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* 1.How can a Lebanese retain or lose his or her newly acquired Nigerian citizenship.
* A Lebanese can acquire a Nigerian citizenship because Nigeria practices dual citizenship.
* The Lebanese can retain his or her newly acquired Nigerian citizenship in the following ways;
* a)preserving and upholding the nation's dignity
* b)joining the armed forces
* C)Holding political positions in Nigeria
* Meanwhile the Lebanese can lose his newly acquired Nigerian citizenship through this following ways;
* a)Renouncing the citizenship and the country
* b)constant involvement in criminal cases such as theft and kidnapping
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* 2. Social Contract Theory explains the evolution of states, what other theories explain the same, and their strengths
* The Origin of the State
* Political thinkers and philosophers have tried and attempted to trace out and explain
* the origin of the state in various methods, according to the nature and the social condition
* prevailed at the time of their thinking. However, there is no valid answer to “what is the
* origin of the state”? There were many contradictions in the thesis on what the origin of
* States. Nowhere in the history has it been recorded when the state came into existence. There
* were various beliefs regarding the origin of the state, some believe that the origin of the state
* lie in the hands of God whereas others believe that they are based on social contract and some
* trust on single force, the family or the process of evolution. The research anthropology
* ethnology and comparative philosophy had tried to focus on the origin of the state but it was
* not adequate.
* Prof. R.N.Gilchrist aptly mentioned that “of the circumstances surrounding the dawn
* of the political consciousness, we know little or nothing from history, where history fails, we
* must restore to speculation”19. Historical method and evolutionary course of action failed to
* prove when mankind originally came under the control of state. It is only the imagination of
* the political scientist and historical researchers that various elements which might have made
* contribution for the origin of the state. As such, there was no agreeable and acceptable
* conclusion among the political thinkers regarding the fundamental question of origin and
* establishment of state.
* As a result, there were various theories concerning the primary or pre historical origin
* of the state propounded by the political scientists and historical researchers. These theories
* are:
  + The theory of Divine Origin
  + Social Contract Theory
  + Matriarchal and Patriarchal Theory
  + Force Theory
  + Historical or Evolutionary Theory.
* The examination and comparison of elements of truth in these thesis shall pave way
* for finding out the secret in the origin of the state and its generally accepted explanations.
* 2.2 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 king20
* .
* According to Maclver, the magic man was priest and king.21 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 them22. 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:23
  + - Monarchy is divinely oriented.
    - Hereditary right is indispensable
    - Kings are accountable for God alone.
    - Resistance to lawful king is sin.
* 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.
* 2.3 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.
* Criticism and value:
* Mc Herman, Morgan and Jenks condoned the patriarchal theory on the ground that
* Matriarchal families are prior to patriarchal families, that is, the process by which the families
* develop from clans into tribes. (According to Maine’s concept, ‘however the tribe in their
* earliest and the primary groups and then comes the clan and finally comes the family, Finally,
* family and state are separate’40). It is wrong to indicate that one develops with the help of
* other. The theory emphasized that the primitive society and family are not the origins of the
* state. However, it has the merit on the ground as the theory emphasised the element kinship
* in making the origin of the state41
* .
* 2.10 Matriarchal Theory:
* The fundamental idea of Matriarchal theory is that “maternity is a fact; paternity is a
* fiction”42. According to this theory in the primitive society, there exisist Matriarchal groups
* or hordes. The kinship could be traced only through mother and there was no common male
* head. Chief exponents of the theory are Mc Herman, Morgan and Jenks. In their publications,
* “Primitive Society” (1866), “Studies in ancient society” (1877), “A history of politics” (1900)
* have described the Matriarchal theory43. According to them, Matriarchal system was prior to
* patriarchal system. There was no male head kinship was found out through mother (and
* mother to daughter). There was no permanent institution of marriage. The permanent form of
* marriage was association of polyandry, women had more than one husband. Therefore, in this
* kind of society the kinship was traced through women and not in men. In this system children
* belong to the clan of their mother. After the mother’s death, the elder daughter takes over the property. To support their idea, they had chosen the similar system existing in Australia,
* Malaya, Bangladesh and Malabar44. According to them, ‘family leads to the formation of
* gens and gens to that of tribes, the expansion of tribes to village, expansion of village to state’45
* Natural Instinct
* Reasoning faculty of men ‘by way of thinking himself’ makes way to instinct.
* Fundamentally, the state is based on the gregarious instinct and reason. The statement of
* Aristotle that man is by nature a social and political animal and he who by nature and not by
* mere accident is without a state is either above humanity or below it further he stated that the
* state came into existence for the sake of more life but it continues for the sake of good life51
* .
* Nature implies man to live in society in order to regulate society based on customary rules
* and regulations. In course of time, rules and regulations took the form of laws, society
* gradually became a political organization which paved way for the evolution of the state to
* which nature and social environment assisted in the development. Thus, the natural and social
* instinct of man had conclusive role in the growth and development of state.
* Kinship
* The important features of state namely organization and authority, command and
* obedience, can be traced in the bond of kinship. Gettle rightly pointed out that kinship
* strengthens the bond of unity and contributes to form the political organization. Many
* features of early state are prescribed to modern state. Mac Iver stated that in kinship creates
* society and society at length creates the states.52 Sir Henry Maine pointed out, “the most
* recent researches into the primitive history of society point to the conclusion that the earliest
* tie which knitted men together in communities was consanguinity or kinship”53. The early
* period family was a social institution and tribe a political institution. The disputes were
* resolved by the head of the tribe. The unification of the tribe form the state. Thus kinship
* played a important role in the growth and development of state.
* Divine Origin Theory:
* The Genesis of Divine Origin Theory:
* The oldest theory about the origin of the state is the divine origin theory. 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.”
* 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 medieval 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.
* 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.
* The Stuart King James I 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 have no right to rebel against him. Even 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. Anyway, the European Kings took shelter under the divine origin theory in order to justify their dictatorships.
* Be that as it may, during a large part of human history the state was viewed as direct divine creation and theocratic in nature. The theory was in currency so long as religion was considered to be the chief motive force of all human activities.
* In the twentieth century this, theory came under criticism being an incorrect explanation of the origin of the state. With the growth of scientific outlook this theory faded into oblivion. Today’s trend is that the state is a historical growth. We shall now discuss the causes of the decline of the theory.
* Causes of the Decline of the Divine Theory:
* In the first place, when a more acceptable theory like the social contract theory came out, the divine theory was dashed to the ground. The new theory suggested that the state is a handiwork of men, not a grace of God.
* In the second place, the Reformation that separated the church from the state debased the coin of the divine theory. The post-Reformation period is a period of non-religious politics. Thus the secular outlook made the divine theory totally unacceptable.
* In the third place, the emergence of democracy was a big blow for the autocratic dogma of mixing religion with politics and thereby it blunted the edge of identifying God with the King. Democracy not only glorified the individual but shattered the divine halo around the origin of the slate.
* Last but not the least was the growth of scientific enquiry and materialistic view of the political mechanism. The result was that the erstwhile blind faith and superstition was no longer acceptable. The people began to accept only those things that stood the test of logic and reasoning.
* Criticism of the Divine Theory:
* There are seven lines of argument in the hands of R. N. Gilchrist levelled against the divine theory:
* The first line of argument of Gilchrist is that the state is a human institution organised in an association through human agency. Modern political thinkers cannot accept the view that God has anything to do with the creation of the state. It does not stand the commonsense of the moderns that God selects anybody to rule over the state.
* The second line of argument is that the divine theory is fraught with dangerous consequences, because a semi-divine King is bound to rule arbitrarily as he is responsible only to God and not bound to heed public opinion. Such a theory will make the ruler despotic and autocratic.
* The third line of argument is that the divine theory is unrealistic because a bad ruler will continue to rule under the divine shield. There were some bad rulers like James II of England and Louis XVI of France, who were replaced by the people. This could not happen if the divine theory was to be accepted.
* The fourth line of argument is that the New Testament of the Bible reversed the divine conception of the state as ingrained in the Old Testament. It is emphatically stated in the New Testament- “Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and unto God the things that are God’s”, which gives the state a human character as against the divine coating.
* The fifth line of argument is that the divine theory is unscientific. The anthropologists and sociologists after careful scientific analysis have discarded the theory as totally untenable as an explanation of the origin of the slate.
* The sixth line of argument is that the divine theory runs counter to the universally accepted conception that the state is the result of a historical evolution. The generally accepted theory of the origin of the state is that various factors like religion, family, force and political consciousness were behind the growth of the state.
* The seventh line of argument is that the divine theory is undemocratic. The inevitable implication of the theory in content and tone will make the King absolute and his government never democratic. So the theme of the theory is against the spirit of democracy.
* 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.
* 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.
* The important role assigned to the man in the creation of the state by the social contract theory shattered all hopes for the divine right theory. The second factor in the decline of the divine right theory was the Reformation Movement in the sixteenth century Europe, which curbed the authority of the Pope and the Church and at the same time brought the monarch and the people in the limelight.
* The scientific and logical thinking associated with the Renaissance and the Reformation enabled men to look into the theory of the origin of the state as something which must be created by non-church and non-god bodies. With the decline of the authority of religion declined the divine authority.
* The final nail of the coffin of the divine right theory was the modern theory of Thomas Hill Green that democracy, i.e., will of the people was the basis of the state