

SUBJECT: POLITICAL SCIENCE I

COURSE: BA LLB SEMESTER I

LECTURER: MS. DEEPIKA GAHATRAJ

MODULE: MODULE IV, THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN OF STATE

FORCE THEORY

The exponents of the force theory were of the view that the origin of state and its development was based on force, that is, force used by the strong over the weak and their consequent control over them. In such a way, wherever the strong group out did the weak the strong became the master and ruled the weak. The strong group became vested with ruling power and the federated were made their subjects. According to the **Jenks** “Historically, there is not even the slightest difficulty in proving that all political communities of the modern type owe their existence to the successful warfare” . The warring clans and tribes established their authority in a definite territory. Their chief became the ruler on the basis of his physical force. The state is born out of force. Exist in force and die in the absence of force. According to **Bluntschli**, force is an indispensable element of the organisation of the state . In the two world wars, Great Britain defended its territory against the Nazi forces only with the military power. Further, the Russian military power stopped the aggression of the German forces.

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 are 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 Leacock 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."

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."

REFERENCES :

- <https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/193715/4/chapter%202.pdf>
- https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/1349/7/07_chapter2.pdf
- https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/1349/8/08_chapter3.pdf
- https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/1349/9/09_chapter4.pdf
- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261181816_Summary_of_Social_Contract_Theory_by_Hobbes_Locke_and_Rousseau/link/59eb253baca272cdddba694/download