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ANSWER TO QUESTION 1

A Lebanese man can retain his newly acquired citizenship as long as he remains a law abiding citizen .He should

1. Obey the law
2. Pay his taxes
3. Render national service
4. Remain loyal to the nation
5. Respect for other citizens rights
6. Respect for national symbols
7. Reporting crimes and criminals

LOSS OF CITIZENSHIP

There are generally two categories of grounds for loss of citizenship.Involuntary loss may occur due to either automatic lapse of citizenship from the citizen for failure to take some action to retain citizenship, or active withdrawal of citizenship by the country. In contrast, "voluntary loss", often called "relinquishment" or "renunciation", is initiated by the citizen.[2It is not always easy to make a clean distinction between the two categories: loss of citizenship due to an initial cause undertaken voluntarily (for example, voluntarily serving in a foreign military or voluntarily naturalising as a citizen of a foreign country) could be seen either as "voluntary loss" or "involuntary loss".[2]A Lebanese can lose his newly acquired Nigerian citizenship if he is found guilty of;

1. Voluntary acquisition of another citizenship
2. Residing abroad on a permanent basis
3. Fraud in the naturalisation process, including [sham marriages](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sham_marriage), or failure to give up the other citizenship in countries which require that as a condition of naturalisation
4. Serving in a foreign military or foreign government
5. Upon adoption by a foreign citizen, or other change in the child's legal relation to the parents such as annulment of maternity/paternity
6. For a minor, upon the loss of citizenship by the parents
7. Failure to fulfill conditions.
8. Voluntary renunciation

Involuntary loss of citizenship does not necessarily mean automatic and immediate loss. Even if a country's laws state that under certain circumstances citizenship is automatically removed, until officials of the government or embassy are informed, that country's government will probably still retain that person's name in its citizenship records.[[4]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Loss_of_citizenship#cite_note-4)

The Lebanese man can also loose his citizenship when his act and conduct has been confirmed to be inconsistent with the provisions of the constitution. Take for instance where:

* Such person(s) has committed an act of treason or an attempt to overthrow the government by force and being convicted by a court of law or tribunal may be deprived of his citizenship by the president although subject to the fact that such person is not a citizen by birth. **see S. 30 (2) of the 1999 constitution**
* Such person(s) has traded or assisted the enemy of Nigeria during the time of war with the intent to cause damage to the interest of Nigeria. **See S. 30 (2) (b) of the 1999 constitution**

ANSWER TO QUESTION 2

.Political thinkers and philosophers have tried and attempted to trace out and explain

the origin of the state in various methods, according to the nature and the social condition

prevailed at the time of their thinking. However, there is no valid answer to “what is the

origin of the state”? There were many contradictions in the thesis on what the origin of

States. Nowhere in the history has it been recorded when the state came into existence. There

were various beliefs regarding the origin of the state, some believe that the origin of the state

lie in the hands of God whereas others believe that they are based on social contract and some

trust on single force, the family or the process of evolution.Here are some of the theories that have been developed over the years

1. Divine origin/rights theory
2. Evolutionary theory
3. Force theory
4. Sociological theory
5. Patriarchal theory
6. Matriarchal theory
7. Marxician theory

### 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.

**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.

STRENGHTS OF THE DIVINE RIGHTS 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.

2) EVOLUTIONARY THEORY

According to **evolutionary theory**, government originates from a family or clan-bound structure, which can explain the formation of the world's first political structures. These earliest and very loosely formed governments were the result of a shift from hunter-gatherer societies to more settled agricultural societies. As families joined to form clans and clans joined to form villages, the need for leaders and a central organizational structure developed. These leaders helped determine how to address still unfamiliar issues, such as water rights for crop irrigation and the distribution of other resources. They also provided an increased sense of safety and security for the society. In many early societies, these first states developed monarchies, with rule based on membership in a ruling family. In modern times, some governments continue to be led by a succession of members from the same family. For example, in the monarchy of Saudi Arabia, the king has been descended from the Āl Saʿūd family since 1744.

J W Burgers reported that “state has a continuous development of human society out

of a grossly imperfect beginning through crude but improving forms of manifestation towards

a perfect and universal organization of mankind”48. According to Leacock “the state is a

growth, an evolution, the result of a gradual process running through out all the known

history of men and receiving into remote and unknown past”49. A detailed examination of the

rise of the state resulted in that there were many factors which have contributed for the

evolution of the state.

Thus, the important factors contributed to the growth of the state are

1. Natural Instinct

2. Kinship

3. Religion

4. Property and defense

5. Force

6. Political Consciousness

Further, investigation reveals that the facts contributed played different role in

attaining the constituent portion of the statehood. The method adopted by each community

varies from each other and is different according to environment. In this regard, Sumner and

Keller rightly pointed out that “As there are no charms or even sharply marked lines of

demarcation between periods of evolution but zones of transition only, it is impossible to say

at what point the state first appears as it is to determine when moral becomes law or at what

hour the child becomes youth or youth a man.

# 3) Force Theory Of Origin Of State

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.

## History of 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.

STRENGHTS OF THE 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. 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

4) SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY OF THE STATE

To the originally, purely sociological, idea of the state, I have added the economic phase and formulated it as follows:

What, then, is the state as a sociological concept? The state, completely in its genesis, essentially and almost completely during the first stages of its existence, is a social institution, forced by a victorious group of men on a defeated group, with the sole purpose of regulating the dominion of the victorious group over the vanquished, and securing itself against revolt from within and attacks from abroad. Teleologically, this dominion had no other purpose than the economic exploitation of the vanquished by the victors.

No primitive state known to history originated in any other manner. Wherever a reliable tradition reports otherwise, either it concerns the amalgamation of two fully developed primitive states into one body of more complete organization; or else it is an adaptation to men of the fable of the sheep that made a bear their king in order to be protected against the wolf. But even in this latter case, the form and content of the state became precisely the same as in those states where nothing intervened, and which became immediately "wolf states."

The little history learned in our school days suffices to prove this generic doctrine. Everywhere we find some warlike tribe of wild men breaking through the boundaries of some less-warlike people, settling down as nobility and founding its state. In Mesopotamia, wave follows wave, state follows state — Babylonians, Amorites, Assyrians, Arabs, Medes, Persians, Macedonians, Parthians, Mongols, Seljuks, Tartars, Turks; on the Nile, Hyksos, Nubians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Turks; in Greece, the Doric states are typical examples; in Italy, Romans, Ostrogoths, Lombards, Franks, Germans; in Spain, Carthaginians, Visigoths, Arabs; in Gaul, Romans, Franks, Burgundians, Normans; in Britain, Saxons, Normans. In India wave upon wave of warlike clans has flooded over the country even to the islands of the Indian Ocean. So also is it with China. In the European colonies, we find the selfsame type, wherever a settled element of the population has been found, as for example, in South American and Mexico. Where that element is lacking, where only roving huntsmen are found, who may be exterminated but not subjugated, the conquerors resort to the device of importing from afar masses of men to be exploited, to be subject perpetually to forced labor, and thus the slave trade arises.

### ****5) 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.

STRENGHTS OF THE PATRIACIAL THEORY

Mc Herman, Morgan and Jenks condoned the patriarchal theory on the ground that

Matriarchal families are prior to patriarchal families, that is, the process by which the families

develop from clans into tribes. (According to Maine’s concept, ‘however the tribe in their

earliest and the primary groups and then comes the clan and finally comes the family

**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.

**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.”**

STRENGHTS OF THE MARXICIAN THEORY OF STATE

**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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