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**Origin Of State.**

**Introduction: Men of merit thought and considered, discussed and criticized the various theories enunciated from time to time and it paved the way for further developments in political thinking The Social Contract theory replaced the theory of Divine Origin and the former was replaced by the Historical or Evolutionary theory.** While introducing the State, in the first Article, we said that it originated in the bare needs of life and continues in existence for the good life of man. But it is shrouded in mystery when and how the State came into existence. The recent researches in the sciences of anthropolgy, Ethnology, and Comparative Philology throw some light on the subject, but all this is not sufficient to offer a matter of fact explanation of the origin of the State. Speculation is then, the only alternative and we examine a number of theories that have been advanced from time to time varying with the credulity of the age. The most important of these theories are:

***1. The Theory of Divine Origin***

***2. The Theory of Force.***

***3. The Theory of Social Contract.***

***4. The Patriarchal and Matriarchal Theories.***

***5. The Historical or Evolutionary Theory.***

**Divine Theory of Origin Of State**

**The Theory Explained.** Divine Theory of Origin Of State, though one of the earliest, has a simple explanation to offer. It is a theory of political authority and not a theory of the origin of the State. The State, its advocates maintain, was created by God and governed by His deputy or Vicegerent. It was His will that men should live in the world in a state of political society and He sent His deputy to rule over them. The ruler was a divinely appointed agent and he was responsible for his actions to God alone. As the ruler was the deputy of God, obedience to him was held to be a religious duty and resistance a sin. The advocates of the Divine Origin Theory, in this way, placed the ruler above the people as well as law. Nothing on earth could limit his will and restrict his power. His word was law and his actions were always just and benevolent. To complain against the authority of the ruler and to characteristic his actions as unjust was a sin for which there was divine punishment.

The theory of the Divine Origin of the State is as old as [Political Science](https://www.politicalscienceview.com) itself. There is sufficient evidence to prove now that early States were based on this conception and all political authority was connected with certain unseen powers. The earliest ruler was a combination of priest and king or the magic man and king The authority and reverence which a ruler commanded depended upon his position as a priest or a magic man . Religion and politics were so inextricably mixed up in the primitive society that not a hazy line of demarcation Could be drawn between the two.

Even today, the State of Pakistan does not seem to draw a distinction between, religion and politics. Sir Mohammad Zafarullah Khan, the then Pakistan Foreign Minister, while speaking on the Objective Resolution in the Pakistan Constituent Assembly in 1949, said: Those who sought to draw a distinction between the spheres of religion and politics as being mutually exclusive put too narrow a construction upon the functions of religion. The abrogated Constitutions declared Pakistan an Islamic Republic to be governed With the Islamic principles. President Zia-ul-Haque significantly modified the 1973 constitution to bring it in conformity to the injunctions of Islam. In addition to Islamic Arab States, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Islamic Republic State of Bangladesh and the Islamic State of Afghanistan are the most recent examples of theocratic States.

The theory that the State and its authority has a Divine Origin and sanction finds equivocal support in the scriptures of almost all religions in the world. In the Mahabharata, it is recounted that the people approached God and requested him to grant them a ruler who should save them from the anarchy and chaos prevailing in the state of nature. “Without a Chief, O Lord”, they prayed ,we are perishing. Give us a Chief whom we shall worship in concert and who will protect us The theory of Divine Origin, however, received a new impetus with the advent of Christianity. Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, said Jesus Christ, and Paul amplified this in his Epistle to the Romans, which has been quoted by writers time and again in support of the theory of Divine Origin. We are, thus, told, Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the Ordinance of God and they that resist shall receive themselves damnation. The theory of Divine Origin so enunciated, believed in and accepted, thus, implied

1. That God deliberately created the State and this specific act of His grace was to save mankind from destruction

2. that God sent his Deputy or Vicegerent to rule over mankind. The ruler was a divinely  appointed agent and he was responsible for his actions to God alone whose Deputy the ruler was. All were ordained to submit to his authority and disobedience to his I command was a sin for which there was divine punishment.

**The Divine Right Of Kings.**

There were direct and precise instructions to the faithful. Although the Roman Empire was a pagan empire, Paul had ordered Christians to accept its authority as derived horn God and thereby admitted that the State, whatever the personal morality of the monarch, was divinely ordained. During the Middle Ages in Europe the theory of the Divine Origin of the State was transformed into the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings. The temporal authority, having emerged victorious over the spiritual authority, claimed that it was a divine favor to the Vicegerents of divine authority. Even today the Queen of Great Britain is a Queen “by the Grace Of God”.

The Stuarts in England found refuge in the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings and its leading exponent was James I Sir Robert Filmer was its enthusiastic supporter. Bousset advocated it in France and supported the despotism of Louis XIV. It was claimed that Kings ruled by divine right and the subjects had no recourse against them. “Kings”, wrote James I, “are breathing images of God upon earth” and disobedience to their commands was disobedience to God. As it is atheism and blasphemy to dispute what God can do, so it is presumption and high contempt in a subject to dispute What a King can do, or to say that a King cannot do this or that. Even rebellion in the cause of religion was deemed a sacrilege because, the State of monarchy is the supreme-st thing upon earth for Kings are not only God’s lieutenants upon earth, and sit upon God’s throne, but even by God himself they are called Gods. As men are children of God, so are men children of the King and they owe him an equal obedience, Without a King there could be no civil society, as the people were a mere heedless multitude incapable of making laws. All law proceeded from the King as the divinely instituted law-giver of his people. The only choice for the people was submission to the authority of the King or complete anarchy. The King could not be held answerable for his actions to human judgment. He was responsible to God alone. A bad King will be Judged by God but he must hot be judged by his subjects Or by any human agency for enforcing the law, such as the estates or the courts. The law resided ultimately in the breast of the King.

The main points in the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings may, thus, be summed up:-

***1. Monarchy is divinely ordained and the King draws his authority from God.***

***2. Monarchy is hereditary and it is the divine right bf a King that it should pass from father to soil.***

***3. The King is answerable to God alone and***

***4. Resistance to the lawful authority of a King is a sin.***

The theory of the Divine Right of Kings, originally used in the Middle Ages to serve as a bulwark against the claims of the Church, Fathers, was later used by Kings and their supporters to defend their existence against the political consciousness of the peoples: when the people claimed that ultimately power and sovereign authority rested with them.

**Evaluation of the Theory.**

That the State is divinely created does not find any place in the present political thought. The State is essentially a human institution, Sand it comes into existence when a number of people occupying a definite territory Organize themselves politically for achieving common ends, The laws of the State are made by men and enforced by them. The State,therefore, oliginated in the bare needs of the life of man and continues in existence for the satisfaction of those needs and aspirations for a good life. To accept it as the creation of God IS to defy nature itself and to exalt the State to a position above criticism and change.

The Divine Origin theory is dangerous as it justifies the arbitrary exercise of royal authority by holding that authority has a religious sanction and origin, and Kings are the vicars of God. When the ruler is made responsible for his actions to God alone and law is held to reside ultimately in the breast of the King is tantamount to preaching absolutism and making the King a despot.

Even if it be conceded that the King is the vicegerent or deputy of God, then, how can the existence of a bad King be justified.  History abounds in examples of bad and vicious Kings. God personifies virtue, grace and benevolence and so should be His deputy It is, accordingly, bad logic to accept the dogma of James I that Kings are breathing images  of God upon earth. Even in the scriptures the theory does riot find unequivocal support. The Bible tells us, Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and unto God the things that are God’s.This saying of Christ does not justify the Divine Origin of the State Finally, the theory does not consider any other form of government except monarchy and that, too, [absolute monarchy](https://www.politicalscienceview.com/advantages-and-disadvantages-of-monarchy/) Such a form of [government](https://www.politicalscienceview.com/state-and-government/) is antagonistic to the democratic ideal which accepts consent as the basis of the State.

Divine Theory of Origin Of State is dismissed as an explanation of the origin of the State At the same time, the theory has a certain value. We cannot ignore the part which religion played in the development of the State. The early rulers combined unto themselves the authority and functions of a king and a priest. Law had a religious sanction and divine or religious law appealed to primitive man more than human law. Obedience to the State was deemed a religious duty and religious worship was Supported by government, Belief in a common religion was, thus, a great combining factor which welded the people in the pursuit of common ends. It taught men to obey when they were not yet ready to govern themselves Finally, the theory of Divine Origin adds a moral tone to the functions of the State. To regard the State as the work of God is to give it a high moral status, to make it something which the citizen may revere and support, something which he may regard as the perfection of human life.

Divine Theory of origin of State and with that the Divine Right of Kings was discredited in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in  the West and was replaced by the Social Contract Theory and Rousseau’s concept of popular sovereignty. Thus, the Voice of God gave place to the voice of the people. basis of a good state. It has to be admitted that it did not exist in ancient Indian state. Eventhough, the epic of Mahabharata and Ramayana taught about good governance and

brotherhood.

#### The Genesis of Divine Origin Theory:

The oldest theory about the origin of the state is the divine origin theory. It is also known as the theory of divine right of Kings.

The exponents of this theory believe that the state did not come into being by any effort of man. It is created by God.

The King who rules over the state is an agent of God on earth.

The King derives his authority from God and for all his actions he is responsible to God alone. Obedience to the King is ordained to God and violation of it will be a sin. The King is above law and no subject has any right to question his authority or his action. The King is responsible of God alone.

### History of Divine Theory:

### The conception of the divine creation of the state may be traced back to remote antiquity. It was universal belief with the ancient people that the King is the representative of God on earth and the state is a bliss of God. Thus the King had both political and religious entity. In the religious books also the state is said to be created by God. In some religions this conception is explicit, but in others it is implicit.

### The divine origin of the state is gleaned first the Old Testament of the Bible. There we find St. Paul saying- ****“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers; for there is no power but of God; the powers that be, are ordained by God. Whosoever resist the power, resisted the ordinance of God and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.”****

### In 1680 Sir Robert Filmer wrote a book entitled The Law of the Free Monarchies, where it is stated the Adam was the First King on earth and the Kings subsequent to him are the descendants of Adam. In the Manusmriti it is said that when the world was thick in anarchy, the people prayed to God to remedy the condition. God was pleased to appoint Manu to rule over the earth.

### This theory prevailed in the old age when religion and politics were combined in the person of the King. In ancient India the Kings ruled over the people according to the injunction of the Dharma, which stood for both religion and politics. Laws fay deep in the profusion of the Sastras.

### In the medieval period the Christians held the Pope in semi-God status. In the Muslim world the Caliph was the Priest-King. The Dalai Lama was the head of the Theocratic state of Tibet. He was considered there as the incarnation of the Buddhist god Avalokitesvara.

### Both the church and the state in their mutual rivalry used the theory of the divine origin in the medieval age. The church asserted the supremacy of the church over the state. On the other hand, the state because of its divine nature emphasised on its supremacy over the church.

### The Stuart King James I claimed that he derived his authority directly from God. According to him, the King is wise and intelligent, but his subjects are wicked.

### Even if the King is bad, the people have no right to rebel against him. Even in the nineteenth century the Kings of Austria, Prussia and Russia formed the Holy Alliance under the notion that they were appointed by God to rule over their people. Anyway, the European Kings took shelter under the divine origin theory in order to justify their dictatorships.

### Be that as it may, during a large part of human history the state was viewed as direct divine creation and theocratic in nature. The theory was in currency so long as religion was considered to be the chief motive force of all human activities.

### In the twentieth century this, theory came under criticism being an incorrect explanation of the origin of the state. With the growth of scientific outlook this theory faded into oblivion. Today’s trend is that the state is a historical growth. We shall now discuss the causes of the decline of the theory.

### Causes of the Decline of the Divine Theory:

### In the first place, when a more acceptable theory like the social contract theory came out, the divine theory was dashed to the ground. The new theory suggested that the state is a handiwork of men, not a grace of God.

### In the second place, the Reformation that separated the church from the state debased the coin of the divine theory. The post-Reformation period is a period of non-religious politics. Thus the secular outlook made the divine theory totally unacceptable.

### In the third place, the emergence of democracy was a big blow for the autocratic dogma of mixing religion with politics and thereby it blunted the edge of identifying God with the King. Democracy not only glorified the individual but shattered the divine halo around the origin of the slate.

### Last but not the least was the growth of scientific enquiry and materialistic view of the political mechanism. The result was that the erstwhile blind faith and superstition was no longer acceptable. The people began to accept only those things that stood the test of logic and reasoning.

### Criticism of the Divine Theory:

### There are seven lines of argument in the hands of R. N. Gilchrist levelled against the divine theory:

### The first line of argument of Gilchrist is that the state is a human institution organised in an association through human agency. Modern political thinkers cannot accept the view that God has anything to do with the creation of the state. It does not stand the commonsense of the moderns that God selects anybody to rule over the state.

### The second line of argument is that the divine theory is fraught with dangerous consequences, because a semi-divine King is bound to rule arbitrarily as he is responsible only to God and not bound to heed public opinion. Such a theory will make the ruler despotic and autocratic.

### The third line of argument is that the divine theory is unrealistic because a bad ruler will continue to rule under the divine shield. There were some bad rulers like James II of England and Louis XVI of France, who were replaced by the people. This could not happen if the divine theory was to be accepted.

### The fourth line of argument is that the New Testament of the Bible reversed the divine conception of the state as ingrained in the Old Testament. It is emphatically stated in the New Testament- **“Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and unto God the things that are God’s”**, which gives the state a human character as against the divine coating.

### The fifth line of argument is that the divine theory is unscientific. The anthropologists and sociologists after careful scientific analysis have discarded the theory as totally untenable as an explanation of the origin of the slate.

### The sixth line of argument is that the divine theory runs counter to the universally accepted conception that the state is the result of a historical evolution. The generally accepted theory of the origin of the state is that various factors like religion, family, force and political consciousness were behind the growth of the state.

### The seventh line of argument is that the divine theory is undemocratic. The inevitable implication of the theory in content and tone will make the King absolute and his government never democratic. So the theme of the theory is against the spirit of democracy.

### Value of the Divine Theory:

### Although the divine theory is totally discredited as an origin of the state, there are some good things in it. The summum bonum of the theory is that it stimulated discipline and law-abidingness among the subjects at a time when these were the needs of the hour in those anarchical conditions. This theory also created the moral responsibility of the rulers, because they were cast with a divine injunction to rule to the perfect satisfaction of the heaven.

### Decline of the Divine Right Theory:

### As an origin of the state, the divine right theory is no longer alive. It is a defunct dogma. The emergence of the social contract theory which held the wishes of the people in high halo dwarfed the godly wishes in the creation of the state. When human activities were considered the motive force of the state, the divine one receded to the background and finally vanished away.

### The important role assigned to the man in the creation of the state by the social contract theory shattered all hopes for the divine right theory. The second factor in the decline of the divine right theory was the Reformation Movement in the sixteenth century Europe, which curbed the authority of the Pope and the Church and at the same time brought the monarch and the people in the limelight.

### The scientific and logical thinking associated with the Renaissance and the Reformation enabled men to look into the theory of the origin of the state as something which must be created by non-church and non-god bodies. With the decline of the authority of religion declined the divine authority.

### The final nail of the coffin of the divine right theory was the modern theory of Thomas Hill Green that democracy, i.e., will of the people was the basis of the state.

### Force Theory of Origin of the State**:**

### Another early theory of the origin of the state is the theory of force.

### The exponents of this theory hold that wars and aggressions by some powerful tribe were the principal factors in the creation of the state.

### They rely on the oft-quoted saying **“war begot the King”** as the historical explanation of the origin of the state.

### The force or might prevailed over the right in the primitive society. A man physically stronger established his authority over the less strong persons. The strongest person in a tribe is, therefore, made the chief or leader of that tribe.

### After establishing the state by subjugating the other people in that place the chief used his authority in maintaining law and order and defending the state from the aggression from outside. Thus force was responsible not only for the origin of the state but for development of the state also.

### History supports the force theory as the origin of the state.

### **According to Edward Jenks:**

### “Historically speaking, there is not the slightest difficulty in proving that all political communities of the modern type owe their existence to successful warfare.”

### As the state increased in population and size there was a concomitant improvement in the art of warfare. The small states fought among themselves and the successful ones made big states.

### The kingdoms of Norway, Sweden and Denmark arc historical examples of the creation of states by the use of force. In the same process, Spain emerged as a new state in the sixth century A.D. In the ninth century A.D. the Normans conquered and established the state of Russia.

### **The same people established the kingdom of England by defeating the local people there in the eleventh century A.D. Stephen Butler Leachock sums up the founding of states by the use of force in these words:**

### “The beginnings of the state are to be sought in the capture and enslavement of man-by-man, in the conquest and subjugation acquired by superior physical force. The progressive growth from tribe to kingdom and from kingdom to empire is but a continuation from the same process.”

### History of the Theory:

### This theory is based on the well-accepted maxim of survival of the fittest. There is always a natural struggle for existence by fighting all adversaries among the animal world. This analogy may be stretched to cover the human beings.

### Secondly, by emphasising the spiritual aspect of the church the clergymen condemned the authority of the state as one of brute force. This indirectly lends credence to the theory of force as the original factor in the creation of the state.

### Thirdly, the socialists also, by condemning the coercive power of the state as one bent upon curbing and exploiting the workers, admit of force as the basis of the state.

### Lastly, the theory of force is supported by the German philosophers like Friedrich Hegel, Immanuel Kant, John Bernhardi and Triestchki. They maintain that war and force are the deciding factors in the creation of the state. Today in the words of Triestchki – “State is power; it is a sin for a state to be weak. That state is the public power of offence and defence. The grandeur of history lies in the perpetual conflict of nations and the appeal to arms will be valid until the end of history.”

### According to Bernhardi-**“Might is the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrement of war. War gives a biologically just decision since its decision rest on the very nature of things.”**

### Criticisms of the Theory:

### Following criticisms are levelled against the theory of force. In the first place, the element of force is not the only factor in the origin of the state; religion, politics, family and process of evolution are behind the foundation of the state. Thus to say that force is the origin of the state is to commit the same fallacy that one of the causes is responsible for a thing while all the causes were at work for it.

### This has been rightly pointed out by Stephen Butler Leacock- “The theory errs in magnifying what has been only one factor in the evolution of society into the sole controlling force.” A state may be created by force temporarily. But to perpetuate it something more is essential.

### In the second place, the theory of force runs counter to the universally accepted maxim of Thomas Hill Green- “Will, not force, is the basis of the state.” No state can be permanent by bayonets and daggers. It must have the general voluntary acceptance by the people.

### In the third place, the theory of force is inconsistent with individual liberty. The moment one accepts that the basis of a state is force, how can one expect liberty there? The theory of force may be temporarily the order of the day in despotism as against democracy.

### In the fourth place, the doctrine of survival of the fittest which is relied upon by the champions of the force theory has erroneously applied a system that is applicable to the animal world to human world. If force was the determining factor, how could Mahatma Gandhi’s non-violence triumph over the brute force of the British Imperialists?

### Lastly, the force theory is to be discarded because political consciousness rather than force is the origin of the state. Without political consciousness of the people the state cannot be created. This is so because man is by nature a political animal. It is that political conscience that lay deep in the foundation of the state.

### We may conclude with the words of R. N. Gilchrist- **“The state, government and indeed all institutions are the result of man’s consciousness, the creation of which have arisen from his appreciation of a moral end.”**

### Merits of the Theory:

### **The theory of force, though untenable as an explanation of the origin of the state, has some redeeming features:**

### First, the theory contains the truth that some states at certain points of time were definitely created by force or brought to existence by the show of force. When the Aryans came to India they carried with them weapons of all kinds and horses to use in the war against the non-Aryans and by defeating the non-Aryans they carved out a kingdom in India.

### Later on, the Aryans sprawled their kingdoms and broad-based their government and ruled with the backing of the people.

### Secondly, the other silver lining of the theory is that it made the slates conscious of building adequate defence and army to protect the territorial integrity of the state. That is why we find commanders of war or Senapati as an important post in the ancient kingdoms.

### In the modern state, we find a substantial amount of money used on defence budget. Every state in the modern world has got a defence minister which unmistakably recognises the use of force in modern statecraft too.

### So it is altogether a different theory of origin of state with the recognition of force which we have studied as a theory of origin of state.

# Divine Theory Origin Of State

The theories of Divine Origin, Force and Social [Social Contract](https://www.politicalscienceview.com/best-books-about-political-science/) are speculative and stand rejected. But it does not mean that they have no practical utility. Each one of these theories contains some element of truth and aids us in penetrating the realm of the past and helps to find out how and why the  State came into existence.

To examine and reject  a speculative theory is a means of arriving at the truth. It is only by groping in the dark that we hope to reach the light. Leacock has tightly said that the rejection of what is false in the speculative theories of the past will aid in establishing more valid conclusions on the residual basis of what is true.  What exists is never new. It is a monument of human effort, the result of prolonged activity. we cannot understand any contemporary institution without some knowledge of its genetic background. Speculative theories exhibit the spirit of the time in which they flourished and are, consequently, the index of the people their thoughts, and their environments and describe the forces that moulded and shaped the practices of the State. Finally, speculative theories led to the development of political thought..

# Divine Rights Advantages and Disadvantages

**Advantages and Disadvantages Of Divine rights:** While monarchy is generally considered as a [form at government](http://www.politicalscienceview.com/what-are-the-different-types-of-governments/) in which the head of the state derives his attire through hereditary succession, any government in which supreme and final authority is in the hands of a single person is a monarchy, whether his office is secured by usurpation, by election, or by hereditary succession. If the monarch is merely the nominal head of the state, and the actual powers of government are exercised by others, the government is in reality an aristocracy or a democracy rather than a monarchy. Strictly speaking, a monarchy exists only when the personal will of the head of the State is a constantly effective and, in the last resort, a predominant factor in government.

Monarchy is probably the oldest form of government, and is the form of organization that most states have taken during the greater part of human history. It has usually been accompanied by the belief that the monarch is divine in nature or that he rules as an agent of the gods or that he rules by divine right. It has been upheld by marry writers, especially in the medieval and early modern period, as the natural and best form of government. Even recent writers have praised it as superior to other forms. Monarchy has been upheld on the ground that it possesses simplicity of or organization and is adapted to prompt and energetic action and to consistent and continuous policy.

It secures strength and unity in administration, since officials are responsible to a single head and can be held to strict accountability. It avoids the contest of party factions or the control of government, and for that reason it is argued that monarchy is best adapted to, secure equal justice for all classes in the state. Since the king stands above all parties and classes, he is able to rule impartially for the best interests of the state as a whole. Monarchy was well suited to the needs of early states, when it was necessary to impress discipline and habits of obedience on uncivilized peoples and when political consciousness and the ability to take part in government were not yet developed.

Even in modern times the process of consolidating national states and of making needed reforms found the strong government of a monarchy decidedly valuable. If a good and wise despot could be assured, many arguments could be used to justify this form of government on the ground of efficiency, especially in times of crisis.

On the other hand, experience has shown that monarchy is subject to certain dangers. If the office of ruler is hereditary, there is no guaranty that a capable person will succeed to office. History is tilled with examples of incompetent and unscrupulous hereditary rulers. Even if the office is filled by some method of selection which aims to avoid the chance of an incompetent ruler, experience shows that when power is concentrated in the hands of a single person it is likely to be administered in the interest of the monarch and the group that surrounds him, rather than for the equitable advantage of all.

If the king is the source of law, there is no guaranty that the will obey even his own law, if it is to his advantage to break it. Even if the government of a monarchy were wise and efficient, it is defective as a form of organization for a civilized and intelligent people. One aim of government should be the development of political interest and loyalty and of social unity. No government in which the people are excluded from taking active part is likely to stimulate public confidence and support or to create an active and intelligent citizenship.

Many writers have pointed out the advantages of a hereditary monarch as the nominal head of a state where the actual government is carried on, in his name by a group of ministers who are responsible to a majority in the legislative body. The influence of such a ruler, if he has the confidence of his people, may be exercised through the advice and warning which he gives to the ministers, especially as his position places him above the strife and tumult of party politics.

Such an office is valuable also in continuing the historical tradition of the state and in serving as a bond of unity and a focus of national patriotism, especially in the case of a scattered empire. Against these advantages may be set the cost of maintaining a royal court, the danger that the monarch will degenerate into a useless idler, and the discrepancy between the theory of hereditary monarchy and the democratic ideas of the present day.

## Absolute Monarchy:

Monarchy represents that [form of governmen](https://www.politicalscienceview.com/forms-of-government/)t where the source of all political authority is to be found in a supreme ruler All the organs and officers of Government are agents of this ruler for the purpose of carrying out his will. All acts of Government are his acts and derive their validity from his sanction. All laws are his commands, though they may have been formulated by one of his agents. As the bearer of sovereignty, his authority is supreme, unlimited, and self determined, both as regards the extent to, and the manner in which it shall in fact be exercised. Louis XIV of France expressed this idea in the famous phrase “L e tat, c’est moi,” (I am the State), what he really meant was: “I am the Government and what I say goes.” This is absolute Monarchy.

The institution of Monarchy is a product of history and it has grown as a part of the evolution of the State. In the early stages of the development of the State the Monarchical system was the most beneficial, for it was characterized by singleness of purpose, unity, vigor and strength. The Monarch combined in him the functions of the law maker, the judge, the executive and the military commander. He was, thus, able to hold together by his own personal force a society which otherwise might have broken up into may elements.

In the beginning, the Monarch was elected and, then, the institution became hereditary and it is now the normal type, wherever it exists. The early Roman kings were elected. The medieval kings were both hereditary and elected. A king may be cloned in our own times. Nadir Shah, the father of the last ruler of Afghanistan, Zahir Shah, was an elected king. But it is not a normal feature and all monarchies are now hereditary. A hereditary king enjoys a life long tenure and the office passes to his heirs according to the law of primogeniture.

Absolute Monarchy, has existed both in the East and in the West up to very recent times. In the East, the leading example of a government of this character was that of Japan. In the eighties of the last century, Japan decided to abolish her old system of government and to establish in its place one corresponding to modern political ideas as represented by the existing governments of Europe and America. But even the new Constitution (1889) established a type of absolute monarchy. Article  of the Constitution clearly stated that the Empire of Japan shall be reigned over and governed by a line of Emperors unbroken for ages eternal.

Barton Ito, in his “Commentaries on the Constitution of the Empire of Japan”, explained the meaning of the phrase reigned over and governed and commented: “it is meant that the Emperor on his throne combines in himself the sovereignty of the State and the government of the country and of his subjects.” In the West, the two most important examples of governments resting on an absolute basis were those of Russia before the Revolution of 1917, and Germany immediately before the adoption of the Weimar Constitution of l9i9.

The despotic king always claimed that he got his authority direct from God, that he was God’s vicegerent on earth, that he ruled by divine right, and that he was answerable to none except God. This belief in the divine right of the kings to rule prevailed in all countries. In China the Emperor was described as the “Son of Heaven” and he claimed to rule by virtue of the mandate that he had received from Heaven.

Referring to Europe  and Britain, Bryce says, “from the fifth to sixteenth century whoever asked what was the source bf legal sovereignty and what the moral claim of the sovereign to obedience of subjects would have been answered that God has appointed certain powers to govern the world and that it would be a sin to resist His ordinance.” The king was, accordingly, free from all human limitations. He was accountable to God alone and not to his subjects. Some kings, no doubt, took high view of their duties and governed well and yet they were Subject to no restraints, except the law of God.

### Merits of Absolute Monarchy:

Perhaps, there could have been no better form of government than absolute Monarchy for disciplining the uncouth and uncivilized people who had emerged out of barbarism John Stuart Mill rightly said, “Despotism is a legitimate mode of government for dealing with barbarians, provided the end be their improvement and the means be justified by actually effecting that end ” Absolute Monarchy possesses the merits of strength, vigour, energy of action, promptness of decision, unity of counsel, continuity and consistency of policy.

Undivided counsel, promptness of decision and a consistent policy are the essential requisites of a good and efficient administration, particularly during periods of national crises and emergencies Monarchy, therefore, comes as a beneficial antidote to chaos or a weak government History is full of examples when the rule of one has been reimposed as a means of protecting the interests of the people at large from the rapacity of the few The English supported their strong Tudor kings, to be their protection against the lawlessness of the armed nobility.

As all the powers of government, [executive](https://www.politicalscienceview.com/the-executive/), [legislative](https://www.politicalscienceview.com/the-legislature/), [judicial](https://www.politicalscienceview.com/the-judiciary/) and military are concentrated in the Monarch, he is able to keep a greater uniformity of purpose in the State. A sagacious king having sturdy commonsense can easily secure the best advice and acts upon it with confidence. His policy is more stable and consistent than the shifting policy of the assembly in a democratic government. An assembly is usually guided by sentiments and is swayed by the arguments of the politicians. Moreover, a Monarch generally takes a very high View of his duties.

He is free to select his officials according to his own pleasure and make them work according to his directions. As the officials can be held to strict accountability, they run the administration to the best of their ability and capacity. The absolute Monarchies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, says Bryce, “saw many reforms in European countries, which no force less than that of a strong monarchy would have carried through. ”

### Defects of Absolute Monarchy:

But no man is fit enough to exercise absolute power. A despot crushes his subjects to the earth and leaves them nothing they can call their own. Even a good despot teaches his subjects to mind their own private interests and to leave everything else to the government. Absolute government is a government by one single person and he administers according to his own good sense of what can be good and right for his subjects and history tells us that the good of the subjects has really meant the interests of the ruler himself. He has never cherished the interests of the subjects. If he does, his absolutism disappears. Moreover, a good king, under a system of hereditary monarchy, is a sheer chance or accident.

There is no guarantee that an able, capable and benevolent ruler must always succeed to the throne. History tells us that imbeciles and fools have been the rule whereas the statesmen and sage rulers have been the exceptions. A hereditary ruler, says [Leacock](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stephen_Leacock%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank), seems on the face of things as absurd as the hereditary mathematician or hereditary poet laureate.

Even if it be admitted that absolute Monarchy is, a good form of government, we, who are brought up in the twentieth century, do not believe in good government unless it is self government, for good government is no substitute for self government.

No government which does not rest upon the affections of the people, which does not stimulate among them an interest in public affairs and create an active, intelligent, and alert citizenship, can be called ideal, and, certainly, no government from which the participation of the people in some from is excluded will ever be able to produce such a body of citizens. An absolute monarch dare not allow liberty and rights to his subjects. He does not inspire in them a vigorous political vitality, patriotic loyalty and social solidarity.

If he does, he invites his own demise as an absolute monarch. He will adopt all measures to firmly establish his authority and it remains unquestionable. To adopt measures that help to infuse in his subjects the spirit of awakening and allows them the enjoyment of rights and other freedoms will spell the destruction of his own authority and most probably his own annihilation.

### Limited Monarchy:

Limited Monarchy is that type of government in which the authority of the Monarch is limited either by, the prescriptions of a written [constitution](https://www.politicalscienceview.com/constitution/) or by certain fundamental conventions, as in Britain. Sometimes the constitution is promulgated by the ruler himself. Sometimes it has been forced upon him by,a successful revolution. But whatever be the cause, limited Monarchy is a constitutional government, and it is, in principle, like the Republican form of government.

The only difference between the two is that under a system of limited Monarchy the chief executive Head of the State is a hereditary king whereas in a Republic the chief executive, usually called, President, as in the United States of America and India, is elected for a number of years and after the expiry of his term of office, if not re-elected, he joins the ranks of the ordinary citizens of the State. But both the constitutional king, under a limited Monarchy, and the President of a Republic, exercise authority as ordained by the Constitution or conventions as in Britain.

They cannot go beyond it. In a limited Monarchy the authority of the king is nominal. The real functionaries are his ministers who are elected members of the legislature and belong to the majority party. They remain in office as long as they can command a majority in and retain the confidence of the legislature. They cannot be  dismissed by the king at his pleasure. Nor can they be chosen at random. Britain is a typical example of a constitutional Monarchy where the King or Queen reigns but does not rule.

### Uses of Limited Monarchy:

The very fact that the authority of the Monarch is limited goes to show that in essence it is a democratic form of Government, The King or Queen in Britain, as Bagehot remarks, has the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, and the right to warn beyond this he or she cannot go. He or she does not exercise any real authority. The actual government is carried on by ministers who represent the majority party in the legislature. The legislature renews its mandate after every four or five years when General Elections are held. Limited Monarchy, therefore, gives the people the real opportunity to actively participate in public affairs and elect administrators who rule the country according to their behest. It is the people who, in the last resort, are the ultimate sovereigns.

The chief merit of a limited [Monarchy in Britain](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monarchy_of_the_United_Kingdom) is the hereditary nature of the ruler. By virtue of a long and uninterrupted tenure of office the King or Queen gains mature administrative experience to guide his or her ministers who are generally amateurs in the  art of administration. He or she exercises what Lowell calls the unifying, dignifying and stabilizing influence. Moreover, the Monarch belongs to no party whereas his or her ministers belong to one. The Monarch, as such, is an umpire in the midst of rival parties, whose main concern is to see that the game of politics is played according to rules.

The days of absolute Monarchy are over. Now even King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia, who was the solitary example of an absolute Monarch, was ultimately replaced by Prince, Faisal as a result of the decision taken by the Council of Ministers and the Consultative Assembly. The powers of Kings, in all countries where Monarchy persists, have been limited either by the prescriptions of a written constitution or by fundamental conventions which form the basis of the Constitution.

In Iran, Shah Mohammad Reza  Shah Pahlvi was the national symbol and powers vested in him were really exercised by his council of ministers. Constitutional monarchy is the only way now to maintain the hereditary principle and royal dignity. A limited Monarchy, according to Woodrow Wilson, is one whose powers have been adapted to the interests of the people and to the maintenance of individual liberty.

Roughly speaking constitutional government may be said to have had its rise at Runnymede when the barons of England exacted the Magna Carta from John. From a King arose, by slow and steady progress, the institution of Kingship and the Monarch now reigns, he or she does not rule. To put it in the legal form, the King or Queen can do no wrong .

# Force Theory Origin Of State

**The Statement of the Theory**. Force Theory of origin of state is another fallacious theory, but historically important, which is offered as an explanation of the origin and meaning of the State. There is an old saying that war beget the king and true to this maxim, the theory of Force emphasizes the origin of the State in the subordination of the weak to the strong. The advocates of the theory argue that man, apart from being a social animal is bellicose by nature. There is also a lust for power in him. Both these desires prompt him to exhibit his strength and in the early stages of the development of mankind a person physically stronger than the rest captured and enslaved the weak. He collected in this way a band of followers, fought with others,  and subjugated the weak.

## Force Theory Of Origin Of State

Having increased the number of his followers, over whom he exercised undisputed authority, he became a tribal chief. A clan fought against a clan and a tribe against a tribe. The, powerful conquered the weak and this process of conquest and domination continued till the Victorious tribe secured control over a definite territory of a considerable size under the sway of its tribal chief, who proclaimed himself the King. Leacock gives a matter of fact explanation of the Force Theory when he says that historically it means that government is the outcome of human aggression, that the beginnings of the State are to be sought in the capture and enslavement of man by man, in the conquest and subjugation of feebler tribes and generally speaking in the self seeking domination acquired by superior physical force. The progressive growth from tribe to kingdom, and from kingdom to empire is but a continuation of the  same process. The theory, in from tells us that the State is primarily the result of forcible subjugation through long continued Warfare, among primitive groups and historically speaking, as Jenks says, “there is not the slightest difficulty in proving that all political communities of the modern type owe their existence to successful warfare.”

Once the State had been established, force, which had hitherto been utilized for subjugating others. Was used as an instrument for maintaining internal order and making it secure from any kind of external aggression. But this alone was not sufficient. Force was used as the sinews of war and power and a bid for superiority, one State fought against another,eliminating the weaker and only those survived which either could not be conquered, or no venture was made to conquer them as they were comparatively Powerful. The theory of Force, therefore, traces the origin and development of the State to conquest and [justices](https://www.politicalscienceview.com/role-and-functions-of-the-judiciary/) its authority,by the proposition that might is right.

### The theory has, thus, four Implications. First, force is not only a historical factor, but is the present essential feature of the State secondly, that the States were born of force only thirdly, that power is their justification and raison d’etre and, finally, that the maintenance and extension of power within and without is the sole aim of the State.

### Theory used in support of diverse purposes.

### The theory of Force has been advanced by different thinkers and writers for advocating their own point of view. It was first used by the Church Fathers in the medieval period to discredit the State, and to establish the supremacy of the Church. They claimed that the Church was divinely created whereas the State was the outcome of brute force. [Gregory VII](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pope_Gregory_VII) wrote in 1080; “Which of us is ignorant that kings and lords have had their origin in those who, ignorant of God, by arrogance, rapine, perfidy, slaughter, by every crime which the devil agitating as the prince of the world, have continued to rule over their fellowmen with blind cupidity and intolerable presumption.”

### In modern times the Individualists owned the theory to protect individual liberty against government encroachment. They characteristic the State as a necessary evil and argued that the State should leaf the individual alone, laissez faire, and should not interfere in what he does, except for the maintenance of internal peace and external security. The Individualists base their arguments on the principle of survival of the fittest  and try to prove that it is only the strong who survive and the weak go to the wall. The Socialists, on the other hand, hold that the State is the outcome of the process of aggressive exploitation on the weaker by the stronger the latter constituting the propertied class who had ever manned administration and directed the machinery of the government to their own benefit. The existing system of industrial organization, it is maintained, hinges upon force because a part of the community has succeeded in defrauding their fellows of the just reward of their labor. They further argue that force is the origin of civil society and government represents merely the coercive organization which tends to curb and exploit the working class in order to maintain the privileged position of the propertied class. The theory of Socialism is a revolt against the State, as it is the product of force and power is its justification and raison d etre. Karl Marx, accordingly, concluded that the State must ultimately ‘wither away’.

### During recent times [the theory of Force](https://www.politicalscienceview.com/force-theory-of-origin-of-state/) was a favorite theme of political philosophy with German writers. Imbued with the desire to make their country a Greater Germany, and at the peak of its glory, they lavished praise on force and considered its indiscriminate use as the most important factor for the solidarity of the nation. Treitschke said that “the State is the public power of offense and defense, the first task of which is the making of war and the administration of justice,” War, he said, consolidates a people, reveals to each individual his relative unimportant, causes factional hostilities to disappear, and intensifies patriotism and national idealism. “The grandeur of history,” he further maintained, “lies in the perpetual conflict of nations” and “the appeal to am will be valid until the end of history.” General Von Bernhardt held might as “the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war. War gives a biologically just decision, since the decision, rests on the very nature of things.” Nietzsche preached the doctrine of the will to power and the superman.

### The individual who can command the highest admiration, according to this doctrine, is the strong man who compels other men to act in fulfillment of his will. Nietzsche, while glorifying the masterly virtues of man, says that a truly moral person has no place for the vulgar and slavish  virtue of humility, self sacrifice, pity, gentleness. Hitler and Mussolini put into real practice the doctrines of these writers. They regarded force as the normal means for maintaining a nation’s prestige, cultural influence, commercial supremacy in the world and for holding the allegiance of citizens at home. This general doctrine of political authoritarianism, both with Hitler and Mussolini, became a creed of dominance by intimidation militancy in international relations, and forcible suppression of political dissent in domestic government. Hitler and Mussolini pushed mankind into another World War, causing unprecedented misery,havoc and destruction. The United Nations Organization was established after the War to save the succeeding generations from the I scourge of war. Yet there is no end to war. There is a show of might everywhere and a never ending race between all powers, big and small, to invent and manufacture deadly weapons of warfare, some to defend, others to offend.

### Criticism of the Theory.

### Force indeed, has played an important part in the origin  and development of the State some of the greatest empires of today have been established through blood and iron. We may see even more of this blood and iron in the days to come. Force is an essential element Of the State. Internally, the State requires force to ensure Obedience to its commands. Externally, it is necessary to repel aggression and to preserve the integrity of the State. Without force no State can exist and sovereignty of the State always rests ultimately on force. Kant said, “Even a population of devils would find it to their advantage to establish a coercive State by general consent.”

### But, all this does not sufficiently explain the origin of the State. Force is, no doubt, one of the factors which contributed to the evolution of the State.  It is however, not the only one, nor the most important factor, and the theory of force errs in magnifying What has been only one factor in the evolution of society into the sole controlling force. Force is, also, not the only basis of the State. Something other than, force is necessary in binding the people together. It is will, not force, Which is the real basis of the State. Sheer force can hold nothing together because force always disrupts unless it is made  subservient to common will.  Force we do need in maintaining the State but its indiscriminate use cannot be permitted. It must be used as a medicine and not a daily diet as force is the criterion of the State and not its essence If it becomes the essence of the State, the State will last so long as force can last. Indiscriminate use of force has always been the former of revolutions, overthrowing governments which rest on force. Since he State is a permanent institution, only moral force can be its permanent foundation.

### T.H. Green has aptly said that it is not coercive power as such but coercive power exercised according to law, written or unwritten, for maintenance of the existing rights from external or internal invasions, that makes a State Might with rights is as lasting as human minds on which it depends.

### Moreover the Theory of Force unduly emphasizes the principle of the survival of the fittest. It means that might is right and those who are physically weak should go to the wall. It is dangerous to employ such a principle in the internal existence of the State Might without right is antagonistic to individual liberty. The State is duly bound to protect equally the weak and the strong and create equal opportunities for all. Externally if might is the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war, there can be no international peace. Every State will be at perpetual War with the rest. This is a condition of chaos, pure and simple,endangering the peace and security of the world. The attention and efforts of every State will be directed towards war preparedness and to win the war, if it comes. War, which is an alias for murder, glorifies brute force, suppressing the moral forces. This is the mean self of man and not his real sell. Is this the end for which the State exists.

**FORCE THEORY**

According to this theory, the state originated due to force exerted by the strong over the weak. The idea contained in the statement is that 'war begat the king'. The same view is expressed by Hume, Oppenheim, Jenks-Bernhardy and Trietschke are the exponents of force theory. A number of rulers also believed in this theory. The powerful conquered the weak state is the outcome of the process of aggressive exploitation of the weaker by the stronger. Might without right is antagonist to individual liberty.There were other factors besides force which helped the expansion of the state. Similarly force alone is not the basis of state and it cannot be maintained by force.

**Criticism**

Force indeed has played an important part in the origin and development of the state. Some of the greatest empires of today have been established through blood and iron.

The theory of force unduly emphasis the principle of the survival of the fittest. It means that might is right and those who are physically weak should go to the wall. It is dangerous to employ such a principle in the internal existence of the state. Every state will be at perpetual war with the rest. This is a condition of chaos, pure and simple endangering the peace and security of the world. The attention and efforts of every state will be directed towards war preparedness and to win the war if it comes. War which is an alias for murder, glorifies brute process, suppressing the moral forces. This is the mean self of man and not his real self.

This theory justifies despotism. It is opposed to the idea of freedom. It is too much to believe that the state is created and maintained by sheer force and the spiritual and moral values have absolutely no place in life.

## ****Force Theory of State****

According to **Force** [**theory of government**](http://www.studylecturenotes.com/tags/theory-state) also known as **force theory of state**, the state was born as a result of force i.e. aggression, war, conquest and subjugation. In ancient times a strong man with the help of his supporters dominated the weaker people of his tribe and established the political relation of command and obedience. This was the beginning of the [**state**](http://www.studylecturenotes.com/social-sciences/law/264-what-is-state). Later on a strong tribe dominated the weaker ones and in this way a kingdom came into being. With the passage of time a strong king subjugated the weaker ones and created an empire.

### A Writer says that **human history is nothing but a record of fighting and wars**. Some people say that people have to start wars because population increased and people were forced to capture the means for the basic necessities. This required better tactics and improve art of war. In this way the strong and better trained people dominated the weaker and less trained people. In order to support this argument the example of England is given.

### In ancient times English fought with one another. The result was that they were divided into seven kingdoms called heptarchy, Later on one king becomes so powerful that he conquered the rest and the kingdom of England was borne. Later on the kingdom of England dominated several other kingdoms of the world and became the British Empire. This goes to prove that the state born as a result of force. The matter does not end there. Even after establishment of the state, force is still required to maintain the state. Within the state force is required to maintain law and order and punish those who violate laws. Similarly in order to defend the orders of the state force was needed.

### ****Force Theory of Government Limitations & Weaknesses****

### Following are the weaknesses of force theory of government

### ****1. Priority given to Force****

### Force theory of state gives more importance to the role of force. No doubt force was and is important but it is not the only element, which has created the state, and preserves it. Today the supporters of this theory forget that force is like a medicine and not a food. There is French saying that “You can do anything with the Bayonet except sit on it.” History has proved that those who come to power by force are also overthrown by force. So force must be used but not regularly.

### ****2. Force is the Basis of State or Government****

### The supports of the force theory of government forget one basic point that “It is not force but will which is the basis of the state.” Force must be used but with the consent of the people. Any state that fails to learn this lesson of history becomes non-existent.

**How to Define Force Theory**

Think about where you live -- the country, the state, the province or county. What do you know about where it came from? There are several different ways that countries and states can take their shape and define their borders. Sometimes this is done peacefully or naturally when a group of people decide to work together to make a society function. More often, though, it is done through the use of force when one group becomes dominant over the others.

This process of establishing a new state or government through the use of force is what's known as **force theory**, which is also sometimes referred to as *conquest theory*. Force theory occurs when a person or a group of people take control of an area, such as a state, and make everyone in that area follow their rules and beliefs. For example, if you were to successfully invade Canada and make everyone in the country abandon their old ways and adopt my new rules, it would be a demonstration of force theory.

Although force theory is the way that most western countries have been formed, it is not the only way. An alternative to force theory is what is known as **social contract theory**, which is when a group of people living in the same area agree to follow certain rules and expectations in order for their society to remain stable.

**Elements of Force Theory**

While the two theories mentioned above are generally how states and countries take shape, they often unfold in different ways and can be identified by the presence of certain elements.

One important element of force theory is **occupation** by a foreign military or government. For example, when the German Army invaded France in 1940, they took control of the people and government through military occupation. This occupation was done with the intention of bringing France under Nazi governmental rule, but was overthrown by Allied forces in 1944.

|  |
| --- |
| Nazi France |
| During WWII, the German Army occupied part of France (shown in pink) with the intention of bring the country under Nazi rule.  |

Another important element of force theory is **colonization**, which is a process in which people from another country or area come into a new area and set up a community. Though colonization doesn't necessarily involve the use of force, historically it has led to the use of force.

**Examples of Force Theory**

There are several countries that have been established through force theory, but some of the most well-known are those in North America.

**WHICH THEORY OF STATE IS BETTER?**

# Divine Origin Theory

## ****Divine Origin Theory**** of the State is the oldest theory of the state. Advocates of this theory believe that kings rules by God’s will, order and authorisation. The Divine Theory of the State is propounded by almost all ****religions**** of the world.

## The ****Old Testament**** records that the king is appointed by ****God**** and God has the sole power to remove him. King is regarded as the incarnation of Lord Vishnu according to several ****Hindu scriptures.****

## During the 17th and 18th centuries the Divine Origin Theory of the State was strongly propagated ...

## The reasons for the decline and rejection of the theory were that politics was separated from religion and the ****Church**** was separated from Politics. Another reason is the birth of ****Nationalism**** and the consequent appearance of ****Democracy.****

## Historians and Scholars attempted to explain the origin of state in terms of family and thus put forth the ****patriarchal and matriarchal (Genetic)**** theories of evolution of state.

## ****Force theory**** believed that state makes use of force for commanding obedience to its laws. The Force Theory was supported by ****Church fathers**** during the middle ages, who tried to discredit the State as a child of force and as an instrument of force and domination.

## In the contemporary age of ****liberal democracy****, no one gives any real importance to the theories of ****divine origin**** of state and the divine rights of the monarchy.

## ****Monarchy**** lives as ****constitutional monarchy**** in Malaysia, Belgium, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Spain, Sweden and some other states of the world.

* The **force theory** is the idea that government originates from taking control of the state by force and is often found in a **dictatorship**—a type of government characterized by one-person or one-party authoritarian rule. Historically, this has been achieved in some cases through forcible invasion or occupation when a more dominant people or state takes control of the political system of a less powerful people or state, imposing its governmental system on that group. New governments can also be formed by force during revolutions or coups within a country. A coup is the overthrow of an established government, and the resulting leader or dictator is most often a military figure. An example of the force theory occurred in Cuba in 1959, when revolutionary Fidel Castro and a small force of guerrilla soldiers defeated the national army and took control of the government. In some cases, governments created by force take on some characteristics of a monarchy, with government power handed down within the dictator's family. Examples are the Assad regime in Syria and the Kim regime in North Korea.
* With the **divine right theory**, government originates with power vested in an individual by God or gods. Generally, monarchs lead governments of this type. This theory was followed in ancient times, including by the ancient Egyptians and Maya. The idea of divine right experienced a resurgence in western Europe in the 16th to the 18th centuries, when King James I of England, several French monarchs, and other rulers asserted that their authority came directly from God—and thus could not be challenged. Russian czars, such as Peter the Great, believed their autocratic rule was God-given, and they used their power to gain territory, wage war, and impose taxation on their subjects.
* **Theory of Divine Origin**

This is the oldest theory concerned in the origin of state. According to this theory, state is established and governed by God himself by agent or vicegerent or vicar of God. The chief exponent of this theory in early times were the Jews and supporters were the early church father.

This theory was used especially in medieval period to establish the supremacy of the church over the state.  The divine origin theory took the form of the theory of the divine right of the king. James I, the first stuart King who said that “Kings are he breathing images of God upon the earth,” and Sir Robert Filmer good examples. Bousset in France elaborated this theory supporting the despotism of Luis XIV, who proudly declared, “I am the state having full authority directly given by God.”

People have no right to rebel against the King, if so it is against the God himself.

* Some of the basic tenets of this theory are:

1.Monarchy is divinely ordained.

### 2.Hereditary right is indefeasible that means cannot be taken away.

### 3.Kings are accountable to God alone

### 4.Resistance to a lawful king is sin.

### According to this doctrine, king began to become despot and tyrant. With the growing political consciousness and rise of democratic ideas, this theory was rejected as unsound in theory and dangerous in practice. It got death blow at the hands of Grotius, Hobbes and Locke. Some moral values can be extracted from this theory.

### FORCE THEORY

### According to this theory, state is the result of the superior physical force and subjugation of the weaker section by the stronger. Physical strength was able to overcome fellow men and to exercise authority over them. Some superior tribes and clans also did so. Then state came into being through physical coercion and compulsion, according to this theory.

### As per this theory, war begets the state and Oppenheim, Jenks and many other supports this view. This theory only emphasizes force and accepts that state is the product of coercion and force only. But force must have been an important factor in the evolution of state but to think it as an only one factor is a mistake. Several other factors, such as, voluntary amalgamation as by force and conquest, as a result of conciliation and agreement, by one another’s cooperation and other peaceful agencies and efforts, etc.

### Force is an important element for both internal and external security of the state but it is not only the cause for the origination of the state. Might only cannot go ahead permanently. It should follow its path with a positive weapon of right. Force is a physical power while right is a mental power, both should go together in the origination of the state, of course there was strong arms but only with the support of other elements according t MacIver. In the words of MacIver, “Force along never holds a group together.” So force is one of the component for the state origination but not whole sole cause.

The force theory holds that the State originated in conquest and coercion. It is the result of the subjugation of the weaker by the stronger. As better captured by Anifowese (1999:96), in the later part of The 29th Century, some German philosophers argued that force was the most characteristic attribute of the State, that „might made right‟ and that power has its own justification. Hence, it was concerned that physically powerful peoples were the „best‟ and the State as Power, was superior to other forms of human associations.

The force theory, accordingly, has no respect for the natural rights of the citizens and does not approve of any resistance to the acts of political authority.