

POLICIES OF DELIBERATION, ACCEPTANCE AND DISTRIBUTION FOR DIGNIFIED HUMAN DEVELOPMENT (BASED ON AMARTYA SEN'S APPROACH)

Saniela Xhaferi
University of Tirana
ALBANIA

ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is to understand the importance of development, as both process and product, to achieve freedom, according to the perspective of Amartya Sen proposed in his book "Development as Freedom". The recent trend that directs the focus towards development, with the complexity and multiplicity of meaning that offers this term, requires a critical reading of "Development as Freedom" and an analytical reflection on the proposed thesis, based precisely on this approach. This also because of utility that displays the progress of development as a matter of economists as much as of policymakers, considering successive crisis that affected the economies of developed countries, since 2000 (the case of US) to present (case Greece). By advocating more political aspects and effects that has economical progress or stagnation of a country in the supranational policy plan, this paper is an attempt to answer some questions: On what basis are defined policies for dignified human development? What are the policies that are widely accepted? A distribution of them guarantees their living with dignity or puts individuals in a process of continuous confrontation with the similar to those, with institution or society in general? In what way, development as freedom provides an overall (comprehensive) toned development?

Keywords: Development, individual freedom, poverty, dignity, distributional policy.

THE MAIN CONCEPTS OF DEVELOPMENT AS FREEDOM APPROACH

Theoretical clarification of development as freedom, according to Sen' perspective precedes materialization of these principles in democratic societies, because these concepts are an integral part for the functioning of the political system in the society. Also, concepts such as fundamental rights and political freedoms associate with democratic governance as much as development as process makes sense in such a system. But, as it has been observed (especially recently), democracy in many cases has failed in its mission to guarantee precisely these concepts, or minimally to create terrain/environment for them (freedoms) to be implemented automatically in countries where democracy is the system. Their violation is phenomenon almost everywhere, in every country, rich or poor, with fragile democracy or consolidated one, albeit at different sizes.

Facing the disrespecting of the multitude of rights and freedoms reserved by individuals is the primary concern of these societies. The question of whether these deprivations of liberty are linked to failures of the democratic system is not the subject of this essay, but one thing is acceptable, they come with the development and the processes that accompany it. Precisely for this reason, it is important to study rapports of freedom at the individual level as well as in the social as whole, and then to determine how development helps their expenditure and at the same time how the expansion of freedoms invests in development.

Sen defines the object of his approach in these terms: "... *If the point of departure of the approach lies in the identification of freedom as the main object of development, the reach of the policy analysis lies in establishing the empirical linkages that make the viewpoint of freedom coherent and cogent as the guiding perspective of the process of development.*" (Sen, 2009) So, Sen argues that the expansion of individual freedom should be seen both as "*the primary purpose and main means of development*" (Tungodden, 2001); these can be called respectively "essential role" and "instrumental role" of freedom (Sen, 2009). So, in this sense, liberty is a social good, and as such, it is the product of an organized activity, with the aim toward it (freedom). Development as freedom implies precisely the development of freedom (individual or not), but also expand the concept of freedom.

"Development as Freedom", although did Sen Nobel laureate in economical sciences, in addition to estimates was associated with negative attitudes by the economists, according to which the approach proposed by Sen is not genuinely economical because it is not limited in its study framework. Therefore, *an approach that deals with "everything", in general is difficult to explain "something" exactly* (Tungodden, 2001). I highlight this fact not for the purpose of highlighting controversies among economists, but rather, to read it in terms of political philosophy (*which is the point of conception, origin of economics*) (Backhouse, 2002).

Development cannot be understood as a stage point, the culmination to which we can come, or we can reach/achieve, but as a process in which should invest economical growth, as well as other elements of economical development. For A.S. development cannot be reduced to "the Economical" because otherwise, this would make *it a goal in itself* (Sen, 2009). But what would be the optimal way to define "the Development" based on the Senian perspective? Of course, an economic aspect of development, that enables the expansion of opportunities for living and improving the quality of life. These, together with economical wealth are the two prospects of development on the conception that Sen makes development as freedom. Seemingly explanation can be directed towards economical terms, or rather economical indicators, but the issue of development as freedom is a trinomial that brings together the economics, the social and the policy.

Development as freedom (economical/or political?)

In determining the ratio of political freedoms with economical freedom and democratic system, *an integrated approach and multilateral, aimed at achieving progress simultaneously on various fronts, including various institutions that support each other*" (Sen, 2009), it is the right solution. An integrated and interdisciplinary approach to development is the vision from which Sen see opportunities to overcome the numerous challenges (lack and deprivation of freedom) that confront today's modern world. It is to this way of understanding freedom as totality/plurality of freedoms that emphasizes not only their instrumental aspect, but also constructive and directly aspect, to which Sen sets the stage/terrain where policies can be developed.

Categorization of freedom in 5 types of clear instrumental freedoms (*political freedoms, economical facilities, social opportunities/social services, guarantees of transparency and safety defenses*) (Sen, 2009), which in terms of development as freedom are associated with each other and aim at improving freedom in general, it is a way to understand practically these freedoms, thus removing any doubt about their applicability. So, faced with a reasoning that sees freedom linked closely to the development, but that hardly differentiates one from

another, Sen defines clearly what should be the objective of governments and policymakers to achieve development, precisely to guarantee these 5 individual freedoms as the basic premise for human development.

Not without purpose he sets out two reasons why Freedom understood in this way should be in the center of the development process:

1. **Evaluative Reason:** *the evaluation of progress should be done mainly in the sense how much are increased freedoms that people have;*
2. **Reason of effectiveness:** *achievement of development depends entirely from the free activity of humans." (Sen, 2009)*

So, to answer the question "On what basis are defined policies for dignified human development?" we should keep in mind these two standards; development evaluation and effectiveness in guaranteeing individual freedoms. If the evaluative reason shows that individual liberties are not increased, then this indicator highlights the fact that current policies are not widely accepted and necessarily it dictates the need to review their (re) distribution. By the same logic, even for development effectiveness issues, there is a continued confrontation of different interest (not necessarily opposed to each other). And if from this confrontation are produced/set "new" policies they will be the natural result of a selection process, which necessarily excludes those policies that oppose development. So, according to Senian approach, every policy determined after a confrontation process is necessarily an admission policy. This is because the confrontation is placing opposite of alternatives that guarantee development. And if the development fails to ensure for the whole society, it means the realization of individual freedoms. Consequently, the development does not exclude anyone as far as guaranteeing the freedom of everyone, even though it comes as juxtaposition of different options, but not to one another exterminator.

Why the individual at the center of the development process?

Sen launches all analysis with the individual, not with aggregate or collective concepts, authentically economical. Considered this individual as an institution, as an agency, he gets values at the same time as object and subject of the development process, and is the only one responsible for the implementation and expansion of individual freedom within this process. Considering the economic development not as a goal in itself and economical indicators as insufficient to assess the progress of a country, is eluded the avoidance of other factors (social and economical adjustments) that define freedom. Thus, an approach not authentically economical, unlimited in its context of the study is the only which it may serve to the individual, as an institution. *Development is indeed a significant engagement/commitment with the possibilities that gives freedom (Sen, 2009)*, and only if the responsibilities for developing the world we live in keep US- the individuals, development could take place and with it even the freedom.

Even though he puts the emphasis on individual freedom, he doesn't find this disconnected from social interaction, since individual freedom is an expression of social commitment, and only within it, it can be guaranteed the individual liberty of each of us.

a. Individual freedom as a social commitment

Following the above analysis, of the opportunities each of us has to increase their freedom, individual freedom should be understood as the responsibility of each of us (both as of all together), as long as this responsibility is also an indicator of our awareness for the common/joint social existence. In this regard, committable freedom is a main principle to be

kept in mind for the achievement of human development. As argued above that individual freedom is an investor in what is common, it means that while this kind of freedom is comprehensive, of course it is an element that ensures dignity in the way of living of each. Consequently, a policy that takes into account such principle, theoretically, tends to be all accepted. It cannot be contentious or rejecting, a policy that has in its objectives guaranteeing individual freedom, and when the latter itself guarantees the principles of equity and social justice. For this reason, confrontation or facing different interests is not essentially conflicting, because engagement in "the Social" creates the environment for the resolution of the interests of all.

b. What guarantee markets?

Sen affirms his pro-ism to the markets and notes that in economical life based on the market, the individual is not simply a mechanism of the system. As Hegel would say, "to know the functioning of the market economy, modern man learns to go beyond its interest; so he is prepared to carry out a real "ethical" within the state, based on commitment to the community. In this sense, the markets have the same logic of action, as the society. So, the individual cannot develop its freedoms outside the society, and also the society cannot have an effective development if individuals do not develop their freedoms. Similarly, even the individual cannot fully exercise his freedom outside the markets (e.g. freedom of exchange); the markets also cannot make sense if individuals do not choose to exercise their freedom of exchange.

It is exactly this symbiotic relation, society and the individual; individuals-the market, that enables the implementation of the distribution policies, and an element that guarantees them, it is found exactly to the market and its mechanisms. Specifically, Sen accepts the freedom of the transaction as essential, because thanks to it is guaranteed the exchange (relations sell-buy) and the latest itself produces effects that make life flourish; also it attributes to exchanges an all accepted role in the development of capitalist societies.

To characterize individual freedoms persuasive, the economy of competitive market ensures that anyone's freedom cannot be increased further when prevents freedoms of someone else (Sen, 2009). Although the market mechanism foresees individual freedom as a key element for the implementation of the exchange, so as an expression of the individual will of each, but also as an expression of self-interest, Sen does not see as "problematic" the freedom in this regard. Because, are precisely those individual freedoms that guide individuals during the exchange process and not simply the maximum fulfillment of self-interest. So, the individual enters the market with the objective to meet its individual needs, but the presence of freedom (it does not matter whether the freedom targets personal interest or any other objective) is the essence of the matter.

From what has been argued above, it is clear that for A.Sen freedom is again the only instrument (but not instrumental freedom) for the implementation of distribution, and as long as this distribution has the ultimate goal to create opportunities for the realization of freedom for everyone, and not just maximization of self-interest, it is a factor for human development. The fact that these freedoms to seek markets are freedom, through which each can provide their freedoms, makes development comprehensive, not exclusive. This offers basic premises for a dignified life. Up to this point are in the state of equality in the possession of freedoms, but their possession cannot be equal, thus the benefit from individual freedoms is conditioned by the possibilities. This conditionality is such not only to individual freedoms, but also for the overall development of society.

c. And Institutions, what do they add to these policies?

The need for applicable policies, not simply drafted policies, the necessity of freedom cannot be overlooked, both for decision-making processes (which policies?) and for opportunities for achieving valid results (which ways of implementation? which institutions?).

Even in the service of purpose (development as freedom) of the individual, Sen *posits the need to balance the role of government and other political and social institutions in functioning of markets* (Sen, 2009). So he set as a priority for development even a range of institutions that are not part of the market, "nonmarket institutions", as Bertil Tungodden calls them. Although in the social function of these institutions, Karl Popper predicted the failure and collapse of communism, exactly from the mistakes of political systems with social trend, Sen finds to these arguments the contrary, that: building social institutions creates the premise that everyone develop its freedoms and furthermore to profit from its freedoms, even when possibilities limits them. Only in this way the individual invests in the development.

If the problem is freedom (lack of it), then the solution is development. In this way we can define Sen's perspective of "development as freedom", and also acknowledge that its opposite is equally true. As I have mentioned at the top of this article, that the concern of democratic societies is the lack of freedom and deprivation that are made to her, for Sen the main concern is extreme poverty and famine in the countries of the Third World. And precisely in their study he finds the causes for this level of development (not dignified) that society has today. Ibid, he finds solutions for changing the situation and his proposal is to focus attention *"on the well-being of those who are in the lower strata of society, not on the effectiveness of those who stand on top of it."* (Sen, 2009)

And acceptability of Sen's approach derives precisely from its success in predicting recent economic crises of Southeast and East Asia (famine) and from alternative approach that makes to the duality Freedom-Development and causal relationship between them that *"links freedom and development inextricably with each other."* (Gay, 2003)

Even though the predictive ability of Sen's theory for poverty and famine is proven by reality, the likelihood that even the solution proposed by him to have the same success is not impossible. Considering *"politics as the art of the possible"*, as Foucault defines it, the solution would be design and implementation of policies that consider the development as "the possible that lead to another possible", i.e. toward freedom. In function of this also cite Isaiah Berlin on "the two concepts of liberty": *"When the objects are accepted, the only missing questions are those of tools and....those are technical, capable to beset by experts or mechanisms, as arguments..."*. So, to sum up, the objective of development is freedom.

And regarding the meaning of living with dignity, Sen does not explicitly make a definition, but this is deduced from the comparison that he makes between economical freedoms with the exercise of political freedoms, as well as the reports of the poor to democracy. And its conclusions exceed the expectations that the lack of economical freedom will result in renunciation of civil rights and political freedoms. In contrast, where the lacks of political freedoms were missing, there appeared poverty and famine. But, besides instrumental role of political freedoms (such as freedom for active participation in decision-making processes), more important is the constructive role of political freedoms. The exercise of these rights and political freedoms means responsiveness or political response to economic needs, i.e. political response to economic constraints, which deprives people from the enjoyment and exercise of economical freedoms. Furthermore, from the discussion and definition of economical needs

of everyone are identified problems, and only after that it is possible to discuss their solutions, or minimally to prevent. This is important for the functioning of democracy, and for one of the main aspects of it: involvement in public debate and articulation of concerns. After all, addressing the issues is the first step that they become policy, through all those mechanisms that democracy provides (lobbying, institutions, interest groups). Their denial is deprivation of democracy, and in this sense the lack of freedoms is a concern/worrying problem for democratic societies, precisely because their denial demonstrates for a lack of democracy. Returning to live with dignity, all of the above elements, if not guaranteed in a coordinated way, apart from hindering the overall development of society, also affect the living with dignity of the individual.

What policies? Dealing/confrontation, acceptance and distribution

Before we determine what policies we need, or otherwise in terms of "development as freedom", what policies make us free to be developed, it is necessary to clarify in advance that the distribution policies, income as a result of facing the policies of freedom and development are widely accepted policies, for the reasons argued above.

"The biggest problem for any economy is how to coordinate actions of people even when this coordination is not part of the purpose of each of the members (Henderson, 2007); Policy, who gets what, when and how; Respect for yourself is probably the most important primary asset (Sen, 2009)". Exactly an approach that seeks to bring all these three principles under a common denominator that preserves intact the core of each, provides Sen in "Development as Freedom", where his concept of freedom is that of "Freedom" with large "F", which implies a synthesis of economical, political and social freedom. This freedom, according to him, can be implemented only in a multilateral development environment and at the same time this freedom is a prerequisite for such a process.

This is Sen's proposal on the theoretical level, but the question how policymakers should intervene in practice, is a question that combines different trials both, political and economical. What is worth to keep in mind during the implementation of development as freedom is *"... The problems are different and based on their complex nature; each requires a serious review of objectives and policy tools."* (Sen, 2009) The truth of policy is not necessarily true of another policy, so he suggests a careful review *of the causal processes involved in growth and development* (Sen, 2009).

CONCLUSIONS

Despite Sen's proposals for a simultaneous examination of different aspects of an issue, together, to achieve overall advantages, the answer to the questions asked at the beginning cannot be normative in a binding sense, because the definition of policies cannot be rigorous, static, or adhere to a "model" given forever. On the contrary, it is dynamic, in a constant confrontation as a result of the fast changing needs. For this reason, policies of distribution if happen to be policies of acceptance in a moment, in another one those are confrontational policies. Sen *expanding the meaning of many of us for the manner of making a descriptive, positivist and normative analysis* (Tungodden, 2001), gives scientific basis to the claim that policies are necessarily/inevitably confrontational, and whether they are acceptance or distribution policies, this is defined and varies with time. So, it is only through a wide recognition of the importance of interdisciplinary reasoning, that we can really know the value of considering the development as an extension of individual freedom.

REFERENCES

- Backhouse, R. (2002). *Historia e Teorive Ekonomike*. Tiranë: Bota Shqiptare.
- Denis, H. (2010). *Historia e Mendimit Ekonomik*. Tiranë: Papirus.
- Gay, J. (2003). *Development as Freedom: A virtuous circle?* Afrobarometer Paper No.29. [Online] Available: http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadf459.pdf
- Henderson, D. (2007). *Klasikë të Mendimit Ekonomik*. Tiranë: Plejad.
- Sen, A. (2009). *Zhvillimi si Liri*. Tiranë: Dudaj.
- Tungodden, B. (2001) *A Balanced View of Development as Freedom*. [Online] Available: [https://www.cmi.no/p\(Mis\)ublications/file/953-a-balanced-view-of-development-as-freedom](https://www.cmi.no/p(Mis)ublications/file/953-a-balanced-view-of-development-as-freedom)