

A Discursive Review of the Concept of Political Will: Exploring a Paradoxical Pair Model for Political Science Research

Professor Abubakar Sadeeqe Abba

Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Abuja-Nigeria,

Abdullahi Idris Abdriss

Independent Corrupt Practices and other Related Offences Commission, Abuja-Nigeria

Abdulrahman Abu Hamisu

Kano Police Academy Wudil, Kano State,

&

Suleiman Mohammed Basheer

Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Abuja- Nigeria.

IJMSSSR 2021

VOLUME 3

ISSUE 3 MAY – JUNE

ISSN: 2582 - 0265

Abstract: Participants in anticorruption and development are not strangers to the conception of political will and lack of political will. However, lack of political will, considered here as a misnomer has gained much currency in development literature because of error in the use of language which doesn't convey precise knowledge and fact. Based on perceptible reality we did a discursive review of political will to unwrap the fallacies inherent in the use of lack of political will in describing failure to achieve established objectives. To practically do this, we formulated Paradoxical Pair Model (PPM) as a framework to properly review the subject to avoid such poor judgment. This Model was arrived at after discursive reflections leading to deductive conclusion that everything in the world of Political Man is transcendently created in pairs, including all that are beyond his knowledge. Consistent with this transcendental fact, we argued to a promising conclusion that dualism and dialectics which defines human existence inspired our PPM. From here we got convinced that will like political will is not only in pairs but paradoxical. Beside, political will expresses duality of concrete existence in contemplation, motivation, action and accountability. Conceivably, we resolved that what profoundly exist cannot lack, and lack itself is not ontological. We concluded that political will cannot lack because it conceives and unveils paradoxes, hoping that the PPM is a useful explanatory and predictive tool for Political Science Research.

Keywords: Lack of political will; Dualism; Dialectics; Created in pairs; Accountability; Paradoxical pair model; Anticorruption; Political man

1. Introduction: Whence is Lack in Political Will?

It is not unfamiliar to repeatedly take notice of the chorus illustration 'lack of political will' like 'lack of data' in nations where development is not on the table for down-to-earth reflection and action. Among other factors, lack of political will is used to excuse and explain failure. As beings of will (Abba, Abdullahi, Hamisu, & Alao; 2016), Political Man is by and large entrapped in paradoxes or so it is. Governments evidently have political will in fullness just like it constitutes the largest producer of data in the formal sector. So, where does lack come from? Is it plausible for something to exist in its obtainable form and content and still be lacking? We hypothesize that lack and lacking are acquired and not inherent manifestations of Political Man. Lack exists when cognitive competence fall short of nature's generous resources and challenges; hence, will like data are indubitably present. Our query is that, is it palpably valid to express lack of will like lack of data and still be clearly plausible? Yet again, as beings of accountability ab initio because Political Man are beings of deeds which predictably lead up to accountability, and if deeds are data by other name, can will from which data (deeds) emerges from be lacking? For now, we put forward that every political animal is a transcendental and political being of will, choice, deed, goal, and accountability.

We set forth that lack of will, strictly, may not knowledgeably describe extant state of being because it is a refutation of will and deeds. Evidently, transcendental and human condition cannot exist without will because it is

will that makes it materiality. Within the context of relating performance output to outcome, development literature are replete with the phrasing lack of political will where every glitch in Government is blamed on lack of political will. And we ask: can government, supposedly elected or selected or a blend to express will, that is, make decisions for public good lacks political will? Our modest political science knowledge would clarify that the political world is an open field of wills, deeds, and goals. But, our query is, what idea does absence, genuine, weak, or strong political will communicates in public and policy discourse? To resolve the ill-defined cliché of lack of political will, the starting point may be to know if social relations of contemplation, contract, production, distribution, and consumption forever immersed in by Political Man can manifests without will.

However, if will serves as a causal variable for development and underdevelopment, let's say, and when the latter is experienced is it will or lack of will? Or when a determinant variable cannot achieve defined goal, is the variable lacking or it failed the intended purpose? Better still, if the intended is not realized and the inadvertent is, deliberately or not, is will in action or not? If this is consistent, does it follow that goal is inescapably tied to will or political will, that is, if every consciously resolute decision is tied to or expected to lead to goal. These conceptual questions are at the inmost core of the purpose of this article. But sorting out the questions plausibly requires understanding the familiar experience of confusing expectation with reality because illusion of prospects can be incorrectly taken for actuality. This is why it is not uncommon that when prospect fail to manifest into expected reality, it is not seen to have manifested into another reality opposite to it through an existential fact called oppositional will.

Perhaps, using disputation reasoning, should lack of commitment to anticorruption be necessarily interpreted as lack of political will or should commitment to corruption be interpreted as political will? If corruption as a generic reality but normatively forbidden by all society is made alternative tool of statecraft as against permissible alternative like anticorruption, is political will existential in this context or not? We ask again, if there is anything like commitment to anticorruption, can the logical disputation be commitment to corruption? Is it cognitively prudent to describe weak commitment to anticorruption as lack of political will? Conversely, if corruption is pervasively a generic reality in a given political economy, is it not conceptually disingenuous to speak of lack of political will if we cannot in the same breath relate with lack of corruption? If causality in political research is any guide, can crisis of value, priority, desire, etc. have the capacity to affect political will, and if yes, is it conceptually valid to say that political will is both a determinant and determined variable? So, is it consistent to agree with Malena (2009) that political will is a manifestation of individual and collective principles, primacies, and aspirations?

For illustrative analysis, we put this analogical presumption across because of the generic role of will in determining human conditions. Causal factors are useful to conceptual framework and because lack is not ontological, interrogating lack of political will as a recurring piece of verse in public discourse may be valid in political science research. Our presumption is that, cognitive competence is integral to the quality of all human conditions; however, for Collins and Porras it is also cognitive choice that defines it (2002). So, is it misleading to relate to lack of a phenomenon if it says little other than obscuring facts and trends that are vital methodically to comprehend everyday existence? Predictably, while we review the concept of political will we are mindful of the duality of Political Man in his cognitive valuing. One of such dualities is the struggle between political will for common good and avarice from the background of justice and political will from above and below within the context of class. But because the thought of man overlaps, that is, in pairs including everything around him, oppositional duality persistently exists beyond man's effort at deconstructing political will from among the political strata of below and above.

Considering the living presumption that lack of political will is much familiarly used compared to political will in most parts of the Geographic South, we seek to adequately comprehend the former. We also seek to spotlight the hypothetical and conceptual inadequacies, if any, and identify determinant factors inspiring the poor conception of political will. Next is constructing a political will model and how it can be a constructive analytical tool for political science research. Guided by the broad values and purpose of political theory and science, we consider that when deeds and goals are properly integrated, the dual character of political will is likely to come out. From this, we proceed to know if political will can be present, absent, weak, or strong as part of response to performance output and outcome in political, bureaucratic, or business effort. This review is basic because so much is taken for granted without knowing that meaning given to concept may not convey precise experience (Abba, Hamisu, & Abdullahi; 2019). So, we arrive at an exploratory deduction that lack of political will may be construed as error in

the use of language. This reality if not fixed up may not help to bring about competent causations that are significant to political science research, perhaps, into the causes of development of nations or even the growth and realization of individual's aspirations.

2. Aristotelian Political Animal (Man): Of Will, Choice, and Accountability

A meticulous reflection on Aristotle's (1999) Politics brings out the actuality that political animal can neither steer clear from being political nor break out from the loop of politics. To stay coherent with this presumption requires relying on extant theorizing of political to sift through diverse thoughts, perceptions and experiences. If this effort is not satisfactory, it points to a retheorizing of the concept of political within the broader context of political will. The thoughts likely to come to light maybe wide-ranging as evidence of the implicit complexity and complexities in the trajectory of manifest political life, that is, if all life in statecraft is political and if statecraft has integral impact on everybody. So, we think through that state, society, community, or family from primeval to the modern age has had to contend and be contended with all that are political from the background of decision and choice. This includes the will that probably drives all that are political and thus the ensuing experience on political life and development generally. Thus, to be political illustrates the making of choice or taking decision. This can be effortless, forcible, independent, spontaneous, deliberate or reluctant. Of these six possible scenarios circumstances, a choice or decision made illustrates the nature of social and political existence and society from a given political will.

A vivid illustration of the historic decision or choice made by our precursor Adam and Eve and the contradictory fallen angel might rather suffice. We construe that decision or choice from will has outcome or accountability as a logical judge advocate. If both Adam and Eve were transcendently guided on the choice to make but still decided against it, it shows that both went for fallen angel's decided choice. For now, we subscribe to the proposition that Political Man are first transcendental and then political beings, and this makes decision to be transcendently and politically far-reaching. Following our illustrated progenitor Adam and Eve, we may suggest that choice precedes decision because the inextricable pair was given between permissible and forbidden choice. But our premise is, does knowledge of consequence of action guide decision or choice or will? For now, let us say that the contradictory fallen angel was aware of both the damage and consequences. However, is it so with Adam and Eve or were they ignorant? The foremost transcendental instruction was: eat from all these trees but do not touch this. We consider there was an unspoken consequence or accountability in the blissful instruction. Thus, if it is a matter of sequence decision comes before choice in their equivalent context. Even so, we may insinuate that before choice is made, the thought of decision for choice making exist *ab initio* or that decision leads to choice; that is, there is deciding to make choice and choice so made becomes decision from will of which choice is intrinsic to.

Considering that decision or choice is subjectively methodical to goal realization, quality of choice or worth of decision is crucial. This helps to know the role of will and the rationalization that follows given that rationalization is by no means a rarity. Illustration of decision from political party manifesto, public policy, strategic action plan, workshop objectives, or programme implementation, etc. speaks to two variables: quality of decisions and the choices ultimately made. Conceptually, choice and decision are articulations of the concepts of political and will in their equivalent forms, context, contest, and content but not without purpose in mind. Thus, when choice and decision are subtracted from the political, the latter is likely to give a different meaning that would have made Aristotle not to have contemplated describing Political Man as a political animal. Illustrating this understanding, it is not implausible that the social world is bequeathed with diversities of basic values and contrasting alternatives (Abba, Hamisu, & Abdullahi; 2019). This makes the making of preferences as a political act among competing and conflicting values and diverse ambitions basic. Preference therefore is an accepted fact existing *ab initio* because of existence of diversity of values created for Political Man that cannot do without being subjective.

The concept political comes out more powerfully with the concept of preference because it underscores the concept of power or right in the articulation of choice. This partly governs priority and initiative as a function of judgment and capability respectively wherein political power or right begins to take form. But let us quickly state that when a political choice is decided the necessity to stand by it or not may no longer be that of discretion but of will, after all choice is considered here as decision of will. Moreso, when decision has gone beyond the freedom to make choice, that is, if choice is a consequence of decision (Hansson; 1994), it is called discretion. What probably would emerge from this tangible theorizing are two variables: power and accountability. More or less, both

inexorably feature in each other in praxis, and the connecting variable in theory is purpose. By power it means the right or responsibility to act out the combination of discretion, initiative, choice, decision, and will (DICDW). This is to see to the realization of goal which ab initio is present and will continue to endure as long as political animal subsists.

Following our approach, a blend of these five adaptable values makes them political since they exist in all public spheres and subject to accountability. If this premise holds, we would provoke Aristotle to recognize accountability, transcendental and political as part of the larger and critical obligations of Political Man. According to Aristotle, “man is a political animal, but to live outside the state is either to be a god or beast” (1999:5). Consistent with our review we transcends Aristotle by asserting that political animal can still be god and beast metaphorically existing in political state as part of the dialectical duality in the making of choice, after all, gods and beasts makes choices. If we take Aristotelian god to be angels and beast as monsters, our presumption is that a mishmash of angels and beasts can exist in political society and state. Succinctly, angels and beasts exist in human forms because Political Man cannot exist without paradoxes or so is his nature. So, depending on what man wants out of social existence either for or against self or others, he is inevitably confronted with paradoxical dualism. So, man’s thought process about accountability is effortlessly engaged and challenged with choices that liberates or not as expressions of will.

Keeping with this presumption, Schwartz (2014:100) had expressed that “choice is what enables us to tell the world who we are and what we care about”. To decide to take a decision, formal or informal, strategic or unplanned, personal or group, state or global, rational or irrational, is to be confronted with the reality of expressing will with all its political variations. By our conception, Political Man is known to have wills not because they live in political society but because they are supposedly intelligent life-form with soul, will, and emotion. But do gods and beasts have will, because if they do it may imply that they also live in political society, except if the kind of god and or beast Aristotle had in mind were different ones. If we have to argue this perspective a bit, we may perhaps, want to conceptualize god and beast so see whether the effort will help in the conceptualization of lack of political will. The two terms of angel and beast are converse related, that is, dialectical duality and must have been contradictorily used by Aristotle to capture the dualism of social existence which precedes him and his forebears. On balance, we construe that the creation of the world and everything in it were created in pairs: let us say, from the highest to the lowest form – angels and beasts respectively, alternation of night and day around the orbit without meeting each other, etc. according to transcendental law.

Bound by our conceptualization, there is an element of beast in every Political Man that involuntarily manifests for useful or voluntarily for destructive purposes. Conceptually, Aristotelian beast illustrates irrationality against humanity while manifesting in unconscionable sadism which attracts natural distaste because it seeks the liquidation of Political Man and Society. One direct consequence is that, because beast acts more with objectionable instinct than by wisdom, the sense of accountability that guides the actions of such Political Man towards approximation of angel is blurted out. So, we presume that in the kingdom of the beast any decision is a decision as any choice is a choice because there is no self-analysis or conscientious consciousness of and value for accountability. Hopefully, if we keep on with our Paradoxical Pair Approach to political will what the reading is likely to bring to light is that gods in the Aristotelian context are transcendental angels with soul but probably without will and emotion. Could this be the probable reason Aristotle described the non-political/apolitical Man as gods? For the moment, let us infer that transcendental angels are not weighed down with emotions and will because they don’t have one unlike Political Man. Again, let us also agree, however, that in political society there are angels with soul, emotion, and will. If this follows, we may argue that political society like Political Man has a lot to do with emotions and will characteristically and predictably.

Again, if we take emotion as a beast of burden and if occupational beast care less about integrity and rationality, what is needed to regulate it are twofold, namely, the will in Political Man and the will of Political Society, that is, the state towards a sense of order, equity and justice. For now, let us insinuate that if emotion like greed and ambition is not regulated by these two wills and emotions bears weak or no relation with rationality the Aristotelian beast is likely to materialize as a force towards becoming a monster. If we fully subscribe to this, we may be insinuating that the two wills have a lot to do expectedly with rationality and nothing with irrationality. How true? Devoid of being political, beast can be natively and effortlessly modified into a monster because it tended towards being soulless and blank out of both transcendental and political accountability. Since the beast is not political or refuses to be one it cares less about political let alone transcendental accountability. Within this

context it can be transformed into natively modified beast overflowing with emotions without integrity and conscience to regulate itself thereby becoming a thorn in the flesh of Political Man and Society.

For the most part, the preceding perspective is likely defined by choices made within the perceptible context of ignorance and knowledge, right and wrong, asceticism and hedonism, integrity and corruption, prospect or otherwise for transcendental and political accountability, etc. With the conceptual utility of accountability in conceptualizing political will because it makes for broader comprehension, the political and spiritual aspect of will feature in the next section because there is an indubitable point of convergence and probably “crossvergence” (Ralston; 2008). Like technology, Political Man cannot sit on the fence because political will expresses choice and decision that by nature has to do with preferences. The preference is either for or against protocols and values that political society chooses to internalize for radicalization or evolutionization of progress. In the next section, accountability is used to conceptualize political will to so see if there is a connection between both and if it amply helps in bringing out the living fallacies embedded in lack of political will.

3. Lack of Political Will: Between Misnomer and Misconception

Political will and lack of political will are pervasive concepts that feature prominently in political theory, development discourse, governance problems, and anticorruption literature. Both are used universally without regard to distinction of geography, class, race, gender, sector or stages of development to a point of being stereotyped. Thus, the concepts of political will and lack of it are shorthand illustration of success and or failure of stakeholders in development, but now they are everyday vocabulary on the street. When government policy and programmes are open to evaluation and analysis, what predictably follows is whether there is/was political will or lack of it. In party democracies, it is generic for opposition political parties, etc. to describe the ruling party as lacking the political will to live up to their party manifesto. Again, whenever there is a huge gap between formulated policy and implementation including the failure to effectively sanctioned retribution for abuse of processes and procedures, it is commonplace to hear of lack of political will.

Political will is hopefully characterized with underlying duality which we presumed not to have been fully appreciated in Political Science Research and in the larger Social Science Research. This review is relevant because will is a duality serving contradictory determinations. Like everything in pairs, will is will and remain unscathed whether it leads to rational or irrational or good or bad end. In other words, political will is independent of the end it serves as its existence cannot be diminished (Abba, Abdullahi, Hamisu, & Alao; 2016). So, political will can be understood paradoxically in pairs in terms of the end it serves and not necessarily as a means: bad or positive, responsibility or irresponsibility, selfish or selfless, integrity or dishonesty, development or underdevelopment, etc. So, we need a conceptualization that brings out the paradoxes embedded in political will in order to bring out the misconception in lack of political will. Hopefully, our presumption that political will is a duality is valid in and for Political Science Research because it brings out palpable contradictory factors that made them possible.

Creating factors opposite to what is expected of society, government, academia, business, NGOs, diplomatic community, etc. illustrate interest or desires of political will that could lead to adverse outcome, tolerated or not. Taken together, will is actionable because it is always a drive, else it wouldn't be a determination or ambition. So, political will cannot be inactive or at rest because like political accountability there is always cyclical demand and supply side to it. As a critical resource, Political Man are endowed with will without cost, except if accountability or choice made is a cost or seen as such; however, it is very popular to hear of insufficient political will rather than abundance of it. We construe this as a fallacy because will exists generously and when it is not used to fulfill agreed purpose, it cannot intelligently speak to absence of it. We argue that when a human condition is paradoxical it is misleading to deny the existence of paradox. This is because paradox itself is not equivalent to lack and lacking but expresses a state of being. Thus, it is profound for participants in political life to acknowledge contradictions rather than absence of contradictions because it is illusory to do so. Our Paradoxical Pair Model says that every creature is contradictory in pairs and inexorable as paradoxes as they generically occur at the level of desires, thought process, policymaking and implementation.

Like political accountability, political will cannot lack but it is not unfamiliar to invalidly hear of lack of political accountability like lack of political will. For one, accountability either to one or more ruling establishments or to broad-spectrum of constituency exist (Fung; 2007). We buttress this with the concepts of governing elites and ruling elites considering that there are until the end of time privileged minority that either govern or rule in the

interest of many or few respectively. This thought is contrary to the Marxian hallucination of classless society because the implication of Marxian classless society is that there will be no contradiction, inequality, leadership, and accountability (CILA) at some time in the world which probably goes against the dualism of the world that predated and outlived Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels. Can we really imagine a world without CILA even when they are all inexorably natural? Does this show that Marx & Engels (1844/2011) and his disciples were not deeply certain to know the dualistic and disproportionate nature of the world? For instance, political accountability expresses some positive features like integrity, courage, self-sacrifice, competence, discipline, and justice. Can these and their opposites constitute indicators for the measurement of political will? Can there be political will as incentive for collective conscience, wisdom, and progress, and to balance it out, can there be political will as a disincentive to these governance values?

What is left is to identify political will for incentive or disincentive to existing purpose for review. This is from the premise that all actions are determined by political will; hence, it is needless contemplating apolitical will because it doesn't exist. Decision, choice, and accountability are never apolitical; Political Man are inevitably and perpetually in power and in social relations, after all power begets social relations and insofar that they belong to family, club, community, business, nation, etc., power is exercised over them both by government and other social forces in society. This again should remind Marx and Engels' heirs that inevitable power relations are ever disproportionate including political will because inequality is not unnatural. On this, we define political will to mean the determining force of political reflection, ambition, thought process, and action and the impelling cause of disparate development and history. Used generically, development if accurately comprehended means progress and retrogression of human individual and society. This is consistent with the thought that political will serves purposes that are both positive and negative. If political will determines political action what is the probable causal influence on political will considering that it is not self-contained?

Presumption is that there are combination of factors that differently determine given political will in given place and condition. Woocher (2014) identified aspiration for, sensitivity to, and thoughts on cost-benefits as the factors determining political will. These are noteworthy considerations but do they effectively govern political will? If they greatly do, shouldn't it be basic to know the extent since we tend to be hesitant in accepting the legitimacy of the assumption? Like Woocher, could Abba, Abdullahi, Hamisu, & Alao (2016) be correct when they identified social consciousness, value, determination, and sense of accountability as factors? Could we be close to getting the factors and accurately too if we adopt Hofstede's (1980) cultural factors: individualism/collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity/femininity, and long/short term orientation, etc. within the context of national culture or are these cultural factors determined by political will? Are religion, ethnicity, geography, legal system, class, cronyism, abundance of natural resource, social justice, and collective conscience, etc. and their opposites potent enough to determine political will? There are also the Nolan Principles of Public Life of "integrity, selflessness, honesty, objectivity, accountability, openness, and leadership" (Nolan Committee; 2009) which we assume to feature obviously and usefully as determinants.

For the last time, we consider Abazovic & Mujkic's "personal preferences, personal interest, personal experiences, political skills, and personal perceptions" (2015:88) as determining factors. Socialization, education, family values, personal discipline, cognitive capability, etc. could also feature as causal considerations. And so we presume that it is easier to identify the forms in which political will manifest, namely, development and underdevelopment and corruption and anticorruption than what determines political will. In like manner, it is also "easier to measure components of political will than with what determines political will" (Abazovic & Mujkic; 2015:83). For instance, policy choices, gap between policy and execution, resource production and allocation, reward and sanction systems, stakeholder recognition and desertion, human capital investment and depreciation, and receptivity to learning and change, etc. are quantifiable elements. Yet again, Brinkerhoff (2000) identified character of politics, (in) adequate resources, pressure group opposition, institutional impediments, and cultural factors as causal influences prefixing political will.

Malena (2009) brought a new dimension to political will by introducing political can and must to explain capability of actors that must be undertaken. These new elements further bring dimensional perspective to bear; however, the elements of can and must wouldn't be subtracted from will because political will goes beyond mere desire as agreed with Malena (2009). This we think through to include cognitive competence and willingness to take on phenomenon or not, that are necessary or unnecessary consistent with existing personal or official or subjective or objective convictions. Accordingly, the entirety of need, capability, enthusiasm, and conviction for action may

have to be available and or considered for incorporation as variables for political will to exist depending on the goal it seeks to serve. Theoretical understanding of will could be gleaned from a psychological perspective and still be of methodical value to conceptualizing political will. For one, public policy as a consequential expression of political will is not intelligently based on reflex action, that is, unconscious formulation, execution, monitoring, and evaluation of policies, projects and programmes. This means action steps, tasks, timelines, resources, potential barriers, communication plan, output, outcomes/evidence of success, and evaluation process required in a work plan template (UNDP; 2009) are not instinctual but volitional undertakings.

If this perspective is categorical enough it follows that there is organic correlation between political will and public policy development and analysis. Interestingly, the idea of public policy is first political because decision and choice which are essentially political act determine the constitution of public order or disorder. We thus insist evidently that decision and choice or decision as choice by political actors is not outcome of primitive feeling though the outcome and process maybe primitive. Privatization for instance, a neoliberal shibboleth of the global ruling class, in the main, speaks to unconscionable war of looting by primitive means, largely epitomizing crude and venal cronyism (Gray and Whitfield; 2014). If this is sure guide, it follows that the nature of outcome in terms of public policy is necessary to adequately conceptualize political will. In doing this we think through that we need not be unmindful that there is not one determinant factor of outcome as evidence of success or failure. This likely explains the broad nature of political will, including the multifaceted impact as there are internal and external factors that allow or disallow realization of established outcomes which are present in political actors thereby prefacing political will. However, not persuaded we assume that the social fact of right and wrong taken as universal value means that accountability exist prior to will, the more reason universal values in their dialectical manifestation should be acknowledged.

To clarify, we follow the universal fact that the world in which political will play out is created in pairs, pairs that are not only contrasting but must interface alternately. Man and woman, beginning and end, love and hate, etc. are in pairs. Relatedly, other classes of pairs are right and wrong, good and evil, integrity and corruption, strength and weakness, wisdom and foolishness, proposition and opposition, etc. As beings of choice and decision, both pairs have become not unusual of Political Man as actuated by will either by affirmation or refutation. However, the existence of these pairs is a compelling presumption that accountability exist prior to the latter pairs like the former and insofar that the pairs are independent of will because they precedes will. On balance, will only feature prominently during the business of making choice or deciding on which of the pairs to keep to or not. Taking almost everything into account, Political Man have consciousness that is deeply and politically alive to cost or benefit, loss or gain, suffering or enjoyment, deform or reform, war or peace, including idealism or pragmatism, etc. with which energies are invested. Of these pairs, wisdom and foolishness are basic because they cause the realization or not of crafted or common goals.

For instance, to achieve common goal, Rousseau (1994) in his General Will, held forth that it requires the existence of collective sentiment and obligation which he admitted was difficult to come by. In the search for solution to the challenges of misery, self-love, dictatorial power against the weak, etc., Rousseau artlessly hoped that when all citizens put their entire power (will) under the dominant direction of the General Will, the challenges whether as the elusive direct democracy or absolutism would be resolved, as individuals and state would reconcile into blended whole. Isn't this too simplistic and an attractive fantasy? To be fair to Rousseau, we decided to methodologically review his political theory within the context of the larger concerns he raised. Rousseau's probable sparse knowledge of dualism, paradox of will, and transcendental accountability, including the casting off of the Aristotelian conception of Man as political animal reinforced his philosophy. Thus, his theory of General Will was oblivious of the fact that dualism of leadership and followership are native to Political Man including the so called lesser beings. This duality means that leadership and followership from which state and citizens emerged from are complements (pair) and oppositional simultaneously.

If this is coherent enough, we contend that will is not transferable as Hobbes (1968) like Rousseau fantasized because leadership and followership are effortless. This is more because every individual will which is actionable with consequences is conditional on and should and would taste political and transcendental accountability. Thus, within the context of our perspective Hobbes' absolutist monarchy was probably oblivious of the certainty of the paradox of will and dualism. The danger is that, denial of will or political will to citizens is in itself motivation to create Hobbesian Nightmare. Unlike Hobbes and Rousseau, it was Locke (1948) that came close to dualism because he recognized two wills: leaders and followers. What Locke was probably unmindful of is the possibility

of two political wills converging or cross verging into, for instance, social norms of corruption without interrogating each. This is why we classified political will into state and citizens' political will, like political will from below and above respectively of which both are subject to political accountability and unaccountability and each and all, to transcendental accountability.

Yet again, we presume that accountability provides direction from which political will sets the compass of its mission, vision and values - tacit or categorical and then linked to goals. But, before effort (will) is linked to goals, political will may also need to be connected to actionable effort in order to know the kind of effort, after all, like effort political will in the final analysis produces each pair of outcome that is consistent or inconsistent with priorities and progress. For this, we contend that to be visionary and or to be a visionary in both public and private realms may not lead to the same outcome if we take the first to be a pragmatist and the second an idealist, like a doer and a preacher respectively within the framework of competently inventing enduring but dynamic progress. Let's say that the political will that emerges from a pragmatist and idealist leads to the determination for change in substance and change in form (status quo) respectively, where change and status quo represents choice from decisions of each. This is the centrality of choice in the conceptualization of political will because it likely leads to rationality or irrationality of decision or outcome.

To stay coherent, we identified six likely facts that political actors are predisposed to reflect on and contend with before taking decision in their paradoxical forms. These are self-absorption or altruism, obedience to or abuse of extant laws, existence of capability or ineptitude, success or failure, positive or negative impact on society and individuals, and end result for initiator or intended beneficiary. To consciously deny reflecting on the cost-benefit of these six facts prior to decision is unusual, but still it paradoxically expresses political will because denial of facts itself is a political illustration of interests. Rotberg (2003) explained that failure in its politicalness is not inevitable but avoidable and necessary as tool for learning and unlearning (Cook & Brown; 1999) considering the imperfection of Political Man. So, the interplay of the quality of political imagination is at the core of decision, the reason failure is not impetuous. We take this seriously because existences of causal factors like imprudence, indiscipline, injustice, and negligence heralds given failure and must have been endured overtime because it paradoxically serves purposes that are adversarial to crafted goals.

To further comprehend political will is the centrality of the role of opportunities and challenges. Pragmatists Political Man are dualistic; he turns challenges into promising opportunities and opportunities into auspicious challenges. This is unlikely with idealistic Political Man that exaggerates everything including strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats. The problem with idealization as a tool for political will by Political Man is that it motivates artlessness thereby making challenges and opportunities look as if they are fictional governance realities requiring no diagnosis. Idealization as a conceptual variable in our proposed theory is vital to comprehend motion against movement and progress and regression. If reform can progress and regress it means "development can be latent and manifest" (Ake; 1996) but with direction – forward or backward since it involves political will, yet political will is not directionless because it cannot be undirected. Typically, reform is a tool for progress but when it lives through the intricate hands of idealization as expression of political will, it becomes latent with undeniable impact. Consistent with our model, reform can be ignited by political will from below or above, used to reveal or hide good intention, buy legitimacy, massage public expectations, protect class self-absorption, identify gaps, and as premium for power. These are realities because of the effortless index of human consciousness, the reason the idea of political will lacking obscures more than it clarifies.

For instance, history is full with societies that have expressed political will from below and above in demanding and supplying of reforms and deformities. A corrupt society whether capitalist or socialist or hybrid tied in with the motion and movement of retrogression having corruption as living norm will reject anticorruption as pragmatic basis for governance. This illustration requires the convergence of both political wills from below and above for corruption to endure. When electorates use their power to elect thievish representatives (part of Rousseau's General Will) as expression of civic duty in political horse-trading, it is political will from below. Orwell (1945) succinctly illustrated this: "a people that elect corrupt politicians, impostors, thieves, and traitors are not victims but accomplices", and presumably it takes political will to be a coconspirator. This kind of electorates' political will is not known to demand for political accountability as equitable restraint on self-absorption of political will from above. For this to be experienced policy process would have to exist where these two political wills interact to thus experience policy success or failure. However, not so with Hammergren (1998) who naively argued that policy success or failure is determined by either the presence or absence of political will in turn. Fair

enough, it is to a point for Hambergren to say that policies will not succeed without political will; however, he is seemingly unmindful of the fact that policies will also not fail without political will.

On balance, we presume that there is political will from below and above in equivalent and contradictory forms at different times depending on the political subjectivities, namely, perspective, feelings, beliefs, desires, or state of mind for progress of governing or ruling elites and citizens. Political will can also emerge from three types of political consensus – consensus between citizens below, between ruling elites above, and between elites and citizens. But, where these three categorizations are not nearby, a forced consensus for reform in/for development can emerge from political below or above, and may require a political will that goes against extant legislations. If living experiences are any functional guide, political will for development or its paradoxical variant has always forcefully come from one strong man from above and afterward enlist others who shares in the vision either out of fear or conviction or both, perhaps, Singapore's Lee Kwan Yew, Ghana's Jerry Rawlings, Libya's Muammar Ghaddafi, Rwanda's Paul Kagame, Nigeria's Muhammadu Buhari, etc. Thus, if decisions are articulations of political will, it suggests that its dialectical reality expresses political economy because of the paradoxical outcomes. Our theoretical grasp is that, if policy reforms can have positive and negative impacts consistent with the transcendental fact that everything is created in pairs, why not political will?

Providing yet another illustration before closing this section, we lay open Klitgaard's (1988) "Corruption is = Monopoly Power + Wide Discretion - Accountability, that is, $C=M+D-A$ to see if it requires review. With the exception of Muhammadu Buhari whose term of office is statutorily regulated to 8 years, history has shown clearly that Lee Kwan Yew had 30 years, Jerry Rawlings spent 19 years, and Paul Kagame has been in power since March 2000 (still counting) including Mahathir Mohammed who governed for 22 years during his first coming, have had long years in power, ample control of power and catholic discretion in governance for development of their respective countries. The question is: can existence of accountability be a causal governance and developmental value and philosophy of leaders even with Klitgaard's Monopoly Power and Wide Discretion? Our Paradoxical Pair Model says that there is a brilliant determination and prospect against corruption insofar as there is the existence of practical consciousness for transcendental accountability which in its entirety confidently and effortlessly guides and determines political accountability, both vertically and horizontally.

To be exact, our practical inference is that when public spirit for legitimacy, pragmatism, and integrity are existential political power in its fullness as well as discretionary autonomy would rather manifest against corruption and other related forms of malpractices. Thus, $A=MP+WD+TA(PA)$; where A is anticorruption, MP is Monopoly Power, WD is Wide Discretion, and TA is Transcendental Accountability (Political Accountability). From this, our reasoning is that democracy as a form of government may not necessarily be required to nurture and experience political accountability insofar that transcendental accountability from whence integrity, public spirit, self-sacrifice, meticulousness, courage, and openness emerge from. These attributes as we so thought might have influenced in great measure the leaders alluded to in the preceding considering the fact that these appraised leaders have left and still do, enduring cornerstone for self-regulating vision for and effort at development.

4. Exploring Political Will using the Paradoxical Pair Model as Analytic Tool for Political Science Research

We consider political will as a methodical concept modestly promising to be a theoretic system for comprehending and explaining how political conditions as observable facts came to be and why. As a universal fact, political will is inherent in all human vocations, and this gives it deconstructive and methodical power to probe into contrasting realities. For instance, political will help clarify public or organizational policy process because outcomes of formulated and executed policies manifest in contrasting pairs or dualities. If political will is a model, it is because it proposes to explain (Henry; 2002), let's say, the nature of existing thought processes, practices, values, existence of policy alternatives, motive for policy choice, forces mobilized for or against change and status quo, etc. The entirety of these realities is determined by political will because it has what Ralston (2008:28) called "predictor influences on value formation and evolution" affecting continuously political, economic, cultural, social, psychic, and technological conditions for development.

Hopeful as a useful tool for interdisciplinary analysis we attempt to relate it to the universal feature that it shares with all theoretic systems. The Smithian, Marxian, Ricardian and other theories of value manifest into explanatory and predictive theories to explain society, struggle and development. So too were the dependency, modernization,

and imperialism theories of development by diverse scholars around the world which began with value formulation and evolution. If power, leadership, dominance, capability, ambition, poverty, wealth, honesty, truth, development, etc. are universal realities, they most likely require greater universal determinant to make sense or infuse nonsense in them. As a causal will, political will is also a basis for value formation and evolution through which these universal values undergo their metamorphosis. Considering the role of value formation and evolution in theoretic structure and systems, political will is hopefully a competent theoretic system seeking to explain reality in diverse applications. And if beyond doubt, theory is “a supposition or a system of ideas intended to explain something” (Stewart, Harte & Sambrook; 2011), it is consistent with our conviction founded on the premise that will in large measure governs value, like political will regulating political value; however, it doesn't mean that values have no connective influence on will, perhaps, an ancillary effect.

Implicit in the attempt at building a theoretic structure is the deduction that if will molds global experiences to the extent of its cogency and corrigibility it largely explains universal practice. But since our deduction is not a conclusion per se, we seek not to claim that political will is already a theoretic system; rather it is to make available the claims if only it has the capability to adequately define and explain reality and make methodological predictions. On balance, a theoretic structure must not necessarily be universal before it is functional for use in so far that the observable facts or value, subjective or objective or both are present for analysis and problem-solving, etc. as consistent with the values of plausible positivism. Illustratively, the Marxian Theory of Class is not universally valid, yet it is used as a theoretic system. As a material fact that political will is in its universality, we do not give in too much to the scientific nature of theory building. Our goal is basically to establish how best reality can usefully be interpreted towards better effort at definition of problem and proficient causality and explanation (Abba & Abdullahi; 2012). Further, our interest is also to see if we have made some possibilities that can facilitate Political Science Research at a period in history when evidence of political researches are rather living lie than be profound problem-solving science to national and international cohesion, security, and development.

As an exploratory tool, our Political Will Approach helps to reveal hidden or open paradoxes in political economy as a context, namely, entrenching weak institutions or embedding the building of resilient institutions. One honest fact when institutions are designed is the natural complementary demand to build or recruit “core capabilities”. However, institutions can be built, yet there can be contempt for the building of capabilities needed to manage institutions because of oppositional will and interest against helpful public service and interest. This is why our approach connects political will to goals because the end point is goal realization. As a material fact we consider that a Political Will Approach is compelling and competent to provide explanation with general application without thought for universal application. Four political actions/actors are likely to emerge from here but generating two paradoxical forms: political will to build institutions and build capabilities by strong men; creating institutions without building capabilities by weak men; building capabilities without creating required institutions by two-faced men; and not creating required institutions and not building required capabilities by hopeless men.

These four organic hypothetical scenarios mean that there are different political wills with differing means leading to different goals. Let's say, the second hypothetical scenario: institutions are created but core capabilities are not recruited or built. This would likely leads to falseness motivating ineptitude, corruption and poor service delivery to designated constituents. It underscores that reality is not fortuitous because every political goal materializes from inner psyche, conviction, and aptitude of Political Man. Taken as anatomy, political will makes possible knowledge of concealed motive and motivations if outcome is at variance with stated goals. Our Paradoxical Pair Model of Political Will as a theoretic system would reveal that since everything is in diversity of pairs it would be difficult for one thought to occur to Political Man as holding same or similar perception is not a possibility at all times without exploring opposite possibilities. So, it is inconsistent to leave out one aspect of a balancing demand like institutions without core capabilities because institutions must pair with capabilities if the goal connected to political will must be achieved. At this point, we contend that the output and outcome from this hypothetical scenario were already predetermined because one of the balancing pair was made victim of oppositional thought rather than a corresponding one.

In this, the Paradoxical Pair Model brings out clearly that there are always choices to make from equivalent or conflicting realities like the Acemoglu & Robinson's (2013) “extractive institution and inclusive institution” as conflicting pair that are most likely to produce different output and outcomes. Hopefully, Political Will Approach as a theoretic system may yet again lend it usefully to provide the explanations behind weak and strong institutions and consistently with weak men and strong men in the task of institution building. We set forth that joint

demands are corresponding necessities that must act upon the rules of complementarities else political will that fail to make this possible becomes capricious. So, we set forth again that political society in its universality develops productive forces either rudimentary or sophisticated even if without brilliant social relations is sure to relationally manifest in error with the opposite pair. And political society is truly relational because one creation cannot stand alone without another in decision making. Further, we would explore that Political Man are known for concrete thought process, and to make it profound he must link will with/to goals. We also maintained that thinking without goals is mere preoccupation that leads to irreconcilable contradiction which hopefully has no place in political will.

Deductively, goals are not meant to be preoccupation but cognitive and actionable endeavour of Political Man. Somewhat, political will is not speculative because every political will expresses goals (Kirzner; 1992), and notably, goals whether formulated, feasible, or accomplished are seen as tangible reality that political will speaks to and seek out. Accordingly, if we connect political will to goals it naturally brings out the common values of establishing priorities and observing progress from which specific driving values of political will manifests. If our presumption that political will is built and not given we presume that goal is also crafted; in other words, there is adaptable connection between political will and goals. For sure, goals are not neutral in form and content; they express perspective, ambition, desire, strategy, future, ideology, and preferences, etc. of individual Political Man or class of Political Man. As a framework, Political Will Approach could study the thinking of individual political leadership either as a governing elite or class of governing elites or ruling elite or class of ruling elites in relation to attitudes, priorities, and goals.

To achieve this, we hopefully take political will as a methodical tool of analysis using Kirzner's "methodological subjectivism" (1992) to probe extant knowledge, vision, beliefs, perception, norms, interest, and expectations of Political Man who determine priorities, craft goals, adopt methodology, identify beneficiary, identify risks, and decides value addition/subtraction to people and society generally. From a broad view, political will as a tool of and for analysis would want to know what Parsons described as "the action frame of reference" (1937:43) of Political Man in relation to decisions and actions in their objectivity and subjectivity. Thus, held ideology or frame of reference whether materialistic or transcendental influences decisions or actionable decisions and set goals. If this follows, is it consistent to assert that belief in transcendental accountability or not largely influences political will in development? Similarly, like Kirzner's "methodological subjectivism", Schumpeter's (1909) "methodological individualism" is useful to political will to comprehend the inevitability of social relations that Political Man enter into irrespective of his choice, namely, reflection, production, distribution, and contract between social forces including the interest that drives all interactions.

Further presumption is that, our Political Will Approach using the Paradoxical Pair Model is hopefully relevant to individual, organizational, and state level of analysis because it is connected to Schumpeterian methodological individualism. For sure, Aristotelian Political Man like Government are relational; hence the inevitability of social and later power relations. Even if there are objective needs to be met, there are varied subjective individual enthusiasms that point towards opposing goals as articulation of political will. In this framework, experience cannot only be explained from the perspective of class or group at all times as Neomaxist would always want to do. No doubt, there are constellations of class or group's interface through which political will emerges; however, individual political will is usually the threshold because no matter how collective decisions are there is individual answerability. At the very minimum, towards overcoming the misplaced misconception of political will, we professed that transcendental will preceding political will is connected to Schumpeterian methodological individualism but not without Kirzner's methodological subjectivism because we consider the latter determining the former.

At this point, we illustrate Kukutschka's (2015) Transparency International's Topic Guide on Anticorruption. Kukutschka indicated that failure of anticorruption reforms and development goals like every other reform and goals are connected to or caused by lack of political will, the intellectual equivocation that has remained pervasive. Similarly, when anticorruption reform strategy is successfully executed with outcomes, political will is the factor responsible; however, when the same reform strategy fails, it is lack of political will. Clearing up this generalized ambiguity that for long has been internal to the concept of political will is the reason for the Paradoxical Pair Model that speaks to dualism in its dialectics. Thus, we propose that much as political will deepens understanding of the direction of interests as conceptually shown here, it does not on its own prevent the realization of outcomes. Rather, political will point to an end through the means it chooses, and because it chooses a given

means and navigating chosen directions, of course, with contrary mindsets and interests, dissimilar knowledge of problems, diverse approach to aligning problem to solution, discrete valuing of stakeholders, etc. the end cannot be same let alone similar. So if these factors are existentially present as expressions of political will, why is the term 'lack' employed to describe what obviously exist either as articulation of political will or its determinants?

It is against the foregoing that we queried Post, Raile, & Raile's (2017) narrow Political Will and Public Will (PPW) approach. They argued that political will exist only when there is understanding of problem potentially leading to effective policy solution. In an earlier work, they had contended that public will exist when there is a shared consensus on a problem including how to work it out (Post, Raile, & Raile; 2010). Although, Raile, Raile, Salmon, & Post; (2014) acknowledged the shared interdependence of political will and public will, they contended that both concepts are distinct. However, by our model what is public is in the first instance political because it involves making decision and carrying out other activities to achieve goals through collective effort. Like Rousseau's General Will, Post, Raile, & Raile's (2017) Public Will may not necessarily lead to collective conscience if actions preceding goals are adversarial to public self-preservation and public accountability. Again, in the absence of common understanding and mutual answerability political will is most likely to produce negative outcomes. To go over this, whether political will or public will, we consider that it may not necessarily be positive alone since negative is a huge possibility in the duality of human conditions and this is not inconsistent with our Paradoxical Pair Model.

Further exposition of political will as analytic tool point to the assertion of two possibilities which political will creates leading to duality of motivations, approaches, and conditions. This is not congruent with the pithy saying: where there is a will there is a way. First, there is always a will and always there is a way. Second, will doesn't necessarily lead to the expected way. Third, one way cannot exist because will is dialectical. Fourth, for duality of will, there is deviation against expected road to be taken as a natural consequence of the choices made ab initio. Fifth, when there is a counter effort against established priorities and expected outcomes as expression of political will, empirical knowledge as fact dictates that there is a road not taken. Sixth, between the road taken and road not taken there is not one but two "social construction of reality", using Berger & Luckmann's (1966) phrase, of course, differently. Seventh, we contend that the minds of political animal are not only socially constructivist it articulates itself into political will for the dialectical reproduction of the anatomy of human condition. Eighth, consequently, when Political Man gather for public or private or public-private business it is will that objectively in large part engender success or failure or winners or losers or what is called the win-win setup in a given task and political economy. Ninth, since self-motivated capabilities, deeds, and efficiency (Teece, Pisano, & Schuen; 1997) are basic to human enterprise, Political Will Approach from the Paradoxical Pair Model lend itself to determining the human conditions in different entities and ages.

5. Conclusion, Limitation and Directions for Future Research

The paper contended with the contrasting reality of political will against the narrow view that it has one perspective and one functional role to its existence, that is, the political will to do what is right and when it fails, then, it is lack of political will. We took this seriously because of the constricted conception, equivocation and fallacy dominant in public discourse most especially in Global South but reduced to political sarcasm by the Global North. Before this deduction we reviewed literature using fact-based view to enable a subjectively objective critique. Doing this, we felt the need for a theoretic model and founded one in Paradoxical Pair Model which guided the paper towards a Political Will Approach. Briefly, the approach was inspired by the duality of Nature where all things and beings were created in pairs including what is beyond the knowledge of Political Man. We envisioned that this manifest condition requires further expression to cognitively reckon that truly, the Aristotelian Political Man are perceptive beings with varying capability for "divergent, convergent, and crossvergent decisions" (Ralston's; 2008). Thus, Man as beings of oppositional decisions are the lifeblood of politics, and Political Man have capabilities for articulating paradoxes in immense form, character, and magnitude.

With this, we posited that political will is a tangible fact and a political subjectivity and objectivity that cannot lack or seen to be lacking. As a broad certainty that is manifestly penetrating, political will can only be asserted and acknowledged and cannot be negated. Thus, existential analysis of social, cultural, political, economic, and psychic world might not begin in effect without political will. This is evident because of the immanent fact that since Political Man are social beings it is not imagined to see them live outside existential collectivity as a relational fact. We put forward that political values, perspective, beliefs, feelings, decisions, choices, and interests are political

subjectivities in Political Science like methodological subjectivities that are played out through political will in the course of the certainty of methodological individualism. Holding these political subjectivities in mind, we were also guided into the native fact that every creature as the mind of Political Man can comprehend are in pairs, but excluding the Supreme Creator because He is Uniquely Unequaled. For this, we decided to keep in mind that, will from which political will emerge is not only an ontological duality that makes choice a vital possibility but easily a paradoxical reality. This reality must first pass through the perceptual chemistry where the dualities walk the tightrope to decision-making.

Now, if Political Science is still a perceptual chemistry for critical thinking to comprehend and competently evaluate and interpret power relations, the ideas put forward are expected to 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 executed and the practicability of goals. As a useful analytic tool, theoretic system or compass for future political research, if ever, we seek a broader and improved knowledge of political will that assists theoretic development. Future research should be able to see whether the set forth Paradoxical Pair Model that guided this work is able to competently facilitate comprehension of interplay between contradictory dualities that interpenetrate the psyche of Political Man before decision and choice are made and taken. Although, as a limitation in this paper, future research in this subject area may wish to look into how political will affects value formation, evolution, direction and development, and to whose benefit. This we might not have done satisfactorily. Doing this, we provided three theories on value formation and evolution by Ralston's (2008), that is, divergence, convergence, and crossvergence theories. If ever, and for purpose of future research, development that emerge from each of these three has something useful to do with political will of leaders, citizens, nations, and global ruling elites as articulation of political subjectivities.

As a modest contribution to existing stock of political research knowledge, we identified value, will, and accountability as significant principles in the valid understanding of political will. As a compelling rule, will is subjectively a determinant. So, our proposed theoretic system is not cast in stone; rather, it is a perspective that takes seriously the idea of will existing prior to value. As a determinant, it is not value that is called to stand in judgment but will-producing action. Although value and priority does regulate choice, decision, opportunity cost, and scale of preference, future research may find it interesting that in the final analysis it is will and unbroken thought for accountability that governs them. If this is persuasive, it is open to future investigation if they are mutually reinforcing and the interactive form it takes. Considering that political accountability is the start and endpoint of political will, a critique of our conceptualization and proposed theoretic system should keep in mind transcendental will and accountability as guide in order to know why political will is an evidential fact that should lead to political accountability. Further, we recognized that political will leads to two or more contrasting performance outcome in relation to established goals; that is, actions that produce output and outcome can be consistent or inconsistent with set goals.

Our set-out theory inspired by every creature is created in pairs may interest researchers to consider because it has a scrupulously methodical attitude to probe into the Aristotelian Master Science - Politics. The paper has enabled us to know that consciousness of opposing thoughts is a definite fact in politics and decision making process because thoughts expressed duality of political wills among competing and conflicting interests. Another idea we brought to bear is that, a given political will naturally has duality of goals that interpenetrates each other. Political and Social Scientists may wish to investigate if our Propositional Will (PW), Propositional Goal (PG), Oppositional Will (OW), and Oppositional Goal (OG) that respectively sets in motion convergent and divergent will and goal are useful in/to Political Science Research. Towards a compelling future, our review of political will provide modest insights into paradoxical facts that typify and underline the intellect, integrity, and psychology of Political Man. Insofar that political will manifest paradoxes in choices and during decisive moment and is understood paradoxically, the thought process and the ideological attitude of actors will be adequately grasped. This set-out theory is a prospective cognitive resource for Political Science Research to think through the timeless fact: every creature is created in pairs. This fact enables Political Man either as researchers, leaders, or citizens to competently grasp the duality of actuality against the misconception of lack of political will which lives in denial of what unequivocally exist with consequences for society and development.

References

1. Abazovic, D. & Mujkic, A. (2015) Political Will: A Short Introduction, Case Study – Bosnia & Herzegovina. Sarajevo: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
2. Abba, A.S., Hamisu, A.A., & Abdullahi, I.A. (2019) “Reconceptualizing Neoliberalism within the Context of “No Alternative to Neoliberalism”: The Need for Diagnostic Social Science”. IOSR Journal of Humanities & Social Science {IOSR-JHSS}, Vol.24, Issue 3, Series 6 (March). <http://www.iosrjournal.org> DOI:10.9790/0837-2403060121
3. Abba, A.S., Abdullahi, I.A., Hamisu, A.A., & Alao, S.O. (2016) “Consciousness for the Institution of Resilient Social Organization: A Formulation of Political Will Perspective”. International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies, Vol. 4, Issue 7, 278-292. <http://www.theijhss.com>
4. Abba, A.S. & Abdullahi, I. (2012) Knowledge Power Structure & Implications on the Future of Nigeria: A Materialist Reflection. Journal of Legislative Studies & Governance, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 41-59 (September-December).
5. Ake, C. (1996) Democracy & Development in Africa. Washington D.C: Brookings.
6. Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J.A. (2013) Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty. London: Profile Books Ltd.
7. Aristotle, (1999) Politics. Kitchener: Batoche Books.
8. Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966) The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Penguin Books.
9. Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2000) “Assessing Political Will for Anticorruption Efforts: An Analytic Framework”, Public Administration & Development, 20, 3: pp. 239-253.
10. Collins, J. & Porras, J. (2002) Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
11. Cook, S. & Brown, J.S. (1999) “Bridging Epistemologies: The Generative Dance between Organizational Knowledge and Organizational Knowing”, Organizational Science, 10, 381-400.
12. Fung, A. (2007) “Democratic Theory and Political Science: A Pragmatic Method of Constructive Engagement”, American Political Science Review, Vol. 101, No. 3, August. <https://www.researchgate.net> Doi: 10.1017/S000305540707030X
13. Gray, Y. & Whitfield, L. (2014) Reframing African Political Economy: Clientelism, Rents and Accumulation as Drivers of Capitalist Transformation. International Development. Working Paper Series. London: Development Studies Institute.
14. Hansson, S.O. (1994) Decision Theory: A Brief Introduction. Stockholm: Royal Institute of Technology.
15. Hammergren, L. (1998) Political Will, Constituency Building and Public Support in Rule of Law Programs. Washington: USAID.
16. Henry, J. (2002) The Scientific Revolution and Origins of Modern Science. Palgrave: Basingstoke.
17. Hobbes, T. (1968) Leviathan. Baltimore: Penguin.
18. Hofstede, G. (1980) Culture’s Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values. Beverly Hill, CA: Sage.
19. Kirzner, I. (1992) The Meaning of Market Process. New York: Routledge.
20. Klitgaard, R. (1988) Controlling Corruption. Berkeley: University of California Press.
21. Kukutschka, R.M.B. (2015) Building Political Will: Topic Guide. Berlin: Transparency International.
22. Locke, J. (1948) The Second Treatise of Civil Government and a Letter Concerning Toleration. Oxford: Blackwell.
23. Malena, C. (2009) From Political Won’t to Political Will: Building Support for Participatory Governance. Ottawa: Lynne Rienner.
24. Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2011) The Communist Manifesto. New York: Penguin Books
25. Nolan Committee (2009) The Nolan Principles – The Seven Principles of Public Life. <https://www.bristol.gov.uk>
26. Orwell, G. (1945) Notes on Nationalism. London: Penguin.
27. Osafo-Kwaako, P. & Robinson, J.A. (2013) “Political Centralization in Pre-colonial Africa”, Journal of Comparative Economics, Vol. 41, pp.6-21. Harvard: Elsevier
28. Parsons, T. (1937) The Structure of Social Action. New York: Free Press
29. Post, L.A., Raile, A.N., & Raile, E.D. (2010) “Defining Political Will”. Politics & Policy, Vol. 38, pp. 653-76. Doi: 10.1111/j.174-1346.2010.00253.x

30. Post, L.A., Raile, A.N., & Raile, E.D. (2017) Guide to Generating Political Will and Public Will: PPW Toolkit.
31. Raile, E.D., Raile, A.N., Salmon, C.T., & Post, L.A. (2014) Defining Public Will. *Politics & Policy*, Vol. 42, pp. 103-30. doi: 0.1111/polp.12063
32. Ralston, D.A. (2008) "The Crossvergence Perspective: Reflections and Projections", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 39, pp. 27-40. Academy of International Business. www.jibs.net doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400333
33. Ricker, W.H. (1995) "The Political Psychology of Rational Choice Theory", *Political Psychology*, Vol.16, No. 1. Rochester: Blackwell Publishers
34. Rotberg, R.I. (2003) "Failed States, Collapsed States, Weak States: Causes and Indicators". In Robert I. Rotberg, *State Failure and State Weakness in a Time of Terror*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
35. Rousseau, J.J. (1994) *Discourse on Political Economy & the Social Contract*. Translated by C. Betts. Oxford.
36. Schumpeter, J. (1909) 'On the Concept of Social Value', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 213-32.
37. Schwartz, B. (2004) *The Paradox of Choice: Why More is Less*. Australia: HarperCollins Publisher. <http://www.harpercollinsebook.com.au>
38. Stewart, J., Harte, V. and Sambrook, S. (2011) "What is Theory?", *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 35 (3), pp. 221-229. Emerald Insight. <http://dx.org/10.1108/03090591111120386>
39. Teece, D.J., Pisano, G. & Shuen, A. (1997) "Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 17, pp. 509-533.
40. UNDP (2009) *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. New York: UNDP
41. Woocher, L. (2001) *Deconstructing Political Will: Explaining the Failure to Prevent Deadly Conflict and Mass Atrocities*. Harvard: Harvard University.