

505 LEVEL TRAINING



THE 1787 CONVENTION WAS NOT A “RUNAWAY CONVENTION”

There are very important differences between the 1787 convention and the Article V convention we’re talking about here.

Most importantly, at the 1787 convention the Constitution itself didn’t even exist, and neither did Article V. The framers wrote Article V in a way that does not allow for another “Constitutional Convention.”

Our Constitution only gives us the authority to hold an amendments proposing convention.

THE 1787 CONVENTION FOLLOWED ITS MANDATE

Second, the Articles of Confederation was essentially a treaty between independent nations, similar to the European Union today, and was hastily drafted during the height of the Revolutionary War. It proved unworkable as a governing document and the Confederation was in danger of collapsing.

In 1787, the States sent delegates to Philadelphia with very broad authority to come up with an idea to fix the mess the Articles of Confederation created, and that convention only had the power to send proposals to Congress. They did exactly what they were authorized to do and sent the new proposal on to Congress. Congress then debated it and passed it on to the states. Nothing about that is a runaway.

THE 1787 CONVENTION IS NOT AN ANOMALY

Finally, the 1787 Convention is far from the only precedent we have for a convention in this country.

We've used the convention process more times than Presidential and Congressional elections combined.

Since that convention in 1787 there have been over 200 state level conventions to amend and adopt state constitutions and all 50 state constitutions are still intact.

Conventions work.

THE 1787 CONVENTION WAS NOT “THE ONLY TIME WE’VE DONE THIS”

Finally, the 1787 Convention is far from the only precedent we have for a convention in this country.

We've used the convention process more times than Presidential and Congressional elections combined.

Since that convention in 1787 there have been over 200 state level conventions to amend and adopt state constitutions and all 50 state constitutions are still intact.

Conventions work.

AN ARTICLE V CONVENTION CANNOT LOWER THE RATIFICATION THRESHOLD

Anything proposed at an Article V convention is bound by the Constitution of the United States, which requires 75% ratification.

Changing the ratification threshold cannot be done at a convention. Theoretically it could be proposed if it was within the scope of the convention, but that proposal would have to be ratified by 75% of the states, just like any other amendment proposed by the convention.

This scenario is a clear case of fear mongering run amok and would have no legal standing.

AN ARTICLE V CONVENTION CANNOT LOWER THE RATIFICATION THRESHOLD

Further, this is a misrepresentation of history. As previously stated the Articles of Confederation were more of a treaty between independent states that gave each of them the authority to pull out of any time they wanted. All they did in Philadelphia was suggest that they do just that and proposed a new Constitution for them to adopt instead.

They sent their suggestion to Congress and Congress sent it to the States for approval. In other words, they didn't adopt a new Constitution at the 1787 Convention or change the ratification process of the Articles of Confederation. They simply proposed that the States each unilaterally pull out of their standing treaty and that, if 75% of them agree, they form instead a single unified nation under a new Constitution.

“I BELIEVE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY IS MORE IMPORTANT”

Most people care about fiscal responsibility. The reason we are focused on campaign finance reform is because it is often the root cause of irresponsible government spending.

Budget decisions made by our federal government are often in response to lobbying done by the same special interests that get members of Congress elected. Whose interests are they serving?

Fiscal responsibility will only come when the federal government is accountable to the People, and that means fixing campaign finance.

“I BELIEVE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY IS MORE IMPORTANT”

More importantly these issues are not in competition. An Article V Convention resolution on campaign finance reform is counted with others on that topic, and one for the issue of fiscal responsibility is counted with its topic.

You can support and vote for both of them.

Let's show the federal government that we believe in the states' rights to hold the federal government accountable when it becomes unresponsive to we the people.

“I’M WORRIED ABOUT A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT”

A balanced budget amendment is a totally separate effort that’s been around for decades and not in any way related to the resolution that we’d like you to support.

Our resolution calls for a limited convention to deal specifically with the special interests dominance in our elections that is corrupting Washington, D.C.. Passing our resolution does not get the BBA any closer.

If applications from different issues could be counted together they would be the first ones to do it, but they can’t.

“I’M WORRIED ABOUT A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT”

Public support for a BBA is a little over 50% of the country, and they have 28 states demanding a balanced budget amendment.

The desire to reform campaign finance can go as high as 98%, and yet we only have 5 states demanding a convention to fix the corrupting influence of big money in our politics.

We should be adding state applications to match public opinion. It’s time to stand up and be counted for what the People want.

“WHAT IS ‘CONVENTION OF STATES?’”

The Convention of the States Project is pushing for a somewhat more open convention to discuss three issues: fiscal responsibility, term limits for Congress, and “limiting the power and scope of the federal government.”

COS is a separate movement from Wolf-PAC. It’s a separate movement from BBA. COS’s applications go into their own pile, which is currently around 12 states.

The COS resolution addresses decisions being made in Congress. The Fair Elections Resolution makes sure the persons making those decisions are accountable to the People.

“THERE ARE TOO MANY RED STATES! THE POLITICAL CLIMATE ISN'T RIGHT!”

QUESTION: Do you think that the states will start turning back to blue and that the pendulum will swing back the way it always has?

If YES: Well then, we need to start now!

The amendment and reforms we are seeking are not going to happen overnight. This is no time to put down a tool that has historically worked to get reform and add an amendment to our Constitution. In fact, this is exactly the time to go on the offense and fight for free and fair elections with every tool of democracy available to us, but we have got to start now.

“THERE ARE TOO MANY RED STATES! THE POLITICAL CLIMATE ISN'T RIGHT!”

QUESTION: Do you think that the states will start turning back to blue and that the pendulum will swing back the way it always has?

If NO: Then we need to act NOW!

We'd better get this amendment as soon as we can while a lot of the state Republican legislators are still responsive to their constituents.

It's not going to get easier if we just sit back and hope for the best.

“THE KOCH BROTHERS / GEORGE SOROS WANT TO REWRITE THE CONSTITUTION!”

Nobody can rewrite the Constitution at a convention. It's simply not possible according to Article V of our Constitution. The convention only has the power to propose amendments which then must be approved by 75% of the states. There is no conceivable way Article V could legally be interpreted any differently.

People like the Koch Brothers & George Soros have too much power right now because of our nation's broken campaign finance system. The amendment we're asking for would take away that power. That's why the Koch brothers' group, Americans for Prosperity, has testified against the Wolf-PAC resolution, and Soros funded groups work in direct opposition to us.

“THE KOCH BROTHERS / GEORGE SOROS WANT TO REWRITE THE CONSTITUTION!”

It's possible other convention efforts are supported by the Koch Brothers, George Soros or other billionaire ideologes but they have only acted in opposition to ours.

But that shouldn't stop us from fighting for what we believe in, nor should it cause us to unilaterally disarm ourselves by taking away the one and only constitutional check we have against a Congress that is already being controlled by the Koch brothers and Soros.

“IS IT TRUE WOLF-PAC IS FUNDED BY GEORGE SOROS?”

No.

“IS IT TRUE WOLF-PAC IS FUNDED BY GEORGE SOROS?”

We want Soros’s money out of our political system just as much as we want the Koch brothers or anyone else who has a disproportionate say in our government because of how much money they have.

You can find every contribution given to us over \$200 on the FEC website. And we are happy to provide you with that documentation if it would be helpful.

Over 99% of our donations come from people chipping in \$10 per month. We are proud to operate a true grassroots movement that reflects the will of the people.

“WHY IS ‘COMMON CAUSE’ OPPOSED TO WOLF-PAC?”

Common Cause has done good things in the past but that doesn't mean they're correct on everything.

Since the 1980's they have adopted talking points from a far-right conspiracy-theory group known as The John Birch Society to spread misinformation about the Article V Convention path. The sources that both groups cite are opinion pieces and cherry-picked quotes rather than legal research and legitimate reports on the subject.

We should be asking them: Who are you funded by? What is your plan for solving this issue?

“WHY IS ‘COMMON CAUSE’ OPPOSED TO WOLF-PAC?”

The truth is they proudly state they’ve been working on campaign finance reform for 50 years, but what do they have to show for it besides using the issue for fundraising?

At some point they became the part of the D.C. establishment, and therefore part of the problem.

It’s time to try something different. It’s time to use the Constitution as the Founders intended to solve this most urgent problem threatening our democracy, and as history has proven to be the logical path to an amendment.