

The Fear Of An Article V Convention: What Should JBS Be Saying?

By Bill Walker

What should the John Birch Society and other JBS allies such as Phyllis Schlafly, Chuck Baldwin, and Tom DeWeese be saying about an Article V Convention? These convention opponents at this time say they want to “preserve” the Constitution, *as it currently exists so we should not have an Article V Convention **even though Article V mandates that one be held.*** That is the problem with their position. The current Constitution mandates Congress call a convention when the states apply. Public record of the applications proves Congress is currently obligated to call. Nevertheless, these so-called “supporters” of the Constitution say we should scrap the convention clause and not call a convention even when the Constitution demands it. In short, veto it—or support the government having the power to do so. How can you “preserve” something you urge be destroyed?

There are two relevant definitions of the word “preserve” in Webster’s Dictionary. The first says, “to keep safe from injury, harm, or destruction; guard or defend from evil.” The second says, “to keep alive, intact, in existence, or from decay (“preserve an old house”; “the right of trial by jury shall be preserved” U.S. Constitution.”) If these JBS advocates believe the first definition defines “preserve” the Constitution then it follows, they believe amending the document is evil. If JBS is true to this definition, it believes the First Amendment, the Second Amendment, the Thirteen Amendment, the Nineteenth Amendment to name a few amendments, are evil. Thus, JBS wishes to “preserve” the Constitution by preventing such “evil.” However, as Webster uses the Constitution itself to define the word “preserve” and the word “preserve” is in the Constitution itself [7th Amendment, Article II “...preserve, protect and defend...”], this definition should be the one used when referring to “preserving” the Constitution. However, is the second definition the one JBS believes?

If JBS really desires to keep the Constitution intact and obey it as is, then logically they cannot believe any part of the current document is evil. Therefore, *all* the Constitution is “good” and therefore should be “preserved” meaning at the minimum obeying all the Constitution as written. Instead, JBS urges we scrap constitutional provisions *without obeying the Constitution’s amendatory process that allows for changes in the Constitution.* If JBS *truly believed the Constitution, be obeyed, as it currently exists, they would urge passage of an amendment to the Constitution eliminating the Article V Convention.* JBS has *never* supported an amendment to eliminate the convention clause. Rather, JBS calls the provision “a bad idea” and urges a convention not occur, even when the Constitution demands it. It would appear from this “analysis” of the Constitution JBS views constitutional mandates not as law but “ideas” which can be dispensed with whenever the “idea” is politically inconvenient. In short, JBS “supports” only the parts of the Constitution it agrees with or which serve to advance its political agenda. This is not support; this is constitutional hypocrisy at its finest. True, patriotic, loyal Americans support all the Constitution. Anyone can support the Constitution when he agrees with it; the real test of a patriotic American is supporting the Constitution when he does not.

JBS wants Constitution clauses scrapped not by amendment but by JBS fiat. In short, the JBS wishes to be its own “constitutional convention” setting in place its version of the Constitution. If allowed to do so, our present Constitution is neither viable nor intact. Hence, it is no longer “preserved.” Thus, the entire JBS premise of “preserve the Constitution” is defeated *if it is assumed the JBS definition of “preserve the Constitution” is based on the second common definition of the word “preserve.” It is not defeated if JBS defines “preserve the Constitution” by assuming the amendment process is “evil” and they will stop that “evil” by whatever means necessary even if that means destroying the document they say they want to “preserve.”* The fact is Article V is part of the Constitution JBS says they wish to “preserve.” If they are telling the truth, they should be as equally dedicated to preserving that part of the Constitution as any other. If they want to eliminate the amendment, the process itself provides the means to do so.

JBS has said all that is required to fix our national problems is we elect the “right” people to Congress who will miraculously turn everything around. Obviously JBS believes those currently in office are not the “right” people so this means electing new ones. Given the incumbency rate in Congress is 98 percent, it follows JBS only has the remaining two percent to accomplish this. Moreover, their “solution” requires all two percent will be the “right” people, that is, elected officials whose political point of view matches JBS.

Let us examine this JBS premise more closely. There are 535 members in Congress, 100 senators and 435 representatives. Each two-year election cycle 468 members face election, 33 senators and 435 representatives. Given the 98 percent incumbency return rate already mentioned, this means the number of “right” people that can be elected each election cycle is ten. Assuming five “right” people are elected to the senate and five to the house in each cycle, *it will require a total of 50 election cycles or 100 years to achieve majorities of the “right” people in both houses of Congress.* Frankly, we cannot afford to wait 100 years for the JBS solution. The economic crisis of this nation grows daily. The political outlook is not much better. *If nothing else, the mixed results of this year’s primary elections demonstrate the JBS “solution” is sheer folly as not even ten “right” people made it past the primaries.*

On the other hand, amendments are very fast solutions, faster than people realize. Ignoring the 27th Amendment, which required 208 years to ratify, nearly all the amendments in the Constitution were proposed and ratified [in less than two years](#). According to the Congressional Research Service, **average ratification time for a proposed amendment is one year, eight months and seven days** *meaning that the problems facing this nation can be solved by amendments in less than one election cycle!* **Moreover, unlike the fifty elections required in Congress, all Article V Convention delegates are simultaneously elected and there are no incumbents. Therefore, the principle of election of the “right” people only works if you are discussing an Article V Convention.** Which makes more sense? Spend the next hundred years hoping to elect the “right” people to Congress (leaving to JBS the problem of how to keep alive all those “right” people already in Congress the full 100 years) or solve the problems we have in less than two years with a single election?

Article V has been part of the Constitution since its creation. In terms of keeping the Constitution relevant our societal needs, it is, without question, the most important part of the Constitution. Without amendments, the Constitution is locked in time. As our society evolves, its problems change requiring new limits on its form of government. Without amendments this cannot occur. The Constitution is therefore unable to satisfy the needs of our society. Our ancestors saw the value of amendments and used them. Given these facts, it is not surprising turnaround time for amendments are shorter than election cycles. Not only are amendments faster but more permanent. We now listen to the JBS and do not see the value of amendments. The problems of these past societies were resolved; we admit our problems are not resolved. Today we give credence to an organization whose only solution means we will never solve them.

Consider how powerful the Founders of this nation intended a convention be. They made its call peremptory on Congress stating the “national rulers shall have no option” on a convention call. The Founders did not any other provision of the Constitution as “peremptory.” They specified applications are not to go congressional committees as this implies Congress has a choice in the matter of a convention call. They specified Congress can neither debate nor vote on a convention call. Obviously, with such power the Founders had great faith in the process. Little wonder. That process had just created the Constitution. However, even these men realized the document they created was not perfect. To remain viable, they knew the Constitution would need amendment from time to time. They created a system allowing amendments regardless of whether Congress wanted them or not. Thus, they created a method where the Constitution would be “preserved” by allowing it change as required thus remaining viable and relevant.

JBS, who says they want to “preserve” the Constitution asks us throw out the wisdom of the Founders for their own. They often speak of the lack of quality and character in the political world today as the reason not to obey the Constitution. Is the quality and character of JBS any better than those they accuse are? **Every argument they have advanced not to call a convention is based on lies. If their wisdom is so great, why do they have to lie about everything to justify it?** If we follow their path, are we certain we will be better off? Where is the proof guaranteeing this? DeWeese, Schlafly and all, cite the dangers of Nancy Pelosi and Harry Reid. Are we certain that *their* “leadership” is a better risk? Can they show even once, where America, in obeying the Constitution and amending the document, has not ultimately been better off?

All constitutional amendments share a commonality. All limit government and are effective in doing so. Government actions allowed before the amendment such as poll taxes, unlimited presidential terms, slavery, disenfranchisement of women, and self-incrimination at trial to cite a few examples were banned by amendments. There is no reason to believe amendments intended to balance the federal budget, create federal initiatives, referendums and recall powers for the people, review of Supreme Court decisions by the states, eliminate the electoral college, establish congressional term limits, set judicial term limits, allow state posse comitatus regarding immigration law, to cite a few examples, will be any less effective than the current amendments are.

Indeed if one examines the problems of this nation objectively two pertinent facts spring to light. First, the violations charged about the excessive government actions originate with language found in the original Constitution (general welfare clause, commerce clause) and not with the amendments. Second, as demonstrated by the 11th and 12th amendments, amendments will resolve these issues. Both the 11th and 12th amendments clarified language in the original Constitution and thus restricted the government from an abuse it had engaged in before those amendments. This evidence is irrefutable; the only solutions to our problems are amendments. No elected official has the authority to alter the language of the Constitution except by amendment. Electing the “right” people is not a solution *because even if the “right” people are elected they will still be required to use the amendment process to solve the problems*. Electing the “right” people is an excuse that solves nothing and leaves JBS still strangling the amendment process.

If the national government is viewed as a river, it is the Constitution and its amendments that are the banks to that river. Therefore, the river is checked. It flows down a limited channel. As time progresses, new banks are required because the river, like all rivers, attempts to cut new channels. We need new banks to stop the flow of government into new channels. Our problems are multiple requiring multiple amendments to resolve. The cold fact is current amendments are insufficient to resolve our current problems *otherwise those amendments would have done so already*. The reason for this is obvious: the already existing amendments were written to deal the problems of “that” society in “that” time, not “our” society in “our” time. Government is out of control and in a manner that has not existed in our history. It is insufficient, if not outright idiocy, to say all we have to do solve our current problems is obey the Constitution “as is” *because nothing in the present Constitution provides the solutions required*.

There is not a single word, for example, that limits or directs how Congress shall budget or spend public monies. Therefore, they can spend trillions to bailout huge corporations. Nothing permits the people to reject specific congressional decisions. Therefore, Congress can mandate it is criminal act not to buy government-controlled health insurance even if 80 percent of the people oppose such a law. Presently, under our Constitution, the people can only hope to remove these members of Congress from office. However, their offensive acts in the form of legislation remain untouched like a poison still pumped into the body. There is nothing allowing for review of federal court decisions by the people meaning if the courts go along, that poison remains. In short, under the present Constitution, the congressional power of purse and judicial fiat is absolute and therefore the causes of the problems remain untouched *even if we obey the Constitution to the very letter*. Only amendments can limit or change these absolute powers.

JBS says obey the Constitution “as is” and all will be fine. In fact, the government *does* obey the Constitution (outside of refusing to obey Article V). It selects a few key phrases, such as “promote the general welfare” or “regulate commerce,” phrases that can only be redefined by amendment, to justify all its actions. Federal courts, claiming powers not in the Constitution “interpret” the Constitution justifying these actions. Only amendments

can regulate judicial interpretation. Only amendments can mandate Congress be limited to its already spelled out listed powers. Only amendments can prevent presidential excesses. Elections were simply never intended *to prevent or correct* constitutional weaknesses within the Constitution itself. That is the job of amendments. We can elect people till the cows come home but even if Rand Paul were cloned 535 times and held every single seat in the Congress simultaneously, he could not change even so much as a single period in the Constitution *unless he used the amendment system to do so*. Moreover, no matter what this conservative clone did legislatively *those actions could immediately be undone by his elected successors*.

Because of the fear of amendment JBS has instilled in us, our government and we have been forced to jerry rig solutions not supported by constitutional provisions that would exist if we amended the Constitution. We have piled solution upon solution, piling jerry rig on jerry rig like unanchored scaffolding built against a skyscraper. Eventually as with any unanchored scaffolding, our jerry rigging will fall to earth. Only amendments provide the anchors make solutions permanent. JBS caused this predicament. They have paralyzed this nation for 40 years. JBS needs to man up and solve the problem they created. JBS must be called on the carpet. We must demand more than a fear campaign out of them. We must demand they provide *real solutions* to the problems about a convention they created. We must demand JBS stop using fear and lies to justify scrapping the Constitution **while offering no other solution that actually will solve the problem. If JBS can or will not do so, they must, for the good of the nation, be rejected and ignored.**

To reject Article V as JBS advocates means consigning the Constitution to the dustbin. In order to “preserve” the Constitution means amending it. Amending keeps the Constitution relevant to today’s needs. Past societies saw the need for amendment and created them to deal with their issues. The 1787 America saw the need for a Bill of Rights. The 1865 society saw a need to prohibit slavery. Thus, they updated the document keeping relevant to that time. It is the Constitution *as amended* that has come down through the ages to be relevant today. It is that Constitution, *an amended Constitution*, vastly different from the original document created in 1787, which the JBS says should be “preserved.” Their hypocrisy screams out. JBS says “preserve” the Constitution “as is” meaning they support amending the Constitution. Then JBS opposes amending the Constitution.

The public must demand more of JBS than spreading fear through lies about a convention. JBS has spent 40 years inventing lies about a convention and not once has come up with a single solution to the problems they themselves created. Before JBS, no such problems existed. The Founding Fathers certainly saw no such problems or they would have dealt with them. Anyone can create fears about a convention. However, when the fundamental issue of whether or not those fears destroy an entire form of government then common sense dictates those that create the fears provide the solutions.

JBS always states an Article V Convention will become a “runaway” convention, write a new constitution, scrap our current document, remove all our rights and implement this

new form of government by dictate. In their minds, no other outcome is possible other than the American people will destroy themselves by using their own form of government to solve their problems. If they view the amendment process as evil then clearly they must also view those who would use it as evil. They say a convention should not be called despite the mandate of Article V. They urge change of government not by amendment, but by consensus of fear. Once the “scrap principle” is established it extends to the entire Constitution. If Article V grants such power, why is it JBS always fails to state Congress has the exact same power as a convention? This constitutional fact means if a convention can write a new constitution, remove all our rights and implement this new form of government without our consent then so can Congress. If a convention is so dangerous, why doesn't JBS sound an equal alarm about Congress? If they are correct, that a particular political persuasion might be so inclined to use the amendment process as they say, why has this group with huge majorities throughout the government not done what they allege? Could it be these people respect the Constitution and Article V more than JBS will admit?

This doomsday convention scenario of constitution overthrow was created by JBS in its 1980's political campaign against the balanced budget amendment. To permit America to go from the few billion in debt to several trillion now, JBS began a systematic, baseless, fear campaign about the “dangers” of a convention. They “warned” 32 applications for a convention were already submitted. They said if two more states applied, a convention would occur. They said a convention was “a bad idea” to make people believe Article V of the United States Constitution is an “idea” rather than a constitutional mandate. Thus, the JBS campaign sowed the seeds in belief the Constitution can be scrapped by the government.

JBS misquoted public record in its scrap the Constitution campaign. Had there *really* been only 32 applications for a convention call by the states, obviously the decision to call would remain with the states. Hence, a convention call could be called a “bad idea” *as the decision to call still was a state decision.* **However, public record shows decades before JBS even existed, the states, by submission of their applications, exceeded the two-thirds numeric count required by Article V. Thus, the states decided Congress was required to call a convention.** Having already applied in sufficient number to cause a convention call, *the matter became a federal requirement no longer controlled by the states.* Hence, an Article V Convention was no longer an “idea” *but a constitutional mandate.* The public record proves the John Birch Society deliberately lied to the public failing to inform of the other 700 applications from the states. From the beginning of its campaign, JBS knew more than sufficient applications existed to cause a convention call. Despite this, they urged Americans overturn their Constitution by scrapping Article V.

The official public record proves that JBS had to know the correct number of applying states. The only official public record used by the Congress to record convention applications is the Congressional Record. However, as part of *its campaign to avoid calling a convention Congress has never complied state applications into a single location within the Congressional Record.* The first and currently only compilation

convention applications at a single source based on photographic copies of original Congressional Record pages is the [FOAVC website](#).

The fact no official repository of convention applications exists means anyone researching applications must plow through thousands of pages of Congressional Record to find the applications. **There is no other way to find these records.** This public record proves the following. The first application submitted containing language for a balanced budget amendment was in 1957 from the state of Indiana. The next such application came in 1961 from the state of Wyoming. *Between those two years, at least 18 other applications on other amendment issues were submitted by the states.* There is no one, forced to research the Congressional Record page by page in order to find the 32 applications JBS cites, that would not have also discovered these 18 other applications. The only plausible reason for not mentioning these applications would be deliberate omission on the part of JBS **as JBS has repeatedly stated there are only 32 applications submitted by states for one amendment issue.**

The public record is even more damning regarding the deliberate lying by JBS as to the next state application submitted. Between 1961 and 1975 when the next application by Virginia containing language for a balanced budget was submitted, 239 other applications on other amendment issues were submitted by the states. These applications included most of the applications for an apportionment amendment. For the record, apportionment has received the second highest number of state applications (38 applying states with repeal of federal income tax 39 applying states being first) in United States history. **Again, the fact Congress does not compile applications into a single source within the Congressional Record means that it would be impossible for anyone researching applications not to have come across these 239 additional applications in their search for specific applications.**

The public record is clear. Even if only one amendment issue is considered, Congress is still obligated to call a convention if the number of applying states exceeds two-thirds of the state legislatures. The correct method of “counting” applications however is not by specific amendment subject of any language within the application but a simple numeric count of applying states with no terms or conditions. Article V is clear: the purpose of the application is to cause Congress to call a convention, not to propose a specific amendment on the part of the states. That job is for the convention itself and it is the sole constitutional assignment of a convention. Therefore, it cannot be assumed by the states as this would serve to nullify part of the Constitution without amendment not to mention violating the principle of the Tenth Amendment. This means the language referring to any amendment issue within the application (if any) is irrelevant. **The application by a specific number of states determines whether Congress is obligated to call an Article V Convention.** Finally, for the purpose of accuracy, the public record shows 36 states, not 32 states, have submitted applications containing language for a balanced budget amendment. There is no way JBS could have researched the public record to find “its” 32 applications and not realized [other applications existed](#). [One application alone](#) lists 35 states that applied for a convention call long before the JBS fear campaign began.

It is impossible to believe any credible political organization embarking on a legitimate political campaign would not thoroughly research the facts surrounding its primary argument that a sufficient number of applications had not already been submitted by the states to cause a convention call. Only by this argument can JBS present its “bad idea” theory. The reason is obvious. If JBS admits there are sufficient applications for a convention to cause a call already submitted, then JBS would directly be calling for the overthrow of the Constitution, a criminal violation. This explains why JBS never varies from saying there are only 32 applications even when public record proves otherwise. Moreover, JBS would be admitting there was nothing to discuss as even JBS admits **if the states apply in sufficient number Congress must call a convention.** Therefore, it must be presumed JBS did research the number of applications submitted by the states and then chose to falsely state that number.

Hence, as public record irrefutably proves the terms of an Article V Convention call were satisfied before JBS began its fear campaign it is clear this campaign, from its inception, not political opposition to a particular amendment proposal, but a concerted effort to overthrow our constitutional form of government. JBS exudes conspiracy from its pores. It has a history of [coups](#) even within its own ranks resulting in [splinter groups](#). Given JBS reputation for coups no wonder these tactics are used on the Constitution. Thus the anti-convention JBS campaign to scrap Article V. Through this lie, the Constitution itself can be scrapped. Once JBS lie takes hold, once Americans learn to fear rather than to trust their constitutional form of government, a government coup is easy. Does anyone *really believe an extremist group like JBS is willing to wait a hundred years for its “solution” to take effect and is not using its campaign for some more immediate, sinister purpose?*

The JBS solution to their “concern” the Constitution will be scrapped by an Article V Convention is to ensure the Constitution is scrapped anyway *without a convention ever being called*. JBS seeks to fulfill its own lies and prophecy; the only way to “preserve” the Constitution is to scrap Article V *thus “amending” the Constitution without bothering to amend it.* This is the same thing JBS accuses its enemies doing--refusing to obey the Constitution “as is”. How can any group have credibility when it does the same thing it accuses others of doing?

In the words of Joseph Goebbels, propaganda minister for the Nazi party, “If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it. The lie can be maintained only for such time as the State can shield the people from the political, economic and/or military consequences of the lie. It thus becomes vitally important for the State to use all of its powers to repress dissent, for the truth is the mortal enemy of the lie, and thus by extension, the truth is the greatest enemy of the State.”

What applies to a State can also be true of a political organization.

The unfounded, myopic reasoning of JBS that the only political solution to Article V is to destroy the thing they say they want to “preserve” raises a legitimate question: what should the John Birch Society and its allies be saying about an Article V Convention beyond their current one note symphony of scrapping the Constitution? As has been

shown in this series of columns the fear by JBS against a convention are groundless. The JBS campaign is based on lies. The fear of a convention was created by JBS for the political purpose of defeating a balanced budget amendment by attacking the process by which it might be proposed rather than the amendment itself. This statement is proven by the fact JBS never mentions any other amendment proposal (and there are over 20 some of which JBS publicly supports) except balanced budget when spreading its convention lies. As such, outside of a balanced budget amendment, it seems JBS has no fears of holding a convention.

How should the JBS and its allies address the fears of a convention proactively rather than reactively as they do now? What solutions should they offer to the fears they created? How do they prove they are in fact, as they say, actually loyal to the Constitution? Certainly loyal Americans are not only obligated to raise issues of public concern but as sovereign citizens ultimately responsible for our nation, obligated find solutions to those problems in order to further the public good. No fear campaign has ever been shown to further public good.

The JBS has raised three primary fears to an Article V Convention. Each fear has been refuted as baseless allegations based on lies. Nevertheless, the rest of this column will show one of method open to JBS to address these fears proactively. Thus, rather than scrapping the Constitution as JBS now proposes, the Constitution is executed as intended. JBS, instead of being known as a fear mongering right wing extremist group dedicated to overthrowing the constitutional process, can be instead present itself as a proactive organization which not only raised awareness of the problems of a convention but moved in a positive, proactive manner to present solutions to those fears in order to facilitate the constitutional process.

There are three major fears JBS [and its allies](#) express about an Article V Convention. First, a convention will become a “runaway” convention such as (they say) the 1787 convention was. This “runaway convention” will create a new constitution. Two, there is no way for JBS to control the convention agenda. Three, a convention cannot be limited to a single subject amendment.

To anyone reading the JBS material on its website, the answer to these so-called problems should be obvious. JBS says it supports the Constitution and the solutions to our problems are found in that document. As to the first concern regarding a “runaway” convention the language of Article V itself clearly limits both Congress and a convention to “proposing amendments...to this Constitution” not to mention it requires 3/4th approval from the states to ratify any proposal thus defeating the fear. Obviously, this constitutional guarantee means nothing to JBS. Given their fears of a convention, this is no surprise as people who operate out of fear rarely are rational in their thinking especially when their goal is to overthrow the Constitution. Hence, they immediately reject any constitutional guarantees designed to prevent the very object they seek as ineffective. To believe the contrary means JBS accepts the Constitution, or any portion of it, cannot be scrapped. This in turn would be admission their entire anti-convention campaign is bogus including their ongoing campaign to have legislature “rescind”

applications after the two-thirds mark has been reached as the states have no more right to veto the Constitution than Congress does.

The rest of America, the 93 percent according to a recent poll, who believe in obeying the Constitution, disagrees with the JBS assessment of Article V. To this vast majority of loyal Americans who really believe in the Constitution, the fundamental law of the land is sufficient. This law presents an obvious solution to the problem JBS raises. It means doing the very thing, JBS says: obey the Constitution, as it currently exists. This means using the already existing ratification process to prevent such mischief. It also means that as the Supreme Court has interpreted Article V mean there is no interpretation, implication or rules of construction permitted of its language, rescissions are constitutionally invalid.

Article V allows only amendment proposals to the present Constitution. Obviously therefore it does not allow any other action by either Congress or convention regarding amendment proposal. Hence, any such action is unconstitutional. As it is unconstitutional, it is also illegal. This means such action can be classified as a criminal action as it is not authorized by the Constitution. Any argument saying as Article V is silent on this point that it is interpretation and therefore not allowed is invalid. An act to create a new constitution and impose it by fiat is an act against *the entire Constitution* and therefore the offense is not limited by any provision of Article V or lack thereof. Hence, the act violates other provisions of the Constitution where such interpretation or construction is permitted.

Thus, a positive response to the issue raised by the JBS of a runaway convention is a public call and political effort to pass a criminal law making it illegal for a convention or a delegate to take any action other than proposing amendments to the present constitution. The criminal law could have a jail sentence (or even a death sentence) as stiff as JBS felt necessary to ensure should any convention delegate attempt any action but proposing amendments to our present Constitution, he/she would face arrest. With this criminal law in place, any danger of a “runaway” convention is negated. JBS says its membership numbers in the thousands. Surely among its secret list of membership are enough members in Congress to enact a law prohibiting a runaway convention should JBS not be satisfied with present laws. Obviously, a single call from the JBS CEO Art Thompson and the JBS National Council to these members is sufficient to enact this law overnight. Absurd—hardly. After all, if an organization can, with no more than baseless lies, paralyze an entire constitutional process, is it beyond conception they have sufficient political power to ensure passage of any national law they desire?

Of course given the provisions in the already existing Patriot Act (Section 802) there really is no need for additional criminal law. Section 802 declares “domestic terrorism” as “acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States; appear to be intended “to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion.” It is doubtful anyone would argue if a convention attempted as JBS suggests it would not be in criminal violation of several federal laws. Obviously, the act influences government policy. Certainly, it would

intimidate the civilian population. Thus, convention delegates could be declare domestic terrorists and arrested immediately.

What JBS is really saying is it knows a convention will engineer is a coup d'etat. They should be careful on this point. Withholding of evidence or knowledge of intent of a federal crime is itself a federal crime. If JBS knows who plans to use a convention in such a manner, they, as loyal Americans, are obligated to report to the proper authorities. However, whenever they have been so confronted to actually name names, they grow silent. Obviously, as with the rest of their baseless charges, they have no such knowledge of anyone planning to use a convention in this manner. To JBS no other outcome of a convention seems possible *except a coup d'etat*. JBS cannot conceive our populace creating good from a convention by electing men and women of good will and purpose. They believe we are only capable of electing those that represent our most evil side. They are incapable of accepting problems facing this nation will be solved by a convention because those so chosen to do so realize it is our final peaceful option to resolve such issues. It is beyond the conception of JBS that Americans, men and women alike, will rise, not sink, to the occasion. In their conspiracy filled lives, the JBS cannot envision that goodness will triumph over evil because all they see is evil. In all of this JBS can imagine of no other result except evil from obeying the Constitution. JBS sees evil in all things. It should not surprise anyone it finds evil in the Constitution. This is sad both for JBS and sad for us that we believe their lies about us so easily. They tell us we are bad, we are evil; we can do no good if we obey a document we know to be good. We accept their lies without protest or rebuke. Perhaps this is the saddest thing of all.

Moreover, the law needed not be a federal law. State officials are also bound by oath of office to support the Constitution. Any state can enact such a criminal law. Hence, all JBS need do is have such a law passed in any state legislature it controls. Obviously, those state legislatures that have passed application recessions based on JBS lies are allies of the JBS. All that is required for enforcement this state law is ensure the convention is held in that state. No doubt, JBS can arrange this through its aforementioned JBS members of Congress. In sum, all JBS need do to prevent a runaway convention is ensure a law exists to prevent it.

The next fear of JBS is the lack of control of the agenda of a convention. Even to JBS the answer to this should be obvious. JBS has a political agenda. While JBS rhetoric says it fears others will control agenda, obviously if JBS controls a convention they will not fear it. Hence, the obvious answer is having its own members run for the position of delegate in a convention election and present their agenda. Obviously, if JBS is so "right" for this country that it believes electing the "right" people for Congress is the solution, is electing convention delegates any less "right"? Hence, simply elect delegates who are allies of JBS in sufficient numbers that they control the convention agenda. Thus, just as Hitler did in the 1930's in Germany, use the democratic process of election to gain control in order to stop others from destroying the nation. After all, if you cannot trust the JBS, the organization that has controlled our nation's amendatory process, prevented us from solving our problems, and is directly responsible for us being where we are now, not to have solutions to our problems, whom can you trust?

Hence, the issue of controlling a convention's agenda is resolved. Elect the "right" people to office who support the JBS agenda. Can anyone doubt if the convention is controlled by the "right" people JBS would continue to oppose the convention? As to JBS believing Americans will only elect evil people with evil purposes as delegates...if the shoe fits. However, for the rest of us who realize the obvious importance of such election and thus will make it the most vetted election in United States history, the chances of evil prevailing is next to none. Americans are not an evil people. It is insulting to suggest in any way we are otherwise.

With the first two fears addressed, the third resolution, limiting a convention agenda to one subject is obvious. With JBS firmly controlling the convention, it can then limit the convention agenda to whatever single subject it wishes. Never mind the problems facing our nation clearly require multiple amendments. All JBS need do is instruct its delegates which amendment subject will be passed by the convention. However, given that JBS supports several amendment proposals already applied for by the states in their over 700 applications for a convention call, this will of course require a decision by the JBS CEO Arthur Thompson and other JBS officers which single subject they will permit be passed by a convention. This however surely is a minor problem for the organization.

Thus, JBS should announce immediately it intends to control the Article V Convention just as it has controlled the amendment process for the past two decades. What is a more obvious a solution than this--- JBS continues controlling the amendment process and we, like lambs to the slaughter, are led to whatever end they intend?