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***ASSIGNMENT: HOW CAN A LEBANESE LOSE OR RETAIN HIS OR HER NEWLY ACQUIRED NIGERIAN CITIZENSHIP***

A Lebanese can lose his/her newly acquired Nigerian citizenship if:

•If he/she renounce his/her 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.

•If he/she has shown himself by act or speech to be disloyal towards the Federal Republic of Nigeria; citizenship or nationality of a country, other than Nigeria.

•If he/she has, during any war in which 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.

 A Lebanese can retain his/her newly acquired Nigerian citizenship if:

•If he/she is of good character and is not found wanting to any crime that may cause him/her to lose his/her citizenship.

•If he/she is not disloyal towards the federal republic of Nigeria.

•If he/she does not engage in fraud in the naturalisation process.

***ASSIGNMENT: Theories of the evolution of state***

 Other theories that explains the evolution of state apart from the social contract theory include:

•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.

 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.”

 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. 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.

 **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.

 The doctrine of divine right can be dangerous for both church and state. For the state it suggests that secular authority is conferred, and can therefore be removed, by the church, and for the church it implies that kings have a direct relationship to God and may therefore dictate to ecclesiastical rulers.

 The theory of divine origin derive their strength and authority from God. government originates with power vested in an individual by God or gods.

 **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.

•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 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.

 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.

**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.”

**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.

•Evolutionary theory/historical theory:According to this theory, the state is a historical growth and result of a gradual evolution. It is a continuous development, cannot be referred to any single moment of time, circumstance and any event, etc.

 According to Burgess, “It is a gradual realization of the universal principles of human nature. There is no single case, place and any trace of deliberate creation of men in the origination of the state, but political consciousness has played its role from early period to modernity in the origination of state.”State was originated on the basis of various causes and varying condition. They are:

a. Kinship

b. Religion

c. Political Consciousness

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.

•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.

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”. the aggressors formed one commonwealth which is called the state.

**Criticism of the Theory:**

The patriarchal theory as the origin of the state is subjected to the following criticisms:

 In the first place, the origin of the state is due to several factors like family, religion, force, political necessity, etc. So by identifying the origin of the state with family, one makes the same fallacy as taking one cause instead of several causes. To say in the words of J. C. Frazer- “Human society is built up by a complexity of causes.”

 In the second place, the theory is incorrect, because in the opinion of several critics the primary social unit was a matriarchal family rather than a patriarchal family. According to Meclennan, Morgan and Edward Jenks who are staunch supporters of the theory, the matriarchal family and polyandry were the basis of the state.The kinship through the female line in primitive society was responsible for the growth of the state. The process was that polyandry resulted into matriarchal society and the matriarchal society led to the state.

 In the third place, the patriarchal theory is built on the wrong premise that the patriarchal family was the origin of the state. Edward Jenks suggested the correct theory that tribe rather than family was the beginning of the state, on the basis of his studies in Australia and Malaya Archipelago.

 In the fourth place, Sir Henry Maine over simplified the origin of the state by attribution it to the family alone. It is because of this over simplicity that the theory has to be rejected as untenable. The authority of the father over the children is only temporary, because his authority ends when the children grow in age. But the authority of the state over the population is perpetual.

•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.

**Criticism of the Theory:**

The matriarchal theory is attacked on the following grounds:

 First, the state was created by several factors, of which the family was one. So this theory makes only a partial study of the origin of the state. Force, religion, politics, family and contract were all there to contribute to the growth of the state.

 Secondly, like the patriarchal theory, this theory also mistakenly analyses the origin of the family as the origin of the slate. The state is something more than an expanded family. They are quite different in essence, organisation, functions and purposes.

 Thirdly, the theory is historically false. It is not a fact of history that the matriarchal system was the only system at a particular time. As a matter of fact, both patriarchal system and matriarchal system prevailed side-by-side. There was a parallel development of both the systems.