs or dualities, for instance, political will help clarify public or organizational policy process. The reason political will is a model is because it intends to explain, for instance, the nature of existing thought processes, practices, values, the existence of policy alternatives, the reason for choosing a particular policy, the mobilization of forces in support of or against change and the status quo, etc. Political will has what Ralston refers to as "predictor influences on value formation and evolution," which continuously affect political, economic, cultural, social, psychic, and technological development conditions.

In the hope that it will be a useful tool for interdisciplinary analysis, we try to connect it to the common trait that all theoretical systems have in common. To explain society, struggle, and development, the Smithian, Marxian, Ricardian, and other theories of value manifest as explanatory and predictive theories. Dependency, modernization, and imperialism theories of development, which began with the formulation and evolution of values, were also included. If authority, dominance, capability, ambition, poverty, wealth, integrity, truth, growth, etc. are general real factors, they probably require more

prominent widespread determinant to check out or mix hogwash in them. As a causal will, political will is likewise a reason for esteem development and development through which these widespread qualities go through their transformation. Political will is hoped to be a competent theoretic system that seeks to explain reality in a variety of contexts, taking into account the significance of value formation and evolution in theoretical structures and systems. Theory is also, "a supposition or a system of ideas intended to explain something" if there is any doubt about it (Stewart, Harte, & Sambrook; 2011), it is in line with our belief, which is based on the idea that value is largely governed by will, with political will regulating political value; However, this does not imply that values do not influence will in some way—perhaps as an ancillary effect.

The deduction that if will shapes global experiences to the extent that they are cogent and corrigible, it largely explains universal practice is implicit in the attempt to construct a theoretic structure. However, since our deduction is not itself a conclusion, we do not intend to assert that political will already exists as a theoretical system; rather, it is to make the claims available if it can adequately define and explain reality as well as make methodological predictions. Overall, a theoretic structure need not be universal before it can be used, as long as the observable facts or value, whether subjective or objective, or both, are present for analysis, problem-solving, and other activities. as consistent with plausible positivism's principles. As an illustration, the Marxian Theory of Class is utilized as a theoretical framework despite not being universally valid. We do not give in too much to the scientific nature of theory building because it is a material fact that political will is universal. Our primary objective is to determine the most appropriate interpretation of reality for a more effective effort at problem definition,

causality, and explanation. In addition, our curiosity extends to the possibility of facilitating political science research at a time in history when political science evidence is more a living lie than a fundamental problem-solving science for national and international cohesion, security, and development.

DISCUSSION

Our Political Will Approach serves as an exploratory tool for uncovering hidden or open paradoxes in the context of political economy, such as enforcing weak institutions or embedding the construction of resilient institutions. The natural complementary demand to develop or recruit "core capabilities" is an honest fact when institutions are designed. Institutions, on the other hand, can be established; however, there may be a disregard for the establishment of the capabilities necessary to manage institutions due to oppositional will and interest against beneficial public service and interest. Because goal achievement is the ultimate goal, our strategy links political will to goals. We believe that a Political Will Approach is convincing and capable of providing an explanation with general application without considering universal application as a material fact. From here, four political actions or actors are likely to emerge, resulting in two contradictory forms: political will to empower powerful men to build institutions and capabilities; establishing institutions through weak men without building capabilities; constructing capabilities without establishing necessary institutions run by men with two faces; and hopeless men failing to establish necessary institutions and capabilities.

According to these four organic hypothetical scenarios, there are distinct political wills with distinct means and goals. Consider the second fictitious scenario: Core capabilities are not recruited or built into institutions. False motivation for incompetence,

corruption, and inadequate service to designated constituents are likely to result from this. It demonstrates that every political goal arises from Political Man's inner psyche, conviction, and aptitude, so reality is not accidental. If the outcome is not in line with the goals that have been stated, political will, when viewed as anatomy, allows for the discovery of hidden motives and motivations. According to our theoretic system of the paradoxical pair model of political will, it would be difficult for a single thought to occur to a political man because holding the same or similar perception is not always a possibility without exploring opposite possibilities. Therefore, it is inconsistent to leave out one aspect of a balancing demand, such as institutions lacking core capabilities, because institutions must pair with capabilities in order to achieve the goal connected to political will. Because one of the balancing pairs was made the victim of oppositional thought rather than a corresponding one, we now contend that the output and outcome of this hypothetical scenario were already predetermined.

As Acemoglu & Robinson's "extractive institution and inclusive institution" as a conflicting pair that is most likely to produce different output and outcomes demonstrate, the Paradoxical Pair Model makes clear that there are always choices to be made from equivalent or conflicting realities. It is hoped that the theoretical system known as Political Will Approach will once more prove to be useful in identifying the causes of strong and weak institutions and consistently engaging both strong and weak men in the process of building institutions. We argue that joint demands are corresponding requirements that must adhere to complementarity rules or political will becomes arbitrary if this is not possible. Therefore, we reiterate that political society, in its universality, develops productive forces, whether rudimentary or sophisticated, even if it is certain to relationally

manifest in error with the opposite pair without excellent social relations. Additionally, political society is truly relational due to the fact that no creation can make decisions on its own. In addition, we would investigate the fact that political men are renowned for their concrete thinking, and in order for him to make it profound, he must connect his will with and goals. We additionally kept up with that reasoning without objectives is simple distraction that prompts beyond reconciliation logical inconsistency which ideally is not welcome in political will.

Deductively, goals are political man's cognitive and actionable endeavor, not preoccupation. To some degree, political will isn't speculative in light of the fact that each political will communicates objectives (Kirzner; 1992), and particularly, goals are seen as tangible realities that political will speaks to and seeks out, regardless of whether they are formulated, realizable, or accomplished. As a result, the common values of setting priorities and observing progress, which are the specific driving values of political will, naturally emerge when we connect political will to goals. If we assume that political will is constructed rather than given, we also assume that the goal is crafted; To put it another way, there is a flexible link between goals and political will. The form and content of goals are definitely not the same; They convey viewpoint, aspiration, desire, strategy, the future, ideology, preferences, and so on. a single political man or a group of political men. The Political Will Approach could be used as a framework to investigate the attitudes, priorities, and goals of individual political leadership—whether as a governing elite or class of governing elites or ruling elite or class of ruling elites.

Using Kirzner's "methodological subjectivism", we hope to use political will as a methodical analysis tool to investigate the existing knowledge, vision, beliefs,

perceptions, norms, interests, and expectations of Political Man, who decides priorities, craft goals, adopts methodology, identifies beneficiaries, identifies risks, and decides value addition/subtraction to individuals and society as a whole. In general, political will would want to know about what Parsons called "the action frame of reference" of Political Man in relation to decisions and actions in terms of their objectivity and subjectivity. As a result, decisions and set goals are influenced by held ideology or frame of reference, whether materialistic or transcendental. If this is the case, is it consistent to assert that belief in transcendental accountability has a significant impact on the development of political will? Similar to "methodological subjectivism," Schumpeter's "methodological individualism" is helpful to political will in understanding the inevitability of social relationships that Political Man enters into regardless of his choice. These social relations include reflection, production, distribution, and contract between social forces, including the interest that drives all interactions.

RESULTS

Due to its connection to Schumpeterian methodological individualism, our Political Will Approach employing the Paradoxical Pair Model is also presumed to be relevant to individual, organizational, and state level analysis. Aristotelian political men, like governments, are, without a doubt, relational; consequently, the inevitable nature of social and later power dynamics. There are a variety of subjective individual enthusiasms that point to opposing goals as articulation of political will, despite the fact that there are objective needs that must be met. As Neo Marxists would like, experience cannot always be explained solely from the perspective of class or group in this framework. Political will certainly emerges through a

constellation of class or group interfaces; However, due to individual accountability regardless of how collectively decisions are made, individual political will typically serves as the threshold. We declared that transcendental will preceding political will is connected to Schumpeterian methodological individualism but not Kerzner's methodological subjectivism because we consider the latter to be determining the former, at the very least, in order to dispel the erroneous notion of political will.

We illustrate Transparency International's Topic Guide on Anticorruption at this point. Kokoschka demonstrated that disappointment of anticorruption changes and advancement objectives like each and every other change and objectives are associated with or brought about by absence of political will, the scholarly prevarication that has stayed unavoidable. Similarly, political will is to blame when an anticorruption reform strategy is successfully implemented with results; However, the lack of political will is to blame when the same reform strategy fails. The Paradoxical Pair Model, which in its dialectics refers to dualism, was developed with the intention of eradicating this generalized ambiguity that has existed within the concept of political will for a considerable amount of time. As a result, we propose that, while conceptually demonstrated here, political will does deepen understanding of the direction of interests, it does not prevent the realization of outcomes on its own. Political will, on the other hand, aims to achieve a goal through the means it chooses, and because it chooses a particular means and navigates chosen directions, it naturally encounters oppositional mindsets and interests, disparate knowledge of issues, divergent approaches to aligning issues with solutions, distinct valuing of stakeholders, and so forth. The end cannot be identical or even comparable. So on the off chance that these variables are existentially present as

articulations of political will, for what reason is the term 'need' utilized to depict what clearly exist either as explanation of political will or its determinants?

We questioned Post, Raile, & Raile's narrow Political Will and Public Will approach in light of the preceding. They contended that political will exist just when there is comprehension of issue possibly prompting successful arrangement. They had argued in a previous work that there will be a public when there is a shared consensus on a problem, including how to solve it. However, Raile, Salmon, and Post; While they maintained that political will and public will are distinct concepts, they acknowledged their shared interdependence. However, according to our model, what is public is first and foremost political due to the fact that it involves decision-making and other actions to achieve goals through collective effort. Like Rousseau's General Will, Post, Raile, and Raile's Public Will may not be guaranteed to prompt shared mindset assuming activities going before objectives are antagonistic to public self-conservation and public responsibility. Again, political will is most likely to result in negative outcomes if there is no mutual understanding and accountability. In light of the fact that negative is a significant possibility in the duality of human conditions, which is consistent with our Paradoxical Pair Model, we consider that political will or public will may not necessarily be positive in and of itself.

The assertion of two possibilities that political will creates, leading to duality of motivations, approaches, and conditions, is emphasized in further exposition of political will as an analytical tool. Contrary to the succinct saying, this is not the case: There is a way where there is will. First and foremost, there is always a way and a will. Second, will does not always manifest in the expected manner. Thirdly, will is dialectical, so

there cannot be a single path. Fourth, for duality of will, there is a natural deviation from the expected path as a result of the choices made in the beginning. Fifth, empirical knowledge as fact dictates that there is a path not taken when there is a counter effort against established priorities and expected outcomes as an expression of political will. Sixth, to use Berger & Luckman's phrase in a different way, there are not one but two "social constructions of reality" between the road taken and the road not taken. Seventh, we argue that, in addition to being socially constructivist, the political animal's mind articulates itself into a political will for the dialectical reproduction of human anatomy. Eighth, as a result, when Political Man gathers for public or private or public-private business, it is their will that, objectively speaking, largely engenders success or failure, winners or losers—what is referred to as the "win-win" setup" in a given task and political economy. Ninth, because self-motivated skills, actions, and productivity.

CONCLUSION

Limitations, and Directions for Future Research The paper challenged the narrow view that political will only has one perspective and one purpose, namely the political will to do the right thing, and that when it fails, it is lack of political will. We took this seriously due to the narrow conception, ambiguity, and fallacy that are prevalent in public discourse, particularly in the Global South, but are reduced by the Global North to political sarcasm. We reviewed the literature using a fact-based perspective prior to this deduction to enable a subjectively objective critique. As a result, we realized that a theoretical model was required and developed the Paradoxical Pair Model, which led the paper toward a Political Will Approach. In a nutshell, the approach was influenced by the duality of nature, in which all things and beings were created in pairs,

including what Political Man cannot comprehend. We hypothesized that in order to conceptualize that the Aristotelian Political Man are in fact perceptive beings with varying capacities for "divergent, convergent, and crossvergent decisions,". As a result, political men are able to articulate paradoxes of enormous form, character, and magnitude because they are oppositional decision-makers.

As a result, we hypothesized that political will is a measurable fact and that political subjectivity and objectivity are inseparable. Political will can only be asserted and acknowledged as a general certainty that is clearly pervasive and cannot be denied. As a result, existential studies of the world's social, cultural, political, economic, and psychic aspects may not begin without political will. Since Political Man are social beings, it is not imagined that they live outside of existential collectivity as a relational fact. This is evident because of the immanent fact. We argue that, in the context of methodological individualism, political values, perspective, beliefs, feelings, decisions, and interests are political subjectivities in the same way that methodological subjectivities are played out through political will. Keeping in mind these political subjectivities, we were also led to the native fact that the mind of Political Man can comprehend pairs of every creature, with the exception of the Supreme Creator, who is Uniquely Unequaled. In light of this, we made the decision to keep in mind that the will that gives rise to political will is not only an ontological duality that makes choice a crucial possibility but also a simple paradox. Before the dualities can make a decision, this reality must first pass through the perceptual chemistry.

Now, in the event that political science is still a perceptual chemistry for critical thinking in order to comprehend and competently evaluate and interpret

power relations, the presented ideas should be thought-provoking and relevant to comprehending political institutions, political culture, political ideologies, technical consultancy, advocacy, capacity for development, including how public policy is decided upon and implemented and the practicability of goals. We seek a more comprehensive understanding of political will that supports theoretic development as a useful analytical tool, theoretic system, or compass for any future political research. Before a decision is made or taken, future research should be able to determine whether the established Paradoxical Pair Model that guided this work is capable of competently facilitating comprehension of the interaction between contradictory dualities that penetrate the psyche of Political Man. However, given the limitations of this paper, subsequent research in this field may wish to investigate the ways in which political will influences value formation, evolution, direction, and development—and to what end? This might not have been done well for us. We did this by presenting three Ralston's (2008) theories on value formation and evolution: the divergence, convergence, and reverence theories. For the purpose of future research, development that emerges from each of these three may have something useful to do with political will as articulation of political subjectivities by leaders, citizens, nations, and global ruling elites.

We identified value, will, and accountability as significant principles in the valid understanding of political will as a modest contribution to existing political research knowledge. Will is subjectively a determinant, as a rule. Therefore, the theoretical system we propose is not fixed; rather, it is a viewpoint that takes the idea that will precedes value seriously. Value cannot be used as a determinant; rather, will-producing action must be used. Although value and

priority do control choice, decision, opportunity cost, and scale of preference, it may be interesting for future research to learn that, in the end, willpower and an unwavering desire for accountability rule them. If this is convincing, further investigation into whether they reinforce one another and the interactive nature of it is possible. A critique of our conceptualization and proposed theoretical system should use transcendental will and accountability as a guide to understand why political will is an evidential fact that should lead to political accountability. This is because political accountability is the beginning and endpoint of political will. In addition, we acknowledged that political will results in two or more performance outcomes that contrast with established goals; That is, actions that result in output and outcome can be in line with established objectives or not.

Due to its meticulously methodical approach to investigating the Aristotelian Master Science of Politics, our set-out theory, which is based on the idea that every creature is made in pairs, may be something that scientists want to look into. Because thoughts expressed duality of political wills between competing and conflicting interests, the paper has revealed that consciousness of opposing thoughts is a certain fact in politics and the decision-making process. We also came up with the idea that a political will naturally has multiple goals that are intertwined. Our propositional will, propositional goal, oppositional will, and oppositional goal, which each set in motion convergent and divergent will and goal, might be useful for political and social science research. Our examination of the political will contributes modest insights into paradoxical facts that illustrate and highlight Political Man's intelligence, integrity, and psychology in the direction of a compelling future. The thought process and ideological attitude of actors will be adequately comprehended insofar as political will is

understood paradoxically and manifests itself in choices and decisive moments. Political Science Research can use this set-out theory as a potential cognitive resource to consider the timeless fact: Pairs are used to create each creature. This fact enables Political Man, whether as a researcher, a leader, or a citizen, to effectively combat the misperception that there is a lack of political will, which lives in denial of what is unambiguously true and has consequences for society and development.

REFERENCES

1. Mujkic, A., and Abazovic, D. (2015) Political Will: A Brief Overview, and a Case Study of Bosnia and Herzegovina Sarajevo: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
2. "Reconceptualizing Neoliberalism within the Context of "No Alternative to Neoliberalism":" Abba, A.S., Hamisu, A.A., and Abdullahi, I.A. The Demand for Social Science Diagnostics IOSR Diary of Humanities and Sociology {IOSR-JHSS}, Vol.24, Issue 3, Series 6 (Walk). DOI:10.9790/0837-2403060121 <http://www.iosrjournal.org> A.S.
3. Abba, I.A. Abdullahi, A.A. Hamisu, and S.O. Alao authored "Consciousness for the Institution of Resilient Social Organization: A Political Will Perspective: A Formulation Vol. 2 of the International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences 4, Issue 7, 278-292.
4. <https://www.theijhss.com> Knowledge Power Structure and Implications for Nigeria's Future: Abba, A.S., and Abdullahi, I. A Realist Reflection. Vol. 2 of the Journal of Legislative Studies and Governance 1, No. 3, pp. 41-59 from September to December
5. C. Ake, Democracy and Development in Africa, 1996 DC, Washington: Brookings.
6. D. Acemoglu and J.A. Robinson, "Why Nations Fail: The genesis of wealth, power, and poverty. London:
7. Profile Books Limited Politics, Aristotle (1999). Kitchener: Books by Batoche.
8. Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1966) The Social Development of The real world: A Treatise on Knowledge Sociology New York, NY The Penguin Press
9. "Assessing Political Will for Anticorruption Efforts:" Brinkerhoff, D. W. An Analytic Framework," Public Administration & Development, vol. 20, no. 3, p. pp. 239-253.
10. J. Collins and J. Porras, Built to Last: The Successful Practices of Visionary Businesses New York, NY Publishers: HarperCollins.