

Mark Meckler Finds Common Ground with Strange Bedfellows, by Orlean Koehle,
author of *America Needs Revival, Not Revision, Dangers and Threats of an Article V Convention*

Conservative Mark Meckler has developed a working relationship with two far left leaders who also want an Article V Convention. They are: Joan Blades co-founder of the far-left “MoveOn.org,” one of the prominent groups that are part of Move to Amend, funded by George Soros; the other leader is Harvard law professor, Lawrence Lessig. Both leftist groups want an Article V Convention because of their desire to overturn the Supreme Court ruling of “Citizens’ United,” and Lessig just happens to believe the Constitution needs to be totally rewritten.



Joan Blades and Mark Meckler stand arm and arm in her Berkeley apartment, for a photo shoot that was part of an article in the *San Francisco Chronicle* January 12, 2013. It is part of a “Living Room Conversation” that Blade created in hopes to bring “common ground” on issues on both sides of the spectrum.¹

Former Tea Party leader Mark Meckler is now a national spokesperson for the (COS) **Convention of States Project**, one of many different national groups all pushing for an Article V Convention, which is (according to COS) the “last-ditch effort” to save the Constitution by adding new amendments.

Joan Blades is a co-founder and on the board for **MoveOn.org**, one of 700 far-left groups who are all part of **Move to Amend**, a national coalition all wanting an Article V to take place as well but for very different reasons. George Soros is a big funder of both MoveOn.org and Move to Amend.

MoveOn.org and Move to Amend work very closely together. In fact, on Move to Amend’s Facebook page, Dec. 7, 2013, they make the following statement:

Yes, they do work cooperatively together in many cases. There are 7 to 10 separate MoveOn.org organizations that are listed as endorsing organizations to Move To Amend on the National website and no doubt dozens of other cooperative efforts ... Here is a list of the hundreds of cooperating organizations that have, publicly, endorsed Move To Amend: <https://movetoamend.org/organization>.²

So, what is wrong with Mark Meckler cozying up to different organizations (no matter how liberal) if they all want the same thing – an Article V Convention (AVC)? Because the COS Project presents themselves as very conservative, they should be diametrically opposed to what Move to Amend wants and stands for. Should it also not bother Meckler that George Soros is also funding these liberal groups and also wants an Article V Convention to take place? Would that not make one a little suspicious of their motives? COS Project leaders also tell their supporters that the AVC will be limited and held only for their conservative amendments, not for liberal ones. How can they say that? There is nothing written in the Article V that authorizes it to be a limited AVC. That is all speculation.

COS Project Amendments: Meckler’s group, the COS Project, wants to hold a convention to adopt the following conservative amendments: *to impose “fiscal restraints, to limit the powers and jurisdictions of the federal government, and limit their terms of office.”*


Move to Amend wants to “*overturn the Supreme Court Ruling of “Citizens’ United,” that would end corporate personhood.*” They want to change election finance rules so only government will give out money for candidates to use in their campaigns. “*Corporations will not be able to buy politicians.*”³ However, candidates would not be allowed to receive any private donations or even use their own money on their campaigns. This would essentially end “free speech” that money provides.

Should this not alarm a “good conservative” like Mark Meckler who is supposed to believe in free speech and the free enterprise system – even in regards to campaigns and elections? Do we want big government to be even bigger and have total control of elections by controlling all the money that goes into campaigning? If Meckler says no to this then how can he work alongside such people who want them?

Mark Meckler Co-hosted a Conference with Another “Strange Bedfellow,” Lawrence Lessig, who also wants an Article V Convention: Lawrence Lessig, a left-wing Harvard law professor, who had served on Obama’s Advisory team for his 2008 presidential campaign and was a candidate briefly himself for president in 2016. He is sometimes called “the Godfather of the Article V movement” because he has been involved in this movement for many years. His group is called “Rootstrikers,” a left-wing group dedicated to the proposition that corporate money has a malign influence on American politics.⁴ Lessig co-hosted a Harvard Conference on the Constitutional Convention with Tea Party Patriots’ Co-founder Mark Meckler, in September of 2011— for the purpose of “bringing the right and left together on this issue.”⁵



Lawrence Lessig



Mark Meckler

Harvard Professor Lawrence Lessig Believes “it’s Time to Rewrite the Constitution:” In a shocking article that Lessig wrote for the Texas Law Review, May 1993, he wrote the following entitled “Fidelity in Translation”: *We live in a time when almost sixty percent of the American public cannot even identify the Bill of Rights. If the document has become so out of date that its meaning is no longer*

plain to all — if it has become impossible to imagine a world where ordinary people carry the Constitution in their pockets — then perhaps it is time to restore its meaning by, as Justice [John Paul] Stevens has recently suggested, amending the text to preserve the meaning. Perhaps, that is, it is time to rewrite our Constitution. [Emphasis added.]

Thus, under the guise of trying to make the Constitution more understandable for “ordinary people,” Lessig reveals his desire to rewrite the Constitution. He reiterates his intentions with the following:

We are like the person who finds himself at the store, with a list he can no longer make out, struggling to reconstruct what it must have been that he wanted to buy; at some point, it may

*make sense simply to decide again what he wants, to rewrite the list, to give up the obsession that it must be the same as the old list, to move on.*⁶

How nice of a Harvard Law Professor to compare our wonderful inspired Constitution with an old grocery list that we can just easily reconstruct. No wonder graduates from Harvard Law school such as Obama have no respect for the Constitution and ignore it or trample on it.

Lessig also wants to have an AVC for the same purpose of having an amendment to overturn the ruling by the Supreme Court of “Citizen’s United.” He also wants campaign finance reform so that millionaires won’t determine our elections, but it’s alright if big government does.

How Can Meckler Possibly Work with and Support a Man Who Wants to Rewrite or Bring in a New Constitution? When one examines what the COS Project is proposing, themselves, in their amendments, it would result in the same thing. Their second recommendation - **“to limit the powers and jurisdictions of the federal government”** would require opening up and rewriting every article of the Constitution with the exception of one, because they all deal with powers granted to the federal government. Is that what a conservative really wants? No, we want to conserve and preserve our wonderful, inspired Constitution that is the foundation of this great nation. We do not want it rewritten by either the left or the right.

AJR 10 Defeated in California: This was the main argument that was used to defeat the COS Project Resolution in California in 2015 by myself and Judi Caler, our Eagle Forum of California Board member in charge of Constitutional Studies. When we pointed out in our letter and in lobbying that the entire Constitution would have to be rewritten if the COS amendment would be achieved “to limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government,” no one was going to vote for it, not even one Republican, even though it was a very popular Republican who had introduced the bill. She quickly withdrew the resolution before the vote by the first committee, the Judiciary, so she would not be so embarrassed.

Of course, California has already passed the liberal Wolf- PAC, Move to Amend AVC bill in 2014 that was asking for an amendment to overturn the Supreme Court’s ruling of *Citizen’s United*. It had the following wording: **“for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would limit corporate personhood for purposes of campaign finance and political speech and would further declare that money does not constitute speech and may be legislatively limited.”**

“Limited Convention:” Notice Wolf-PAC also has the words that this would be a limited convention only for the “sole purpose” of proposing their amendment: **“Be it further Resolved, That this application is for a limited constitutional convention and does not grant Congress the authority to call a constitutional convention for any purpose other than for the sole purpose set forth in this resolution.”**⁷

Mark Meckler Used to Warn People against an Article V Convention of the States: In his book that he co-authored with Jennie Beth Martin, *Tea Party Patriots*, published in 2012, Meckler quotes from and agrees with political analyst Dick Morris who states:

But no amendment has ever been passed by a convention. Those who have considered such are rightly fearful that an open-ended convention could produce changes that would alter the very frame-work that guarantees us freedom. Who wants a group of politicians to have the power to repeal the First Amendment or mess with our system of elected representatives? More likely any convention would get so tangled up in such issues as abortion, gay marriage, and gun control that it would never be able to address anything else. p. 106. (Emphasis added)

Meckler’s Change of Heart: Now Meckler and other conservative leaders are all for a COS Convention. What happened to change their minds? Could it be all the money that is pouring in in support of this cause?

They assure us that an AVC would be protected and would not turn into a run-away convention where a whole new constitution could be proposed or passed. What guarantees are there of such? Couldn't conspiring men disguise themselves as patriots, attend as delegates, and then propose that the U.S. Constitution be scraped as an old, outmoded, out-of-date document? As stated above, should we not be rightly fearful that it would be an **“open-ended convention and would alter the very framework that guarantees us freedom?”**

Trying to Make Sense of this: Phyllis Schlafly also had a hard time figuring out why conservatives would want to support such an endeavor: *“It’s amazing how some foolish Republicans are working overtime to give the liberals the opportunity and the power to do such damage to our great U.S. Constitution.”*⁸

Those wanting an AVC for whatever reason seem to be saying, “Since our elected officials are not honoring the Constitution, we have to change the Constitution to reign in our out-of-control elected officials.” Would it not make more sense to recall or impeach or vote out of office the elected officials instead and get new ones? What would guarantee that the elected officials would honor or obey any changes to the Constitution when they don't show it any respect now?

Comparing this Logic to the Bible: Changing the Constitution to reign in the out-of-control elected officials by an Article V Convention is like saying: “Many Bible-believing Christians and Jews are not living by what they profess to believe in – the Bible, so, therefore, we will have to change the Bible, to reign in the out-of-control, unrepentant people.” To most of us, that sounds ludicrous. The whole purpose of the Bible is as a guide for our lives, to help us to become better people, to raise us up to a higher standard. Changing it will not make the people live it any more than they are now.

I believe the same could be said about our amazing Constitution. Its purpose is also to make us better people and secure our liberty and general wellbeing. The preamble explains what its purpose is: *“...to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.”*

Just as the Bible does not need to be changed to change the people, neither does the Constitution need to be changed. The politicians and the people electing them are the ones who need the changing. If the elected officials are not doing what they said they would do and are not honoring their oath of office, they need to be booted out and replaced by those who will honor their oaths to the Constitution.

¹ <http://www.sfgate.com/politics/joegarofoli/article/MoveOn-founder-Tea-Party-figure-meet-4204384.php>.

² <https://www.facebook.com/search/str/moveon.org>.

³ Katerina Nicholas, *World Digital Journal*, Wolf-Pac.com, Nov. 9, 2011.

⁴ <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/rebooting-the-republic/>.

⁵ <http://www.conconcon.org/>.

⁶ Orlean Koehle, *America Needs Revival, Not Revision, Dangers and Threats of an Article V Convention*, 2017, p.37

⁷ *Ibid*, p. 46

⁸ *The Phyllis Schlafly Report*, “Unexpected Suggestions for Constitutional Changes,” May, 2014.

Orlean Koehle has been the State President of Eagle Forum of California since 2002. She is a wife, mother of six, grandmother of 8, former teacher, now author of 12 books. To order her book *American Needs Revival, not Revision*, or any of her books, go to www.booksfortruth.com. She can be reached at caleagle@sbcglobal.net.
