



DEFEATING ERRONEOUS OPPOSITION

DEO.COSfacts.net

"It is easier to alarm people than to inform them."

~William Davie, Constitutional Convention Delegate, 1787

**Claim / Video
Link**

Response

**Extra
Links**

**Image
Links**

[Article V is silent on the process / rules unknown](#)

Yes, Article V does not include a description of the rules and process for conducting an Article V convention, and the Constitution also refers to trial by jury, writ of habeas corpus, bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, etc., without providing details about these in the actual text of the Constitution either. The absence of such details in Article V indicates numerous aspects of the Constitution require us to understand the Framers expected established legal definitions, lawful procedures and historical precedents of their own day to be understood and followed, just as they are to this day. You don't really think our elected official's take an oath to "support and defend" a document that's insufficiently clear in what it prescribes, do you?

[Article Link](#)

[Image Link](#)

[If Congress calls it, Congress controls it](#)

Yes, Congress does have a role to play, and it is only to name the time and place where the states will initially convene. Article V gives states the tool of decentralized federalism to ensure those appointed by the state legislatures control it. Case law and historical precedent recognize the convention provision was intended to provide an alternative to the congressional route of proposing amendments.

[Article Link](#)

[Image Link](#)

[It can't be limited or controlled / a COS would do too much](#)

Yes I've heard that too, and thankfully the text of Article V, historical precedent and case law say otherwise. The process requires 68% of initiating states to be in agreement--an overwhelming majority of such a convention, as intentionally designed by the Framers because they did not want such a convention to be convened unless there was a broad consensus among a solid majority. That 68% do the work of identifying and supporting a specific issue they'd like to address via an Article V application. Even if the entire other 32% were against the intent of the 68%, there is no way that minority could throw such an overwhelming majority of the convention off track. In addition, any state could and would litigate in order to ensure anything outside the scope of the advance parameter of the convention did not emerge from the convention.

[Article Link](#)

[Image Link](#)

<u>What's the use? / a COS won't do enough</u>	<p>Yes, I share your concern, and thankfully past experience really informs us otherwise. The historical effect of the clarifying language that amendments have provided for America speaks for itself.</p>	<u>Article Link</u>	<u>Image Link</u>
<u>Justice Scalia said he was against having a "Constitutional Convention"</u>	<p>Yes, I've heard the clip where he says that, and he followed that statement with a clear defense of a proposal convention, which is the only kind of convention Article V authorizes. He effectively makes the case for the process of states engaging in a convention to propose amendments--wishing it were even easier for states to do than it currently is. The clip that is frequently taken out of context is from 1:06:00-1:06:27. To get the full context, you have to watch until 1:07:05.</p>	<u>Extra Video Link</u>	<u>Image Link</u>
<u>They don't follow the Constitution now; why amend?</u>	<p>Yes, that's a common perspective, and it should give us pause to consider--are all our existing laws really being ignored? Fact is, they do follow most of the Constitution--consider amendments alone (see image). But why do you think they've ignored it? It's because they perceive they have the authority to decide, for example, what the "General Welfare," "Necessary & Proper" and "Commerce" clauses mean--and the courts tend to back them up on it. When we use the Article V tool given to us by our Framers to remove the vagueness of these clauses they've manipulated for their own purposes, they will be better boxed in and our liberty will be restored.</p>	<u>Extra Video Link</u>	<u>Image Link</u>
<u>George Soros & corrupt politicians will take it over</u>	<p>Yes, the corrupt are a concern, and we shouldn't reject or neglect part of our Constitution simply because they're around. If fears of nefarious characters, the swamp and opposition prevent us from from trusting, following and using the Constitution to hold a convention that simply proposes amendments to limit the tyranny they've been pursuing, then they have us right where they want us, and they can continue doing what they've been doing indefinitely. The Framers knew the best way to deal with uncertainty and fear in a world that tends toward tyranny: federalism. Nothing takes the power away from the central-planners more effectively than 68% of the states saying they've had enough and 75% of the states boxing them in. Soros and his cronies are opposing us at every turn. Their greatest fear is of a decentralized convention of states process that will undermine the influence they've worked so hard to achieve.</p>	<u>Article Link</u>	<u>Image Link</u>

<p>California's trying to use Article V to kill the 2nd Amendment</p>	<p>Yes, and this reveals the wisdom of our Framers. Newsom & CA will need 33 more states to apply, but 28 states have Constitutional Concealed Carry--do the math. Per Article V, 68% of states must agree on what to convene about for a proposal convention to be held. The Framers knew what they were doing.</p>	<p>Article Link</p>	<p>Image Link</p>
<p>We could lose the 2nd Amendment</p>	<p>Yes, we want to make sure we protect the 2nd Amendment, and the subject matter areas of the COS resolution in every state involve LIMITING federal terms of office, spending, power and jurisdiction. Limiting the right of American citizens to keep and bear arms--a right that our Constitution says shall not be infringed--is not germane to any aspect of these subject matter areas.</p>	<p>Article Link</p>	<p>Image Link</p>
<p>We don't know how a convention would work</p>	<p>Yes, that is a common perspective, and thankfully Article V along with historical precedent and case law actually gives us a clear picture. When the states have a chance to engage in the decentralized process of proposing solutions that fit a prescribed parameter within the paradigm of federalism the Framers gave us, it will demystify this process so many have been pushing a narrative of uncertainty for, and the fearmongering of our opposition will be revealed for what it is. This COS will be the catalyst to help us refine and renew our republic.</p>	<p>Article Link</p>	<p>Image Link</p>
<p>Constitutional Convention / Con-Con</p>	<p>Yes, a "Constitutional Convention" certainly isn't the answer, and it's a good thing Article V doesn't allow for anything called a "Constitutional Convention" as explained in section 1 of this resource. In your opinion, what is the likely intent of someone who knowingly tries to manipulate or alter the actual language of Article V from "a convention for proposing amendments" to "Constitutional Convention" or "Con-Con?"</p>	<p>COSfacts.net</p>	<p>Image Link</p>
<p>I don't want to open up the Constitution</p>	<p>Yes, and thankfully an Article V convention to propose amendments only opens up a meeting for the states to discuss amendment proposals that fit a pre-determined parameter--if and only if 68% of states agree on that parameter. If they can't decide on an agreeable amendment proposal within that parameter, nothing is done. If an agreeable proposal emerges, the Constitution isn't "opened up"-- states review only the amendment proposal and decide on supporting the proposal that fits the pre-determined parameter. If 75% approve, it becomes an amendment.</p>	<p>Article Link</p>	<p>Image Link</p>

<p>Our leaders today don't have the character, virtue of the Founders / Framers</p>	<p>Yes indeed, our Founders/Framers were remarkable, and what made them special is their commitment to learn from the truth available to them. Inspired by that truth, they did the hard work of crafting a governing document that has proven its worth by being the longest lasting Constitution the world has ever seen. People today should judge our own civic character and virtue by our willingness to actually support and defend what they gave us--to bear true faith, allegiance and loyalty to what they gave us, as all oaths of citizenship and office require. Dismissing, discounting or ignoring what our Framers gave us is infidelity to them and our Constitution. Our remarkable Framers gave us what we need to make useful alterations to the Constitution, and we are required to follow the internal prescription of the Constitution by amending it as legally codified, not by deceitfully and subversively ignoring or rejecting selective parts of it out of hand. Anyone suggesting we do such a thing is revealing their own character and virtue to be questionable and therefore, it is no wonder we have elected people with similar character and virtue today. How can we as citizens bemoan politicians who dismiss and ignore parts of the Constitution if we are doing the same thing by selectively rejecting part of Article V without following the law to change Article V if we believe it to be detrimental to us today?</p>		<p>Image Link</p>
---	--	--	-------------------

<p>The Constitution is perfect the way it is</p>	<p>Glad to hear you think so, and I agree because it contains multiple checks and balances that have resulted in us having the longest lasting Constitution in force the world has ever seen. This document you say you revere contains Article V, which has one of our most significant checks against centralized tyranny. It provides us today with 51 sources to initiate useful alterations or amendments. Those who want to dismiss the Article V convention provision want to reduce the sources available for initiating proposals of useful alterations from 51 (Congress + 50 states) to just 1--only 1--Congress. This 98% reduction in possible sources for amendments gives the national legislature sole discretion & full control--the power to propose and the power to refuse to propose anything helpful and useful. Rejecting our Framers provision of an Article V convention removes a critical check against centralized control in DC and, consequently, it certainly doesn't demonstrate a belief that our Constitution is perfect the way it is.</p>		<p>Image Link</p>
<p>Madison was against an Article V convention</p>	<p>Yes, I've heard that assertion before and found many have been misled about Madison's take on the subject. The claim is well-documented to be erroneous and to originate with those who are not aware of the context of the actual statement he made, as well as several other references which clearly indicate his support for what he and the other Framers agreed to unanimously include in their draft of the Constitution.</p>	<p>Article Link</p>	<p>Image Link</p>
<p>Don't use Article V; use Article VI and the 10th Amendment to nullify</p>	<p>Yes, I too value Article VI and the 10th Amendment, just not at the expense of Article V. Are there any other parts of the Constitution besides Article V you don't want us to trust & follow? Articles V & VI are not mutually exclusive. Why not use both? Those not committed to the Constitution want you to selectively support & reject portions of it. The clear choice of any citizen seriously committed to our Constitution is to apply all parts of the Constitution in our governance. Let's use Articles V & VI, the 10th Amendment, and everything else available in the Constitution to preserve liberty!</p>	<p>Article Link</p>	<p>Image Link</p>

<p><u>The 1787 convention was a runaway--this one will be too</u></p>	<p>Yes, I've heard that perspective and have found many have been misled about how we went from the Articles of Confederation to our beloved Constitution by the slanderous suggestion our Framers did something illegitimate. The claim is well-documented to be erroneous and to originate with those who do not value our founding principles the way you and I do. Just as there is no basis for this historical claim, there is no basis for irrationally fearing an imagined precedent.</p>	<p><u>Article Link</u></p>	<p>Image Link</p>
<p>Now is definitely not the time to take such risk</p>	<p>"We shouldn't utilize the Constitution's provision for an Article V convention for proposing amendments until I and others like me deem it safe. When will that be? We'll let you know. We are the gatekeepers of utilizing Article V, so until we give the states the green light, we're against any state considering any Article V application for a convention to propose amendments." We don't need self-appointed social sages telling us when it's "safe." What the Framers gave us says at any given time Congress can agree to propose. At any given time 68% of the states can agree to propose. And either 13 states will say "Nope" or 38 states will say "Let's do it." This is what makes us a self-governing constitutional republic--not citizens persistently cowering in fear. The "I revere, support and defend the Constitution, but I just don't think it's prudent to trust and follow it at this juncture" doesn't really compute with me. Count me among those willing to do everything I can to influence my state to be true to our God-given Constitution, which has produced the greatest degree of prosperity, liberty, creativity and peace the world has ever seen, and count me among those who are willing to stay that course of trusting, following and using our Constitution while trusting God will have a hand in answering our prayers to turn our country around--just as He did with Roe v. Wade, rather than being completely consumed by anxiety, fear, worry and uncertainty about those who mean us harm. Fear is a powerful force. It causes those who claim to be devoted to the Constitution to selectively choose which parts of it they just can't commit to "at the present time." Waiting around for some group of people to decide in their "wisdom" what time is a good time to trust and follow the Constitution is oligarchy, not liberty.</p>		<p>Image Link</p>

<p>Liberty is each state deciding for itself whether or not to apply for an Article V convention. A state is free to decide not to.</p>	<p>Yes, and there's an important distinction to keep in mind: if that state decides not to join other states in a well-intentioned endeavor to propose useful alterations because it does not consider the proposed alterations necessary, that's one thing. Not joining them out of irrational fear that boogeymen bad actors can ruin our Constitution and country by hijacking the process because they don't trust what the Framers gave us is entirely another. We should exercise the federalism the Framers gave us with confidence in our governing documents, not hand-wringing spurred on by debilitating anxiety and fear.</p>		<p>Image Link</p>
<p>Why do some conservatives not support an Article V cos?</p>	<p>The reason some conservatives are not pushing for it is that they have believed the doom and gloom the liberal establishment has sold them about there being no safeguards. The federalism the Framers gave us will work, but it requires us to trust, follow and use the decentralizing tool they gave us in Article V.</p>		<p>Image Link</p>
<p>I heard that dark money is funding COS</p>	<p>Responsible citizens living in fear of every dollar spent and the multi-faceted motivations behind the funding of everything under the sun will find solace nowhere--except oddly enough with simply keeping things the way they are and maintaining the current status quo--which has been and will continue to be manipulated by those who do not have America's best interests at heart.</p>		<p>Image Link</p>
<p>I can't decide. Tell me who endorses and who opposes an Article V COS.</p>	<p>Organizations that oppose are Common Cause, Planned Parenthood, National Council of La Raza, Greenpeace, Democracy 21, NAACP, NEA, Americans for Democratic Action, Brennan Center for Justice, Center for American Progress, Center for Media and Democracy, Daily Kos, Democracy for America, Earthjustice, Emily's List, Mi Familia Vote, etc.</p>		<p>Image Link</p>
<p>Worried about the Constitution being rewritten</p>	<p>Thankfully, Article V of the Constitution doesn't allow for the possibility for our governing document to be replaced--only for a "convention to propose amendments." And thankfully, the only subject matter areas that may be considered during the convention COS is promoting are those that LIMIT federal terms of office, spending, power and jurisdiction. The minimum 68% strong majority of the states required to initiate an Article V "convention for proposing amendments" will not permit the maximum 32% minority to deviate from this parameter.</p>		<p>Image Link</p>

<p>It's naive to think it wise to pursue an Article V convention in this political climate</p>	<p>Yes, we certainly want to be wise, and especially in how we move our country forward in the right direction. Would real naivety be demonstrated by those who want to trust and follow all of our Constitution, including Article V, or by those who think they have risen above the need to trust and follow all of our Constitution because they have better "insight" and "understanding" than our Framers that the typical American committed to follow our Constitution just doesn't have?</p>		<p>Image Link</p>
--	---	--	-----------------------