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QUESTION 1; How can a Lebanese retain or lose his or her newly acquired Nigerian citizenship.

Firstly, citizenship is the status of a person as recognized under the constitution of a country or a sovereign as being a legal member of such country or state. It gives the person holding the citizenship access to all the benefits and rights stated in the constitution of such country. In Nigeria, there are four ways to become a citizen of the country, they are;

1. Citizenship by birth: this is for those who were born in Nigeria. Although being born in Nigeria does not automatically confer Nigerian citizenship.
2. Citizenship by Descent: this means at least one of the parents of the person is a Nigerian even if the person was born outside of Nigeria.
3. Citizenship by Registration: this type of citizenship can be obtained by any of the following persons:

. a foreign woman married to a Nigerian man.

. anyone who is of age born outside of the country whose either one or both grand-parents is or was a citizen of Nigeria.

. a foreign child adopted by Nigerian parents.

1. Citizenship by Naturalisation: anyone who is of age and has lived in Nigeria for at least fifteen years and has intentions to continue residing in Nigeria. Such person must be familiar with the customs and language of Nigeria and must be able to support him/herself.

Lebanese nationality law governs the acquisition, transmission and loss of Lebanese citizenship. Lebanese citizenship is the status of being a citizen of Lebanon and it can be obtained by birth and naturalization. Lebanese nationality is transmitted by paternity(father). Therefore, a Lebanese man who holds Lebanese citizenship can automatically confer citizenship to his children and foreign wife (only if entered in the civil Acts Register in the Republic of Lebanon). Under the current law, descendants of Lebanese emigrants can only receive citizenship from their father and women cannot pass on citizenship to their children or foreign spouses.

Multiple generations of Lebanese have made their home in Nigeria. Some are the descendants of migrants who arrived in West Africa as early as the 19th century, leaving behind their small Middle Eastern nation in search of opportunities elsewhere.

From all that has been said, one can come to the conclusion that a Lebanese can acquire a Nigerian citizenship through any of the four ways listed above. However, someone who has acquired a Nigerian citizenship can also lose it. Here are some of the ways one can lose their Nigerian citizenship;

1. When a registered or naturalized citizen voluntarily acquires the citizenship of a foreign country.
2. Naturalized citizen, before seven years of residence, sentenced to prison for three years or more.
3. Joining the military of a foreign state.
4. Joining the government of a foreign state.
5. Performing some act to intentionally give up citizenship.
6. Treason: the nationalized citizen can equally lose his citizenship, if found guilty of this offence.
7. Renouncement: the individual can lose his citizenship by renouncing it.
8. Through disloyalty: a naturalized citizen can lose his citizenship if his activities are prejudicial to the country’s corporate existence.
9. Supporting another country: if a citizen is found supporting another country engaged in war with his country, his citizenship may be deprived him.

Question 2: social contract theory explains the evolution of states, what other theories explain the same, and their strengths.

Before I delve into the various theories that explain the evolution of state, let me discuss on how the theory of social contract explains the evolution of state.

Firstly, a theory is a category with which we analyse, organize, and synthesize phenomena into interconnected and internally coherent wholes. When referring theory to citizen and state relation, it can be defined as the conceptual tool with which we identify pattern of discrimination in social phenomena regarding from the citizens and their place in a state. In political discussions which are of relevance to us in this course, two forms of the theory of social contract which became significant during and after the middle ages are;

1. The governmental contract; this means a tacit agreement between the government and the people. This idea was largely employed by the defenders of popular liberties in the middle ages to resist the claims of rulers to an absolute dominion over their subjects. In other words, the idea borders on deposing a ruler when he/she had violated the agreement or pact to promote a happy life according to which he/she was chosen.
2. The social contract; this borders on the institution of a political society by means of a compact composition and agreement among the people by ordaining some kind of government which they would all yield to because of the experience of not being able to resolve grievances in the state of nature where all were subject only to the law of nature.

The origin of the social contract theory is premised on an agreement entered into by men who originally had no governmental organization which resulted into a state. However, to understand the essence of a contractual agreement (social contract) which can be found in the political treatises both of the east and of the west, it is pertinent to understand that previously, the history of the world was divisible into two;

1. The pre-institution of the state; in this era, there was nothing like government. Hence, there was no law which could have been forced by a coercive authority. In effect, it would be apt to say that men and women lived in a state of nature, and inevitably were subject only to regulations prescribed by nature because there are no human authorities to formulate these rules let alone enforce them.
2. However, after a time lapse, a decision was reached for the establishment of government based on their consent to part with their liberty having obeyed the laws of government. The consent to part with their liberty is subject to a consensus having lived in a state of nature without a coercive agency. Hence, the state is a human creation as a result of contractual agreement between men and women.

After looking at the social contact theory, its origin, nature, forms and attributes, we can now discuss on the other theories and their different perspectives on how the state came to be. One should keep in mind that these theories all attempt to give a better understanding on how the different scholars of the theories feel about the evolution of a state. They also have their strengths and their criticisms. These theories are; the theory of divine origin, the theory of force, the patriarchal theory, the matriarchal theory and the historical theory.

1. The theory of Divine origin.

This theory is also known as the divine rights of kings. Its three main propositions are the following; . that the state was established by the ordinance of God

 . its rulers or leaders are divinely appointed hence are not accountable to any authority but God.

 . that the will of God is supposed to be made known by revelation immediately to certain people who are his earthly vice regents and by them communicated to the people.

It is glaring therefore that in this theory that obedience to the state becomes a religion as well as a civil duty and obedience is obviously a sacrilege. However, it is interesting to note that the view that the bad as well as the good leader were the representatives of God and as such entitled to unconditional obedience. Another merit of this theory is that it may create in the mass of the people, a sense of the value of order and obedience to law, so necessary for the stability of the state. And also to the rulers a moral accountability to God for the manner in which they exercise their power.

1. The theory of force.

This theory proposes that the state is the result of the subjugation of the weaker by the stronger. To justify this, in the eighteenth century, Hume expressed that: ‘it is probable that the first ascendant of one man over multitudes began during a state of war, where the superiority of courage and of genius discovers most visibly, where unanimity and concert are most sensibly felt. The long continuance of that state, an incident common among savage tribes, inured the people to submission.’ It is in this light that he conceived that a state is founded when a leader, with his band of warriors, gets permanent control of a definite territory of a considerable size. This may occur in one of two ways.

. when the leader, after firmly establishing his or her position as ruler of his or her own tribe, extends his/her authority over neighboring tribes until he/she comes to rule over a large territory.

. a state is founded by successful migrations and conquests.

1. The patriarchal theory.

The greatest supporter of this theory is Sir Henry Maine. The theory argues that the unit of primitive society was the family, in which descent was traced through males and in which the eldest male parent was absolutely supreme. The theory then goes further to argue that despite the eldest parent’s supremacy, his supremacy does not extend to life and death. Meaning that the eldest male parent was as unqualified over his children and their houses as over his slaves. How a state is said to be made according to this theory is seen in the case of a break up in the single family that is conducted by the head of the first family, into more families and then the aggregation of the common wealth of tribes. Another point to note is that this theory conceives the state as an extension of the family in such a way that the head of the state could be viewed as the father and the people, his/her children. Noteworthy is the fact that the patriarchal family which, according to this theory, was the foundation of the modern state and was characterized by three features; male kinship, permanent marriage and paternal authority. Speaking on male kinship, it is indeed integral to this theory that the members of the patriarchal family should be able to trace their descent through the male. The essence of this is the fact that men are counted of kin because they are descended from the same male ancestor. Permanent marriage on the other hand, is a social institution. However, one shouldn’t assume that it is the marriage of one man one woman. On the contrary, polygyny-when a man has more than one wife as that was the common practice. Lastly, paternal authority means that the male ancestors had well-nigh despotic authority over the group.

Its strength lies in the fact that as an explanation of the origin of the state, it emphasizes one essential element in the making of the state-kinship.

1. The Matriarchal Theory.

This theory is the exact opposite of the patriarchal theory in the sense that while the descent was traced through men, in the matriarchal theory it states that it is traced through women. Scholars in favor of this theory are; McLennan, Morgan and Jenks. Another distinguishing feature of this theory from the patriarchal theory is the fact the matriarchal theory holds that the primitive group have no common male head and that kinship among them could be traced only through the woman. To explain this theory better, it is important to use Jenks’ illustration of the primitive society in Australia which posits that; the real social units of the Australians is not the tribe but the totem group-the totem group is primarily a body of persons distinguished by the sign of some natural object, like an animal or tree which may not intermarry with one another. The other side of the rule states also that the savage may marry into another totem that is specially fixed for him and not only that, he also marries all the women that are in his generation in that totem. Under this system, it is obvious that as far as there is any recognition of blood relations it is through the woman and not through the man. According to Jenks, society organized on such basis gradually evolved into the family marked by the paternal descent so men began to take to pastoral occupations, they domesticated animals and they recognized the value of women’s labour in tending sheep and cattle and thus arose the institution of permanent marriage. It is also important to note that the tribe instead of the family as the primary group in time breaks into clans and into households, and ultimately into individual members.

1. The historical/evolutionary theory.

The theory is generally accepted because it did not consider the state neither as a divine institution nor as a deliberate human contrivance. It conceived the state coming into existence as the result of natural evolution. The proposition therefore of the state as a product of history was aptly captured succinctly by J.W.Burgess who explained that the evolutionary theory is premised on a gradual and 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. This theory says that the beginnings of government cannot be traced to a particular time or cause because of the result of various factors through ages such as the influences as kinship, religion, war and political consciousness.

. kinship; in early society, the first and strongest bond of government was kinship. This bond defines family discipline which would scarcely be possible among races in which blood-relationship was subject to profound confusion and in which family organization, therefore had no clear basis of authority on which to rest.

. common worship/religion; this is another element in the welding together of families and tribes. This worship evolved from primitive animism to ancestor-worship. When ancestor worship became the prevailing form of religion, religion was inseparably linked with kinship, for at the family or communal altar, the worshipper did homage to the great dead of his/her family or group and craved protection and guidance. The primitive man had implicit faith in the existence of spirits, the spirits of the dead and the spirits of nature. The medicine-man or woman professing ability to control them by means of his/her socery, naturally came to be regarded as with mysterious awe and acquired unique influence.

. war; the demands of constant warfare often led to the rise of permanent headship. In effect, when a tribe was threatened by danger or involved in war, it was driven by necessity to appoint a leader. This continuity of war conduced to the permanence of leadership. Accordingly, war and conquest helped to give the mark of territoriality to the state. In the patriarchal society or tribe, the nexus had been that of blood, but when the leader established his/her authority over a territory by conquest, over a people with whom he/her had no blood relationship, all those who lived in that territory become his/her subjects thus making blood no longer the essential bond of unity.

. political consciousness; originally, government was spontaneous, natural, and twin-born with man and the family. Aristotle, could be said to have been starting a fact when he said ‘man is by nature a political animal’. This act becomes more cogent based on the fact that the need for order and security is an ever-present factor, man knows instinctively that he/she can develop the best of which he/she is capable only by some form of political organization. Though at the beginning, it might well be that the political consciousness was really political unconsciousness. However, just as the forces of nature operated long before the discovery of the law of gravitation, it is only apt to agree that political organization really rested on the community of mind, unconscious, dimly conscious, or fully conscious of certain moral ends present throughout the whole course of development.