

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

The Social Sciences: The Root and Route of Political Science

Ogunnoiki, Adeleke Olumide

Graduate Student, Department of Political Science,
University of Lagos, Akoka, Lagos State, Nigeria

Abstract:

The social science has generally been regarded as a category of science that accommodates solely the disciplines which study Man in relation to his social environment for the purpose of formulating laws, generalisations and more importantly to make predictions on the future actions of Man. Distinct as it is from the other category of science i.e. the pure science which accommodates disciplines that study inanimate objects, the social science as one out of the two categories of science is yet to have a universally accepted number of fields of study that comprises it. But for the sake of this paper, the six major social science disciplines were identified and treated accordingly - Political Science, Economics, Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology and Geography. These fields of study as at today can arguably be said to have developed to an appreciable level. Nevertheless, their development, in particular political science, is tied to the other social science disciplines. This paper therefore takes a critical look at the origin of some of the concepts, theories, scholars etc. in political science from the five social science disciplines mentioned above, the present status of political science; as well as the pathway the discipline is following. In this research paper, it was discovered that political science indeed has its root in the other five social science disciplines. But as touching the direction of political science, the discipline, based on the dynamic nature of Man and social problems, would dwell more on the interdisciplinary approach in order to have a holistic understanding of them, be able to make predictions, solve and if possible, control and forestall the unacceptable actions and occurrence of the former and latter respectively. The historical and comparative approaches were adopted in the course of this study with secondary sources of qualitative data as part of the research methodology.

Keywords: root, route, social science, pure science, political science, economics, geography, anthropology, sociology, psychology, interdisciplinary approach

1. Introduction

In the academics, the 'social science' is one out of the two broad categories (the second being the pure science) which certain fields of study that utilise the scientific method can be classified under owing to the nature of the object they study. The 'social sciences' on the other hand are the disciplines which primarily study human behaviour and the society (Obo and Adejumo, 2014; Otaha and Dickson, 2014). In other words, when we use the words 'social sciences' or 'behavioural sciences' which some intellectuals use interchangeably, reference is being made to the fields of study that empirically observe the behavioural pattern of Man in his social environment with the main aim of formulating laws, models, generalisations and theories that best explains not only the actions and rationale of Man but to enable the user of such laws, models, generalisations and theories to make to an extent, valid predictions about the future actions of Man despite the impossibility to make accurate predictions in the social sciences (Streeck, 2012).

No doubt, there is a universally accepted meaning of 'social science' and 'social sciences'. However, the same cannot be said of the total number of the disciplines that make up the social science. This over the years has further been compounded by the inability of social scientists to resolve the boundary problem between one social science discipline from another. As a result of these long-standing problems, there has been a variation in the number of disciplines categorised under the social science from one University to another (Otaha and Dickson, 2014). This prevalent discrepancy in the number of social science disciplines become lucid when scholars and higher institutions of learning alike go as far as including history, philosophy, archaeology, linguistics and jurisprudence in the social science, which more often than not, falls under the arts, humanities and law respectively. No wonder Scott Gordon was of the opinion that "If an extraterrestrial being were preparing a report on our scholarly and scientific activities, he might start by looking at our university organization, but he would very quickly run into difficulties. He would find, for example, that the study of crime is carried on, not only in the School of Law, but also in departments of Criminology or Forensic Studies, Sociology, Economics, Philosophy, Political Science, and Psychology, some of which are classified as social sciences and some not. He would find that in some universities History is classified as a social science and in others it is in another division, usually called 'Humanities'" (Gordon, 1991, p.1).

Although there are others, the social science is made up of majorly six closely related but distinct disciplines. These six fields of study are namely: Political Science, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Anthropology and lastly Geography. Each of these disciplines under the social science takes a keen interest in one out of the various dimensions Man can be studied in his social environment. As at today, each of these fields of study in the social science enjoy what can be called an 'independent status'. Despite the independence of the six social science disciplines, it would absolutely be wrong of us to straightaway assume that each of the mentioned disciplines have not benefited one from the other over the years. For Political Science (which the Greek philosopher Aristotle (384-322 B.C) regarded as the 'master science'), the development of the discipline to the appreciable level it has attained today, is traceable to a large extent to the other five fields of study in the social science. Hence, in order to systematically X-tray the root and route of political science vis-a-vis the above mentioned social sciences, this paper has been compartmentalised into the following sub-headings: conceptual clarification, the nature of 'science' in the social sciences, the origin and development of the social sciences, the social sciences: the root of political science, the social sciences: the route of political science and lastly, concluding remarks.

2. Conceptual Clarification

There are but three salient concepts capturing the whole essence of this paper. Clarifying each and every one of them would afford us a concrete intellectual background on the subject matter 'the social sciences: the root and route of political science'.

2.1. Social Sciences

"If our world were very neat, and static, we would have little difficulty in determining what is 'social science', or its various branches; we would only have to examine the curricula and research programmes of the social science departments. But our world is not neat..." "There is not much point in arguing over what is 'social science' and what is not.... We could emphasize the word 'science' and say that social science is the study of human behaviour by *scientific methods*" (Gordon, 1991, pp.1-2).

According to Bayer (1992), the social sciences are those fields of study that empirically study the "human society, societal groups, individuals in their relationships with others or institutions of societies and material goods as expression of human cohabitation" (cited in Dönmez and Domigall, 2011, p.3). Put in another way, the social sciences are concerned with that "part of human behavior ordinarily described as action and not with mere movements of, or at the surface of, the body (Rosenberg, 2008, p.21).

"The Social Sciences, like other empirical sciences, try to explain two sorts of phenomena: events and facts" (Elster, 1989, p.3). They are also "concerned with change in society" (Caraça, 2004, p.6). Nevertheless, the aim of the social sciences "is not to define the good society or to justify particular forms of human behavior, but to explain the variations and similarities in societies, organizations, and behavior" (Hirschman, 2000, p.5).

2.2. Root

Naturally, the first answer that comes to mind for some whenever they are asked the meaning of the concept 'root' is that, it is that lower part of a plant underneath the surface soil that firmly keeps it upright and nourishes it. For others, the meaning of 'root' is the causation of a thing or event. The Mathematicians also have their own understanding of the word 'root'. In Mathematics, the root of a given number is that number which when it multiplies itself would give you the given number e.g. the $\sqrt{4}= 2$; and when 2 multiplies itself, equals to 4. But in the context of this paper, 'root' means the source of a phenomenon. Going by this, the origin of salient concepts, mainstream theories, celebrated scholars etc. in political science from the other five social science disciplines would be traced in this paper.

2.3. Route

'Route' on the other hand, though it has a similar British pronunciation with the word 'root', takes to a different meaning. Travelers, most especially transporters, would not find the word 'route' strange. Though, they might not be able to give a befitting definition of the concept, they can attempt it by using their daily experience of moving from one place to another along interlinked roads or sea lanes. Taking a cue from this, 'route' therefore can be conceptualised succinctly as the direction, pathway or course a person or thing can/is taking in order to arrive at a desired destination.

3. The Nature of 'Science' in the Social Sciences

Over the background to the study, it was mentioned again and again, the word 'science' which is a common attribute of the 'social sciences' and 'pure sciences'. At this juncture, one cannot evade the pertinent question whether the social sciences are an exact science like the pure sciences or that they are a pseudo-science.

"The notion that the social sciences must be judged by reference to the natural sciences has been, and continues to be, the most prominent theme in the literature of the philosophy of social science. It not only reflects the general view that there is a 'unity of scientific method' but, more specifically, that the practices of the natural sciences constitute the standards to which the social sciences are obliged to conform. This notion has survived the controversies among philosophers concerning the philosophy of science. As we have seen, there is, today, no consensual view of this. Presumably, the social sciences are to be judged by reference to the natural sciences even though there is no agreement concerning the epistemic foundations of the natural sciences themselves" (Gordon, 1991, pp. 635-636).

"The problem of whether the social sciences are genuinely scientific immediately raises two questions: What are the social sciences? What is it to be scientific?" (Geller, 1984, p.567). Having answered the first question in the introductory section of this paper where it was accentuated that the social or behavioural sciences are the disciplines that study Man in his social environment - Political Science,

Economics, Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, Geography etc., the next question raised would be addressed. For the latter question, though scholars as Cohen (1994) believe that it is not a fruitful question to ask whether or not the social sciences are scientific in the sense of the physical sciences (cited in Sarewitz and Pielke Jr, 1999, p.128), just as some philosophers and social scientists equally find uninteresting or unimportant the question whether the social sciences have progressed as fast as natural sciences (Rosenberg, 2008, p.8), an answer can be provided having known first and foremost what is meant by the word 'science'.

"To some, science refers to difficult high school or college-level courses such as physics, chemistry, and biology meant only for the brightest students. To others, science is a craft practiced by scientists in white coats using specialized equipment in their laboratories. Etymologically, the word "science" is derived from the Latin word *scientia* meaning knowledge. Science refers to a systematic and organized body of knowledge in any area of inquiry that is acquired using "the scientific method" ..." (Bhattacharjee, 2012). Similarly, Eminue (2001) points out that science is a systematic (organised) body of knowledge as well as a method and a system of deriving the truth. It is systematic because it establishes or seeks to establish a relationship between theory and empirical facts. It gathers facts or data and links them together in their causal sequence with a view to establishing causal relationships or drawing valid inference (cited in Obo and Adejumo, 2014). This organised body of knowledge is gotten by no other means other than through the scientific method of observation. The purpose for adopting the scientific method, be it the pure or social sciences is to enable its users make valid predictions. "Prediction is central to the process of science—it is fundamental to the scientific method" (Sarewitz and Pielke Jr, 1999, p.123) as it helps scientists in knowing ahead of time possible future events and how such events can be controlled in the present, particularly the unpleasant ones.

From all that has been said thus far, there is a whole lot of difference that set the social and pure sciences pillars apart. "Politics, like other social sciences, has a scientific character because the scientific method is applicable to its phenomenon, viz. the accumulation of facts, the linking of these together in casual sequences and the generalization from the latter of fundamental principles or laws" (Appadorai, 2004). Generally, the social sciences are far from been as developed as the pure sciences for reasons which can be adumbrated. Firstly, the pure sciences subject of study is rather static in nature – matter, atom, compound etc. unlike human beings who are erratic in behaviour thus making accurate predictions almost impossible in the social sciences. Lastly, it is possible for the pure sciences at the comfort of a conducive and controlled environment as a laboratory to study and conduct experiment on inanimate objects. But human beings cannot be subjected to laboratory experiment let alone controlled in order to study the pattern of their behaviour. Rather, political science like the other five social sciences study Man in his social environment. Owing to these differences that make the social sciences far from being an exact science as the pure sciences, it can emphatically be stated for record purposes that political science like other social science disciplines, is a pseudo science.

4. The Origin and Development of the Social Sciences

Making a comparison, the social sciences are relatively new to the disciplines in the pure science. "Even though the social interactions in a society have probably been of interest for many centuries, scientific studies of social interactions began as late as during the 19th century with sociological publications including "Suicide" by Émile Durkheim and "Système de politique positive" by Auguste Comte, the latter of which also set stone for a positivist approach to social sciences" (Dönmez and Domigall, 2011, p.4).

According to Barnes (1948), the origin of the social sciences is traceable to the Industrial Revolution of Europe. The Industrial Revolution was a technological revolution in the late 18th and early 19th century which began in England in 1760 when machines replaced human labour in the production of manufactured goods. This was the era the German philosopher, Karl Marx (1818-1883) in his materialistic interpretation of the history of society, identified as when the 'capitalist mode of production' commenced. During this period, the manufacturing sector changed for the better as industrial output increased immensely compared to when human labour were in use.

The industrial revolution of the late 18th and early 19th century Europe, of a truth, is "the greatest transformation in the history of humanity" (Barnes, 1948). This notwithstanding, as it brought an end to the existing social order, it consequently gave rise to new socio-economic and political problems such as overcrowded urban areas, widened income gap between the class of the 'haves' and the 'have not', the unhealthy rivalry and competition between the imperial powers of Europe over foreign territories that were to serve as a market for surplus goods, source of raw materials to fuel their industries and, cheap labour. It was these and other socio-economic and political problems within and across societies that led to the creation of the social sciences. Much as scholars in the Global North have been successful in pegging the origin of the social sciences to a particular historical event, those in the Global South have not failed to do likewise especially in shedding light on the agenda of the West to divorce social knowledge from social needs in the Third World.

According to the Nigerian born Professor of Political Science, Claude Ake, the major reason behind the introduction of Western social sciences in Third World countries was to continually subordinate them in the disadvantaged position that they are in presently. The reasons for doing this are not farfetched. Following the integration of African economies into the European capitalist system during the colonial era (Ake, 1981), the capitalist West needed to keep Third World countries subjugated firstly, to remain a profitable landmass to invest capital and make profit. Secondly, a source for cheap labour and resources and lastly, a sizable market for their finished and surplus goods. To Ake therefore, Western scholarship is meant to aid the 'imperialistic' agenda of the West as they are an important tool for controlling Third World perceptions of their world and eventually Third World behaviour (Ake, 1979, pp.99-100). In his words, Ake said that:

- "Outsiders tried to influence the characters and teaching of the social sciences in Africa in order to further their imperial purposes. This was done largely through the big foundations, the provision of university teachers to Africa, the award of scholarships to promising African students as part of university staff-development programmes, and the sponsorship of

textbooks. Such an effort, combined with the legacy of Western education surviving from the colonial experience firmly established Western mainstream social science in most of Africa. However, these social sciences with their foundations in the well-known classics, were oriented towards defending the values of order and capitalism” (Ake, 1984, pp. 619-620).

“The rapid development of the social sciences is no doubt one of the more striking phenomena of our century. The diversification of approaches, adoption of new research tools and methods, broadening of analytical scope and penetration into new areas have caused a profound upheaval in the social science landscape, especially in the last few decades. The number and pace of these developments have led the social sciences to lay a claim to proper scientific status, and to recognition and a role of their own in academic institutions and in the world of research in general. What is more, a large number of new fields have emerged as a result of the desire to give the social sciences a direct active role to play” (Braillard, 1984, p.627). One of such new fields of study which has caused the social sciences to play a proactive role especially in dealing with societal problems is ‘International Relations’ after the horrendous First World War (1914-1918) and the carnage witnessed in the Second World War (1939-1945).

No doubt, the social sciences at present have developed to an appreciable level. However, it cannot be denied that there are a number of factors hindering their swift and full development. One of these factors is what Claude Ake calls the ‘commodification’ of the social sciences. “The social sciences have been commodified and it would appear that problems associated with commodification constitute the greatest challenge to the social sciences today. Commodification limits in very fundamental ways the scientific development of the social sciences and their contribution to human wellbeing. More specifically, it divorces the production of the social sciences from social needs, renders social science knowledge more prone to aid domination than enlightenment and focuses research on problems of limited scientific value” (Ake, 1984, p.615).

5. The Social Sciences: The Root of Political Science

Having addressed in passing the debate whether or not the social sciences particularly political science is an exact or partial science as well as the origin and development of the social sciences, the crux of this paper which is to first and foremost extensively trace the root of Political Science components in the other five social science disciplines would explicitly be treated in the paragraphs below. Going by the sub-theme of this section ‘the social sciences: the root of political science’, what would basically be pointed out here is the origin of some major concepts, theories, scholars etc. of Political Science in Economics, Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology and Geography.

5.1. Economics

“The word ‘economics’ derives from a compound of two classical Greek words: *oikos* and *nomos*, meaning respectively ‘household’ and ‘law’. Some writers of the Greek classical era used the word *oikonomia* to refer to the basic principles (i.e. ‘laws’) of household management. This use survives today in the college subject of Home Economics, but plain Economics, as every student of it is aware, deals with the economic problems of a much larger entity—the nation and, indeed, the world as a whole” (Gordon, 1991, p.169).

Economics as defined by a renowned scholar in the discipline, is the “the science which studies human behaviour as a relationship between ends and scarce means which have alternative uses” (Robbins, 1932). Put in a proper perspective, Economics focuses on the production, exchange and consumption of goods and services. More importantly, it is concerned with the creation and accumulation of wealth in a State.

Prior to now, economics as we know it today was not called economics but studied as “political economy” by classical political economy scholars of the 18th and 19th century – Adam Smith, John Stuart Mills, David Ricardo etc. The etymology of ‘political economy’ is from the Greek words *polis* meaning ‘City-State’ and *oikonomos* translated to English as ‘household management’.

Political science as a social science discipline has been able to trace the origin of its study of political economy to economics. Political economy as it is being studied today in political science, makes us understand the relationship between State power and the management of the market (the economy). “Political economy goes beyond traditional economics to study, among other things, the social and institutional processes through which certain groups of economic and political elites influence the allocation of scarce productive resources now and in the future, either for their own benefit exclusively or for that of the larger population as well” (Todaro and Smith, 2012). “Political economy is about the sources of political power and its uses for economic ends” (Collier, 2006). Thus, it can be said that political economy is “concerned with the relationship between politics and economics, with a special emphasis on the role of power in economic decision making” (Todaro and Smith, 2012).

5.2. Sociology

From the word *Socius* (Latin) meaning “Society” and *Logos* (Greek) “the study of”, Sociology simply put is the study of Man’s interaction in the society. As for its goal, Sociology seeks to understand Man’s interaction in the society as no Man is an island on his own. He cannot live in total isolation or autarchy. Thus, he must interact with his fellow Man which makes Sociology a relevant social science discipline.

Political scientists, as a matter of concepts and theories can trace some of them which are often used in the discipline to sociology. Culture as a concept is one of them. In sociology culture is “the total way of life of a people, the social legacy that the individual acquires from his group” (Kluckhohn, 1963). This concept of culture in political science has been closely studied by intellectuals in the discipline as political culture. As Lucian Pye (1962) rightly asserted, political culture is “the set of attitudes, beliefs and sentiments which give order and meaning to a political process and which provides the underlying assumptions and rules that govern behaviour in

the political system". It has also been conceived as "specifically the pattern of individual political orientations, the attitudes towards the political system and its various parts and to the role of the self in the political system" (Almond and Verba, 1963).

Theoretically, the General Systems Theory developed by the biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy, which later was imported into the social sciences by sociologists, has been judiciously utilised by political scientists. David Easton who prides himself for developing the system theory in political science sees the political system as "any interaction in society through which binding or authoritative allocations are made and implemented" (Easton, 1953). According to the system theory in political science, the political system is made up of units that each perform not only a function but are interdependent one on the other. The political system, using Easton's model, has an 'input' section for 'demands' and 'supports' from the environment which passes through the 'conversion process'. As the conversion process is not capable of handling all demands and supports at a go, the 'gatekeepers' e.g. interest groups at the conversion process are there to manage this situation and then what makes it through the conversion process would come out in the 'output' section in the form of laws, policies, authoritative resource allocations etc. What comes into play afterwards is the 'feedback mechanism' and then, the circle continues.

Another interesting way to look at how the development of political science is traceable to sociology is to take into account the scholars in the field. In Political Science, a good number of its renowned scholars have a solid background in Sociology. David Easton that was earlier mentioned, is a foremost political scientist who was disciplined in Sociology. Another sociologist(s) to have developed a mainstream theory in political science are none other than the Italians Vilfredo Pareto and Gaetano Mosca and, the German Roberto Miché. These three notable sociologists are celebrated scholars in political science owing to their formulation of the Elite Theory which they used in pointing out that, the society is divided into two strata – the minority ruling elites the wield power (which they further divided into the governing and non-governing elites), and the majority i.e. the masses that prefer to be ruled by a few (Varma, 1975; Olaniji 2001; Onah, 2010).

5.3. Anthropology

Derived from the Greek words *Anthropos* meaning 'human beings' and *Logos* 'the study of', "Anthropology is the study of humanity and nature of human kinds in all ramifications his biological, physical and social characteristics and above all why and how people are different? Anthropologists are interested in understanding how the societies work, its social structure and human behavior, its past, present and future" (Otaha and Dickson, 2014).

Political Science as a social science discipline has greatly benefitted from Anthropology most especially 'Political Anthropology'. Political anthropology is that branch of anthropology that focuses on the political structure; system and; institutions in a society. In the case of Third World countries, political anthropology investigates how the political system of these countries were transformed from those prevalent in magnificent pre-colonial empires to the democratic system of government that was adopted by the colonial masters during the colonial era, only for this system to be retained by their former colonies who currently are experiencing a great deal of difficulty operating and managing such alien political system after gaining political 'flag' independence.

Generally speaking, that political scientists are able to understand how conflicts and warfare, ethnicity, symbols, rituals, identity, religion, culture etc. shape the politics of a country would not have been possible without an anthropological insight and ethnography.

5.4. Psychology

The behaviour of Man as a product of the state of his mind and mental process is another way of observing Man in his social environment. This angle from which Man can be observed critically has been what Psychologists have preoccupied themselves with empirically in time past and in recent years.

Psychology as the scientific and systematic study of behaviour and mental process (Lahey, 2004), is a derivative of the Greek words *Psyche* meaning 'the mind' and *Logos* as 'the study of'. Psychologists' study of Man ranges from the biological functioning of the organs and hormones in the human body, response to stimuli, perception and processing of information, the diverse personalities Man can take, and the psychological abnormalities or disorders he can suffer from. From the above topical issues within the scope of psychology, political science takes a keen interest in the study of personalities and the collective thinking of people particularly when it concerns policy makers and the quality of the decisions that they make. As Robert Jarvis rightly asserted "...it is often impossible to explain crucial decisions and policies without reference to the decision-makers' beliefs about the world and their images of others" (Jarvis, 1976, p.28)

The study of the idiosyncrasy of political leaders and how they perceive the world through the filter of their lenses, belief system or ideological point of view has dominated foreign policy analysis in Political Science. In Psychology, "the process of receiving information from the outside world, translating it, and transmitting it to the brain is called sensation" while "the process of interpreting that information and forming images of the world is called perception" (Lahey, 2004, p.114). Perception as a concept has been that concept political science borrowed from psychology and accordingly has utilised vis-à-vis the analysis of nation-states foreign policy. Another way to look at the impact of psychology on foreign policy studies in political science is to conduct an assessment of the cerebral differences and compromises major stakeholders make in the actual formulation of a State's foreign policy before the implementation stage. Here, policy makers have a tendency to subordinate their personal preference to the politics of arriving at a consensus on a policy action or inaction to take. This process of arriving at a consensus is called "*Groupthink*".

5.5. Geography

Last but not the least of the social sciences is Geography. "Geography is the study of spatial distributions and space relations on the earth's surface" (Ackerman, 1965). It is correct to say that there is an existing relationship between politics and geography in the real world. This marriage between politics and geography gave rise to the concept 'geopolitics' as was coined by the Swedish scholar, Rudolf Kjellén.

According to Hans J. Morgenthau, "Geopolitics is a pseudo-science erecting the factor of geography into an absolute that is supposed to determine the power, and hence the fate of nations. Its basic conception is space. Yet, while space is static, the peoples living within the spaces of the earth are dynamic. According to geopolitics, it is a law of history that people must expand by "conquering space," or perish, and that the relative power of nations is determined by the mutual relation of the conquered spaces" (Morgenthau, 2007, p.178).

There are three classic geopolitical events in world history which political scientists study. The first is the quest of the ambitious French General, Napoleon Bonaparte whose intension was to conquer the powers of Europe in the 18th century and thus make France a hegemon. The second is Imperial Japan's invasion of Southern Manchuria, China in the early 1930s and lastly, the Führer of Nazi Germany, Adolf Hitler who had an agenda that would bring about the dominance of the Aryan race the world over. He began by pursuing what he called *Lebensraum* (living space). Thus in 1938, Nazi Germany annexed Austria, grabbed Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia and then invaded Poland on September 01, 1939 which precipitated the Second World War (1939-1945).

5.6. The Social Sciences: The Route of Political Science

It would be inappropriate to begin the discourse on the route of political science (which is the direction political science is following) without accounting for the development of political science to its present state. "Political science as an academic discipline within the social sciences is concerned with the systematic study and analysis of politics. It attempts to understand the behaviour of individuals, groups and societies, the factors and conditions that affect the political actors, political events and institutions" (Anifowose, 2015, p.5). In a nutshell, political science is concerned with the scientific study of the behavioural pattern of Man as a 'political animal' vis-a-vis his pursuit, acquisition and exercise of 'power' at the macro level i.e. the State.

The origin of the discipline dates back to ancient Greece where the word 'politics', from the Greek word *polis* (meaning 'City-State') was coined. The locus of politics till date and as always is, 'power'. Politics as a matter of fact is a ubiquitous phenomenon. No sector or institution whatsoever in a society is devoid of it. Thus, politics can be observed at the micro level – family, associations, corporate organizations etc. and at the macro level - the State. Several scholars for many years now have proffered in published literatures a definition of politics. Lasswell (1936) to start with says that politics "is who gets what, when and how". For Morgenthau (1948), politics is a struggle for power. But to Easton (1965), politics succinctly is the "authoritative allocation of values".

The father of the science of politics has not changed from been the Greek philosopher, Aristotle (384-322 B.C) while the Italian political thinker, Niccolò Machiavelli remains the father of 'modern politics'. Despite the recognition of these political philosophers and many others who have contributed immensely to the study of politics with their classic works, it took the effort of a French political philosopher of the 16th century in person of Jean Bodin (1530-1597) to coin once and for all the discipline's title '*Sciences Politiques*' which when translated to English is Political Science. In the United States, among the first set of Universities to create the Department of Political Science are the University of Minnesota in 1879 and Columbia University in the year 1880.

As touching the development of Political Science, it has been studied from the standpoint of three schools – i) the Traditionalist School ii) Behaviouralist School iii) Post-behaviouralist School. The traditionalist school is by far the oldest of the three. The approaches of the traditionalists to the study of politics were the sole method of political analysis adopted by the founding fathers of the discipline (Olaniyi, 2001). Notable traditionalists include Plato, Aristotle, Thomas Hobbes, Baron de Montesquieu etc. who adopted the normative, philosophical, institutional, descriptive, legalistic, comparative approaches to the study of politics (Olaniyi 2001; Onah, 2010).

The traditionalists dominated the study of politics up until the outbreak of the Second World War (1939-1945). With the war over in 1945, the behaviouralist school took the centre stage by championing the 'scientific revolution' in political science (Anifowose, 2015). Having scholars as Charles E. Merriam, Authur F. Bentley, Graham Wallas and David Easton of the Chicago School, the behaviouralists were interested in the empirical study of human behaviour. In order to do this, they adopted and applied the instruments of the pure sciences such as charts, tables, simulations, models etc. David Easton was the scholar that contributed immensely to the behaviouralist movement. It was Easton who came up with the 8 intellectual foundation stones of behaviouralism in political science which are i) regularities, ii) verification, iii) pure science, iv) value, v) techniques, vi) quantification, vii) systematisation, and viii) integration (Varma, 1975; Gauba 2003; Onah 2010).

The behaviouralists fell short in a number of ways. Firstly, the school was fast making the study of politics too abstract with the development of models and the likes. By implication, the behaviouralists lost touch with reality. Rather than solving societal problems, they preoccupied themselves with the analysis of it. These shortcomings led to the emergence of the post-behaviouralist school after the presidential address of David Easton at the American Political Science Association (APSA) in 1969. This school emphasized 'relevance' and 'action' in political science. They also argued that values cannot be separated from facts and that political scientists should become proactive in identifying and solving societal problems.

Going by the past and present state of the discipline, the following can be said to be the plausible route of political science vis-a-vis the social sciences. Political science no doubt has tilted to and is now not only exploring the academic pathway driven by the scientific method and interdisciplinary approach but, is finding its ground in it. Being partially scientific and dwelling heavily on the multidisciplinary approach, Political Science in the future therefore would be borrowing and utilising more of the concepts, models,

theories etc. of the other social sciences that best offer a logical explanation of the actions and inactions of the political Man; societal problems as they rear their ugly head, and lastly help in finding a lasting panacea to these problems.

6. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, a conceptual clarification on what the social sciences, root and route are, the major disciplines that fall under the social science and also the academic debate whether or not political science like other social sciences is an exact science in the real sense was successfully addressed. In the main body of the work, the origin and development of the social sciences; the root of political science in the five social science disciplines that were mentioned, the present status of the discipline and finally the route of political science vis-a-vis the said five social sciences was equally touched. From all indications therefore, political science no doubt is bound to dwell heavily on the interdisciplinary approach. Studying Man as merely a *homo politicus* has in recent past proven to be insufficient in making predictions regarding Man's future actions and inactions. Should political scientists had maximised the knowledge of psychology for instance, they could have properly understood Adolf Hitler's belief system and foreign policy and thus forestalled the outbreak of the Second World War (1939-1945). Though political science would be utilising the interdisciplinary approach the more in the nearest future in order to better understand the rationale and actions of Man, it would still fall short in making accurate and time-tested predictions as Man forever is an erratic being. Therefore, the prevalent laws, generalisations or theories that best explain the political Man at any given point in time may not accurately do the same in another era.

7. References

- i. Ackerman, E. A. (1965). *The Science of Geography*. Washington D. C.: National Academy of Science.
- ii. Ake, C. (1979). *Social Science as Imperialism: A Theory of Political Development*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- iii. Ake, C. (1981). *A Political Economy of Africa*. New York: Longman Inc.
- iv. Ake, C. (1984). 'Commodification of the Social Science'. *Epistemology of Social Science 102: The Scientific Status, Values and Institutionalization*. *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 4, pp. 565-727, UNESCO.
- v. Almond, G. & Verba, S. (1963). *Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- vi. Anifowose, R. (2015). "The Nature and Scope of Political Science" in Anifowose, R. & Enemuo, F. (eds). *Elements of Politics, 2nd Edition*. Bariga: Lagos, Sam Iroanusi Publications.
- vii. Anifowose, R. (2015). "Political Behaviour" in Anifowose, R. & Enemuo, F. (eds). *Elements of Politics, 2nd Edition*. Bariga: Lagos, Sam Iroanusi Publications.
- viii. Appadorai, A. (2004). *Substance of Politics*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- ix. Barnes, H. E. (1948). *An Introduction to the History of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- x. Bhattacharjee, A. (2012). *Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices, 2nd edition*. Florida: Global Text Project.
- xi. Braillard, P. (1984). 'The Social Sciences and the Study of International Relations'. *Epistemology of Social Science 102: The Scientific Status, Values and Institutionalization*. *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 4, pp. 565-727, UNESCO.
- xii. Caraça, J. (2004). "Social Sciences and Social Change" in *Re-inventing the Social Sciences. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)*.
- xiii. Collier, P. (2006). *International Political Economy: Some African Application*. Centre for the Study of African Economics, Department of Economics, Oxford University. Being a paper prepared for AERC, pp. 1-22.
- xiv. Dönmez, D. & Domigall, Y. (2011). *What is the Difference between Social and Natural Science? Being a Doctoral Seminar Paper*, Universitt St. Gallen.
- xv. Easton, D. (1953). *Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*. New York: Alfred A Knopf.
- xvi. Easton, D. (1965). *A System Analysis of Political Life*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- xvii. Elster, J. (1989). *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- xxviii. Gauba, O. P. (2003). *An Introduction to Political Theory, 4th edition*. New Delhi: Rajiv Beri for Macmillan India Ltd.
- xix. Geller, E. (1984). 'The Scientific Status of the Social Sciences'. *Epistemology of Social Science 102: The Scientific Status, Values and Institutionalization*. *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 4, pp. 565-727, UNESCO.
- xx. Gordon, S. (1991). *The History and Philosophy of Social Science*. London: Routledge.
- xxi. Hirschman, C. (2000). "The Development of the Social Sciences Prior to Globalization and Some Thoughts on the Future". Being a Paper presented at UCLA Conference, April, 14-15.
- xxii. Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- xxiii. Kluckhohn, C. (1963). *Mirror of Man*, Greenwich.
- xxiv. Lahey, B. B. (2004). *Psychology: An Introduction, 8th edition*, Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- xxv. Lasswell, H. D. (1936). *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*. New York: Whittlesey House.
- xxvi. Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics Among Nations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- xxvii. Morgenthau, H. J. (2007). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace, (Revised by Thompson, K. W.)*. 6th edition. New Delhi: Kalyani Publishers.
- xxviii. Obo, U. B. & Adejumo, T. O. (2014). *The Social Sciences and the Scientific Study of Society: The Fact - Value Dichotomy Debate Revisited*. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 10, pp. 1-11.

- xxix. Olaniyi, J. O. (2001). *Introduction to Contemporary Political Analysis*. Lagos: Fapsony.
- xxx. Onah, E. I. (2010). *Contemporary Political Analysis*. Lagos: Concept Publications Limited.
- xxxi. Otaha, I. J. & Dickson, V. J. (2014). Social Sciences as a Panacea to Rural Development in Nigeria. *JORIND*, 12(2) pp. 47-53.
- xxxii. Pye, L. W. (1962). *Politics, Personality and Nation Building*. New Haven.
- xxxiii. Robbins, L. (1932). *An Essay on the Nature and Significance of Economic Science*. London: Macmillan.
- xxxiv. Rosenberg, A. (2008). *The Philosophy of Social Science*, 3rd edition. Boulder: Westview Press.
- xxxv. Sarewitz, D. & Pielke Jr., R. (1999). Prediction in Science and Policy. *Technology in Society*, 21, pp.121-133.
- xxxvi. Streeck, W. (2012). We simply do not Know: On the Benefit of Social Sciences for Policy-Making. *Academic Swiss Caucasus Net (ASCN)*, pp. 4-7.
- xxxvii. Todaro, M. P. & Smith, S. C. (2012). *Economic Development*. 11th edition. Addison-Wesley: Pearson.
- xxxviii. Varma, S. P. (1975). *Modern Political Theory*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.