

Citizenship Illuminated by Various Examples

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

Its opposite is the principle of freedom. The off-spring of American Freemen do not belong to the King but to their 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.

Adrien Nash August 2013

~ ~ ~ ~

Justice Gray wrote in the explanation of the Wong Kim Ark ruling: "The same rule (just soli) 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."

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? (Answer: none)

The Declaration of Independence was a radical and total alteration in the relationship between col-

onists 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.

Adrien Nash August 2013

[http://www.leagle.com/decision-result/?xmlidoc/In+INCO+20120807211.xml/docbase/CSLWAR3-2007-CURRGULZAR v. STATE No. 20A03-1202-PC-88-971 N.E.2d 1258 \(2012\)](http://www.leagle.com/decision-result/?xmlidoc/In+INCO+20120807211.xml/docbase/CSLWAR3-2007-CURRGULZAR 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 county to county, 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? 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/>

~ ~ ~ ~

State vs. Federal Common Law:

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 com-

munications 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. 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.

~ ~ ~ ~

You don't know the truth, and can't handle it!

~ 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>

Defending "the Greater Good" for Society  
against Individual Rights & Freedom

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 from 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