

Congress Owes US Eleven Conventions!!!

By Bill Walker

(Author's Note: This story was originally released on March 6, 2016. It originally stated Congress owed the American people ten conventions under the terms of Article V of the Constitution. On November 5, 2016, as a result the House Judiciary Committee uncovering 14 previously unrecorded applications in its gathering of the state application record, the number of sets of two thirds applications rose to eleven. The story has been updated to reflect this fact of public record).

It would be wonderful if, on hearing the news Congress is obligated to call **Eleven** Article V Conventions, Convention of States, Compact for America and Balanced Budget Amendment Task Force (among others) would publicly say something like, "We eagerly welcome the news that public record proves Congress is obligated to call, not one, but **Eleven** Article V Conventions and we look forward to the first one!"

But don't hold your breath.

The fact is these dedicated "same subject" directed convention maniacs are mesmerized. No matter the record, or the facts—even if those facts benefit what they want to achieve—they ignore them. So they all continue seeking new state applications in order to achieve the magical 34 applications required by Article V based on a bogus theory. The fact the states have already reached this threshold **Eleven** times is ignored.

Public record proves Congress is now required to call **Eleven** Article V Conventions. See: www.foavc.org/StateApplications/Numeric.htm. I have always said I estimated Congress was required to call between six and eight conventions based on the number of applications, the number of applying states and the number of times those states had repeatedly submitted applications to Congress. Given the terms of Article V (one application per state, call a convention whenever a set of two thirds of the state legislatures apply) it seemed fairly obvious multiple conventions were mandated. So I estimated between six and eight conventions owed. Only recently however were the public records examined and the results summarized: I was wrong. There are **eleven** conventions mandated by the applications!!!

If you accept the bogus theory of "same subject" directed convention as the basis of a convention call like the above groups then the public record (www.foavc.org/StateApplications/Amendment_Subject.htm) shows at least **FIVE** amendment subjects have reached the two thirds threshold required by Article V. All the above groups are charter members of the "same subject" directed convention theory, a theory long on conjecture but short on facts. Thus the fact all seek a balanced budget amendment and the states have already submitted the necessary applications for such a convention (IF "same subject" were the correct method of count) is ignored. See: www.foavc.org/StateApplications/Same_Subject_Convention.htm .

These people are so disconnected with political reality that when the facts of public record PROVE what they seek has already been achieved and what they believe in (same subject) is

totally wrong, they ignore the facts and continue if nothing has happened. The problem is other concerned organizations cannot ignore this public record nor other facts about a “same subject” directed convention nor Supreme Court rulings nor public law nor anything else which might be described as official public record meaning these bogus ideas of “same subject” directed convention must and will ignored by them when they make their decisions about an Article V Convention.

Some of the facts surrounding the applications make the assertions of the above groups laughable. Their assertions prove how out of touch they really are. For example, the Balanced Budget Amendment Task Force claims “27 states” have submitted applications for a convention call. The public record shows the BBA Task Force is slightly behind the times. This record proves the necessary 34 applications to cause a convention call (assuming again acceptance of the “same subject” theory which again is a bogus theory) on the subject of a balanced budget was reached in 1983! The record is even more laughable if the correct method of count is used. By 1982 **NINE** Conventions were mandated meaning it was then possible to present the issue of a balanced budget amendment at convention **NINE** times.

Even the John Birch Society (JBS), a major opponent of an Article V Convention, looks like idiots in light of the public record. The dream of every JBS member is the repeal of the 16th Amendment—Federal Income Tax. The necessary applications needed to achieve their goal were reached in 1989—despite their campaign to stop an Article V Convention. In short, they were busy trying to defeat their most prized political goal and despite their best efforts, it was achieved anyway.

Speaking of the JBS campaign here’s the biggest laugh. The numeric count of state applications, which is the count of applying states with no other terms or conditions, and is what Article V specifies as the basis for a convention call, proves that prior to the start of the JBS campaign in 1983 to stop an Article V Convention, the states had submitted **SEVEN** sets of state applications for a convention call. Since 1983 the states have submitted **THREE** more sets of applications for a total of **TEN** sets of applications requiring **TEN** Conventions. They’ve since completed an **eleventh** set of applications. Whenever I think of a “successful” political campaign I can assure you the JBS campaign to stop an Article V Convention won’t come to mind.

As to “same subject” directed conventions; the issues surrounding this bogus theory of convention tabulation should make any politically sane person (and I realize I might have said an oxymoron) cringe. I doubt anyone in the above groups will heed this message, but as I’ve said before, as the political reality of actually holding a convention begins to manifest itself, the blast furnace of the amendment process will begin to melt away such bogus ideas as “same subject,” “rescissions” and other such baloney reducing them to pools of irrelevancy. Political groups that cling to irrelevancy fade away. See:

www.foavc.org/StateApplications/Same_Subject_Convention.htm

What about the JBS assertion of rescission of applications affecting the public record of applications or that the 1787 Convention was a “runaway” and therefore a convention called under the terms of Article V should not be called? More horse manure which all of the groups above devour. No wonder these groups are in a fantasy world—they take their information from

a declared opponent of the very thing they hope to achieve then wonder why it is so difficult to achieve what they want. The JBS assertion of rescission is forbidden by federal criminal law (a law which predates all so-called “rescissions”). The latter assertion of “runaway” convention is refuted by an official vote of Congress which determined years ago the 1787 convention acted entirely within the bounds of the call issued by Congress in 1787. In other words: there never was a runaway convention. See: www.foavc.org/StateApplications/Rescissions.htm and www.foavc.org/StateApplications/Runaway_Convention.htm.

Things are changing regarding an Article V Convention. While these records may not be the game changer they are the herald of events yet to come. It is time to separate fantasy from fact; reality from fiction; accuracy from error or more correctly, outright lying. Soon accuracy of information will become paramount in the Article V movement. Those groups who become accurate and rely on accurate information will remain. Those who do not will perish. It's that simple. These groups will soon face, for them, a hard choice: either be accurate, accept the public record and make political choices based on that public record or remain as you are, make your decisions based on some fantasy theory which has no legal or constitutional standing and fall into the political abyss from which there is never a return.