

More Reasons to Oppose the Call for a Convention of States – 031614

Two items have been posted on the WEB in support of a Convention of States, click [HERE](#) and [HERE](#). The first is a WND article quoting Dr. Farris and the second is an American Thinker Article by Rob Natelson. You should carefully read both and think about what is said. The following is my take.

The WND Article

The WND article paints a clear picture that those who advocate a Convention of States (CoS) are calling for a closed-door convention in which every complaint that may be made against the Federal Government can be the basis of an unlimited number of Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. [The call for a CoS is stated as “to limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government.”]

No doubt there is much about the Federal Government that needs to be reined in. As a TEA Party leader I whole heartedly am pro-active in reducing the spending, size, and regulatory actions by the Federal Government. But I also know that such an environment in which the scope and number of proposed Amendments is unlimited by “to limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government.” Is outright dangerous. It infers the very grounds for fear of a run-away convention.

But the chilling content of this article is a quote of a statement made by Farris: “I [would] propose reconfiguring the Supreme Court after the model of the European Court of Human Rights. ... That one change would do more to ensure a constitutional government than anything I know.”

Really?!!!! Think about that statement and keep in mind that our Founding Documents, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, are based on Natural Rights. “Human Rights” are an invention of the U. N., click [HERE](#), and is central to the Left’s agenda, click [HERE](#). So I am forced to ask who is Farris and exactly what is his agenda? Come to think about it, this statement of his has much about it that is like the bill for amending the U. S. Constitution which he, as the President of ParentalRights.Org, click [HERE](#), tried to have passed in the Virginia General Assembly: common to

Michael Farris is the President of ParentalRights.Org.

<http://www.parentalrights.org/index.asp?SEC=%7B86776D54-6EE5-47B0-B99F-E8190E53AD06%7D>

This is the proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Given the chance I am sure he would bring it up at a COS.

SECTION 1

The liberty of parents to direct the upbringing, education, and care of their children is a fundamental right.

SECTION 2

The parental right to direct education includes the right to choose public, private, religious, or home schools, and the right to make reasonable choices within public schools for one's child.

SECTION 3

The United States or any State shall not infringe these rights without demonstrating that its governmental interest as applied to the person is of the highest order and not otherwise served.

SECTION 4

This article shall not be construed to apply to a parental action or decision that would end life.

SECTION 5

No treaty may be adopted nor shall any source of international law be employed to supersede, modify, interpret, or apply to the rights guaranteed by this article.

The American Thinker Article

Natelson makes an effort to convince the reader that the consequences of all of the Amendments that have been made to the Constitution of the United States have been good things and that life has proceeded in a better manner since they have been made. He focuses on Amendments XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVII, XIX, XX, XXII, XIV, XXV, and XXVII.

XII – This changed how we elected Presidents and Vice Presidents. I agree that it made matters clearer and somewhat more straight forward. ON the other hand it encouraged the strength of the Party System and it undid what was a portion of the check and balance aspects originally built into the Constitution. Before the XII Amendment the President was the candidate who received the most votes and the Vice President was his opponent. Thus the force of a particular way of thinking (a Party) in the Executive Branch was avoided. There was less likely teaming up as it is today with Obama and the Democrats in the Senate. The originally the selection of (voting for) President and Vice President was by an Electoral Board, not direct vote by the People. Moreover, the method included a provision that diminished the tendency to promote only a home-boy. The selection of the Board members was done by the States. This was one aspect of State “check and balance” Voice. This State participation was, in part, a consequence of the U. S. being a Union of States.

I am not saying the method was preferable to how we elect a President and Vice President today. But the change diminished the strength of the Voice of the States in Federal Affairs and it promoted the Party System. Perhaps it would have been better if the change would have allowed popular vote by the People

but made the President the one with the most votes and the Vice president as the one with the next-most votes.

XIII – I am in complete accord it. As a matter of fact Article V anticipated such an Amendment.

XIV – Historical facts have established this Amendment was illegally ratified. The SCOTUS and lower courts have twisted and bent the meaning of the content of this Amendment to such an extent that the consequences in many ways has harmed the U. S.

XV – I am in accord with it. An argument has been made that if indeed all men are created equal then it was not necessary. But I am certain it has force due to alter our thinking and to conform to a single standard.

XVII – This amendment completely undid the check and balance between States and the Federal Government. And no, it did not come about as Natelson describes. It came about because some States failed to attend to providing Senators and having them participate. As a consequence Yellow Journalism took over and heated the discussion to an extent that the People were swept into a frenzy to ratify this Amendment and not realize the harm it caused.

XIX - I am in accord. But again, if all men are created equal then I am not certain it was needed other than to force a bunch of men to accept what was right.

XX – It changed a date. What it should also have done was made the change in who is in Congress and the White House the day after the elections and not two or more months after the elections.

XXII – I agree, after Roosevelt's adultery of the standard set by Washington it was probably necessary.

XXIV - I am in accord. But this sets me to wonder if XXIV, XIX and XV should not originated at the same time.

XXV – I agree this was an oversight in the Constitution as originally written

XXVII – Should have been in Article I\

But all of this begs the fact that there are issues with XIV, XVI, and XVII. It begs the issues we have with the Left on the first ten Amendments. It begs the fact that host of Amendments Farris and Levin and others would like to put into place would create problems. But most of all, it begs the important point that the problem is with the morals and values of today. As John Adams said, "We have no government armed with power capable of contending with human passions

unbridled by morality and religion . . . Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." For a whole host of quotes to this effect click [HERE](#). So there is only one conclusion: It is not the Constitution that has a problem and needs Amendments. It is We the People who need a little attitude adjustment.