

A5C: Not the “Limited” Convention You Were Promised!

Dear Senator,

If you think you’re voting for an application asking Congress to call a “limited” convention under Article V of the US Constitution, you’re mistaken.

According to Art. V, Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments upon the applications of 2/3 of the states (or 34). It will be up to Congress to decide when 34 states submit valid applications. Nothing in Art. V or the Constitution says that applications need to be the same or similar; and nothing in Art. V says the convention is limited by the subject of the application.

But for years, the convention lobby has been telling Legislators that 34 states must pass applications with *the same language* before Congress can call a convention; and that the convention can’t veer from the subject of the application. This false narrative was invented to bolster the proponents’ claim that the convention can’t run away—and offset legislators’ biggest concern.

But there is no such thing as a *limited* convention. The ostensible subject of the application is merely *bait* designed to induce specific groups of people to support a convention.

And now convention promoters are implicitly admitting they’ve been deceiving legislators all along with their promise of a *limited* convention! They are [creatively counting to 34](#) (see “Considerations” & “Conclusions”) by gathering any previously-passed applications they can to justify Congress’s calling a convention in 2022.

The following Chart lists the states the convention lobby wants Congress to aggregate toward the 34-state goal to trigger a convention. Note that 26 Balanced Budget Amendment (BBA) applications are being aggregated with at least one Convention of States Project (COS) application, and with 6 “*unlimited*” applications that have nothing to do with either!

Convention Lobby Strategists now claim 33 states with Applications for an Article V convention (A5C): 26 BBA’s, 1 COS, and 6 on any and all subjects:		
Article V Applications	States	Total Applications
Balanced Budget Amendment plus COS	27: AL, AK, AZ, AR, FL, GA*, IN, IA, KS, LA, MI, MO, MS*, NE, NH, NC, ND, OH, OK, PA, SD, TN, TX, UT, WI, WV & WY	*GA’s BBA application expired on 1/1/20. So pro-convention strategists slipped in GA’s COS to replace GA’s BBA. *MS includes COS, because their BBA is in question.
“Unlimited”: Any & All Subjects	6: IL , KY , NJ* , NY , OR , WA	*NJ rescinded 12/20/21. What will strategists replace it with?
Total Applications today per convention strategists	33	Ignoring both the sunset of GA’s BBA & NJ’s repeal; and counting 6 obsolete apps, strategists say their next State will be #34!
This info is based on a presentation (slide 3) and Chart by “Let Us Vote for a Balanced Budget Amendment Citizen’s Campaign.”		

When pro-convention strategists count the BBA applications, they are including 5 states that have *never* passed BBA applications, along with Oregon, which specifically rescinded its BBA in 1999! The six unrelated applications were passed between 1789 and 1901; note their subjects and dates of passage. Convention lobby strategists use these applications like wild cards in a game of Rummy!

<u>New York</u>	1789	Bill of Rights
<u>Kentucky</u>	1861	To avert the Civil War
<u>New Jersey</u>	1861	To avert the Civil War
<u>Illinois</u>	1861	To avert the Civil War
<u>Oregon</u>	1901	Direct Election of Senators
<u>Washington</u>	1901	Unlimited convention

Other groups lobbying for a convention can claim these wild cards as well. In fact, having passed their application in only 4 states, US Term Limits (USTL) claimed 28 states—a 700% increase—by using wildcards!

[HERE](#) is a link to the interactive map that was available on the USTL website until we exposed their duplicity. Click on CO, IL, IA, KS, KY, NE, NJ, NY, NC, OH, OR, WA, & WI. USTL added these 13 states, along with 11 states that passed the broad COS application which includes term limits, to the 4 states that actually passed their single-subject term limits application.

Understand that *any* application for an A5C, no matter how limited it may seem *on its face*, means a convention where *anything* can happen. Delegates to an A5C would be sovereign representatives of “We the People” and, as such, have the power “to alter or to abolish” our “Form of Government,” per the Declaration of Independence, para. 2.

The Delegates—and *we have no idea who they’d be or how they’d be selected*—can propose a new Constitution which would have its own new (and easier) mode of ratification. This is what they did at the “amendments” convention of 1787—and *that* is our only precedent for a convention called to “amend” our federal Constitution. And we ended up with a new Constitution.

Please Vote “No!” on your State’s application(s) asking Congress to call an A5C—and rescind all applications that your State passed, no matter how long ago.

The convention lobby doesn’t believe a convention would be limited. Why should you?!