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

A newly acquired citizenship can be lost or retained at any point in time but this is totally dependent on the behavior of the individual in question.

 A Lebanese that has just newly acquired citizenship can retain his citizenry by;

1. **Following rules and regulations;**

 Rules and regulations are instilled doctrines documented in the constitution to ensure the safety and guidance of citizens in a country. These rules are set aside by the legislative arm of government. If the Lebanese is of good behavior and does not go against rules and regulations, he or she is likely to retain his citizenship as a Nigerian for a while.

1. **Payment of dues and taxes;**

Taxes refer to the percentage of money that is subtracted from income earners in an economy. This money is used to provide the essential and basic amenities of the society to make life easier. A Lebanese can retain his citizenry by continuous payment of taxes and dues like rent and electricity bills.

1. **Voting during elections;**

Voting is the act of choosing a leader to represent a group of people in the society and make decisions on behalf of them. As a new Nigerian citizen, the Lebanese can choose to vote during elections whether he likes it or not but naturally a citizen of any country is expected to vote during election.

1. **Respect the rights of individuals;**

 Rights are referred to those privileges we are allowed to enjoy as citizens of a country or as human beings in general. Some of the rights of individuals include; right to life, right to freedom of association, right to religion and others. To retain his citizenship as a Lebanese, he does not go around to violate the rights of other individuals in the society.

1. **Be vigilante;**

To be vigilante means to be watchful of one’s environment in case of trouble like theft and robberies. However, this is not necessary to keep one’s citizenship it would be explicit for the Lebanese to point out culprits in his or her neighborhood and the police to bring them to justice.

 It is already stated in Sec 30. (1) of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria that the president may deprive a person who is a citizen of Nigeria if the person has been sentenced to imprisonment for a term of not more than three years. In order for this Lebanese to also lose his citizenship here are a few things that he or she a do to lose this newly acquired citizenship if he or she;

1. **Does not follow rules and regulations;**

If the rules and regulations are not followed by this Lebanese individual he or she can be sentenced to an amount of time in prison and his citizenship can be revoked.

1. **Does not have loyalty;**

 If the Lebanese citizen is not loyal to Nigeria and patriotic or he or she betrays Nigeria by leaking official secrets and various other information concerning the state, this citizenship can be revoked.

1. **Damages and vandalization of government properties;**

Vandalization means to spoil or to destroy. If the Lebanese should by any means destroy government property on purpose or while still in good mental position and is caught by the authorities, his citizenship is likely to be revoked.

1. **Violation of the rights of other individuals;**

 If the Lebanese should violate the rights of other individuals by either trespassing, killing, raping or robbing people he or she can be charged to court and can serve an amount of time in jail and his citizenry can be revoked or lost.

1. **Refusal to pay taxes and dues;**

Exercising constraint when it is time for dues to be paid or taxes can lead to arrest and hence the revoking of his or her citizenry. The Lebanese should therefore pay taxes and dues when the need calls for it.

**Social contract theory explains the evolution of states, what other theories explain the same and their strengths?**

 **Social Contract Theory;**

 The Divine theory established the ‘Divine Rights’ of kings. In contradiction, the social contract theory emphasized that the state was not the creation of God but it was the result of an agreement entered into by men who originally had no government organisation. The history of world is divided into two periods; the period before the state was initiated and the period after. In the first period there was no government. There was no law that could be enforced as there was no human authority to formulate and to enforce them. Man lived in a state of nature, in which they were subject to follow only such regulation that nature was supposed to prescribe. How men lived in the state of nature without coercive agency of a government, what made them establish a government, the term of contract and the party to contract where discussed in the theory. One thing accepted by all the exponents of the theory was that the state was a human creation as a result of contract. The concept of social contract was found in the political treatises of both east and west. Kautilya in his Arthasasthra mentioned that “the king Manu supported the payment of one-sixth of the grains grown and one-tenth of their sovereign dues, the king took the responsibility of maintaining the safety and security of their citizen. Plato in his Crito stated that Socrates was represented as awaiting calmly the execution though it was unjust, because he would not breakup his contract with the state by escaping from prison into exit. Milton in his “Tenure of Kings and Magistrates” argued that men were born free, and that wrong sprang up through Adam’s sin, wherefore to avert their own complete destruction men agreed by common league to bind each other from mutual injury, jointly to defend themselves against anything that gave disturbance or opposition of such agreement. The power of kings and magistrates is nothing else “but what is only derivative transferred and committed to them in trust from the people, to the common good of them all in whom the power yet reminds fundamentally, and cannot be taken them, without the violation of their natural birth right”.

Value of the theory; With all its defects the theory has certain merits. It emphasized the state to ensure safety and protection of its subjects. The civil society rests on the consent of the ruled and not on the ruler which paved way for modern democracy. Man born free and after the contract.

**Force Theory:**

 The exponents of the force theory were of the view that the origin of state and its development was based on force, that is, force used by the strong over the weak and their consequent control over them. In such a way, wherever the strong group out did the weak the strong became the master and ruled the weak. The strong group became vested with ruling power and the defeated were made their subjects. According to the Jenks “Historically, there is not even the slightest difficulty in proving that all political communities of the modern type owe their existence to the successful warfare”. The warring clans and tribes established their authority in a definite territory. Their chief became the ruler on the basis of his physical force. The state is born out of force. Exist in force and die in the absence of force. According to Bluntschli, force is an indispensable element of the organization of the state. In the two world wars, Great Britain defended its territory against the Nazi forces only with the military power. Further, the Russian military power stopped the aggression of the German forces.

The force theory is scientific, its application could be seen through the historical incidents. Herbert Spencers doctrine of the “Survival of the Fittest” proves and upholds the theory. Through “blood and iron” some greatest states have been established.

**Evolutionary theory:**

All the five theories were analysed before regarding ‘The Origin of the State’ is inadequate, incomplete, defective and speculative. It was not able to give the true and correct explanation of the origin of the state. It was lacking on the ground of logic, legal, philosophical and historical defect. It is an assumption and the emphasis are on the one or two facts which is insufficient to come to a definite conclusion. In this regard, Dr. Garner has aptly stated, “the state is neither the hand work of God; nor the result of superior physical force; nor the creation of resolution of convention, nor a mere expansion of family. The state is not a mere artificial creation but an institution or natural growth of historical evolution”.

**The theory of Divine Origin**

 This is the oldest theory among the origin of the state. It stated about the right of kings. The formal statement of this theory is that the state has been established by and ordinates of God; its rulers divinely appointed; they are accountable to no authority but God, as described in Bible. The combination of earlier rulers where of priest and king or the magic man and king. According to Maclver, the magic man was priest and king. All are combined as one. In the epic Mahabarath, it is recorded God appointed Manu to rule the people as per their request to protect them James in his work “The Law of Free Monarchies”, kings are justly called God, for they exercise a manner of resemblance of divine power on earth, King are accountable for God only. The people cannot question him for the right or wrong done by him. James has stated the following rights of the king in Law of free Monarchies:

1. Monarchy is divinely oriented.
2. Hereditary right is indispensable
3. Kings are accountable for God alone.
4. Resistance to lawful king is sin.
5. This theory has supporters only among the religious people. It has been nullified for being unhistorical, irrational and unscientific. Its merit was a powerful factor in preserving order and strengthening the respect of man, property and government and it reveals itself in the political organization.