Politics, Law and Administration: The Perspective of Theory

Adebayo T. SALAMI*

Abstract

What approach to scholarship that should determine the study and understanding of politics, law and administration? The approach here adopted as an answer to the question focuses on two critical areas of the referenced scholarship. The first entailed conceptual explorations and expositions within the standard requirements of social science scholarship and the broad humanities at large. The second, without necessarily deviating from the knowledge identity of the same social science scholarship, approached the study and understanding from the formulated idea of knowledge relationship as a technical expression standing alone, and further within the necessity to integrate the two areas within an epistemological basis of human inquiry. The accompanying presentation hence followed the standard pattern of research questions as the chosen path with which to illuminate the embedded thesis/argument of the paper. It becomes important to consequently ask: is there any relationship of knowledge between and among politics, law and administration? If there is, what is the relationship like? What knowledge identity and framework that can help to seek the study and understanding of the relationship from the perspective of its interrogation and the scholarly amplification of same? Again, what either justifies or should justify the knowledge of the relationship and its study? The question can still be further asked: what knowledge foundation that should determine the study of the relationship? The paper therefore seeks to argue an essential point. What is this essential point? In addition, how does the point in turn constitute the advanced thesis of the paper? The understanding of the knowledge relationship between and among politics, law and administration, the paper holds the view, is critical to the achievement of the purpose of any social organization. In other words, the essence and purpose of any social organization technically and unarguably revolve around the extent to which state managers have deeper appreciation of the knowledge relationship between and among the concepts as being significant and pivotal to the idea of social organization especially from the perspective of its essence and purpose.

* PhD Department of Political Science, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria, Corresponding author: salami.adebayo@oouagoiwoye.edu.ng

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the
Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

The point about significance, it requires further pontification, raises an important issue of knowledge? What is this issue, and again, what both explains and justifies its significance especially from the perspective of the choice of academic and intellectual engagement? The issue and justification revolve around the idea of the appropriate determination of the theory of interrogation and scrutiny to the extent of in turn providing the very important theoretical framework of amplification and analysis: Therefore, using the knowledge framework of the discipline of political science/ political theory, the paper, within the central objective of reinventing the existing theoretical framework of interrogation and scrutiny, advances the argument and thesis that the idea of the state, particularly the character and form of same, is critical to undertake any reformulation against the backdrop of the African experience of democratic politics. The methodology of study is qualitative and has its roots in the "theories of the state". The contribution of the paper to knowledge fundamentally revolves around the idea of "knowledge relationship" and its attendant amplification within the new focus of study, understanding, and research priorit formulation and execution.

Keywords: *Politics; Law; Administration; Theory*

1. Introduction: The Context of Intellectual Engagement and Interrogation

What is the idea of 'context' particularly within the perspective of an intellectual engagement? In other words, what does it seek to present, and what in turn justifies the presentation? 'Context', in the existing circumstance, is about a uniqueness of examination and analysis within a targeted goal/objective, the targeted goal/objective of redefining and reinventing an already established subject-matter of study for good understanding as a requirement of knowledge advancement. "The perspective of theory" to the intellectual engagement and interrogation of the knowledge relationships (of both exploration and exposition) between and among politics, law and administration therefore makes compelling the placement of the interrogation and engagement within certain important knowledge fundamentals. What are these knowledge fundamentals, and what explains their importance within the context of interrogation and engagement? The answer the question requires placement within a rigour of presentation. Part of the rigour of the presentation is to quickly ask the question: what is the meaning of the idea of " knowledge fundamentals" within the existing circumstance of conceptualization and operationalization? The idea of "knowledge fundamentals" is essentially a formulation that carefully and systematically targets good understanding of the intellectual engagement and interrogation of the relationships between and among the ideas of politics, law and administration as concepts of meaning-making generalizations. The idea of "knowledge fundamentals" is therefore carefully about the answer to the question: what best provides for the study (particularly from the perspective of theory) of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration? The idea, in addition, is technically about providing

appropriate theoretical perspective of intellectual engagement and interrogation. The starting point of the identification and articulation of the fundamentals to the extent of the labelling as "knowledge fundamentals" is to engage the meaning of "the role of theory" in general terms and further within the context of the paper. The idea of a theoretical perspective as used in the paper captures the two dimensions to the meaning of what 'theory' is and the appropriateness of same in the existing foundations in normative and empirical expressions. A theory, within the context of the paper, is appropriately about a knowledge of description, explanation and prediction. The idea of a theory as a "knowledge of description, explanation and prediction" is fundamentally about a formulated idea within a logic of exposition and expression of the realities and abstractions of the universe in the embedded and defined activities of distinction and uniqueness. As an idea within a sense of logic with which to describe, explain and predict the embedded and defined activities of the universe, theory therefore performs critical and important roles with which to understand the embedded and defined activities. "The perspective of theory" to the understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration, is therefore technically about the deployment of knowledge skills and strategies considered relevant for the purpose of enabling the exposition and exploration of the relationships from the perspective of scholarship. " The perspective of theory" consequently seeks systematic organization and presentation. The "systematic organization and presentation" is in turn about a knowledge arrangement of distinction and difference within the body of idea on the subject matter as found in extant literature. "The perspective of theory", it requires emphasis, is further in technical terms about how general and specific circumstances influence and shape the emerging ideas of exposition and exploration to the extent of enabling a critique from the standpoint of scholarship. While general standards require mentioning and referencing, situational circumstances however provide the rare opportunity for the study of politics, law and administration. Emphasis and focus on local and regional variations provides the opportunity of good study. "The perspective of theory" within the diversities of intellectual exposition and exploration presents a particular approach to study within the defined scholarship. We might ask at this juncture: what is the advanced thesis of the paper, and within what knowledge exposition and exploration? The thesis/argument of the paper is that politics, law and administration owe their proper meaning-making, study and amplification to the context of theory. In other words, the study, understanding and subject-matter amplification of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration can be facilitated and enhanced only in relation to their theoretical interrogations and scrutiny. The idea of the context of the theory

has related to it the question/issue of appropriateness. The question can therefore be clearly asked: what theory that is suited for the study and understanding, and how appropriate and fitting is it?

A suited theory for the purpose of the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration is fundamentally about "the theory of the state" as a social organization whose continuing existence is further guaranteed by the authority to make, implement and enforce its own decisions. The idea of a society as a social organization comes into being within the framework of politics, law and administration. The existence and sustenance of the framework make compelling the study of politics, law and administration. The framework, it requires note, indicates both senses of theoretical and practical articulation of the idea and authority of the state/government. The framework in addition serves as the instrument of evaluation and assessment of the extent of the authority of the state in the particular and special area of absolute exercise and control of power. The thesis as already propounded compels the stating of its methodology of accomplishment/advancement. So, what is the method of engagement and within what larger context of methodology? The idea of method and methodology, with respect to the thesis and its advancement, is fundamentally about how the thesis enjoys the required approach of scholarship within the prescribed standard of scrutiny in extant literature. It is, in both theoretical and practical terms, about the extent of the division of the paper and the interrelationships between and among its parts. This part of the paper, before the other parts of it are highlighted, and beyond the preliminaries as earlier mentioned, requires a technicality of focus and engagement targeted at what exactly "the perspective of theory" is to the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration within the larger context of the organization of the state. Again, what does this perspective of theory entail? And what knowledge arrangement/theme that can best express it to the extent of presenting a standard of accomplishment? Before we come to the other parts of the paper as the knowledge arrangement that helps to enable the appreciation of our thesis of advancement, answering the question (what the perspective of theory entails?) revolves around the accompanying knowledge substantive issues distinct from the knowledge fundamentals. The question about "the perspective of theory" of engagement and interrogation seeks not only what the substantive knowledge issues of interrogation and engagement are, but their enabling description and articulation so that they can in turn constitute the basis for a subject-matter amplification. "The perspective of theory" is therefore as enabled and supported by the disciplines of political science, law and public administration.

The substantive knowledge issues hence revolve around the extent to which the recognition (or lack of same) between among the disciplines of political science, law and public administration can either jointly or independently enable the appreciation of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration. The idea of independence of public administration from political science, for instance, presents a knowledge issue. The knowledge issue of whether or not the long recognized dichotomy between politics and administration can still be sustained in the face of global quadruple developments of both domestic and international consequences. Related further is whether or not the idea of the invention of the state has not made necessary the replacement of "administration" with "management". And from the perspective of law, the question becomes necessary to ask to the extent of in turn constituting a substantive knowledge issue: 'which area of law that is most suited for the purpose of studying and understanding the knowledge relationships between politics, law and administration? "The perspective of theory" within the existing technicalities of amplification, explanation and analysis, is in addition about the appropriateness of 'approach'. An 'approach' to study especially from the stand-point of social science scholarship, is fundamentally about what allows for comprehensiveness of interrogation, engagement and scrutiny. It unarguably provides the knowledge indices and criteria with which to regularly assess and evaluate the extent to which the formulated knowledge fundamentals of our study and understanding of subject-matters actually captures the details of their scrutiny. "The perspective of theory" as an 'approach' to the study and understanding of the relationships of knowledge between and among politics, law and administration presents the adopted/chosen style of the scholarship of engagement. This section of the paper, introduction, carefully targets the following goals and objectives. Firstly, it seeks to situate the interrogation and scrutiny of politics, law and administration within a knowledge relationship and to emphasize further that the knowledge relationships is critical to the interrogation and scrutiny. Secondly, it seeks to present the point that the appreciation of the knowledge relationship is rooted in the defined knowledge intellectual pluralism of political science, law and public administration and further within the strengths of the disciplines as representing a multi-disciplinary approach. Lastly, to enable proper and correct appreciation of the envisaged knowledge of interrogation and scrutiny within the advanced thesis.

Next to the introduction is the necessity to further situate the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration within the knowledge framework of study and understanding. This is the section on the

purpose of the state. The argument here is that the concepts, and the knowledge relationships between and among them, are better understood within the idea of the state especially from the perspective of its purpose and the justification for its existence. Within the overall goal and objective of enabling simplification through careful and systematic presentation is the necessity to as well overcome the embedded ambiguities. This is the preoccupation of part three of the paper. This section or part argues the point that a neatness of conceptualization and operationalization of politics, law and administration is fundamental to the advanced thesis. Next to the section is section four. The section appropriately presents the topic of our intellectual/academic engagement from the perspective of theory. Critical to it and the related justification is the subject-matter amplification, explanation and analysis. The subject-matter amplification and analysis of the relationships of knowledge between and among the concepts of politics, law and administration. The section carefully and systematically presents the "theories of the state" and undertakes the critiques of same within the overall objective of seeking the appropriate knowledge framework for proper and correct understanding of the meaning of politics, law and administration and further within the study of the knowledge relationships between and among them. The 'science' of intellectual engagement, scrutiny and interrogation comes with the related issues of methodology. This is section five of the paper. "The perspective of theory" as the knowledge framework of interrogation and scrutiny of the concept of politics, law and administration, and of the study of the relationships of knowledge between and among them, compels the focus on some methodological issues with far reaching implications on the formulated thesis and its advancement. Section six provides the conclusion to the study.

Politics, Law and Administration 1: The Purpose of the State as the Knowledge Foundation Framework of Study and Understanding

The understanding of this section of the paper and its relevance to the formulated thesis require us to deliberately ask certain important questions and seeking answers to them. What these questions within the overall goal and objective of helping to illuminate this section of the paper? What does the phrase, "the purpose of the state", mean? What intellectual context that should define the meaning and conceptualization? Again, what is meant by the phrase, "the knowledge foundation framework"? As a reiteration, the answers to the questions are critical to this section of the paper and its overall purpose within the larger context of same. Before a comprehensiveness of presentation within the body of the entailed technicalities of

amplification, explanation and analysis, "the purpose of the state" refers to the *raison detre* for the state within the context of the history of human civilization and further as a social organization. The "knowledge foundation framework" on the other hand, is about providing the relevant epistemological context of interrogation and scrutiny. Combined together, the section saddles itself with the intellectual responsibility of creating a knowledge arrangement of interrogation and scrutiny that is imbued with both the capacity and capability of properly and correctly distilling the study and understanding of politics, law and administration as conceptual terminologies and further within the perspective of a knowledge relationship. It is appropriate at this juncture to ask the question: how can the idea of "the purpose of the state" provides the intellectual context with which to scrutinize and interrogate the concepts of politics, law and administration? The "intellectual context" under reference here is the idea of "knowledge foundation framework" The question can be rearranged as: how is the correct explanation and analysis of the concept of politics, law and administration rooted in the idea of "the purpose of the state", and to what extent does same in turn constitute a "knowledge foundation framework" of interrogation and scrutiny? The answer to the question exists in two forms. The two forms are: (a) engaging the phrase, "the purpose of the state", and (b) situating the engagement within the related extant theories in literature, The phrase, "the purpose of the state", is essentially about the reasons and the justifications for the state as the greatest invention ever made by man. The reasons and justifications in both theoretical and practical terms encapsulate the purpose of the state as further technically expressed in the related duties and responsibilities as technically formulated, The phrase, "the purpose of the state" requires the exploration and exposition of political theory for proper meaning-making. And the question is therefore apt: what is the political theory of exploration and exposition like? The political theory of exploration and exposition as the knowledge sophistication of scrutiny is well captured in what Laski (1982) within a wider context of academic exposition calls: "the purpose of social organization". In one of his classic works titled: *A Grammar of Politics*, Laski (1982) undertakes the simplification of the theoretical sophistication of "the purpose of social organization" within five essential components of: (a) "the change of scale", (b) "the necessity of government", (c) "the end of the state", (d) "state and society" and (e) "the nature of political power" (Ibid:15-35). We can again ask: how critical are the "essential components" as knowledge themes to ensuring proper and correct meaning-making of politics, law and administration as conceptual terminologies? The criticality of the themes to the accomplishment of the said task requires their understanding by Laski (1982). The understanding of the theme is however, here

limited to what Laski (1982) says about them. In "the change of scale", Laski (1982) draws the attention of the global intellectual community to the changing realities of our world as interpreted by different philosophers. He argues the point that: "A new political philosophy is necessary to a new world" (Ibid:15) He continues: "The perspective of social thought has shifted in a direction different from the horizon set for it by Benthman and Hegel in the last century. If the large aims we have in view are not dissimilar to theirs, the materials at our command and the scale upon which we live are both, for good or ill, vaster than at any previous time" (Ibid:15) What meaning-making can we infer from the above positions within the overall goal and objective of providing the "knowledge foundation framework" that is appropriate and suited for the scrutiny of politics, law and administration? The submission of Laski (1982) in the context of the above draws our attention to the complexities that are associated with the organization of the modern world and how the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and relationship can help us to address these complexities from the perspective of theory and practice.

Within the theme of what Laski (1982) calls "the necessity of government", he argues the point that: "The activities of a civilized community are too complex and too manifold to be left to the blind regulation of impulse: and even if each man could be relied upon to act consistently in terms of intelligence, there would be need for a customary standard by which the society in its organized form agreed to differentiate right from wrong" (Ibid:17-18). He concludes: "The theory of philosophic anarchy is impossible, in fact, so long as men move differently to the attainment of opposed desires" (Ibid:18) What Laski (1982) wants us to know about "the necessity of government": within the larger context of the study and understanding of "the purpose of social practical organization" is that "the necessity of government": as an idea meaning of fundamental purpose and existence only in relation to the recognized relationship between and among politics, law and administration. In "the end of the state", Laski (1982) clearly declares that, it, the state,: "...becomes an organization for enabling the mass of men to realize social good on the largest possible scale" (Ibid:23). The question is again very important to ask: how is the state an organization or how does the state become an organization? Reference to 'organization' here is an idea of coordinating influence, function, duty and responsibility. Because it is an "idea of coordinating, influence and responsibility", among others, the idea, in fundamental terms, revolves around the related ideas of politics, law and administration. Why? This is because *what* function that is to be performed by the state is usually a product of idea of contest as politics which in turn requires the protection of the law and its consequent administration in systematic terms to guarantee the permanent existence of the state. In "state and

society", Laski (1982) argues the point that "we obey the state because in the end it most truly represents ourselves or rather we are obeying that best self which makes us one with and of our fellows" (Ibid:30).What meaning can we give to the submission? This is unarguably an important question. We can as well provide the answer from his perspective and understanding. According to Laski (1982:30); "The state is thus the universal in which each of us, as particulars, finds our meaning". The idea of the state as "universal" by Laski (1982) is about its existence within the context of the society. "State and society" from the perspective of "the purpose of social organization" as the broader context of interrogation and scrutiny of "the purpose of government" presents an arrangement of politics within the framework of law and administration. The latter becomes a reinforcement of the idea of the state from the perspective of its purpose. The last theme within the knowledge categorization and description of Laski (1982) is "the nature of political power". How vital is it in providing the "knowledge foundation framework" for the study and understanding of the concepts of politics, law and administration? The answer to the question exists in the description "the nature of political power" as provided by Laski (1982). The fundamental point of Laski (1982) in that respect is his note that: "A working theory of the state must, in fact, be conceived in administrative terms. Its will is the decision arrived at by a small number of men to whom is confided the legal power of making decisions" (Ibid:35). In other words, the state, as argued by Laski (1982), is first and foremost an administrative term possessing the will of politics and law. Concluding this section of the paper requires asking the question: how is the understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration rooted in the explanation, discussion and analysis of the purpose of the state/government? The indication as here provided is that a perspective of theory to the interrogation and scrutiny of the concept of politics, law and administration exists in the proper and correct context of scholarship only in the articulation of the knowledge relationships between and among them of which " the purpose of the state/government" is vital to from the perspective of the epistemology of amplification.

Politics, Law and Administration II: Conceptual Explorations, Scrutiny and Meaning-Making Generalizations

Scholarship, the argument is here being made, thrives within the deliberate necessity to avoid ambiguities when it becomes absolutely important to do so or lesson same especially when it is absolutely important as well. The paper, it requires note and emphasis, tries to put up a standard on the intellectual engagement of the subject-matter of politics, law and administration and of the knowledge relationships between and among them within certain important knowledge fundamentals as constituting the essential of the required scholarship of engagement and understanding. Good scholarship is therefore about careful and systematic presentation within the overall goal and objective of enabling understanding through equally good communication by either deliberately avoiding or lessening the embedded ambiguities. Important to the task as identified is the necessity for simplification through careful and systematic presentation as a style of the defined scholarship. This section of the paper seeks the exploration and scrutiny of the concept of politics, law and administration within the overall goal and objective of being able to formulate and develop meaning-making generalizations. The concepts are here engaged in the order of listing. The first concept, the concept of politics, requires proper clarification and distinction from political science. This is enabled by the fact that the discussion and analysis of knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration as here accomplished is situated within the idea of political science as constituting an approach to study and understanding. As the title of the paper already indicates, "the perspective of theory" is based on the substance that helps to define and describe the discipline of political science. Political science is therefore the study of politics. So, what is "politics" in the context of the paper, and as possessing a knowledge relationship with law and administration?. The answer to the question requires a cautious approach. The caution is necessitated by the fact that the embedded integration has contained in it far-reaching knowledge implications and consequences given the already established tradition of scholarship as constituting important criteria of evaluation in which the paper in turn enjoys some elements of knowledge distinctions. The answer to the questions therefore follows the necessity and justification for the caution. What politics is, particularly within the context of the paper, can be aggregated and summed up within important critical areas of amplification as already advanced by celebrated scholars. While the subject-matter of politics is expressed in knowledge diversities, and the diversities in turn as intellectual pluralism, the expressions, it requires good judgment declaration, point towards the same direction of meaning in the existing hot debates. Again, while indicating good scholarship, the debates are not without

consequences and implications for the intended good scholarship. The focus of the paper, given the significant of the section, is to engage the existing contributions in extant literature as conceptual explorations with the view to using same to formulate and develop far-reaching meaning-making generalizations as the advancement of scholarship in its own right.

According to Lasswell and Kaplan (1950), politics is: "the process of making and execution of governmental decisions or policies". In the opinion of Easton (1971), politics is: "the authoritative allocation of values" Lasswell (1936) in similar vein, defines politics as: "who get what, when and how?" For Merki (1967), politics is: "the quest for power, order and justice" Wright (1955) defines politics as: "the art of influencing, manipulating and controlling others" In the distinctive perspective of Ranny (1975), politics is a process and the process is about the: "resolution of conflicts in the society". Finally, according to Dyke (1960), politics is: "the struggle among actors pursuing conflicting desires on public issues". At this juncture, there is the compelling responsibility of assessment and evaluation from the perspective of critique as a scholarly exercise. So, what are we critiquing and how can the critique help in the substantiation and advancement of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration? We are trying to critique the strength and weaknesses of the definitions in the particular and specific area of advancing the understanding of the subject-matter of politics. While the identification and articulation of the strengths and weaknesses of the definitions do not necessarily amount to the existence of superiority between and among them, the idea of critiquing the definition is to determine the extent to which individual definition enables the recognition of distinction and the distinction in turn as being sufficient enough or provide the relationships of knowledge between and among politics, law and administration, part of the focus of this section of the paper. Individually and collectively, the definitions can be said to provide important idea about what politics is irrespective of the dimension of intellectual or academic engagement. The idea of politics as a process of making and implementing decisions at the level of governmental apparatus cannot be controverted. The idea of politics further as request for power, order and justice can as well not be controverted. In addition, the idea of politics as the art of influencing, manipulating and controlling others is again a very fitting description. Politics further as the pursuit of conflicting interests to the extent of leading to conflict and the necessity to resolve same is equally very appropriate. Notwithstanding the above as constituting a meaning-making generalization, the definitions are still with significant lacunae. What are these lacunae? and what justifies the necessity to focus on them? The responsibility of the

paper as already stated is to use "the perspective of theory" to undertake the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration. The first lacuna of the definitions is the lack of appreciation of the integrated idea of politics for holistic and comprehensive meaning-making. Politics was defined in such a way as to indicate its lack of relationship with context. Politics, the argument is here being advanced, makes much meaning and sense only in relation to context. The first lacuna is related to the second. And the second is about the implication emanating from the failure to properly situate the idea of politics within the context of interrogation and scrutiny. The failure gives the indication of politics standing alone and without relationships with law and administration. The lacunae do not only constitute significant implication for the scholarship of engagement and scrutiny, they help to limit the universality of politics as an idea of knowledge.

The second concept of our exploration is the concept of law. What is law? And what difference of knowledge can we make between it and politics?. Because the defined responsibility of examination, discussion and analysis is that of exploration important therefore is the question of 'how'? How can the exploration as here being accomplished present a standard of scholarship? The answer to the question of 'how' is about the extent of the intellectual/academic engagement of the subject-matter of law so as to be able to overcome the related ambiguities. The extent is therefore a matter of the related 'science' of accomplishment within the overall goal and objective of simplification. The 'science' is technically about the perspectives of conceptual engagement and analysis. These are the perspectives of the semantic and technical. Jumping at the meaning and understanding of law within the entailed theories of jurisprudence is capable of complexifying the understanding of same. While law is defined by the technicalities of intellectual engagement, beginning the understanding of the technicalities from a low-level to a higher level of substantiation and amplification is considered as the fulfillment of a standard expression of scholarship. Law, in the authoritative opinion of Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, is: "a binding custom or practice of a community: a rule of conduct or action prescribed or formally recognized as binding or enforced by a controlling authority". According to the Dictionary, law is further: "a statement of an order or relation of phenomena and so far as is known is invariable under the given condition". How relevant are the definitions to the study and understanding of the relationships between and among law, politics and administration? The perspective of the semantic to the exploration of the meaning and understanding of the concept of law, is to provide the ground framework of intellectualism against the backdrop of the possessed simplification strength. The study and understanding of the

knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration should fundamentally be approached from the perspective of how the definitions of law as provided by Webster's Dictionary can enable the simplification of the perspective of the technical especially given the necessity of having to deliberately advance the knowledge of the technical as a social phenomenon of study. What Webster's definitions help to provide in the existing instance is how the embedded features constitute the knowledge fundamentals of assessment and evaluation. In the context of "the purpose of the state/government", 'law' is unarguably a prescribed rule of conduct that is formally recognized as possessing a binding effect of authority. Law is hence a framework of regulating the excesses of administrative and political/officials within the idea of the state as a social organization. The idea/concept of law within the framework of social organization requires additional exploration beyond what Webster's Dictionary helps to provide. This is earlier referred to as the technical perspective.

The technical perspective to the understanding and meaning of law exists in two dimensions. These are the dimensions of the legal and sociological theories of engagement with the emphasis of the paper on the sociological because the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration have a better opportunity of study and understanding when the embedded abstractions are concretely situated. The perspective of the "sociology of law" therefore provides the proper and correct context of interrogation and scrutiny. The immediate questions then become: (a) what are the defined features and elements if this perspective to the study and understanding of law? ; (b) to what extent is the knowledge identity of the perspective dependent on the elements and features?; and (c) what meaning-making generalizations that can be derived from the features and elements? The questions and their answers particularly within the context of the paper target one thing, and that is the precise understanding and meaning of the technical perspective to the idea of law. And the starting-point will be to rely on the short but powerful understanding of law by Hart (1961). According to him, law is: "the rules of behaviour" (Ibid:15). The definition uniquely contains two important elements of scholarship. The elements of legal theory/jurisprudence and social science. Legal theory in terms of abstract-justification of theory, and social science, as the indication of concreteness/empiricism. A sociological approach/perspective to the interrogation and scrutiny of the idea/concept of law exists in the amplification of the subject-matter made by Milovanovic (2003). According to him: "In addressing the question: "what is law"?, one responds to the question of how society is organized" (Ibid;1). The question can again be asked: how is the

organization of the society a depiction of law? The answer to the question can be found in the observation/note made by Milovanovic (2003). So, what is the observation/note like? According to him: "To study law is to study the evolving structures of society in a developing political economy" (Ibid:1) Emanating from the submission is the idea that law is fundamentally about the structural organization of a society particularly as the society tries to attend to the critical issues of production, distribution and consumption. Again, and as a question, what conclusions that can be made from the sociological approach/perspective to the amplification of the subject-matter of law and further in relation to the study of politics and administration as the expression of "the purpose of the state/government" from the larger context of the idea of social organization? The conclusions, in technical terms, individually and collectively represent the answers to the previously asked questions to the extent of in turn constituting a body of knowledge of explanation, discussion and analysis. The technical perspective to the understanding and meaning of law hence possesses certain features and elements of description and categorization as the shared values of description and categorization and by extension, the shared values of distinction and identity. Firstly, it combines the features/elements of abstraction and concreteness. Secondly, the elements and features in turn serve the purpose of assessment and evaluation. Finally, the result of the assessment and evaluation becomes a standard of reference. The study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration from the perspective of law should therefore target how the evolving structures with which societies are being organized constitute the "rules of conduct". The perspective of political science as the disciplinary mode of engagement in turn should target the extent to which a political theory of amplification can integrate the knowledge relationships within the idea of "the purpose of the state/government".

Let us now turn to our final concept of exploration, the concept of 'administration'. As part of the starting-point of the interrogation and scrutiny, we need to make some important clarifications. So, what are we clarifying and what justifies the clarification? The focus of our intellectual/academic engagement is the idea of 'administration' from the perspective of the state/government. This in turn justifies the idea of 'public administration' as the focus of our conceptual exploration. The idea of 'administration' properly as 'public administration' should not be confused with 'public management'. Accepted that the topic has the word 'administration' in it, reference to it within the body of the paper is clearly about the idea of government/state as 'public administration'. In other words, the concept of 'administration' is used in the paper to target the organization of the

state/government. The clarification will however, be meaningful to the extent of in turn serving a critical component of the scholarship that is here being embarked upon when we are systematic about it within the details of exploring the idea of 'public administration'. The details of the accompanying presentation involve still our focus on the concept of 'administration' before its narrowness to 'public administration'. Therefore, what is 'administration'? According to Adebayo (1981), 'administration' is: "the organization and direction of persons in order to accomplish a specified end". (Ibid:1) What interpretation can we give to the definition? The answer is technically about the identification/recognition of the distinctive elements of the definition. Again, what are the distinctive elements of the definition? They are that 'administration' involves: (a)"organization," (b) "direction", and (c) "specified end". These elements give additional information about the fact that we talk of 'administration' as involving the organization and direction of people for the attainment, consolidation and sustenance of specified end/goals and objectives. In the existing circumstance of illustration, "organization" is the "formal structure of authority and flow of work....", while "direction: is :the continuous task of making decisions, embodying them in specific and general instructions, and setting the pace as the leader of the organization", and "specified end" as targeted goals and objectives". It is critical to at this juncture ask the question: how can the definition of Adebayo (1981) help to shape the meaning and understanding of 'public administration'? If the clarity had earlier been made that public administration is the type of administration that makes possible the organization of the state for the purpose justifying its existence, what 'public administration' now is should deserve the attention of knowledge consequences around the theory and practice of interrogation and scrutiny. Again, because what the paper seeks to engage itself with is as already stated, too much attention should not be given to the idea of 'public administration' from the perspective of theoretical scrutiny and interrogation. We should rather focus on the practical effect of the idea of 'public administration' within the larger context of engaging the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration, the focus of the paper. The practical effect of the idea of 'public administration' within the focus of the paper is therefore about how administration influences and shapes politics and law within the overall goal and objective of the state as the purpose and justification of its existence since ages past.

Politics, Law and Administration III: A Theoretical Framework of Analysis and Justification

"The perspective of theory" to the interrogation and scrutiny of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration in bold and fundamental terms is about maintaining and sustaining the distinction between conceptual and theoretical frameworks of analyses in the standard practice of contemporary social science research methodology and further within the scholarship of amplification. The idea of "the perspective of theory" is further about using the nature and character of theory within the larger context of social science to engage the focus of the paper, the relationships of knowledge between and among politics, law and administration. The immediate questions then become: what is the nature and character of 'theory' of the brand of social science scholarship? And how can the theory within the context of its defined nature and character aid the examination, discussion and analysis of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration? The two questions and their answers shall occupy this section of the paper. So, what is the nature and character of theory of the brand of social science and further within the scholarship of engagement and advancement? The answer to the question technically involves the immediate interrogation and scrutiny of the idea of nature and character within the context of the scholarship of reference. By "nature and character", reference is here made to the defining elements, features and characteristics of 'theory' of the social science brand. The above helps to bring out an important information. What is the information, and what makes it important? The information is about the uniqueness and peculiarity of the idea of theory in social science. And the importance of the information is hinged on the point that the focus of the paper is the idea of a theory as a perspective for the interrogation .... within .... for the interrogation and scrutiny of the concepts of politics, law and administration, within certain defined knowledge fundamentals. "The perspective of theory" as here employed is therefore about the application of the meaning and understanding of 'theory' within the context of social science to enable the understanding of the concepts of politics, law and administration and the knowledge relationships between and among them.

Some ideas of knowledge within the larger context of seeking the amplification of the nature and character of theory deserve our engagement and analysis for a good demonstration of the scholarship of expression. The question now is: what are these ideas, and what explains the justification of their engagement? The referenced ideas are embedded in the philosophical basis of theory from the dimension of social science. In other words, the proper understanding of the ideas owes its existence to the philosophical foundations of social science and by extension, to the idea of social science theory. Put in another way, the study and investigation of the "nature and character of theory" and the implication of same on the explanations and analyses

of contemporary social science subject-matter of amplifications owe their existence to the philosophical foundations of social science and social science patterned scrutiny. The ideas of the empirical foundations of social science theory, are legion of which only three here deserve our attention. The ideas and the extent to which they, in turn, influence and shape the understanding and meaning of social science theory from the perspective of the nature and character of same are in themselves critical thematic issues and topics of great significance in the exploration of the idea of the philosophy of social science and its research. The three here identified are (a) the meaning and understanding of science, (b) the philosophical basis of social science method, and (c) the understanding and interpretation of social world as social realities. Again, what is being indirectly said is that social science theory is rooted in the subject-matter of social science as its nature and character. We can now ask from the start: what is the exact meaning and understanding of 'science' in social science to the extent of in turn shaping and influencing its theory and further within the idea of "nature and character"? The idea of 'science' in social science is related to the problem involved in trying to study the behavior of mans. See Goode and Hatt (1981), among others. Man, it requires emphasis and note, is lacking dependability and reliability. The above constitutes a problem of study when it is in turn related to seeking the understanding of the behavior of man from the standpoint of generalization. Because knowledge advancement is about the resolution of the related knowledge problem, it then means the idea of contextualizing the framework of engaging the knowledge. The contextualization is therefore technically about formulating and developing what can best enable the idea of "pattern" from which generalization in turn revolves around, and from which, again, the idea of theory develops from. The idea of 'science' in social science is therefore about the formulation and development of generalization, meaningful generalization to be specific. But the science cannot stand alone except in relation to method. 'Method' becomes critical to the generation, interpretation and the analysis of our data. Because the study is about the observed pattern of human behaviour, the idea of pattern to in turn enable the formulation and development of generalization hence requires proper management due to the nature of man as lacking dependability and reliability. So the idea of method is about knowing the social world. The social world is in turn certainly about the study of the social realities of our existence. The critical question is: how is the knowing and understanding of our social world possible? Observation and experience are critical to the knowing and understanding. Observation and experience therefore constitute the foundation of the idea of science in social science and its research as the organization of the study and understanding of social realities. The idea of science within a context is, again, fundamentally about

the assumed theory of intellectual/academic engagement. We might at this juncture ask the very important question: how does the above help to influence and shape the idea of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration from the perspective of a theory?

The answer to the question is about formulating and developing a theoretical framework for the study and understanding of the relationships between and among politics, law, and administration. The achievement of the responsibility is further about asking the question: what conditions of scholarship informed by social realities that should in turn inform and shape the formulation and development of the theoretical framework of analysis? The conditions in technical terms are the ideas of knowledge that should in turn enable invention and justification of the idea of the state/government from the perspective of the purpose and raison de'tre for its existence. In other words, knowing and understanding the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration should technically capture the idea of the state/government. This is because the idea of the state/government best captures the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law, and administration. The formulation and development of the relevant theoretical framework of both expression and scrutiny therefore revolves around the idea of state/government. Again, because the capacity and capability of the state/government not only revolve around politics and law, but administrative as well, the formulated and developed theoretical framework of the scrutiny and interrogation of the knowledge relationships should as well address the administrative component of the organization of the state/government. Before us, therefore, is the emergence of the "theories of the state". Before we shall here examine, discuss and analyze its knowledge properties and features, it has become important to reflect on its justification. So, what is the justification of the choice of theoretical framework of analysis from the perspective of its suitability and appropriateness? Again, what knowledge basis that should inform the knowledge exposition particularly within the context of the purpose of this section of the paper. Two points explain the justification. Firstly, the choice of the theoretical framework of analysis tallies with the already established position that the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law, and administration can take place only in relation to the organization of the state. Secondly, the choice of theoretical framework of analysis can be further justified on the ground that it provides the concrete context with which to and appropriately interrogate and scrutinize the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law, and administration as a conceptual formulation. The study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration

hence involve the fundamental question: how can the "theories of the state" enable the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships? The answer to the question is another paper on its own! Consequently, the question requires modification and the justification exists in the point that is already established, i.e the necessity to provide a concise approach to the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration. The modified question now is: what are the specific "theories of the state" that can, as a requirement of technicalities of application and usefulness, provide succinct understanding and study of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law, and administration within the idea/perspective of the purpose of the state/government as a social organization?. These are: (a) "the class theory of the state", and (b) "the pluralist theory of the state". Again, what explains and justifies their deliberate choice? "The class theory of the state" aligns with the idea of law from the sociological standpoint of engagement, discussion and analysis. "The pluralist theory of the state provides the theoretical and practical context with which to engage the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships as our subject-matter of focus. So, what are the elements of "the class theory of the state" to the extent of in turn providing insights into the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law, and administration? Reference to the elements of "the class theory of the state" is not in fundamental terms about detailed and comprehensive discussion and analysis of the theory. For detailed and comprehensive, discussion and analysis of the theory, readers might want to see the very important classic work of Vincent (1987) on the "*Theories of the State*". The reference to the element of the theory is essentially aspects of it that are critical to the establishment of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law, and administration. Particular focus on the theory is not considered appropriate here because Karl Marx never sought to interpret the state but to change it. Again, Karl Marx, it requires note and emphasis, used his understanding and knowledge of the state to respond to particular events in human history and the theories of their engagement and analysis. Finally, the approach of Karl Marx is further rejected on the ground that he only focused on the functional role of the state in the economy rather than on the constitutional role of the state which appears very more significant under the circumstance. The economy only represents a portion of the social organization of the state. But there is still a fundamental question: can "the class theory of the state" be properly and correctly explained without the reference to Marx and his followers? The question is very important to ask because of the embedded contradictions in the thoughts/ideas of Karl Marx and his followers, particularly Engels, among others.

Even though they said that they were not interested in the interpretation of the state, their later works proved them wrong. This is a problem on its own.

The elements and features of "the class theory of the state" that are useful for the purpose of enhancing the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration revolve around the struggles between and among the social composition of the state, and how the struggles in turn necessitated the ideas of constitutional and institutional regulations and control for the stability and sustenance of the purpose of the state as a social organization. The elements and features of "the class theory of the state", therefore indicates the steps that the state should take to ensure the consolidation and sustenance of political/regime stability as being necessary to attain the idea of the state/government as a purposeful social organization. The state is consequently compelled with the responsibility of expanding the scope of its operation to be able to, on permanent basis, sustain its capacity and capability as a purposeful social organization through the enlargement of the idea of politics as the contests of ideas, the legislation of same as law with constant administration for good results. The knowledge relationship has already established above again requires clarity and freedom from ambiguities through proper conceptualization and operationalization. The framework of law and its administration as part of the conceptualization is therefore critical to the accommodation aspect of politics. Because politics is about ideas particularly with respect to the effectiveness and efficiency in the organization of the state for good results, and because the ideas in turn exist within the natural arrangement of the society as a dynamic interaction/expression, there is, it requires additional note and emphasis, the related arrangement of politics within the framework of law and administration as the hallmark of any society in desire of stability, progress and development. Concluding this section/part of the paper requires a question: how can "the pluralist theory of the state" be used to explain, discuss, analyze and justify the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration? The answer to the question should first seek comprehensive and detailed examination, discussion and analysis of 'the pluralist theory of the state". Vincent (1987) has been very helpful in this regard. The lacuna in his efforts should however, be the source of the answer to the question as earlier asked but it is still very important to mention here that the reference to "the pluralist theory of the state" has its source in philosophical pluralism of which, and according to Vincent (1987), "... denotes the acceptance of diverse theories of knowledge or frames for understanding the world" (Ibid:181). Because the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration have their sources in abstraction and concreteness, "the pluralist

theory of the states" for relevance in the existing context of engagement, discussion, and analysis, should have its philosophical foundation expanded to the realm of politics. The point has justification in the fact that the idea of government and by extension, governmental authority, as the expression of the power and authority of the state, is based on the idea of political pluralism as the source of the legitimacy of government. Therefore, and further within the necessity to situate the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law, and administration in the context of practical politics. "the pluralist theory of the state" requires the accommodation of both philosophical and political pluralism. While philosophical pluralism already exists in the interpretation of Vincent (1987), political pluralism is fundamentally about the existence of multiple and competitive sources of political power. The above in turn places the better appreciation of "the pluralist theory of the state" within the idea of democracy. Democracy is hence critical to the identification and articulation of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, laws and administration. Democracy, particularly democratic politics, provides the relevant instance for the proper study and understanding of politics, law and administration. Politics as a contest of idea takes place most fittingly in a democracy. Democracy provides to politics the required context and legitimacy for the exercise of power as an expression of the authority of the state. Again, because democratic politics is a murky water, the law and its consequent application through the administration of justice helps to capture and present the existence of the knowledge relationships.

Politics, Law and Administration IV: A Thematic Organization of Study and Understanding

Critical to the central focus and objective of the paper is to advance the scholarship on the subject-matter of the conceptual explorations, expositions and analyses of politics, law and administration beyond the general direction of same as already provided in extant literature through imaginative contribution. The imaginative contribution of the paper to the body of the related scholarship revolves around the formulated and developed idea of a knowledge relationship particularly within "the purposeful organization of the state". The knowledge relationship is therefore about providing an arrangement of research and teaching organization for the study and understanding of politics, law and organization. Because the goal is about detailed and comprehensive study and understanding, it therefore raises additional matters/issues of knowledge consequences and effects. Part of the issues, among

others, is further amplification of the knowledge relationship from the perspective of scholarship that is critical to the study and understanding of politics, law and administration. Relating the issue and matter to teaching and research makes the idea of thematic organization important to it. The question is hence about: What themes and topics that can effectively and efficiently aid the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration? The ides of themes an topics are important and critical attempts at establishing the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration as formal instructions of purposeful teaching, study and research, and further as a scholarly exercise within defined knowledge identity and uniqueness. The themes and topics should therefore revolve around: (a) the definition of the knowledge relationship within certain important knowledge criteria of assessment and evaluation, (b) the placement of the knowledge relationship within proper and correct epistemological foundation, (c) the delineation and specification of the knowledge boundaries between and among politics, law and administration within the idea of the knowledge relationship of interrogation, scrutiny and discussion, (d) the contextualization of the knowledge relationship as part of the building and formulation of the universal criteria of assessment and evaluation, (e) constant critiquing of the knowledge relationship as a scholarly exercise, (f) the formulation and development of a multi-disciplinary approach to the study and understanding of the knowledge relationship particularly within the larger context of the humanities at large.

The challenge is hence about using the framework formulated above to design topics and themes for the study and understanding of the relationships of knowledge between and among politics, law and administration. The first is therefore about a conceptual engagement of the knowledge relationship as an idea of knowledge. It is technically about providing answer to the question: what exactly is the meaning and understanding of the relationships between and among politics, law and administration? The question of 'what' is fundamentally about the making of the difference and distinction between the knowledge relationship and other relationships of knowledge in extant literature. The distinction is critical to providing a kind of knowledge identity of significance particularly within the context of the intellectual/academic engagement of our subject-matter of study and understanding. The second as a topic of teaching and research organization is fundamentally about providing for the knowledge relationship an epistemological foundation. What philosophy of interrogation and scrutiny that should determine the basis of the knowledge relationship is therefore a very critical question to ask? The philosophical basis is again fundamentally rooted in normative and empirical

expressions to the extent of in turn determining the level/amount of the contained subjectivity and objectivity particularly as choices influencing and shaping our approach to the scholarship of interrogation and scrutiny. The study and understanding of any knowledge relationship of scholarship particularly between and among politics, law and administration should seek to know the embedded contents of the knowledge relationship and the impact of time on the embedded contexts. The fact that the study and understanding of the knowledge relationship takes place within a philosophical framework as the ideology of engagement possesses the advantage of the appropriate determination of what knowledge features and characteristics that help to distinctly describe the embedded contents and the extent of their existence, standard wise. Because the idea of a knowledge relationship is a distinct formulation targeting how the concepts of politics, law and administration can be best explored, it indicates the knowledge relationship as a subject-matter of study requiring distinction and differences from others. This leads us to the third point of our earlier note. The study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration as a distinct subject matter should therefore possess the relevant intellectual and academic boundaries within the larger context of the humanities even in the instance of inter-disciplinary engagement. Again, the study and understanding of the knowledge relationship between and among the concepts require distinct conceptualization and operationalization as a meaning-making intellectual/academic exercise. The conceptualization and operationalization of the relationship of knowledge between and among the concepts are unarguably fundamental to enabling critical/in-depth study and analysis. Critiquing becomes the final component of the thematic organization of the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration. The critique should target the technicalities in relationship to their amplification especially from the perspective of their evaluation and assessment. There should be the deliberate consciousness to, among others, identify the strengths and weaknesses that help to define the knowledge relationships as being helpful to the study and understanding of politics, law and administration.

Politics, Law and Administration V: The African Experience

What explains and justifies the African experience/perspective to the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration? The explanation and justification owe their existence and usefulness

to the choice of our theoretical framework of analysis, the "theories of the state" especially from the dimensions of class and pluralist as already stated. While they are here referred to as constituting the relevant frames of the theory of interrogation and scrutiny, they however, serve the purpose of our illustration as the indication of practical politics. Practical politics, the point is in turn here being made, provides the relevant context for the proper study and understanding of "the purpose of social organization" which the state, particularly the idea of its nature and character, helps to symbolize. The question then becomes: what area of the state activity that is easily amendable to the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration? In addition, what helps to justify the context of Africa as a fitting demonstration of this area of state activity? Our choice area of state activity is democratic governance to the extent of in turn demanding distinct examination, discussion, explanation and analysis as democracy and governance. The two cases of democracy and governance in Africa help us to engage local/regional circumstance within the context of universal criteria of assessment and evaluation. Two things therefore quickly require our intellectual engagement within the overall objective of seeking the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration from the perspective of practical politics as the purpose of the social organization of the state. They are: (a) the universal criteria of assessment and evaluation, and (b) the African circumstance/situation of democracy and governance. Reference to (a) and (b) should be further anchored within the required technicalities of amplification particularly as formulated indices and criteria of assessment and evaluation. The universal criteria and indices of assessment and evaluation of democracy and governance as constituting the use of "practical politics" to illustrate the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration revolve around the liberal idea of democracy particularly as constitutional democracy. The overriding principle of constitutionalism helps to emphasize the authority and supremacy of the constitution and its related provisions on all matters and issues which the relationships in turn revolve around. In addition, the idea of the constitution as the fundamental legal charter of any democracy of the liberal variant and brand is further particularly about the same constitution as being central and pivotal to the organizational and structural arrangement of government and the related processes and procedures of decision-making. The related processes and procedures of decision-making are again critical to the illustration of the idea of "practical politics" as constituting the technical context of the explanation, discussion an analysis of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration. The idea of democracy and further within the technical

expression of constitutional democracy hence possesses the universal framework of assessment and evaluation. Again, the fact that the governance process and procedure take place within the framework of the same democratic arrangement is critical to the advancement of the argument that the same universal criterion of assessment and evaluation is equally applicable. Governance hence possesses the relevant framework of interrogation and scrutiny only in relation to democracy and further as democratic governance, and democratic governance in turn as the perfect illustration of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration. The idea of the constitution in the technicality of its existence in political systems of the world hence provides a critical criterion with which to assess and evaluate the extent to which we can say that political systems are democratic and from which the governance system is as well dependent. The idea of the constitution and technically the principle of constitutionalism therefore provides the theoretical framework with which to seek the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration. The study and understanding in turn require placement within the context of "practical politics". The above justifies the focus on Africa where democracy and governance and the embedded processes and procedures are excellent practical illustrations of the knowledge relationships.

The reference to the "African experience" is therefore about helping to build, formulate and develop critical ideas and thematic areas with which to seek the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration. The integration of democracy with governance to create the concept of democratic governance is therefore an attempt to invent for the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships a unified approach with which to in turn formulate and develop meaningful generalizations. Reference to the experience of Africa is therefore fundamentally about how the predicament of her democratic governance can enable the quick identification and articulation of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration, and the knowledge relationships in turn around critical thematic issues such as: the rule of law and courts, establishing and maintaining judicial independence, the "judicialization of politics", constitutionalism, the legal structure of democracy, law and regulation, criminal justice reform and administration law and society, administrative law, among others. With the identification of these thematic areas considered critical to the interrogation and scrutiny of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration, we might now ask: what articulation should then follow? Because the concern is about the study and

understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among the concepts, the articulation should consequently seek the formulation and development of the relevant questions of research for greater and in-depth amplification. We might ask: (1) what influences the courts and the rule of law in Africa to the extent of in turn creating a challenge for democratic governance? (2) why is judicial independence difficult to establish and maintain in Africa?; (3) why do African politicians attempt to manipulate the law always?; (4) what either explains or justifies the connivance of the bureaucrats as African politicians attempt to manipulate the law? (5) why is the African society lawless?; among others. The study and understanding of the relationships of knowledge between and among politics, law and administration from the perspective/experience and circumstance of Africa target the achievement of something very important. The idea is certainly not to degrade Africa, but to seek how the study and understanding can help to address the democratic governance challenge in the continent.

The Emanating Issues of Methodology

"The perspective of theory" to the amplification of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration should not give the indication of either the lack or absence of an empirical approach. Notwithstanding the normative nature of some theories, they are still connected to important matters of knowledge advancement whose bases exist in empiricism or empirical approach. Because the existing efforts have some stains of science particularly within the context of specific social science amplification, they as well have in them important matters of method and methodology. What are these matters and to what extent are they in turn issues of knowledge of the science of engagement and interpretation? The matters as issues of the science of engagement and interpretation revolve around how the knowledge relationship between and among politics, law and administration can be empirically demonstrated for testing. The first issue is rooted in hypothesis formulation. In this issue of hypothesis formulation are matters of knowledge expression and consequences particularly given the foundational existence of social science in philosophy. The issues as questions have their expression in the following: (a) what should be the understanding of the knowledge relationship or what should best provide for the understanding of the knowledge relationship?, (b) what should the understanding of the knowledge relationship target? (c) how can the emanating be identified and articulated?, (d) how can the formulated knowledge relationships satisfy the testable precondition? and (e) are the knowledge relationship internally determined or restricted only to internal

conditions and circumstances? The second emanating issue is: what best provides for proper scientific understanding of the formulated knowledge relationships as hypothesis in themselves? "The perspective of theory" as the focus of the paper is as well fundamentally about a particular understanding of science as an approach to the study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration. The already established relationship between science and theory in the specific context and situational circumstance of social science helps to reveal a very important point which the paper revolves around. And the point is that the making/formulation and development of meaningful generalizations from our study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration. The emphasis on "meaningful generalizations" requires reiteration. The concern of the paper is therefore about the formulation and development of meaningful generalizations arising from our study and understanding of the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law, and administration. The 'how' question in relation to the above therefore constitutes a critical issue of method and by extension, methodology. The emanating issues as here discussed help to substantiate the thesis of the paper as earlier propounded. The science of engaging the subject-matter of our study i.e the knowledge relationships between and among politics, law and administration is unarguably rooted in the idea of theory as a logical expression saddled with the academic responsibility of having both the capacity and capability of the description, explanation, and prediction of social phenomena.

Conclusion

What conclusion can we make from the paper? From the starting-point, the paper established clearly well its advanced thesis to the effect that proper interrogation and scrutiny of the idea of politics, law and administration and of the knowledge relationships between and among them exist only in "the perspective of theory". The paper further within the related conceptual explorations and expositions of the ideas as concepts in extant literature again established the fact that proper understanding of the concepts should be within "the purposeful organization of the state". In other words, a meaning-making understanding of generalizing consequences of the concepts exists only in the governmental arrangement of the state as the reason and justification for the invention of same. "The perspective of theory "therefore provides the essential knowledge elements and fundamentals for the scrutiny and interrogation of the concepts of politics, law and administration.

References

Adebayo, A. (1981). *Principles and Practice of Public Administration in Nigeria,* New York: John Wiley and Sons

Dyke, V. (1960). *Political Science: A Philosophical Analysis,* Stanford: Stanford University Press

Easton, D. (1971). *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science* (2nd Ed.), New York: Alfred Knopf

Goode, E. & Hatt, P. (1981). *Methods in Social Research.* McGraw-Hill International Book Company

Hart, H. (1961). *The Concept of Law.* Charendon Press

Laski, H.J. (1982). *A Grammar of Politics.* Georga Aclen & Unwin

Lasswell, H. (1936). *Politics: Who Gets What, When and How?* McGraw-Hill Book Corporation

Lasswell, H. & Kaplaan, A. (1950). *Power and Society.* Yale University Press

Merki, P. (1967). *Political Continuity and Change.*Harper and Row.

Milovanovic, D. (2003). *An Introduction to the Sociology of Law (3rd ed.)*. Criminal Justice Press

Ranny, A. (1975). *The Governing of Men,* Hinsdale. The Dryden Press

Vincent, A. (1987). *Theories of the State.* Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Wright, Q. (1955). *The Study of International Relations.* Appleton Century Craft

****Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary.* Merriam-Webster Incorporated.