

## Dual Citizenship: A Legal Paradox

Arturo M. de Castro

51 ATENEO L.J. 870 (2007)

*SUBJECT(S): CONSTITUTIONAL LAW*

*KEYWORD(S): DUAL CITIZENSHIP, CITIZENSHIP RETENTION AND REACQUISITION ACT*

Dual citizenship, as a condition or status of having dual allegiance to two different countries at the same time, is universally recognized as undesirable. Dual allegiance, in the long run, would be detrimental to both countries of which a person may legally claim to be a citizen in terms of questionable loyalties and abuse of citizenship for convenience devoid of the fealty or loyal commitment inherent in allegiance and citizenship. A person so situated, by accident of birth, must choose only one nationality and devote his single and undivided allegiance and loyalty to the country of his choice.

The 1987 Constitution adopts the policy that dual allegiance is inimical to national interest and shall be dealt with by law. While the Court has differentiated dual allegiance as a result of an individual's volition as opposed to dual citizenship which is involuntary, the Citizenship Retention and Reacquisition Act allows all natural-born Filipino citizens who have lost Filipino citizenship through naturalization as citizens of another country by simple expedience of taking an oath of allegiance to the Republic of the Philippines. Thus the main distinction posited by the Court appears to have been washed away by the enacted of said law.

The Article in its Conclusion ultimately solves the paradox of dual citizenship by recognizing that there is no dual allegiance before the dual citizen makes a choice by taking an oath of allegiance of the country of his choice. On the other hand, dual citizenship under the present law based on dual allegiance to the foreign country required as final step in naturalization as citizen of that country, in tandem with the allegiance to the Republic of the Philippines as a mode of reacquiring dual Philippine dual citizenship must be declared unconstitutional.