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A citizen is an individual who is a legal member of a country or state who owes allegiance to a particular country he or she resides in which the person enjoys full civil rights and political rights. As citizens we have fundamental human rights, duties and obligations. There are different types of human rights which are social, political, economic, legal and civic rights. A citizen has the right to vote and be voted for. The government is meant to provide essential amenities like good roads, infrastructure and health care facilities for citizens which in turn citizens are meant to obey rules and regulations, payment of tax and levies.

There are four methods of acquiring citizenship which are:

1. Citizenship by birth: A person can acquire citizenship of a given state even if the parents are not from the country or place e.g. a child born in Britain by Nigerian parents can claim citizenship of Britain.
2. Citizenship by Naturalization: A citizen of another country who has lived in another country for a long period; for example fifteen years as in the case in Nigeria can apply for citizenship of the country he resides. Before the application is approved by the government of the country, the applicant must fulfill other conditions which vary from country to country, he or she must marry a citizen, have good character, must be capable of contributing usefully to the advancement and progress of the country, renounce his former nationality etc. If the application is accepted, the applicant will take the oath of allegiance and a certificate of naturalization will be issued to him or her.
3. Citizenship by registration or marriage: This is a method by which a person or non-citizen can acquire citizenship through marriage e.g. a South African woman married to a Nigerian may register as a citizen of Nigeria. The person must reside in Nigeria and should take the oath of allegiance and renounce her South African citizenship.
4. Honorary Citizenship: This is when citizenship of a country is granted to a distinguished or eminent foreigner without the usual requirements as a mark of honor e.g. Miriam Makeba, a citizen of South African was honored with the citizenship of Liberia, Ethiopia and Guinea.

Duties and Obligations of a citizen

There are many duties and obligations of a citizen which are:

1. Law abiding: Every citizen is expected to obey all laws of his country including traffic laws irrespective of his position.
2. Payment of Taxes: A good citizen is expected to pay all the taxes due to him as at when due from which government can provide him and others essential services.
3. Loyalty: Every citizen owes loyalty to the government, his community and even to himself as one of his duties.
4. Civic Responsibilities: It is also the responsibilities of a good citizen to register during registration exercise and vote during elections if he is qualified to do so.
5. Care of Public Property: A good citizen should always take good care of public property whether placed in his custody or not whenever he comes in contact with it.
6. Honesty: A good citizen is obliged to exhibit high degree of honest when dealing with the government of his country and other citizens.
7. Respect for National symbols: It is obligatory of every good citizen to show respect to national symbols like the national flag, coat of arms which stands as a symbol of authority.

Citizen and Their Rights

UDHR (Universal declaration of human rights) was established by the UN assembly on December 10th 1948. This declares that human rights are inevitable and universal which cannot be changed. It was formed after the second world war .There are so many rights that are important to human life which cannot be taken easily from citizens expect when they are guilty of crimes they commit. They are;

1. Right to life
2. Right to freedom of speech and expression
3. Right to peaceful assembly and association
4. Right to fair and equal hearing
5. Right to freedom from discrimination
6. Right to freedom of movement
7. Right to education
8. Right to vote and be voted for
9. Right to ownership of property
10. Right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

Who is a Lebanese?

A Lebanese is a person from Lebanon or of a Lebanese descent.

Conditions a Lebanese must satisfy before he or she can become a Nigerian citizen

1. The person must have lived in the country for a long period of time which may range from 15-20 years:
2. The person must marry a citizen for about five years.
3. He or she must have a good character with an outstanding reputation.
4. At least two people must attest to his or her conduct.
5. The person must be of age in other words he must be eighteen years above.
6. The person must take the oath of allegiance.
7. He or she must be capable of contributing usefully to the advancement and progress of Nigeria.
8. The non-citizen must renounce his former nationality.
9. He has shown clear intention of his desire to be domiciled in Nigeria

Ways a citizen could forfeit his acquired citizenship

There are so many ways a citizen can forfeit their citizenship which are

1. If the citizen renounces his citizenship:

The person must send a letter of renunciation to the nearest Lebanese embassy or consulate. The embassy will forward the renunciation to Lebanon. The embassy will notify the individual if the renunciation is approved.

1. He can forfeit his acquired citizenship if the government of his country denies him of such right: If the person is not able to meet the president or the country’s expectations of becoming a citizen, he or she is denied of such right.
2. If he or she is jailed for more than three years within seven years the person acquired citizenship: If the person is jailed for more than three years within seven years of acquiring citizenship, he or she is irresponsible and will not be productive for himself and the country at large. The person can bring shame to the society and country at large.
3. If the citizen is found guilty of treasonable felony: The person who is now a citizen can lose his citizenship by committing a serious crime like killing someone. The person loses the right as a citizen of the country (Nigeria) and maybe sentenced to death if the crime being committed is serious.
4. If the activities of the citizen are prejudicial to the corporate existence and interest of the country: The activities of the citizen can be bad in the aspect of criminal activities like Boko Haram or being a spy to another country or your work placing a threat to the wellbeing of the country.
5. If there is a fundamental breach of the citizenship agreement binding him or her for example false declaration: If there is a breach to agreement binding the person to the country, the person loses his or her citizenship like claiming to be another person while you are not which is highly punishable by law.
6. If the citizen joins any subversive organization within the five years he acquired the citizenship: If the citizen joins any organization that is illegal and against the peace of the nation, he or her rights as citizen would be aborted and might end up in jail.
7. If the citizen has a dual citizenship that if he has not renounced the citizenship of his former country.

2. A State can be defined as a group of people living in a particular geographical territory with citizens to obey rules and regulations free from internal and external attack or interference.

There are many theories of state which are social contract theory, divine theory, evolution theory etc. These theories talk about evolution of states, gives reasons and enable us to understand, find out problems, causes, effects and solution.

1. Divine theory of state:

Divine theory is the oldest theory about the origin of state. It is also known as the theory of divine right of kings. The exponents or founders of this theory believe that 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. 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 medival 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. Obedience to the king is ordained to God and violation of it will be 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 conception of the divine creation of the state may be traced back to remote antiquity. It was a universal belief with the ancient people that the king is the representative of god on earth and the state is a bliss of God. The king has both political and religious entity. They believe that the state is created by God. The Stuart King James 1 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 had no right to rebel against him. 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. The European kings took shelter under the divine origin theory in order to justify their dictatorships. During a large part of human history the state was viewed as direct divine creation and theocratic in nature. Religion was considered to be the chief motive force of all human activities. Both the church and the state in their mutual rivalry used the theory of the divine origin in the medieval age. In the twentieth century, divine theory came under criticism being an incorrect explanation of the origin of the state. With the growth of scientific outlook the theory faded into oblivion.

Causes of the decline of divine theory

In the first place, when a more acceptable theory like the social contract came out, divine theory was outdated. The new theory suggested that the state is a handiwork of men, not a grace of God.

In the second place, the emergence of democracy was a big blow for the autocratic dogma of mixing religion with politics.

In the third place, the growth of scientific enquiry and materialistic view of the political mechanism. The result is that the blind faith and superstition was no longer acceptable. People begin to accept those things that stood the test of logic and reasoning.

Criticism of divine theory

1. Modern political thinkers cannot accept the view that God has anything to do with the creation of state.
2. The divine theory is unrealistic because a bad ruler will continue to rule under divine shield e.g. James 11 of England and Louis XVI of France.
3. The New Testament of the Bible reversed the divine conception of the state as ingrained in the Old Testament.
4. Divine theory is unscientific, anthropologists and sociologists after careful scientific analysis have discarded the theory as totally untenable as an explanation of the origin of state.

Value of Divine theory

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

1. It stimulated discipline and law abidingness among the subjects
2. It created moral responsibility of the rulers because they were cast with divine injunction to rule to the perfect satisfaction of heaven.
3. Patriarchal theory as the origin of state:

The principle exponents of this theory is Sir Henry Maine.

According to him, the state is 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 wields great power and influence upon other members of his family.

His writ was carried out in the household. The 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 generation which stands for a household. 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. It makes tribe and the aggregation of the tribe constitutes the commonwealth. ” Edward Jenks is the other advocate of the patriarchal theory is of the view that the foundation of the state was caused by three factors which are male kinship, permanent marriages and paternal authority. The salient feature of the patriarchal theory is that the families grew through the descendants of the father, not the mother. Both monogamy and polygamy were the order of the day. The eldest male child has a prominent role in the house.

Criticism of the Theory

1. 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.

1. The patriarchal theory is built on the wrong premise that the patriarchal family was the origin of 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.
2. Sir Henry Maine over simplified the origin of the state by attributing it to the family alone. It is because of this 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 children grow in age. But the authority of the state over population is perpetual.
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 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 though study of the tribes of Australia came to the conclusion that the Australia tribes were organized in some sort of tribes known as totem groups. Their affinity was not on the basis of blood relationship but through 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 was introduce. Examples of matriarchal system are princess ruling over Maratha countries, Queen ruling over Malabar.

Criticism of the theory:

1. Firstly, like the patriarchal theory, this theory also mistakenly analyses the origin of the family as the origin of the state. The state is something more expanded family. They are quite different in essence, organization, functions and purposes.
2. Secondly, the theory is historically false. It is not a fact of history that the matriarchal system was the only system at a particular time. Patriarchal system and matriarchal system prevailed side-by-side.
3. Thirdly, 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.
4. Force Theory of 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 human beings. By emphasizing 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. The theory of force was supported by German philosophers like Friedrich Hegel, Immanuel Kant, John Bernhardi and Treitschke. They maintain that war and force are the deciding factors in the creation of the state. Today in the words of Treitschke- “State is power; it is a sin for a state to be weak. That state is the public power of offence and defense. The grandeur of history lies in the perpetual conflict of nations and the appeal to arms will be valid until the end of history”.

According to Bernhardi- “Might is the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrement of war. War gives a biologically just decision since its decision rest on the very nature of things”.

The exponents of this theory hold 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 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 their 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 the 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 to empire is but a continuation from the same process”.

 Criticism of the theory:

1. The element of force is not the only factor in the origin of the state; religion, politics, family and process of evolution are behind the foundation of the state. Thus to say that force is the origin of the state is to commit the same fallacy that one of the causes is responsible for a thing while all causes were at work for it.
2. The theory of force runs counter to the universally accepted maxim of Thomas Hill Green-“Will, not force, is the basis of the state”. No state can be permanent by bayonets and daggers. It must have the general voluntary acceptance by the people.
3. The theory of force is inconsistent with individual liberty. The moment one accepts that the basis of a state is force, how can one expect liberty there? The theory of force may be temporarily the order of the day in despotism as against democracy.
4. The doctrine of survival of the fittest which is relied upon by the champions of the force theory has erroneously applied a system that is applicable to the animal world to human world. If force was the determining factor, how could Mahatma Gandhi’s non-violence triumph over the brute force of the British imperialists?
5. This theory is to be discarded because political consciousness rather than force is the origin of the state. Without political consciousness of the people the state cannot be created. This is because man is by nature a political animal. Political conscience that lay deep in the foundation of the state.

Merits of the theory

1. The theory contains the truth that some states at certain points of time were definitely created by force or brought into existence by the show of force.
2. This made slates conscious of building adequate defense and army to protect the territorial integrity of the state.
3. Marxician theory of origin of state :

The Marxists are of the view that state is a creation by the class-struggle with the help of force. They do not agree or support other theories. This is a different theory of origin of state with the recognition of force. 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 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 contradictions 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 quarreling 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.

 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 is to exploit the other classes. Lenin also emphasized on the element of force to be restored to by the proletariat against the bourgeois. Thus Lenin incorporated the element of force too in the creation of the state.

 Criticism of Marxist theory:

1. In the first place, it is no where stated in history that state in its origin is linked with the class struggle.
2. The Marxist theory is not original, but secondary because it carries the old wine of the force theory in a new Marxist bottle. Force has been discarded as unsatisfactory theory in the creation of state.
3. By identifying the state with the party Marxism encourages the Totalitarianism of the worst type like Fascism and Nazism making dangerous.
4. Marxist dogma that the state is a creation of the class and it will die with the death of class is false and misleading. The states are permanent and no state withered away for want of a class to back it.
5. Evolutionary theory of state:

The evolutionary theory holds the view that the state has originated through a gradual evolutionary process. Dr. Garner has aptly stated, “the state is neither the handwork of God; nor the result of superior physical force; nor the creation of resolution of convention, nor a mere expansion of family.” It treats state as a product of historical evolution or development like any other human institution. The evolutionary theory is more realistic and scientific in approach. There are key factors which played part in the evolution of the state which are; kinship, religion, force, property and defense, social instinct and political consciousness.

1. Kinship:

The important features of state namely organization and authority, command and obedience can be traced in the bond of kinship. It was based on 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 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 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.

1. Religion:

Religion provided the bond of unity in early society. It also affected walks of life. The worship of a common ancestor and common gods created a sense of social solidarity. There were 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.

1. 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. The leader of another community with enough armed forces eg enough warriors can defeat the other leader of a community through war and claim the community perhaps with the people in it, crops, money, food e.t.c.

1. Political consciousness:

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. According to Bluntschli, “desire for social life leads to organization of state”.

1. Property and defense:

The primitive people passed three stages to acquire prosperity: (1) hunt man stage, (2) herd man stage, (3) agricultural stage. In course of time, people came to know the practical use of agriculture which made settle at one place and in this way village came into existence. The art of agriculture trade developed and successfully expanded, as a result, idea of property and the interest in keeping it with them lead to conflicts. To protect the property, people of one tribe united themselves and their property. Thus in order to avoid dispute, the need for law and regulation and administer the necessity of the state were thought of. Gettle has rightly stated that as wealth increased, so the idea of property also developed and laws were needed for protection and regulation of property rights and for the settlement of property disputes. This played a huge role in developing and establishing a state.