

Why Does Country Need New Citizens Who Won't Defend It?

0 0 0 0

by David Codrea , July 27, 2015



Why is it in our interests to recognize citizenship for foreigners who will not “provide for the common defence”? — Photo: USCIS

The United States Citizenship and Immigration Services has [announced a change in policy](#) regarding the oath taken by naturalization candidates: They will no longer be required “to declare that they will ‘bear arms on behalf of the United States’ and ‘perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States.’”

Exclusion on religious and moral grounds has its roots in the Founding era, some will point out.

“After the Declaration of Independence, a number of state constitutions specifically recognized the rights of conscientious objectors,” the book [Congressional Protection of Religious Liberty](#) documents. “The 1776 Pennsylvania constitution provided: ‘Nor can any man who is conscientiously scrupulous of bearing arms, be justly compelled thereto...’”

Likewise, the constitutions of Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine provided similar exemptions. Those were practical recognition concessions concerning people and faiths that were already established at the time.

Still, this latest move by the Obama administration leaves open some questions.

The preamble to [the Constitution](#) includes a handful of specific limited purposes for forming a national government that are often intentionally overlooked by those counting on the rest of us being neither informed nor on guard. Among the justifications for states ceding power to the federal arrangement: “provide for the common defence ... and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity.”

Why is it in our interests to recognize citizenship for foreigners who will not “provide for the common defence”? The Constitution was written for us, so it seems fair to ask: What’s in it for us? What’s in it for our Posterity?

It’s also fair to ask, since the whole government ostensibly was set up for us, why such a change was made without consulting us beforehand through our representatives, and asking how we felt about it? For an administration that makes such a big deal out of trying to con people into thinking we live in a “democracy,” why have the representatives of the people been bypassed on such a potentially revealing litmus test of sincerity?

With problems experienced with some foreign nationals let into this country without proper vetting and without ascertaining how their admission further secures the Blessings of Liberty, it’s also fair to wonder how many oaths are just part of a ritual needed to mask hostile loyalties.

While the USCIS policy went into effect July 21, there is still time to provide inputs, including protests, assuming you, as an Oath Keeper, have objections to this change and would like to make your views known. You have a little over a week to do that, by sending your inputs, per the Policy Manual Comment process, to ope.feedback@uscis.dhs.gov. The only thing I would add, assuming your Congressman and Senators are not total wastes of time, is to include them on your correspondence.

Categories: [2nd amendment](#), [All](#), [Oath Keepers](#)

Tags: [citizenship](#), [Constitution](#), [oath](#), [USCIS](#)

About Author



[David Codrea](#)

David Codrea blogs at The War on Guns: Notes from the Resistance (WarOnGuns.com), and is a field editor/columnist for GUNS Magazine. Named “Journalist of the Year” in 2011 by the Second Amendment Foundation for his groundbreaking work on the “Fast and Furious” ATF “gunwalking” scandal, he is a frequent event speaker and guest on national radio and television programs.