

How to get a new Constitution *under the pretext* of proposing amendments

1. The Convention of States Project (COS) claims that an Article V convention is the remedy our Framers gave us to “rein in” the fed gov’t when it “violates its constitutional limitations”. Their claim is *absurd* as well as *false*.

Their claim is *absurd* because our Constitution *already limits* the fed gov’t to a handful of powers (see [Chart](#)). Our problem is that everyone *ignores* the existing limitations.

Their claim is *false* because contrary to Michael Farris’ assertion [see 2nd para [here](#)], Mason never said it. Mason was a Delegate to the federal convention of 1787 where our Constitution was drafted. He & the other Framers agreed that the purpose of amendments is *to correct defects* in the Constitution [[link](#)]. Madison’s Journal of the Convention shows that on [June 11, 1787](#), Mason said:

The Constitution now being formed “will certainly be defective,” as the Articles of Confederation have been found to be. **“Amendments therefore will be necessary,** and it will be better to provide for them, in an easy, regular and Constitutional way ... It would be improper to require the consent of the Natl. Legislature, because they may abuse their power, and refuse their consent... The opportunity for such an abuse, may be **the fault of the Constitution [a defect] calling for amendmt.”**

Mason’s concern was that Congress might not agree to amendments needed to fix *defects* in the Constitution; so he didn’t want the Constitution then being drafted to require Congress’ approval of amendments.¹

But Mason hated our Constitution & wanted another convention to get rid of it. On [Aug. 31, 1787](#), he declared:

“that he would sooner chop off his right hand than put it to the Constitution as it now stands” and if it weren’t changed, he wanted “to bring the whole subject before another general Convention.”²

¹ Under the Articles of Confederation [[link](#)], amendments had to be approved by Congress and all of the States [Art. 13]. Should the new Constitution also require Congress’ approval of amendments? **That** was the issue the Framers discussed on June 11.

² **Mason’s [& Patrick Henry’s] desire for an Article V convention so they could get rid of the Constitution of 1787 was no secret.** See, among Madison’s letters:

Ap. 22, 1788 to Jefferson [[link](#) at pp. 121-122]: “Mr. H—y is supposed to aim at disunion. Col. M—n is growing every day more bitter ... I think the Constitution and the Union will be both endangered ... And if a second Convention should be formed ... [i]t will be easy also for those who have latent views of disunion, to carry them on under the mask of contending for alterations...”

Nov. 2, 1788 to Randolph [[link](#) at p. 295], recites how, on Oct. 27, Patrick Henry introduced in the Virginia Assembly an application to the first congress “to call a second convention for proposing amendments to it...” and that Mr. H—y’s “...enmity was levelled, as he did not *scruple* to insinuate agst the *whole system*; and the destruction of the whole system I take to be still the secret wish of his heart, and the real object of his pursuit...”

Dec. 8, 1788 to Jefferson [[link](#) at p. 312]: “... there are others who urge a second Convention with the insidious hope, of throwing all things into Confusion, and of subverting the fabric just established, if not the Union itself...”



Mason also objected to Madison's proposal that only Congress would propose the amendments – he said people should also be able to propose them. So Gov. Morris & Mr. Gerry moved to add the convention method to Article V [\[link\]](#).

And because a People *always* have the right to meet in convention “to alter or to abolish” a gov't & set up a new one [\[link\]](#), the convention method was added to Art. V; but Madison, Hamilton & Jay began to warn against it.

Today, various factions want a convention so they can get a new Constitution for this Country. New Constitutions are already written or in the works: e.g., the [Constitution for the Newstates of America](#), the [Constitution for The New Socialist Republic in North America](#), [George Soros's progressive Constitution](#), & the [new Constitution globalists need](#) to move the United States into the North American Union. *It's the Globalists who are behind the push for an Article V convention* [e.g., [link](#) and [link](#) and [link](#)]³

2. State Legislatures can't control the Convention

State Legislatures “apply” to Congress to call a convention. Congress “calls” the convention. Pursuant to Art. I, §8, last clause, Congress makes the laws to carry out its delegated power to “call” the convention.

And when the Continental Congress called the convention of 1787 to “revise” our 1st Constitution, the Delegates ignored the instructions from Congress & the States and wrote a new Constitution with a new & easier mode of ratification [\[link\]](#).

That's why James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, 4 US Supreme Court Justices, and many other legal scholars warn against another convention [\[link\]](#). **Constitutional litigators & law professors William Olson and Herbert Titus recently warned that COS's “false assurances” are “reckless in the extreme”** [\[link\]](#).

3. Why it's urgent for States to rescind their existing applications for an Article V convention

To induce State Legislators to pass applications for a convention, COS and other groups have *falsely assured* them that Delegates can't do anything except draft the amendment(s) specified in the State's application; and have *falsely assured* them that State Legislatures will have control over the convention from start to finish.

In reliance on such *false assurances*, 27 States have applications on file with Congress asking Congress to call a convention to draft a “balanced budget” amendment; 15 States passed the COS application for a convention; 5 States passed George Soros' Wolf-PAC application; & various States have passed other applications throughout the years.

But Congress has the power to count these applications however they want - Congress may aggregate them to get the 34 States needed to call a Convention.⁴ **If Congress calls a Convention, the Delegates will have the power to propose a new Constitution with its own new mode of ratification - COS's “false assurances” to the contrary notwithstanding.** If you aren't worried, read the proposed Constitutions listed above; & note that the Newstates Constitution is ratified by a *national referendum* (Art. XII, §1). Whoever controls the machines determines the outcome.

4. The Real Solution

We must dust off our copies of our Declaration of Independence & Constitution, learn them & adhere to them. Stop taking fed funds to implement unconstitutional fed programs. *And rescind your States' existing applications for a convention.*

³ But COS is apparently using [petitions with fake signatures](#), emails which were found to be [“a high-tech fraud”](#), and [misleading polls](#) to make Legislators believe *the grassroots* wants a convention.

⁴ The [Congressional Research Service Report](#) shows that Congress has traditionally claimed “broad responsibilities in connection with a convention, including (1) receiving, judging, and recording state applications ... (4) determining the number and selection process for its delegates...” (page 4). **Congress is very close to having applications from 34 States – we hang by a thin thread.**