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**ASSIGNMENT**

1. How can a Lebanese retain or lose his or her newly acquired Nigerian citizenship?

**Firstly, who is a citizen?**

A citizen is a legal member of a particular country who possesses full right to claim a state as his own. A citizen is a resident of a city or town, who is entitled to vote and enjoy other privileges of the country. A citizen of a country is someone on whom all the social and political rights of the country are conferred upon. For example citizens of Nigeria have the right to live, work and take part in the civic life. Citizens of a country enjoy certain rights and privileges that noncitizens of a country may not have access to. The citizens of a state have some legal and natural right which they must enjoy as citizens A Citizen possesses every right in the state and also performs his/her duties as a legitimate member of the state.

Some of these rights include:

* Right to life,
* Right to freedom of movement,
* Right to freedom of speech,
* Right to own and acquire property anywhere in the country,
* Right to fair hearing,
* Right to vote and be voted for,
* Right to freedom of association and assembly,
* Right to dignity of human person,
* Right to private and family life,
* Right to personal liberty,
* Right to freedom of conscience and religion, etc.

Although citizens of a country enjoy rights in their country, they are also certain behaviors expected of every citizen in a country. Such behaviors are known as duties of citizens of a country.

These duties include;

* obeying the law,
* defending your country,
* serving on a jury or as a witness,
* Paying of taxes etc.

**What is Citizenship?**

Citizenship is the status of a person recognized under the custom or law as being a legal member of a sovereign state or belonging to a nation. Citizenship refer to a status conferred on person coupled with rights, privileges and duties. Citizenship also means the state of being a citizen of a country or countries. Citizenship is a relationship between an individual and its state or nation involving the individual’s full political membership in the state as well as permanent allegiance to it. Citizenship is the position or status of being legally recognized as a member a particular country, either by nativity or naturalization. It can also be defined as the process by which a person becomes a legitimate member of a given state. The statute governing citizenship, its types, procedure for acquisition, renunciation, dual citizenship, and deprivation of citizenship in Nigeria is the 1999 constitution.

**Types of Citizenship**

1. **Citizenship by birth**: This is the type of citizen that occurs when a person is born in a particular place. Citizenship by birth is the most common mode of acquiring citizenship. This generally means that a person is a citizen of the country he is born into. This may not totally represent the position in Nigeria. In Nigeria, a person can acquire citizenship by birth, pursuant to Section 25 of the 1999 Constitution, in different ways and they include:
2. A person who is born in Nigeria after 1st October 1960 who either of his parents or any of his grandparents are citizens of Nigeria is a citizen of Nigeria. This means that a person born in Nigeria can still be citizen of Nigeria where neither of his parents are Nigerians provided any of his grandparents are citizen of Nigeria.
3. Where neither of his parents or any of his grandparents are citizen of Nigeria, the fact he was born in Nigeria would make him a citizen of Nigeria by birth. This is in contract with a common practice in U.S.A where a person who neither of his parents or grandparents are U.S. citizen but born in U.S can still be a United State citizen.
4. Also a person born in Nigeria before 1 October, 1960 who either his parents or grandparents belongs to or belonged to a community indigenous to Nigeria is a citizen of Nigeria by birth.
5. Another circumstances a person can acquire citizenship by birth is where a person is born outside Nigeria but either of whose parents is a citizen of Nigeria. This is contained in Section 25(1) (c). This means the fact that a person was born outside Nigeria does not disqualified such person from been a citizen by birth provided either of his parents is a citizen of Nigeria
6. **Citizenship by registration**: Another mode of acquiring Citizenship in Nigeria is citizenship by registration. This is the type of citizenship given to a person who marries someone in a particular country because marriage entails registration.

This applies to the following people;

1. Any woman who is or has been married to a citizen of Nigeria. This provision apply to a woman who was married to a Nigeria man but is divorced. A non-Nigeria man who is married to a Nigerian woman cannot be a citizen of Nigeria by Registration.
2. A person of full age and capacity born outside Nigeria any of whose grandparents is a citizen of Nigeria. "Full age" in Nigeria context is presume to be a person who is 18 years of age and above. A person born outside Nigeria neither of his parents are citizen of Nigeria, although cannot be a citizen by birth but can be a citizen by registration provided he is of full age and capacity and any of whose grandparents is a citizen of Nigeria.

Such a person would apply to be registered a citizen of Nigeria and upon fulfilling certain requirements and to the satisfaction of the President would be register a citizen of Nigeria

The requirements include:

* He is a person of Good character,
* He had shown a clear intention of his desire to be domicile in Nigeria,
* He had taken the Oath of Allegiance as contained in the Seventh schedule of the constitution,

The question whether he has satisfied these requirements is subjective as it is based on whether it had been met to the satisfaction of the President. It is important to note that according to Section 131(a) of the 1999 Constitution, only a person who is a Nigerian citizen by birth can run for the office of President of Nigeria.

1. **Citizenship by Naturalization:** This occurs when a person resides in a particular place for a long period of time. Furthermore, a person can acquire citizenship of Nigeria through Naturalization. A person can apply to the President for the grant of a certificate of Naturalization. There are certain requirements which had to be met to the satisfaction of the President.

The following are requirements for naturalization and they include:

* He is a person of full age and capacity.
* He is a person of Good character
* He has shown a clear intention of his desire to be domicile in Nigeria.
* He is, in the opinion of the Governor of the state Where he is or he propose to be resident, acceptable to the Local community in which he is to live permanently and has assimilated into their way of life of that community.
* He has taken the Oaths of Allegiance prescribed in the Seventh schedule of the 1999 Constitution.

**How to Become a Citizen of a Country**

1. **Marriage**: An individual who marries outside his or her domain can acquire the citizenship of the place he/she married to.
2. **Good character**: A person can become a citizen by his/her good disposition or character
3. **Statutory age**: A person must have attained a particular age before becoming a citizen, the statutory age depends on the country.
4. **One’s contribution to the country**: The usefulness or the extent of a person’s contribution to a country can facilitate his or her status as a citizen.
5. **One’s readiness to stay in a country**
6. **Residency** i.e. the person must have stayed in the country for a particular number of years.

**Limitations to rights of citizens**

The rights of the citizens stated in the constitution are not absolute; they are limited to some extent. There are some conditions under which these rights can be curtailed. Some of the limitations to rights of citizens are;

* During emergency period like war, or threat to internal security, a citizen may be detained without trial by the authority if the person is regarded as a security risk
* The right to life of a citizen can be denied if the person is found guilty of a murder or criminal case.
* The right to freedom of assembly or association can be denied if the association is not in accordance to the law of the land. e.g. cultism,
* Right to freedom of movement can also be denied if the citizen has criminal case pending in court in which giving the criminal bail might jeopardize the investigation of the case by the law enforcement agencies.
* The right to vote can also be curtailed if a citizen is not 18 years old.

When a non-citizen of a county is given citizenship in a foreign country, although he is now recognized as a legal citizen, he can either choose to retain or lose his citizenship of the country. A person can reside in Nigeria for a long time and not be a citizen of Nigeria. A person may not be born in Nigeria but still be confer the citizen status of Nigeria. Citizenship is different from Residence. The questions to be discuss centered on the concept of citizenship in Nigeria.

**A Lebanese who just newly acquired Nigerian citizenship although is now recognized as a citizen, he / she can still loose the citizenship to the following reasons;**

* Voluntary acquisition of another citizenship,
* Residing abroad on a permanent basis,
* In the naturalization process, including sham marriages, or failure to give up the other citizenship in countries which require that as a condition of naturalization,
* Serving in a foreign military or foreign government,
* Upon adoption by a foreign citizen, or other change in the child's legal relation to the parents such as annulment of maternity/paternity,
* For a minor, upon the loss of citizenship by the parents,
* Failure to fulfill conditions,
* Voluntary renunciation,

1. Social contract theory explains the evolution of states. What other theories explain the same, and their strengths.

Aside social contract theory, there are other theories that explain the theory of state and they are;

**Evolutionary or Historical Theory**

The evolutionary theory of origin states that most states evolved from family. It explains that state is the product of growth, a slow and steady evolution extending over a long period of time and ultimately shaping itself into the complex structure of a modern state. This theory is more scientific. The state is neither the handiwork of God, nor the result of superior physical force, nor the creation of evolution or convention, nor a mere expansion of the family. The state is not a mere artificial mechanical creation but an institution of natural growth or historical evolution says Professor Garner.

There were a number of factors which helped the evolution of the state. They were kinship, religion, war, migration economic activities and political consciousness. The important factors which contributed to the growth of the state are;

1. Kinship

2. Religion

3. Property and defense

4. Force

5. Political consciousness

**Kinship**

Kinship is the most important and was based upon blood relationship and kinship was the first strongest bond of unity. Family constituted the first link in the process of the evolution of the state with the expansion of the family arose new families and the multiplication of families led to the formation of clans and tribes. Kinship was the only factor which bound the people together.

According to Professor Mac Iver, the magic of names 'reinforced the sense of kinship, as the course of generations enlarged the group. The blood bond of son ship changed imperceptibly into the social bond of the wider brotherhood. The authority of the father passes into the power of the chief once more under the aegis of kinship new forms arise which transcend it. Kinship creates society and society at length creates the state.

**Religion**

Religion provided the bond of unity in early society. It also affected all walks of life. The worship of a common ancestor and common goods created a sense of social solidarity. There was fear in the hearts of men as far as religion was concerned. Even today we see religious practices, affairs and faith in uniting people. In the early days a number of races are united by religion and unity was essential for the creation of state.

**Force**

Force also played an important part in the evolution of the state. It was the use of physical force that was responsible for the growth of kingdoms and empires.

**Property and Defense**

Property and defense played a vital role in the evolution of state in ancient times particularly among the people who were nomads, vagabonds and tribal. Prof. Laski has referred to the necessity of acquiring property by the members of society and protecting the property acquired with reference to the population mentioned above. This led to making adjustments in the social system and relationship between the members of different groups. The need to protect property ultimately compelled the ancient people to establish the state.

**Political consciousness**

The last is political consciousness arising from the fundamental needs of life for protection and order. When the people settle down on a definite territory in pursuit of their, subsistence and a desire to secure it from encroachment by others. The need for regulating things and persons is felt imminently and this is the essence of political consciousness.

It follows that many factors helped the growth of the state. No single factor alone was responsible for its origin. Sometimes all and sometimes many of them help the process by which uncivilized society was transformed into a state. Of all the theories which seek to explain the origin of the states, the evolutionary theory is the most satisfactory. It should be noted that no theory pin-points the time at which the state originated as a consequence of many factors working in union at different times.

**Strengths of evolutionary theory**

* It encourages peaceful co-existence
* It brought harmony to the individuals who practiced

**THE THEORY OF DIVINE ORIGIN**

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. 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 of a king that it should pass from father to son.

3. The king is answerable to God alone; and

4. Resistance to the lawful authority of a king is a sin.

The theory of divine origin was popular for a long time but later on it began to decline on account of many factors.

**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 Manuscript 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 Avalokiteshhvara.

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 emphasized 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. The theory of divine theory states that the leaders of a state come about as a result of ordination from God. This is not such a common method of state origin these days, though it was one of the most popular in the past.

**Strengths of Divine Theory**

Although the divine theory is totally discredited as an origin of the state, there are some good things in it. The summary 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.

**MATRIARCHAL AND PATRIARCHAL THEORY.**

**Matriarchal Theory**

The chief exponents of the matriarchal theory are Morgan, McLennan and Edward Jenks. According to them, there was never any patriarchal family in the primitive society and that the patriarchal family came into existence only when the institution of permanent marriage was in vogue. But among the primitive society, instead of permanent marriage there was a sort of sex anarchy. Under that condition, the mother rather than the father was the head of the family. The kinship was established through the mother.

Edward Jenks who made a thorough study of the tribes of Australia came to the conclusion that the Australian tribes were organized in some sort of tribes known as totem groups. Their affinity was not on the basis of blood relationship but through some symbols like tree or animal. One totem group men were to marry all the women of another totem group. This would lead to polyandry and polygamy also.

This matriarchal system continued until the advent of the pastoral age when the permanent marriage was introduce. We find the existence of the Queen ruling over in Malabar and the princesses ruling over the Maratha countries. These are examples of the matriarchal systems of life.

McLennan, Morgan and Jenks are the notable exponents of matriarchal theory. The matriarchal system was prior to the patriarchal system and tribe. There was no permanent institution of marriage. A woman had more than one husband and because of the uncertainty of male parentage kinship was reckoned through woman that is from mother to daughters.

In the place of a family consisting of a man his wife and children there was a large and loosely connected group called a horde or pack organized for matrimonial purposes.

The matriarchal family developed as indicated below;

* First there was a tribe and it was the oldest and primary social group.
* In course of time a tribe breaks into clans
* Clans in their turn give place to households
* At last comes the modern family.

**Strength of the Matriarchal Theory**

The whole written history of the human race has been a story of conflict, warfare, genocide, slavery, injustice and poverty, and we don’t find much difference today in our TV news. We have had many great thinkers trying to solve these problems, through either religion or politics, but what is noticeable with all these solutions, is that they all have failed Religions like Christianity, Islam and Buddhism all have not succeed in stopping conflict and wars. And in many cases seem to make the situation worse, as conflict between different religions and religious sects has caused many wars.

Political systems haven’t been that successful either, as countries with different political ideologies have fought each other, over this. They even have failed to create equality as well. For instance in the French revolution that promised equality for all people, only succeeded in creating a reign of terror as men like Robespierre and later Napoleon Bonaparte fought for power. Later on Communism and Socialism also attempted to create an equal society but likewise failed. The only political system that has noticeably improved the lives of the people has been democracy, even though wars and inequality are still commonplace in democratic countries. Because of the failure of both religions and politics to create a better world for us all, many people have given up on this, while those who still try, end up using the same methods that has been tried so many times in the past. But throughout recorded history the one thing that hasn’t been tried and that is Matriarchy. In the whole of recorded history it has been men who have ruled our world, and as history has shown us so many times, men do a terrible job in doing this. So if we recognize that men on the whole make dreadful rulers, then it makes sense to see if women can do a better job.

**Patriarchal Theory**

The Patriarchal theory explains that the state originated from the patriarchal family or the family in which the pater or father was the head. The principal exponent of this theory is Sir Henry Maine. According to him, the city is a conglomeration of several families which developed under the control and authority of the eldest male member of the family.

The head or father of the patriarchal family wielded great power and influence upon the other members of the family .His writ was carried out in the household. This patriarchal family was the most ancient organized social institution in the primitive society.

Through the process of marriage the families began to expand and they gave birth to gen which stands for a household. Several gens made one clan. A group of clans constituted a tribe. A confederation of various tribes based on blood relations for the purpose of defending themselves against the aggressors formed one commonwealth which is called the state. Sir Henry Maine’s analysis of the growth of the state is- “The elementary group is the family connected by the common subjection to the highest male ascendant. The aggregation of families forms the gens or the houses. The aggregation of houses makes the tribe. The aggregation of the tribes constitutes the commonwealth.”

Edward Jenks who is the other advocate of the patriarchal theory is of the view that the foundation of the state was caused by three factors, namely male kinship, permanent marriages and paternal authority. Thus, the salient feature of the patriarchal theory is that the families grew through the descendants of the father, not the mother. The male child carried on the population though marriages with one or several women, because both monogamy and polygamy were the order of the day. The eldest male child had a prominent role in the house.

Another important supporter of this theory was Aristotle. According to him- “Just as men and women unite to form families, so many families unite to form villages and the union of many villages forms the state which is a self-supporting unit”. As for documentary evidence in support of this theory, there were twelve tribes who formed the Jewish nation as we gather from the Bible. In Rome, we are told that the patriarch of three families that made one unit exercised unlimited authority over the other members.

State is an enlargement of the family. Originally the family consisted of a man, his wife and children. The father was the head of the family and his control and authority was complete in all respects over all its members. When his children married there was expansion in the original family and it led to the establishment of new families. But the authority of the father and head of the original family remained as before, and it was duly acknowledged by all his descendants. This constituted the patriarchal family. The chief exponent of the patriarchal theory is Sir Henry Maine.

The following important points may be noted in Patriarchal theory

* In the Patriarchal family the element of paternity was the chief fact.
* Descent was traced not only through males and from the same ancestor. None of the descendants of a female was included in the primitive notion of family relationship. Kinship was accordingly, purely negative.
* Permanent marriage was the rule whether monogamy or polygamy
* The Head of the family was the basis of all authority, and his power was unqualified over his children and their houses and other relations of all descendants howsoever numerous.

He controlled not only the business affairs of the group which he headed but its religion and its conduct. The family was the primal unit of political society, 'the seed led of all larger growths of governments, 'as Woodrow Wilson calls it. The single family had developed into several families; yet all of them were fully conscious of their ultimate kinship. Bound together by ties of common ancestors, they associated in a wider common fellowship group, the gens, owing allegiance to some elected elder - perhaps the oldest living ascendant or the most capable. Similarly, the gens broadened into the tribe. The pastoral pursuits gave way to agriculture and settled life on a definite land became a matter of necessity; land tribes united to form the state.

In support of his statement, Sir Henry Maine cited the patriarchs of the Old Testament 'families' and 'brotherhood' of Athens, the patriapotestos in Rome and the Hindu Joint family system in India.

**Strengths of Patriarchal Theory**

* It is a socially –constructed system where males have primary power.
* It affects many aspects of life, from political leadership, business management, religious institutions, economic systems and property ownership, right down to the family home where men are considered to be head of the household.

**FORCE THEORY**

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 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.”

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-Bern hardy and Treitschke 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.

**Strengths of Force 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.
* The theory of force, though untenable as an explanation of the origin of the state, has some redeeming features
* Secondly, the other silver lining of the theory is that it made the slates conscious of building adequate defense and army to protect the territorial integrity of the state. That is why we find commanders of war or Senavati as an important post in the ancient kingdoms.
* In the modern state, we find a substantial amount of money used on defense budget. Every use of force in modern statecraft too.

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.

**MARXIAN THEORY OF ORIGIN OF THE STATE:**

The Marxists are of the view that the state is a creation by the class-struggle with the help of force. 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. The Marxists began with the primitive society where there was no surplus wealth to quarrel with and so there was no state.

With the passing of time, society was getting split over hostile classes with conflicting interests. This class antagonism was the root cause of the state. When agriculture was learnt as an art of culture there was ample food which resulted in private property. The insoluble contra-dictions as a result of division of labor became so acute that it was not possible for any class to keep reconciled in the state or to keep the quarrelling classes under control. The most dominant class that controlled the mode of production came to establish the state to ensure its dominance over the other classes who did not own the modes of production. The state thus became an instrument of domination and oppression of one class over the other classes.

Thus the state came in to ensure the right of the dominant class to exploit the other classes. As the dominant classes kept on changing hands so also changed the character of the state. So V. G. Afanasyev in his book Marxist Philosophy maintained that the state was not imposed from outside, but it was a product of society’s internal development at a certain stage of development. With the break-up of the social order ensued class-conflict which the society became powerless to dispel.

Emphasizing the economic factor as the key element in the class struggle, Fred rich Engels observed- “But in order that these antagonisms, classes with conflicting economic interests, might not consume themselves and society in sterile struggle, a power seemingly standing above society became necessary for the purpose of moderating the conflict, of keeping it within the bounds of ‘order’ and this power, arisen out of society, but placing itself above it and increasingly alienating itself from it is the state.”

The state was the medium of the economically dominant classes. V.I. Lenin developed on the above thesis by bringing the communist party as the dominant class, namely the proletariat and his state, namely the USSR where the proletariat was the dominant class which was to exploit the other classes. Lenin also emphasized on the element of force to be resorted to by the proletariat against the bourgeois. Thus Lenin incorporated the element of force too in the creation of the state.

The Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci made a little departure from the Marxist tenet by stating that a state is the creation of the political party that holds on power. According to him, the political party is the “modern prince”, evidently using the expression of N. Machiavelli. He went to the extent of asserting that the party represents the national popular collective will and aims at the realization of a higher and total form of modern civilization. Here we find that the author is more in agreement with the German idealist Hegel than the Marxists.

This is in broad analysis of the Marxist views as culled from the writings and opinions of Engels, Lenin and Gramsci. Now we shall draw up the criticism of it. Commanders of war or Senavati as an important post in the ancient kingdoms. In the modern state, we find a substantial amount of money used on defense budget. Every state in the modern world has got a defense minister which unmistakably recognizes the use of force in modern statecraft too.

**Strengths of Marxism Theory**

1**. It tends to create a system of true equality**: Although Marxism’s system of government is considered as communism, it places an emphasis on human rights, with its foundation encompassing equal gender roles, health care and access to education. As Marx believed, there should be equality before the law and societal services, where everyone has an equal stance and opportunity with no dominant gender. This means that every person would be able to get access to the most important things he needs regardless of whatever he does, wherever he lives or how much he makes to provide a better living for those depending on him.

2. **It offers benefits to the society:** If you look at the Marxist theory, it considers society as a whole, which means that it acknowledges all the social forces involved, including the power interests of different groups. Stressing the role of class struggle or conflict within society between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, it is effective in explaining change in society. In essence, it organizes society under capitalism, where the bourgeoisie tends to maximize profit with the proletariat.

3. **It helps with capitalism;** Ironically, when huge multi-nationals dominate the entire world economy, capital advocates would tell us that the future lies with small businesses or always state that “Small is beautiful”. However, we can consider that the youthful phase of capitalism is gone beyond recall. But as far as Marxism is concerned, free competition inevitably begets monopoly, where the struggle between big and small capitals always yields to the same result. In modern times, the vast power of multi-nationals and monopolies seems to exercise a total stranglehold on the world, holding access to economies of scale, staggering sums of money, ability to manipulate commodity prices and even the influence of government policies. Now, Marxism was able to predict the inevitable tendency towards monopolization, where free competition was a standard.

4. **It reduces the tendency of debt:** Under the Marxist philosophy, communities will be working together to achieve success, where all people would come together to provide for each other, with the help of the government distributing resources as required.

5. **It protects the rights of unions**: Rather than exploiting managers, Marxism encourages unions to stand up for personal rights, creating a system of checks and balances for a maximum production level to be achieved. As it is believed that this philosophy never exploits workers by management, followers believe that unions are definitely a great idea.
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