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**HOW CAN LEBANESE RETAIN OR LOSE HIS OR HER NEWLY ACQUIRED CITIZENSHIP**

Citizenship is the status of a person recognized under the custom or law as being a legal member of a sovereign state or belonging to a nation. The idea of citizenship has been defined as the capacity of individuals to defend their rights in front of the governmental authority.

Firstly ways Lebanese can retain his or her newly acquired Nigerian citizenship.

* He or She must have good character so as for the citizenship not to be withheld from him or her.
* He or she must not plan or conspire against the government to over thrown the government.
* Serving in the armed forces of a country which is engaged in hostilities against Nigeria.
* To formally renounce a Nigerian in front of another Nigerian officer.

Ways a Lebanese can lose his or her citizenship.

* Also, the President may deprive A Lebanese by registration or naturalization of his citizenship if he trades with the enemy of Nigeria during the period of war in which Nigeria is physically involved or conducts business that is against the interest of Nigeria. This applies to both registration and naturalization.
* The Nigerian President can deprive a naturalized Lebanese of his Nigerian citizenship if such person bags an imprisonment of three years or more within a period of seven years after he was naturalized.
* The President can also deprive a registered or naturalized Lebanese of his Nigerian citizenship if he is considered to be disloyal to the Federal Republic of Nigeria. This consideration would be based on his acts or speech or after due enquiry by the President in a manner stated in the regulations. Please note that the act or speech must relate to what he did or said from the records of proceedings of a court of law or tribunal established by law.

**SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY EXPLAINS THE EVOLUTION OF STATES WHAT OTHER THEORIES EXPLAIN THE SAME AND THEIR STRENGTH**

First let us discuss the social contract theory Social contract theory, nearly as old as philosophy itself, is the view that persons’ moral and/or political obligations are dependent upon a contract or agreement among them to form the society in which they live. Socrates uses something quite like a social contract argument to explain to Crito why he must remain in prison and accept the death penalty. However, social contract theory is rightly associated with modern moral and political theory and is given its first full exposition and defense by Thomas Hobbes. After Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau are the best known proponents of this enormously influential theory, which has been one of the most dominant theories within moral and political theory throughout the history of the modern West. In the twentieth century, moral and political theory regained philosophical momentum as a result of John Rawls’ Kantian version of social contract theory, and was followed by new analyses of the subject by David Gauthier and others. More recently, philosophers from different perspectives have offered new criticisms of social contract theory. In particular, feminists and race-conscious philosophers have argued that social contract theory is at least an incomplete picture of our moral and political lives, and may in fact camouflage some of the ways in which the contract is itself parasitical upon the subjugations of classes of persons.

**OTHER THEORIES THAT EXPLAINS EVOLUTION OF STATE AND THEIR STRENGTH**

**MATRIARCHAL THEORY**

 Mclennan, Morgan and Jenks are the notable exponents of matriarchal theory. The matriarchal system was prior to the patriarchal system and tribe. There was no permanent institution of marriage. A woman had more than one husband and because of the uncertainty of male parentage kinship was reckoned through woman that is from mother to daughters. In the place of a family consisting of a man his wife and children there was a large and loosely connected group called a horde or pack organized for matrimonial purposes.

The matriarchal family developed as stated.

* First there was a tribe and it was the oldest and primary social group
* . In course of time a tribe breaks into clans
* Clans in their turn give place to households.
* At last comes the modern family.

Criticism

* The matriarchal theory is more sociological than political. It seeks to explain the origin of family and not that of the state.
* There is no adequate proof in support of the matriarchal system as the universal and necessary beginning of society.

**FORCE THEORY**

 According to this theory, the state originated due to force exerted by the strong over the weak. The idea contained in the statement is that 'war begat the king'. The same view is expressed by Hume, Oppenheim, Jenks-Bernhardy and Trietschke are the exponents of force theory. A number of rulers also believed in this theory. The powerful conquered the weak state is the outcome of the process of aggressive exploitation of the weaker by the stronger. Might without right is antagonist to individual liberty.

 There were other factors besides force which helped the expansion of the state. Similarly force alone is not the basis of state and it cannot be maintained by force.

Criticism

Force indeed has played an important part in the origin and development of the state. Some of the greatest empires of today have been established through blood and iron.

The theory of force unduly emphasis the principle of the survival of the fittest. It means that might be right and those who are physically weak should go to the wall. It is dangerous to employ such a principle in the internal existence of the state. Every state will be at perpetual war with the rest. This is a condition of chaos, pure and simple endangering the peace and security of the world. The attention and efforts of every state will be directed towards war preparedness and to win the war if it comes. War which is an alias for murder, glorifies brute process, suppressing the moral forces. This is the mean self of man and not his real self.

This theory justifies despotism. It is opposed to the idea of freedom. It is too much to believe that the state is created and maintained by sheer force and the spiritual and moral values have absolutely no place in life.

**PATRIARCHAL THEORY**

The Patriarchal theory explains that the state originated from the patriarchal family or the family in which the pater or father was the head. State is an enlargement of the family. Originally the family consisted of a man, his wife and children. The father was the head of the family and his control and authority was complete in all respects over all its members. When his children married there was expansion in the original family and it led to the establishment of new families. But the authority of the father and head of the original family remained as before, and it was duly acknowledged by all his descendants. This constituted the patriarchal family. The chief exponent of the patriarchal theory is Sir Henry Maine.

 The following important points may be noted in Maine's Patriarchal theory.

 1.In the Patriarchal family the element of paternity was the chief fact.

2.Descent was traced not only through males and from the same ancestor. None of the descendants of a female were included in the primitive notion of family relationship. Kinship was accordingly, purely negative.

3.Permanent marriage was the rule whether monogamy or polygamy.

4.The Head of the family was the basis of all authority, and his power was unqualified over his children and their houses and other relations of all descendants. howsoever numerous.

 5.He controlled not only the business affairs of the group which he headed but its religion and its conduct.

The family was the primal unit of political society, 'the seed led of all larger growths of governments, 'as Woodrow Wilson calls it. The single family had developed into several families; yet all of them were fully conscious of their ultimate kinship. Bound together by ties of common ancestors, they associated in a wider common fellowship group, the gens, owing allegiance to some elected elder perhaps the oldest living ascendant or the most capable. Similarly, the gens broadened into the tribe. The pastoral pursuits gave way to agriculture and settled life on a definite land became a matter of necessity; land tribes united to form the state.

In support of his statement, Sir Henry Maine cited the patriarchs of the old testament 'families' and 'brotherhood' of Athens, the patriapotestas in Rome and the Hindu Joint family system in India.

Criticism

Modern theories show that the patriarchal family was not universal, the patriarchal theory was subjected to severe attacks.

Patriarchal and matriarchal theories are in essence sociological rather than political theories.

Stephen Leacock says nonetheless; both the theories sufficiently establish that family is the original link in the evolution of the state.

Both these theories do not satisfactorily explain the origin of the state. Matriarchal and patriarchal could have been prevalent in certain early societies. But it is wrong to assume that the creation of state was occasioned by these systems. There was not substantial proof to support the universal validity of these theories.

**THEORY OF DIVINE ORIGIN**

The theory of divine origin is the oldest among all theories. According to this theory state is established and governed by God himself. God may rule the state directly or indirectly through some ruler who is regarded as an agent of God. The trace of divine origin is seen in the epic Mahabarat. According to the Mahabarat there was anarchy in the beginning in the society and the people prayed to God to come to their rescue. They offered the following prayer. 'Without a chief, O Lord we are perishing Give us a chief, whom we shall worship and who will protect us'. It was under these circumstances that God appointed the king to rule the people.

To quote King James I of England,

'Kings are justly called gods for they exercise a manner of resemblance of divine power on earth. Kings are accountable to God above and only. The people cannot question him for the right or wrong done by him.

The rise of Christianity and the growth of the power of the church in the medieval period led to a conflict between church and state and an active discussion of the divine origin of political power. All were agreed that the ultimate source of authority was divine but the supporters of the church say that Pope alone received his power directly from God. Kings are breathing images of God upon earth. Even if the king be wicked, the subject has no right to rebel against him. To rebel against the king is to rebel against God himself for the God's chosen Vassal.

The main points in the doctrine of the divine right of kings may thus be summed up.

1. Monarchy is divinely ordained and the king draws his authority from God.

2. Monarchy is hereditary and it is the divine right of a king that it should pass from father to son.

3. The king is answerable to God alone.

4. Resistance to the lawful authority of a king is a sin.

The theory of divine origin was popular for a long time but later on it began to decline on account of many factors.

Criticism: The theory of divine origin has been criticized on many grounds.

To say that God selects this or that man as ruler is contrary to experience and common sense. God cannot be expected to do such worldly things for human beings. The theory is dangerous because it pinpoints the unlimited and arbitrary power of the kings.

The theory of divine origin of the state advocates only monarchical form of government. The monarchical form of government is practically disappearing from the world. No wonder the theory of divine origin also does not find its supporters in modern times.

We all believe in the theory of evolution. Everything in the world has grown up by slow degrees and consequently the same must have been the case with the state. It is too much to believe that one-day God thought of creating the state and created one.

The theory put emphasis on revelation and not reason. In modern times we attribute everything to reason and hence it is not accepted today.

Although the theory has many defects and is no longer accepted today, it cannot be denied that it had its utility.

The theory of social contract with its emphasis on consent, was a great deadlock to the theory of divine origin. It was maintained that state was created by individuals by means of a contract and not by God. The separation of the church from the state was also partly responsible for the decline of the theory.

**Historical or Evolutionary theory:**

All the five theories were analyzed 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 is 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. 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. 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. 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