

EXCERPTS FROM SUPREME COURT'S OPINIONS ON THE EDUCATION OF ILLEGAL ALIENS

Special to the New York Times Published: June 16, 1982

<http://www.nytimes.com/1982/06/16/us/excerpts-from-supreme-court-s-opinions-on-the-education-of-illegal-aliens.html>

WASHINGTON, June 15— Following are excerpts from the Supreme Court's ruling today in Plyler v. Doe, in which the Court held that children who are illegal aliens have a constitutional right to a free public education. The majority opinion by Associate Justice William J. Brennan Jr. was joined by Associate Justice John Paul Stevens and by three Associate Justices who also wrote separate concurring opinions, Lewis F. Powell, Thurgood Marshall, and Harry A. Blackmun. The dissenting opinion by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger was joined by Associate Justices Byron R. White, William H. Rehnquist, and Sandra Day O'Connor.

From Majority Opinion By Justice Brennan....

10. Although we have not previously focused on the intended meaning of this phrase, we have had occasion to examine the first sentence of the Fourteenth Amendment, which provides that "[a]ll persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States. . . ." (Emphasis added.) Justice Gray, writing for the Court in *United States v. Wong Kim Ark*, 169 U.S. 649 (1898), detailed at some length the history of the Citizenship Clause, and the predominantly geographic sense in which the term "jurisdiction" was used. He further noted that it was impossible to construe the words "subject to the jurisdiction thereof," in the opening sentence [of the Fourteenth Amendment], as less comprehensive than the words "within its jurisdiction," in the concluding sentence of the same section; or to hold that persons "within the jurisdiction" of one of the States of the Union are not "subject to the jurisdiction of the United States."

Id. at 687.

Justice Gray concluded that [e]very citizen or subject of another country, while domiciled here, is within the allegiance and the protection, and consequently subject to the jurisdiction, of the United States.

Id. at 693. As one early commentator noted, given the historical emphasis on geographic territoriality, bounded only, if at all, by principles of sovereignty and allegiance, no plausible distinction with respect to Fourteenth Amendment "jurisdiction" can be drawn

between resident aliens whose entry into the United States was lawful, and resident aliens whose entry was unlawful. See C. Bouve, *Exclusion and Expulsion of Aliens in the United States* 425-427 (1912).

~~~~~  
From Dissenting Opinion By Chief Justice Burger:

Were it our business to set the nation's social policy, I would agree without hesitation that it is senseless for an enlightened society to deprive any children - including illegal aliens - of an elementary education. However, the Constitution does not constitute us as "**Platonic Guardians**" nor does it vest in this Court the authority to strike down laws because they do not meet our standards of *desirable social policy*, "wisdom" or "common sense."

We **TRESPASS** on the assigned function of the political branches under our structure of **limited and separated powers** when we assume a *policymaking role* as the Court does today.

The Court's holding today manifests the justly criticized judicial tendency to attempt speedy and wholesale formulation of "remedies" for the failures - or simply the laggard pace -of the political processes of our system of government. The Court employs, and in my view **abuses**, the 14th Amendment in an effort to become an omnipotent and omniscient problem solver. That the motives for doing so are noble and compassionate does not alter the fact that the Court **DISTORTS** our constitutional function to make amends for the defaults of others.

In a sense, the Court's opinion rests on such a unique confluence of theories and rationales that it will likely stand for little beyond the results in these particular cases. Yet the extent to which the Court departs from *principled* constitutional adjudication is nonetheless disturbing.

The dispositive issue in these cases, simply put, is whether, for purposes of allocating its finite resources, a state has a legitimate reason to differentiate between persons who are lawfully within the state and those who are unlawfully there. The distinction the State of Texas has drawn - based not only upon its own legitimate interests but on classifications established by the Federal Government in its immigration laws and policies - is not unconstitutional.

The equal protection clause protects against arbitrary and irrational classifications, and against invidious discrimination stemming from prejudice and hostility; it is not an all-encompassing "equalizer" designed to *eradicate every distinction* for which persons are not "responsible."

Dissenting Opinion:

'Fundamental Rights'

The importance of education is beyond dispute. Yet we have held repeatedly that the importance of a governmental service does not elevate it to the status of a "fundamental right" for purposes of equal protection analysis. The Court points to no meaningful way to distinguish between education and other governmental benefits in this context. Is the Court suggesting that education is more "fundamental" than food, shelter or medical care?

Without laboring what will undoubtedly seem obvious to many, it simply is not "irrational" for a state to conclude that it does not have the same responsibility to provide benefits for persons whose very presence in the state and this country is illegal as it does to provide for persons lawfully present. By definition, illegal aliens have no right whatever to be here, and the state may reasonably, and constitutionally, elect not to provide them with governmental services at the expense of those who are lawfully in the state.

Today's cases, I regret to say, present yet another example of *unwarranted judicial action* which in the long run tends to contribute to the weakening of our political processes.

[ 18. As the District Court observed in No. 80-1538, the confluence of Government policies has resulted in the existence of a large number of employed illegal aliens, such as the parents of plaintiffs in this case, whose presence is tolerated, whose employment is perhaps even welcomed, but who are virtually defenseless against any abuse, exploitation, or callous neglect to which the state or the state's NATURAL CITIZENS and business organizations may wish to subject them.]

19. ~With respect to the actions of the Federal Government, alienage classifications may be intimately related to the conduct of foreign policy, to the federal prerogative to control access to the United States, and to the plenary federal power to determine who has sufficiently manifested his allegiance to become a citizen of the Nation. No State may independently exercise a like power. ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

An advanced search of the term "**natural citizen**" located this from the HARVARD LAW SCHOOL LIBRARY; -THE VEST POCKET LAWYER booklet c. 1919

418. The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land.

419. The Constitution of the United States gives to every NATURAL CITIZEN, and guarantees to that citizen, political, religious, and civil rights.

420. Every NATURAL CITIZEN of the United States, is first, a citizen of the United States. Then, this same citizen of the United States may be a citizen also of any individual state in the union.

[The use of the adjective "natural" to describe citizen is evidence of a form of citizenship which is outside of the legal realm, -pre-dating it, existing as a natural extension of the natural realm which has as a fundamental element of all social groups, the Law of natural membership (off-spring are the same as their parents). In the realm of national membership we have the natural law of natural citizenship. By that law, all children of citizens are citizens also, just like their parents from whom they inherit their national membership.

If one parent is an alien, then the off-spring of such a couple will be a hybrid, cross-breed citizen with dual citizenship. Such citizens are not eligible to serve as President. Obama is not such a citizen because he did not inherit the citizenship of his mother since, for domestic births within marriage, citizenship is inherited from the head of the family, which is the father.

He also did not inherit American citizenship from his father. Instead, he inherited only provisional Kenyan citizenship. By American law, Obama is still not an American citizen, although he is presumed to be one due to an institutionalized error established by Attorney General John Griggs in 1898. So Obama, instead of being a "natural born citizen" as the Constitution requires, is merely a presumptive political policy citizen whose presumption of citizenship could be nullified with the signature of the Attorney General or the President. Zero chance of that happening.

~~~~~  
Annual Report of the West Virginia Bar Association
Transcript of Annual Meeting held 1887
West Virginia Bar Association Page 41

I would be glad to know how there can be any distinction without regard to the rights conferred on a corporation and the rights which the NATURAL CITIZEN possesses. No one will contend that a NATURAL CITIZEN may not engage in any sort of business transaction of a pursuit which the law recognizes. How then can it be said that if the right be conveyed to and conferred upon a corporation to carry on business in its corporate name the business

has any more public character than the ordinary pursuits of any NATURAL CITIZEN?

How can it be said that the rights given that corporation are other than similar rights of a NATURAL CITIZEN.

[<http://books.google.com/books?id=YMYvAQAAMA AJ&pg=RA1PA41&lpg=RA1PA41&dq=%22NATURAL+CITIZEN%22+born,+naturalized&source=bl&ots=u1QGAYhkLp&sig=4bEoylPAMzPI0unBzXWBIOO7QDs&hl=en&sa=X&ei=zuS8UdTmD5LkqAG5rYCoDA&ved=0CFYQ6AEwCDgK#v=onepage&q=%22NATURAL%20CITIZEN%22%20-born%2C%20-naturalized&f=false>]

~ ~ ~
57th Congress, 2nd Session U.S. SENATE
Document No. 46
Jurisdiction of Federal Courts over Corporations

Corporation Is A Citizen

Purpose.

It is proposed herein, by invoking the aid and guidance of the fundamental rules of justice and equality, to urge upon Congress the necessity for enacting into law the form and substance (if not the exact words) of the bill hereinafter formulated, the design of which is to CORRECT a growing ABUSE and to advance a much-desired remedy.

The "Citizen" of the Constitution

For more than a half a century the judiciary of the United States, using as a basis a line of reasoning CONTRARY to the Spirit of our national Constitution, has, by a mere FICTION, construed the word "CITIZEN" as used in Article III, Section 2, to be extended to and include the word "corporation".

From the foundation of the Government up to 1844 the United States Supreme Court naturally and justly held that "citizen" and "Corporation" had, for all purposes, two separate and distinct meanings.

The word "citizen" in our American system of government was held to mean and include only a *natural person* who was endowed with the privileges and blessing of the qualifications which made him an **American Freeman**. That word in those days had as high and as noble a meaning as had the word "King" in the parlance of Europe.

The great Chief Justice Marshall, in the case of Bank of the United States v. Deveaux, gave this meaning and significance to the word "CITIZEN" thus: "For the term citizen ought to be understood as it is used in the

Constitution and as it us used in other laws; that is, to describe the **real persons** who come into court, in this case in their corporate name." And again, in the same case, "A corporation aggregate can not , in its corporate capacity, be a citizen." (5 Cranch, 61.)

Change Making a Corporation a Citizen...

Comparison of Corporation Then and Now.

~And all this time the powers and privileges of NATURAL CITIZENS have not increased a single iota, so that while it might have been fair to have a NATURAL CITIZEN and a corporate citizen on a par in 1844, at present it only makes an odious comparison. Hence a remedy is herein suggested to give greater recognition to the just demands of the NATURAL CITIZEN, without injuring or disturbing the rights of the honest and good-intentioned corporate citizen, the design and purpose being to bring back the equality of citizen before the law, be such citizens NATURAL or CORPORATE.

It is respectfully submitted that no honest opposition can be made nor will be made, by those truly representing the people -the **natural citizens** of the land, -to a proposition that has as its cardinal principle "equality before the law".

~ ~ ~
The large corporations of today have members (stockholders) scattered all over the country, and even over several countries. In addition to this, the principle is too well founded and too universally recognized that the corporation, as such, has a separate and distinct IDENTITY, INDIVIDUALITY, and responsibility from its members. Hence the THEORY must be preceded upon that the corporation is itself the entity, the party, the CITIZEN.

Injustice of Present System

~I also think that corporations chartered under the laws of the States should, for the purposes of jurisdiction in the Federal courts, be declared to be citizens in each and every State in which they have an office, or in which they carry on or conduct any part of their corporate business.

There are hundreds of corporations in this country today which never perform a single corporate act in the State of their creation, except to pay the secretary of state the fees for a certified copy of their charter. The sole object of the creation of such corporations is to *avoid the jurisdiction* of the State courts in the States where they do business.

To illustrate: There is the Southern Pacific Railroad; it is a Kentucky corporation. It has not now and never had an inch of road or dime's worth of property in that State, and it never expected or intended to have. The object was to use its TECHNICAL CITIZENSHIP (under the decisions of the Supreme Court) in Kentucky to escape the jurisdiction in the State courts in the States in which it carried on its business.

If these FRAUDS -I use the term advisedly, -on the jurisdiction of the Federal courts had been **exposed**, and these corporations made to answer in the State courts of the States in which it they conduct their business, in all suits except those involving Federal questions, there never would have been any necessity to create the Circuit Court of Appeals.

Previous Effort to Secure Relief.

Judge Seymour D. Thompson (a gentleman without peer as an authority on the subject of corporation law) very frequently attacked the abuse of jurisdiction:

That the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States assented reluctantly to the **doctrine** stated in the preceding section illustrates one of the most *pitiable* characteristics of the judicial administration, -the HABITUAL GREED of jurisdiction exhibited by courts and judges, and the *insincerity* manifested by them in interpreting constitutional provisions and statutes relating to their own jurisdiction.

The question was one of extreme simplicity. It related solely to the meaning with which the framers of the Constitution and of the judiciary act had used one of the plainest, simplest and best understood words in our language, -the word "citizen".

Never before had it been regarded as referring other than to a single person endowed with the ordinary political privileges and franchises of the country of which he was a resident.

Never before had it been used to designate a body of persons, collected or organized in any manner, nor with any faculty whatever.

THE JUDGES KNEW THIS.

They knew that the men who used the word "CITIZEN" in those instruments had no idea that they were describing *an artificial collection* of persons.

~~~~It is to be borne in mind that the question did not involve the mere question of the jurisdiction of the national courts; it involved something more. All jurisdiction had been apportioned between the national and the State judicatories; and hence the Federal judicatories,

in seizing upon a jurisdiction which had not been conferred upon them by the Constitution and judiciary act, seized a portion of the jurisdiction belonging to the States, and DEFRAUDED the State tribunals of a portion of their rightful jurisdiction. It was a plain case of THEFT of Jurisdiction.

It illustrated a charge which Mr. JEFFERSON, in one of his letters written some years before, had made against the tendencies of the Federal judiciary, "working like gravity, -by night and by day, -gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a THIEF, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the government of all be consolidated into one."

Overruling their former decisions, and under a miserable pretext which involved the DISTORTION of a PLAIN WORD from its NATURAL meaning to a meaning which had NEVER BEFORE been assigned to it, the court now announced the following rule:

"A corporation created by and doing business in a particular state is to be deemed to all intents and purposes as a person, although an ARTIFICIAL PERSON, an inhabitant of the same State, for the purposes of its incorporation, capable of being treated as a citizen of the State, as much as a NATURAL PERSON. Like a citizen it makes contracts, and though in regard to what it may do in some particulars it differs from a natural person, and in this especially, the manner in which it can sue and be sued, it is substantially, within the meaning of the law, a CITIZEN of the State which created it, and where its business is done, for all the purposes of suing and being sued."

That statement of the law was probably EXTRA-JUDICIAL, but its authority was established by later decisions against the vigorous dissent of a minority of the court.

### JEFFERSON'S WARNING

The jurisdiction thus seized upon, to continue in the language of Mr. Jefferson, continued to "advance its noiseless step like a thief" until the court had reached the DOCTRINE that, for the purposes of the Federal jurisdiction, a corporation is conclusively presumed to be a CITIZEN of a State under whose laws it is created, and, conversely, that it can not be a citizen of

a State other than the State under whose laws it has been created.

Stated in another way, this doctrine is that although a corporation is not itself a citizen, yet of ALL THE PURPOSES of federal jurisdiction founded upon *diverse citizenship*, the stockholders who compose the corporate body by and under the name given them by the statutes of a State, are to BE TREATED AS CITIZENS of that State, and are estopped from denying that they are such.

And this is so although all of its business may be prosecuted elsewhere, and all of its offices and places of business may be outside of the State by whose laws it has been created, and all its stockholder may be residents of the State in which it is impleaded in the Federal court as a "Citizen" of such other State.

The most striking commentary which can be made upon the IMPROPRIETY, if not the CRIMINALITY, involved in the seizure of this jurisdiction, is found in the manner in which it operates in respect of what is now known as the "TRAMP CORPORATION".

Under the rule thus established, a number of citizens of one State can organize themselves into a corporation under the laws of another State, through the mere aid of an attorney employed there, without acquiring a residence or even temporarily coming within such State, for the purpose of engaging in business in their own State, and can thus succeed in bringing all actions by and against them within their jurisdiction of the Federal courts, ousting the jurisdiction of their own State courts over such actions. (29 Am. Law Rev., 864)

## 10 Jurisdiction of Federal Courts Over Corporation Flagrant Abuse of Existing Law

The injustice in the present construction of the word "citizen" for the purpose of jurisdiction, is not so very VICIOUS per se, but becomes so by the ABUSE which is thereby permitted. ~

It requires very little argument to show the great INJUSTICE, inconvenience, and unnecessary expense suffered by one class of persons by reason of the opening of a JUDICIAL SIDE DOOR which permits another class (of citizens, i.e., corporations) a means of retreat not enjoyed by both.

### Futility of State Legislation

This kind of EVIL was undertaken to be remedied by the State of Wisconsin by an enactment which...

Here it will be seen that not only did the legislature do all it could to prevent \*foreign\* corporations from

invoking Federal jurisdiction, but the corporation itself voluntarily waived its right to invoke that jurisdiction. ~ ~ ~ Here too, the DOCTRINE now IN VOGUE that "Corporation" and "Citizen" means the same for the purposes mentioned was REAFFIRMED by Mr. Justice Hunt in this direct language: " A corporation has the same right to the protection of the laws as a NATURAL CITIZEN and the same right to appeal to all the courts of the country." Hence it is positively apparent that any relief to be granted to CORRECT THIS EVIL must come from the national Congress.

### Voluntary Entrance into Foreign State.

It is a fact that all the States of the Union have laws relating to foreign corporations. ~ It is wholly optional with a corporation whether or not it desires to operate outside the State of its creation. ~ When it goes into that FOREIGN STATE it should be in all respects with the idea that the citizens of that State are entitled to every single privilege to which it (the foreign corporation) is entitled.

It should not ever be with the idea that it is entitled to any advantage over other citizens; and under the DOCTRINE of the EQUALITY OF CITIZENSHIP it should not be permitted to have any advantage; and if it has such, under just legislation should not be permitted to retain it.

[criminal "foreign citizens" require EXTRADITION to home jurisdiction for prosecution.]

~Continuing, Mr. Russell, says:

This ground of jurisdiction (diversity of citizenship) with its PERVERSION, presently referred to, steadily furnishes about one-third of the cases in the Federal court, nearly all of which one-third are naturally and properly justiciable in the State courts. Unfortunate conflicts of decision have resulted. Citizens have been drawn away from their homes and local courts, and have smarted under the impression that the General Government has a HOSTILE and UNFRIENDLY government, not having THE GOOD OF THE PEOPLE at heart."

And again, as pointed out by this eminent jurist, continuance of the present construction of the word "CITIZEN" as the law of the land is a prolific source of annoyance and hindrance to the Federal courts themselves, and should for that reason be ABOLISHED by Congress. ~Congress should *abolish this jurisdic-*

*tion completely*; and with it would go, of course, the PERVERSION of this jurisdiction which is exercised over corporations. That PERVERSION and its enormous effect in creating delay in the Federal courts we will now consider.

~Private corporations aggregate are nothing but partnerships with superadded qualities; and the Rights of ARTIFICIAL PERSONS composed. ~ ~ Now, to give the association of citizens (a corporation) a greater right of suit in the courts of the United States than is possessed by each and all of the individual citizens composing the association, by means of a PURE FICTION that all have that right, when none in fact may have it, is believed to be an ABUSE more far-reaching in its consequences than *any now existing* in our courts. ~ ~ ~

But the Supreme Court, in that regard, has refused to follow out the legitimate consequence of its own decisions... Those decisions, in the later history of the court, are believed to have been UNSOUND. ~ ~ ~

~ It is undoubted that corporations were not within the contemplation of the framers of the Constitution when they created the jurisdiction over controversies between citizens of different states.

~ How is it then that we see daily examples of a corporation suing or being sued in the Federal circuit courts as a citizen of the State incorporating it when, first, not one of the individuals composing it is, in fact, a citizen of that State; and when, second; every one of the individuals composing it is a citizen of the same State with the opposite party to the suit, and when, third; all the business of the corporation is transacted outside the State which incorporated it, and all the actual business offices are outside that State, and when, fourth; all these facts are well known to all concerned in the suit, including the court itself, which takes judicial knowledge of the statute of the incorporating State not requiring members or officers to be citizens, and when the court well knows that the suit *does not really* involve a controversy properly with the jurisdiction under the judiciary act (citizens of one jurisdiction versus citizens of another).

How is it, I repeat, that we see these suits occurring *daily*? It is because the Supreme Court has determined that in such cases the facts SHALL NOT COME OUT; and this for the reason expressly stated, -that if the facts should come out the jurisdiction would be defeated. (Am. Law Rev., supra.)

## Protest of Federal Courts.

"One can not wink so hard as not to see that this so-called corporation was one of those elusive, evanescent, will-o'-the-wisp corporations existing only in name and a FRAUD upon the laws of the State where it was attempted to be formed, and equally a FRAUD on the States or Territories and their citizens in which it carried on its business...by a mere pretense of compliance with the law of a State in which they do not reside, and do not intend to carry on any business, in order that they may ESCAPE ALL LIABILITY for the hazards of the business in which they are engaged, and enjoy the privileges of litigating in the United States courts. These privileges are obtainable under existing...decisions of the courts. (Owen v. Shepard, 59 Fed., 746.)

## The "Thief in the Night"

There is perhaps no better way to show the growth of this jurisdictional ABUSE than by quoting from the decisions which caused it. From these quotations it will be seen that Mr. Chief Justice Marshall denied the right of a corporation to be called a "citizen"; Mr. Justice Wayne allowed the presumption to be entertained, and Mr. Justice Grier completed the ILLUSION by making the PRESUMPTION of citizenship conclusive.

Chief Justice Marshall: The jurisdiction of this court being limited...both parties must be citizens to come within the description. That invisible, intangible, and artificial being, -that mere legal entity, (a corporation aggregate) is certainly not a citizen, and consequently can not sue or be sued in the courts of the United States unless the rights of the members in this respect can be exercised in their corporate name.

Justice Wayne: A corporation created by and doing business in a particular State is to be deemed to all intents and purposes as a person, although an artificial person, -an inhabitant of the same State...capable of being treated as a citizen of that state as much as a NATURAL PERSON.

Justice Grier: If the declaration sets forth facts [?] from which the citizenship of the parties may be presumed or legally inferred, it is sufficient. The presumption arising from the habitat of a corporation in the place of its creation being conclusive as to the residence of those who use the corporate name and exercise the faculties conferred by it, the allegation that the "defendants are a body corporate by the act of the general assembly of Maryland" is a sufficient averment that the real defendants are citizens of that

State. (Marshall v. B. & O. Railroad Company, 16 How., 328.)

Conclusion ~...Congress is urged to exert its power to give the country a legislative fact which will, in terms, transcend a judicial fiction, to the end that in the eye of the law, as in the spirit of the Constitution, all citizens are equal, be they natural or corporate.

#### U.S. GREEN CARD OFFICE

<http://www.usgreencardoffice.com/blog/what-is-a-sponsored-green-card>

What is a Sponsored Green Card?

A sponsored green card is also known as a family based green card and is based on a relative in the family who has achieved lawful permanent resident status in the US or **has become a natural citizen** of the United States.

<http://www.leagle.com/decision-result?xmlDoc/In+INCO+20120807211.xml/docbase/CSLWAR3-2007-CURR>

GULZAR v. STATE No. 20A03-1202-PC-88.  
971 N.E.2d 1258 (2012)

Naveed GULZAR, Appellant-Petitioner, v.  
STATE of Indiana, Appellee-Respondent.  
Court of Appeals of Indiana. August 7, 2012.

~After the guilty plea hearing, Gulzar had consulted with an immigration attorney who explained that because of his theft conviction, Gulzar would be unable to renew his green card or **become a natural citizen**. Id. at 13. Gulzar testified that if he had been advised by trial counsel that his guilty plea would subject him to automatic deportation, he would not have pled guilty because it would prevent him from **becoming a natural citizen** and require him to go back to Pakistan. Id. at 12.

~ ~ ~ ~  
LAHORE, PAKISTAN: Rejection of the writ petition by the Supreme Court, regarding the reconstitution of the Election Commission of Pakistan filed by Dr Tahirul Qadri, has once again sparked intense debate over the status of dual nationals in Pakistan. The term, dual nationals, should be distinguished from that of foreign nationals and hence, these must not be confused with each other. There have been attempts to reduce dual nationals to **pariah** status. National sentiments towards them give the impression as if they are the root cause of all ailments of the country.

It should not be forgotten that most dual nationals are *natural citizens* of Pakistan and have secured this status by birth. There is no justification whatsoever of depriving any natural citizen of his/her basic citizenship right

guaranteed by the Constitution. The Pakistan Citizenship Act, 1951 recognizes the right of dual nationality of its citizens with **17** countries. Therefore, having been recognized by law, dual nationals should also be given full citizenship rights by allowing them to participate in the country's political life. In Pakistan, the part of the Constitution, **barring dual nationals from becoming parliamentarians** contradicts the state's official policy on the issue of dual nationality. It must be ratified by either changing the state policy on dual nationals or by amending the Constitution to this effect.

As far as the **oath of allegiance** of a dual national to a second country is concerned, it is only a *legal formality*, (!!!) varying from country to country, and does not affect his loyalty to the first state.

If people like Sayeeda Warsi, Lord Nazir Ahmed and Lord Sarwar, despite being of Pakistani origin, can secure important political positions in the UK, then why not in Pakistan? Instead of complicating the issue of dual nationality, we should deal with it objectively by putting it in its true context. Doubting the patriotism and sincerity of millions of expatriate Pakistanis is neither justifiable nor justified. Therefore, dual nationals should also be given their due.

Mohsin Raza Malik Published in The Express Tribune, February 28th, 2013.

<http://tribune.com.pk/story/513425/recognising-rights-of-dual-nationals/>

re: CAN I BE FORCED TO TESTIFY AGAINST HUSBAND?

Reply

I remember there being 2 types of spousal privilege. One type belongs to the spouse of the defendant, so they can waive it and testify if they want to, but can't be forced to do so. The other type belongs to the defendant and can only be used to keep out communications--whatever the defendant told the spouse, sort of like the attorney-client privilege. This the non-defendant spouse cannot waive because it belongs to the defendant, BUT it only works for communications made during the marriage. It wouldn't work for any statements made before they were married.

Under U.S. federal common law, the spousal testimonial privilege is held by the witness-spouse, not the party-spouse, and therefore does not prevent a spouse who wishes to testify from doing so.[3] The rationale of this rule is that if a witness-spouse desires to testify against the party-spouse, there is no marital harmony

left to protect through the obstruction of such testimony. This common law principle is the view in a minority of U.S. states. A majority of U.S. jurisdictions, however, do not follow U.S. federal common law; in most states, the party-spouse, and not the witness-spouse, is the holder of spousal testimonial privilege.

~~~~~  
CITIZEN is to "subject" what Freeman is to serf.

I understand what citizenship is. But I don't understand what subjectship is, nor what Citizenship is.

Being a Citizen is an equal membership in an association of equals.

Being a subject is being an unequal, monarch-owned, life-long possession of a dictator.

The former is about self-sovereignty, while the later is about servitude. There is no equivalence between them. They are from opposite worlds. They can't be interchanged nor substituted for each other.

Adding adjectives in front of them does not change that fact, even if they are the same adjectives. It is not the adjectives that makes them identical because it is the nouns that make them different. The nouns are from wholly different universes. One is natural while the other is dictator-imposed. "All the fruit of seed, sow, sheep, cow, serf, and slave belong and remain the property of the Lord of the domain because they came into existence on his property." That's jus soli.

It's opposite is the principle of freedom. The off-spring of freemen do not belong to the King but to the parents, and they inherit their national membership from them, not from the King's soil or his self-proclaimed borders.

Freemen have an obligation to protect and defend their families and society, and that may include serving in the national military. But subjects have an obligation to obey and obey and obey because they are subject and not free. They are born to obey and be subservient all their life unless they are born into the elite ruling class. But for the freeman, the government is the one meant to obey, -obey the will of the People, which includes the will to be free.

"The same rule was *in force* in all the English Colonies upon this continent down to the time of the Declaration of Independence, and in the United States afterwards, and continued to prevail under the Constitution as originally established."

Foggy, what does "in force" mean? There were thirteen independent colonies with thirteen colonial governors, legislatures, and courts, each of which had its own laws

about who was a subject, a born subject, and a natural subject. So "in force" by what force?

The Declaration of Independence was a radical and total alteration in the relationship between colonists and government as the monarchical principles of subservience and unquestioning obedience were rejected (except by pathetic servile Loyalists like yourself).

What went before did not survive the overthrow of the old by the Declaration of Independence when it came to membership in one's sovereign state. All concepts of monarchical authority were trashed and reviled, and natural rights became king in their place. The first natural right is the right of belonging. Children belong to parents and parents belong to their civilized society, not to the Crown. Children inherit that which the parents possess, whether riches or poverty, pride or shame, high status or ignobility, including membership in their family, society, State, and nation.

The States were the arbiters of who their citizens were and state law was supreme over naturalization processing as well as immigration. Only Virginia has been identified as a State that granted jus soli citizenship to children of immigrants. No one has yet identified any others that didn't strictly follow jus sanguinis. So the proclamation made by an ignorant Chief Justice does not change reality. It is what it is, -not what fantasy claims it is.

A now retired NSA official told me last year: "I hope you do not expect to learn anything about our ops any time soon. The reason this stuff is so secret is that it would scare the pants off a lot of people... It's just safer and politically expedient for everyone to remain blissfully ignorant."

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/inside-the-nsa-peeling-back-the-curtain-on-americas-intelligence-agency-8658016.html>

It is thus necessary that the individual should finally come to realize that his own ego is of no importance in comparison with the existence of his nation; that the position of the individual ego is conditioned solely by the interests of the nation as a whole...that above all the unity of a nation's spirit and will are worth far more than the freedom of the spirit and will of an individual...This state of mind, which subordinates the interests of the ego to the conservation of the community, is really the first premise for every truly human culture...The basic attitude form which such activity arises, we call...(-to distinguish it from egoism and selfishness) "idealism". By this we understand only the individual's capacity to make sacrifices for the community, for his fellow men. (Adolf Hitler speaking at Bueckeberg, Oct. 7, 1933)