

The Matter is Pretty Clear Now
Another Bob Schulz Scam in Progress

By Bill Walker

In a [recent column](#) I discussed the upcoming “Continental Congress 2009” which supporters have gone out of their way to say is “not a constitutional convention” as if even this were true this “congress” would have the slightest authority to change anything in this nation. Such a denial shows a clear arrogance on the part of this “congress.” For the information of those supporting this “congress” they should know that all actions in the 1700’s were authorized by already existing, recognized governments, i.e., the colonial or later state legislatures, not by a bunch of private citizens getting together for a private meeting. In short, the First and Second Continental Congress and the Congress of the Articles of Confederation were all authorized by sovereign authorities with the sovereign authority to so constitute a government body.

Not so for Mr. Schulz’s “congress.” And make no mistake: this is just a continuation of scheme by a man to have as many people join in illegal criminal activity by withholding federal income tax (a criminal offense). This “congress” is a sham. Clearly, its purpose will be that of Bob Schulz and not that of a free, open and completely public convention with no pre-conceived agenda. Instead, it will obviously be aimed at simply being a mouthpiece for Bob Schulz’s positions.

A free, open convention such as this “congress” might be useful if its outcome were not already rigged. People, free to express themselves and to examine all possibilities and look at all facts, might actually come to useful conclusions unlike those stated in the [“agenda of the congress”](#) just released by Mr. Schulz as well as his [“vision statement.”](#) These documents clearly show there is already a plan in place to have this “congress” rubberstamp a pre-conceived agenda. This allegation is proven simply by reading the end pages of the “agenda” clearly showing an already determined result, an Articles of Association, planned for release by the “congress.” What happens if the “congress” in free and open debate instead suggests publicly supporting a call for an Article V Convention or some other action or takes no action whatsoever?

In contrast to this to this pre-conceived plan, consider the 1787 Constitutional Convention. Many of the states and delegates submitted so-called plans to the convention. But nowhere is there a document showing that before the convention met, the Constitution had already been written and the course of the convention already determined. This is obviously not the case with Bob Schulz’s “congress.” Let us not forget this “congress” was planned and created in [secret meetings](#) not open to the public.

Let us examine this so-called agenda for a couple of points. The first point of the agenda states, “The Constitution cannot defend itself and is not a menu.” This is true, Americans must defend our Constitution. However, given the Bob Schulz is on public record as opposing obeying the Constitution and calling an Article V Convention when [mandated](#)

[by Article V to do so](#) it is clear he believes the Constitution is a menu allowing the government to pick and choose what will and will not be obeyed. Mr. Schulz is obviously therefore a constitutional hypocrite. A further point: how can delegates from “49 states” have written this agenda when they haven’t even met yet?

Another point about this “congress.” I have tried several times to contact so-called “delegates” to this “congress” and ask them about an Article V Convention and urge them to bring the matter to the attention of this “congress”. No doubt, others have also tried other issues. All delegates have ignored any effort to be contacted regarding a convention. How can these “delegates” be said to represent the people when they will not even respond to them? In this, they are no different than the members of Congress so it should be no surprise to them when they are treated the same by the real Congress that they treat others.

If there is any question this is simply a continuation by Bob Schulz to further his own agenda which has included several court cases which he has lost and sanctions by the federal courts regarding fraudulent income tax schemes designed to see people don’t pay their income tax, it is eliminated by the fourth statement in the agenda which states, “CC 2009 is the appropriate next step in a 14-year process by the free People to hold the STATE AND FEDERAL elected officials accountable to the federal Constitution.” The only way this statement can be true is if one realizes Bob Schulz has been on this trail for 14 years and now wishes to drag others along with him.

As noted in my other column, Bob Schulz has a fixation on the First Amendment. Despite the fact, the courts have rejected his opinions about the First Amendment; Bob Schulz will not be deterred. It is clear the violations he speaks of are violations regarding his interpretation of the First Amendment. For example, there is not one public record Bob Schulz has ever produced showing violation of First Amendment by any government official. Indeed, in his public presentations, Schulz proves this by the fact he was allowed to file petitions in court and to meet with public officials. That is all the First Amendment mandates: the right to petition the government and it clear by Schulz’ own admission, he has never been denied that right. If there were, he would shout from the rooftops waiving the public document as proof. On the other hand, the violation by the government in refusing to obey the Constitution regarding an Article V Convention call is irrefutable by simple examination of public record and that public record readily available for examination on our website, www.foavc.org.

Schulz then states the people, having “exhausted their administrative and judicial remedies...now wish to exhaust their constitutional remedies.” He also states the “congress” wishes “to focus on facts, avoiding opinions” and “focus on violations of the Constitution.” Fine. Where in this 22 page pre-conceived agenda is one word about the violation of Article V? Why, given that the states have submitted 750 applications many of which address the very issues Schulz grieves about, are these facts of public record not even permitted one moment of public discussion by these so-called delegates of the people? Why do these so-called delegates run from a convention to the point they will not even discuss it?

Why for example on page 7 of this agenda where the 16th Amendment is discussed as a subject of the “congress” is it not mentioned that public record shows 39 states have requested an amendment to repeal the 16th Amendment? It would seem logical that if the “congress” is going to discuss the “facts” about the 16th Amendment that a sufficient number of applications exist not only to cause a convention call on this issue alone but that there is sufficient state support to ratify the amendment. As this would eliminate the issue as well as being the solution to Bob Schulz’s 14-year campaign, it would seem such discussion would be obligatory. Yet, Bob Schulz is on public record as opposing repealing the 16th Amendment via an Article V Convention. Hardly a consistent position by Mr. Schulz or for a “congress” whose slogan is “defend, NOT amend” the Constitution. In sum, it is obvious, it clear this “congress” is not about finding actual solutions to issues, such as repeal of the 16th Amendment but about promoting the ego of a single man who believes it must be done his way or we have “exhausted” our constitutional options.

As my other column indicated, I have heard Bob Schulz speak in glowing terms about the lawsuits he filed. He glided by the fact he also has been in court as a defendant over income tax evasion schemes but he spent hours regaling the audience about his court history, which can be summed up as achieving nothing. He lost everytime he went to court. On this historic record, we are to pin our hopes and “exhaust” our constitutional remedies. How can Schulz state this when an Article V Convention has not even been tried? Are we to assume if this “congress” does not get the public support it craves then we the people have “exhausted” our constitutional remedies? Does that mean this fate of this nation hangs on whether or not Bob Schulz’s “congress” rubberstamps his already demonstrated failure?

Hardly. Eventually after all these other efforts have failed—and they will fail, then a famous quote by a fictional character Sherlock Holmes will provide the answer. “When you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, *however improbable*, must be the truth.” One by one these impossible solutions, the Tea Parties, the Tenth Amendment movement and now this “Continental Congress 2009” have come forth as solutions to legitimate national problems, proven false and thus been eliminated as impossible solutions to those problems. However improbable it may be in the minds of those who conceived them, the only answer to constitutional violations by the government is to use the Constitution to solve them and that means an Article V Convention. It is an irrefutable and simple truth: the only documented constitutional violation by the government publicly and officially acknowledged by them is their refusal to call an Article V Convention. The government has never officially or publicly acknowledged any other violation and while those supporters of these violations may shout to the rooftops, the fact is when called on to do so, they cannot produce documented, concrete proof to prove their claims. If this so-called “congress” is not going to discuss that truth, then they are meaningless.

Bob Schulz’s pre-conceived “congress” should be rejected out of hand as dangerous, possibly criminal and certainly not offering any real viable solution for the problems of

this nation. Clearly, its agenda has already been decided beforehand. Its slogan clearly shows it has no intention of using the tools within the Constitution designed and intended to resolve such problems and therefore has rejected the Constitution out of hand. These reasons alone are enough to reject this “congress” as nothing more than it is—a bunch of private citizens getting together to vent their problems led by a false prophet.