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(1). A Lebanese as well as any other person can both retain or loss his or her citizen status in various ways...  
  
According to the Nigerian citizen act enacted by the government of Nigeria a person can gain citizenship by  
• Birth  
• Registration   
• Naturalisation   
Given the fact that a Lebanese by the issue of the title the person has already acquired Citizenship by being born in Lebanon therefore a Lebanese can gain a dual Nigerian citizenship by registration and naturalisation.  
• Registration   
According to this act..26. (1) Subject to the provisions of section 28 of this Constitution, a person to whom the provisions of this section apply may be registered as a citizen of Nigeria, if the  
  
President is satisfied that -  
  
(a) He is a person of good character; two people to testify to that which one should a Religious minister...  
  
(b) He has shown a clear intention of his desire to be domiciled in Nigeria; and  
  
(c) He has taken the Oath of Allegiance prescribed in the Seventh Schedule to this Constitution.  
  
(2) The provisions of this section shall apply to-  
  
(a) Any woman who is or has been married to a citizen of Nigeria or every person of full age and capacity born outside Nigeria any of whose grandparents is a citizen of Nigeria.  
  
• Naturalisation   
  
By naturalization: 27. (1) Subject to the provisions of section 28 of this  
  
Constitution, any person who is qualified in accordance with the provisions of this section may apply to the President for the same of a certificate of naturalisation.  
  
(2) No person shall be qualified to apply for the grant of a certificate or naturalisation, unless he satisfies the  
  
President that -  
  
\* (a) He is a person of full age and capacity;  
  
\* (b) He is a person of good character;  
  
\* (c) He has shown a clear intention of his desire to be domiciled in Nigeria;  
  
\* (d) He is, in the opinion of the Governor of the State where he is or he proposes to be resident, acceptable to the local community in which he is to live permanently, and has been assimilated into the way of life of Nigerians in that part of the Federation;  
  
\* (e) He is a person who has made or is capable of making useful contribution to the advancement; progress and wellbeing of Nigeria;  
  
\* (f) He has taken the Oath of Allegiance prescribed in the Seventh Schedule to this Constitution; and  
  
\* (g) He has, immediately preceding the date of his application, either-  
  
(i) Resided in Nigeria for a continuousperiod of fifteen years; or  
  
(ii) Resided in Nigeria continuously for aperiod of twelve months, and during the period of twenty years immediately preceding that period of twelve months has resided in Nigeria for periods amounting in the aggregate to not less than fifteen years.  
  
28. (1) Subject to the other provisions of this section, a person shall forfeit forthwith his Nigerian citizenship if, not being a citizen of Nigeria by birth, he acquires or retains the citizenship or nationality of a  
  
country, other than Nigeria, of which he is not a citizen by birth.  
  
Retaining citizenship   
  
Since the lebanese ministry of migration has allowed for dual citizenship and also the Nigerian constitution, a Lebanese may retain his leadership as long as he or she has been naturalized or registered.  
  
Losing citizenship in Nigeria  
  
VOLUNTARY: Voluntary renunciation of Nigerian citizenship is permitted by law. Contact the Embassy for details and required paperwork. INVOLUNTARY: The following are grounds for involuntary loss of Nigerian citizenship: Registered or Naturalized citizen voluntarily acquires the citizenship of a foreign country.  
  
Naturalized citizen, before seven years of residence, sentenced to prison for three years or more. Registered or Naturalized citizen is convicted of acts of disloyalty to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.  
  
29. (1) Any citizen of Nigeria of full age who wishes to renounce his Nigerian citizenship shall make a declaration in the prescribed manner for the renunciation.  
  
(2) The President shall cause thedeclaration made under subsection (1) of this section to be registered and upon such registration, the person who made the declaration shall cease to be a citizen of Nigeria.  
  
(3) The President may withhold theregistration of any declaration made under subsection (1) of this section if-  
  
(a) The declaration is made during any warin which Nigeria is physically involved; or  
  
(b) In his opinion, it is otherwise contrary topublic policy.  
  
(4) For the purposes of subsection (1) of this section.  
  
(a) "full age" means the age of eighteenyears and above;  
  
(b) Any woman who is married shall bedeemed to be of full age.  
  
30. (1) The President may deprive a person, other than a person who is a citizen of Nigeria by birth or by registration, of his citizenship, if he is satisfied that such a person has, within a period of seven years after becoming naturalized, been sentenced to imprisonment for a term of not less than three years.  
  
(2) The President shall deprive a person, other than a person who is citizen of Nigeria by birth, of his citizenship, if he is satisfied from the records of proceedings of a court of law or other tribunal or after due inquiry in accordance with regulations made by him, that -  
  
(a) The person has shown himself by actor speech to be disloyal towards the Federal Republic of Nigeria; or  
  
(b) The person has, during any war inwhich Nigeria was engaged, unlawfully traded with the enemy or been engaged in or associated with any business that was in the opinion of the president carried on in such a manner as to assist the enemy of Nigeria in that war, or unlawfully communicated with such enemy to the detriment of or with intent to cause damage to the interest of Nigeria.  
  
31. For the purposes of this Chapter, aparent or grandparent of a person shall be deemed to be a citizen of Nigeria if at the time of the birth of that person such parent or grandparent would have possessed that status by birth if he had been alive on the date of independence; and in this section, "the date of independence" has the meaning assigned to it in section 25 (2) of this Constitution.  
  
32. (1) The president may make regulations, not inconsistent with this Chapter, prescribing all matters which are required or permitted to be prescribed or which are necessary or convenient to be prescribed for carrying out or giving effect to the provisions of this Chapter, and for granting special immigrant status with full residential rights to non-Nigerian spouses of citizens of Nigeria who do not wish to acquire Nigerian citizenship.  
  
(2) Any regulations made by the president pursuant to the provisions of this section  
  
shall be laid before the National Assembly NIGERIA.  
  
  
  
(2)  
  
  
1. Divine Origin Theory:  
  
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.  
  
 2. The Patriarchal Theory as the Origin of the State:  
  
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 organised 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  
  
 3. The Matriarchal Theory as the Origin of the State:  
  
The chief exponents of the matriarchal theory are Morgan, Meclennan 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 organised 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.  
  
4. 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.”  
  
5. Marxician 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 labour 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.  
  
Emphasising the economic factor as the key element in the class struggle, Fredrich 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 emphasised 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 realisation of a higher and total form of modern civilisation. 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.  
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