

Convention of States Reveals their *Revolutionary* Agenda: An Unlimited Convention to Structurally Change the U.S. Constitution

By Janine Hansen, Constitutional Issues Chairman Eagle Forum, April 5, 2016

In an article on WorldNetDaily dated March 3, 2014 the revolutionary agenda of the Convention of States organization was unmasked. <http://mobile.wnd.com/2014/03/new-push-for-limits-on-washington-power/>

The Convention of States deceptively proposes a “limited” convention for “the purpose of limiting the power and jurisdiction of the federal government.” It sounds reasonable until you realize that the purpose of the entire Constitution was to “limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government.” It then becomes clear that the COS proposal will open every portion of the Constitution to change.

The article includes an incredible list of proposed Constitutional revisions for an Article V Constitutional Convention. “Among the issues that could fall under **the single subject** would be a **balanced budget amendment**, a new definition of the **General Welfare Clause**, a redefinition of the **Commerce Clause**, a ban on the use of treaty provisions inside the U.S., limits on **executive orders**, **term limits** for Congress and the Supreme Court, federal tax limits and a sunset of all existing federal taxes. Of course, these are merely examples of what would be up for discussion.” This sounds like a rewrite of the Constitution.

The breadth and depth of the Convention of States proposals are mind boggling. None of their proposals would be necessary if our government abided by the Constitution **now**. What makes us naïve enough to believe that they would abide by any new amendments? More importantly, what happens when an Article V Constitutional Convention of the States opens the entire Constitution to structural change by the politicians? In the original Constitutional Convention even the ratification process was changed from a unanimous requirement for approval by the states to just nine of thirteen states.

The article continues with more structural Constitutional changes, “Would anyone be interested in the idea of removing federal officials? State legislatures currently have no power to impeach federal officials from their states. This is not a viable option. This would, however, **be a proper amendment to suggest at the Convention of States we are proposing**. I like the idea of giving the state governments the power to impeach congressmen and senators from their states,” said Michael Farris, Co-Founder Convention of States Project, who sees himself as the new James Madison. Has Farris forgotten that we have elections which have the power to recall at the ballot box any Congressman or Senator now?

More proposals for structural change, “The federal courts regularly refuse to rule on constitutional issues they want to avoid by calling them ‘political questions’ or by claiming that no one has standing to sue ... One of my ideas for an amendment would be to automatically grant state legislatures standing to challenge any action of the federal government as violating its constitutional limitations,” said Farris who envisions himself as the Chairman of the Convention.

Farris continues his rewrite wish list, “I [would] propose **reconfiguring the Supreme Court after the model of the European Court of Human Rights**. There are 46 nations in that court’s jurisdiction, and every nation appoints one judge. We should expand the Supreme Court to 50 justices and have the states appoint the justices for a specific term (six or eight years) with no right of reappointment. That one change would do more to ensure a constitutional government than anything I know.”

When one structural change takes place, like the repeal of the 17th Amendment, the ramifications are far-reaching and the consequences stretch over generations. We have 229 years of experience living under the Constitution which would be upended by these arrogant proposals. There is no way of knowing what the far-reaching ramifications and consequences of these proposals would be. Or more importantly, what possible revolutionary proposals would be considered and adopted by an Article V Constitutional Convention of appointed establishment politicians.

There is wisdom in amending the Constitution in the traditional way by having Congress, which must face reelection, propose a single amendment and providing ample time for consideration by the elected State Legislatures. Even then, if the nation comes to believe that the amendment was not in the best interest of our country, the single amendment can then be repealed like Prohibition was. But this same scenario does not apply if an Article V Constitutional Convention “for the purpose of proposing amendments” approves a plethora of structural changes to the Constitution and this by appointed delegates who will never face election. This is the Convention of States proposal, an unlimited convention opening every section of the Constitution to structural change and possibly a revolutionary rewrite. Do you trust your state politicians and the politicians from States like California to monkey with your Constitution? Is it worth the risk?