

The Master Plan

Assuming you believe they can, the two ways States can secede from the union

By Bill Walker

Assuming you believe the states have the “right” to secede from the union there are two ways the states can “secede” from the union. Many on the right are working hard to convince everyone else they do have that “right.” Of course, right from the start, these advocates gloss over the fact the last time states seceded from the union it cost 600,000 American lives. Put in today’s figures, that would mean 61 million dead over the “right” of the states to secede from the union.

But secession is a two way street and it is in that fact that the master plan of these same advocate groups, such as the John Birch Society and individual advocates such as [Tim Baldwin](#) ultimately relies. The plan is admittedly brilliant. It is being done right out in the open and to date is slowly but incrementally winning the day. Fundamentally, the master plan can be summed as: you can either leave the union or have the union leave you.

The first way is obvious. The state simply declares it is leaving the union. There it sits all alone, perhaps with a small number of states as allies, an easy target for the federal government to march in and re-establish the Constitution and federal law in the state. In the ultimate end, the state would gain nothing. After what may be a long drawn out bloody conflict, federal troops would overwhelm the state’s defenses producing thousands of dead and another violent reminder that secession cannot work becomes history.

However, there is a second way which these advocates think will avoid bloodshed but as will be shown will only end the same way. Here the advocates of secession have been diligently at work spreading fear in a brilliant campaign of forecasts of doom and destruction in order to plan the seeds of the plan. I speak of an Article V Convention and the applications needed to bring this about. The Constitution mandates there must be two-thirds applications from the states to compel Congress to call a convention. If there are not two-thirds applications, Congress cannot call a convention.

Ask any of these advocates and they will proudly state a convention will end the earth, as we know it. They will cite all sorts of dangers they “know” (but never with any evidence to back it up) will happen at a convention such as a convention will remove all our rights, write a new constitution and impose it on us by fiat. They will also say to stop this states must *rescind* their applications already submitted for an Article V Convention.

Never mind that the purpose of an Article V Convention is for the *states* to have equal say in proposing amendments and that it is *they* who ultimately ratify proposals thus

giving them tremendous power in the Constitution, a power these advocates want to nullify. Never mind the Constitution does not allow for rescission of applications and to that end the Supreme Court has stated that Article V is “clear in statement and in meaning, contains no ambiguity, and calls for no resort to rules of construction.” Never mind that if the principle of rescission existed, you could have members of Congress change their minds on their votes for bills after they became law thus nullifying the laws. Presidents could change their minds regarding signing of bills thus nullifying laws. Judges could change their minds on rulings made from the bench, months or years later effecting terrible effects on the parties involved in the lawsuit. Voters could change their minds after an election, by simply showing up the next day at the appropriate office saying they voted for a particular candidate and now wanted to change their votes such that the election is thrown out. The obvious dangers of all this needs no further comment.

All of these are examples of votes. The states vote to apply for a convention call. Members of Congress vote to pass a piece of legislation. The president casts his vote when he decides whether or not to veto a piece of proposed legislation. A judge casts his vote when he makes a decision in a lawsuit. Members of the public likewise vote in elections. And none of these decisions has a rescission clause in them meaning that a new action must be undertaken for any change to be made, not that a vote already made can simply be “rescinded.”

In the case however of Article V, such new action cannot include a rescission of a previous application because Article V does not permit it. Article V is “clear in statement and in meaning, contains no ambiguity, and calls for no resort to rules of construction.” Therefore, unless Article V states it, it does not exist.

But secession advocates want everyone to believe the states can rescind applications, despite the dangers of establishing this principle in the Constitution, despite the fact the Supreme Court has ruled it is unconstitutional to do this, despite the fact over two thirds of the states have applied for a convention thus mandating Congress call for a convention. Ignore anything to establish applications can be rescinded.

For by establishing this principle, they achieve their master plan. If they can convince enough people the states can rescind applications (and they have had success convincing some state legislators of this “right” in some states) then they believe they can stop a convention by reducing the number of applying states below the two thirds mark required by the Constitution. Never mind the fact the applications were above the two-thirds mark and that Congress is required to immediately call a convention. They cheer the news Congress is refusing to obey the Constitution and accept, without any hesitation the principle that Congress can veto the Constitution. The dangers of this should be obvious and thus require no further comment.

Because it is all part of a master plan. Once it is established the states can rescind applications then these succession advocates will turn to their real goal: using the “right” of rescinding to rescind *ratification votes* on already in place amendments and ultimately the Constitution itself. Indeed recent increased action on the part of succession advocates

may indicate they are satisfied they have established the “right” sufficiently to proceed to step two of the master plan. Obviously, if the power to rescind by the states exists in Article V it must exist in all parts of Article V where the states have an action they may exercise.

Because of the fact, all 50 states have submitted applications for a convention call, if the rescinding advocates are to be believed, it then requires 17 states to rescind applications. However, if they are correct, or enough people believe they are correct, it only requires *one state* to terminate an already ratified amendment or the Constitution itself. Remember the Constitution, according to these people, was illegally ratified in the first place. Never mind that all original thirteen states ratified the Constitution. Never mind the Constitution specifically forbids the states from belonging to a confederation thus permanently terminating the Articles of Confederation as the ruling law and structure of this nation. The fact is these advocates believe the Constitution never actually replaced the Articles of Confederation and that a convention duped all the states into joining its new form of government. In short, these advocates believe the leaders in all the states were a bunch of stupid boobs who could not even see the danger in front of their face of the Constitution.

The master plan is simple but brilliant. Unlike applications, which have no numeric limit as to the number of times a state can apply, ratification votes are strictly numerically limited. It requires three fourths vote in order to ratify *and no more* meaning there are no “extra” votes hanging around somewhere from the states. Thus, *if you believe the secession advocates point of view*, for the ratified amendment voted by the states and already a part of the Constitution, to remain ratified it follows the vote of every state that voted to ratify must remain in place. Otherwise, that amendment ceases exist as it no longer has the three fourths vote necessary to be part of the Constitution. But secession advocates hold states can rescind their votes in regards to Article V meaning their vote is always on-going, subject to rescission at any time the state is so disposed. Hence, the entire Constitution is temporary entirely subject to the whims of the states at any time just as it was with the Articles of Confederation. It was because of this constant turmoil the states finally called for a new form of government but succession ignore this historic fact instead yearning for the good old days of the Confederation. In sum, they hold states can rescind ratification votes at any time just like application votes.

Similarly, it follows by the logic of these advocates that if one of the thirteen states, which originally ratified the Constitution, can rescind its vote of ratification, the entire Constitution can be nullified. Hence they are [at work today](#) trying to establish in one of the original thirteen states that it has the power to rescind applications. Secession in reverse. The state does not leave the union; the union is dissolved leaving the state behind.

Thus, the master plan is to establish states can rescind applications and then move on to begin to disassemble the Constitution by simple rescinding of a single ratification vote in select states. Perhaps their goal will be to rescind the 16th Amendment, or they may begin with the 13th Amendment or the 19th Amendment. Perhaps they wish to silence their opposition and will start with the First Amendment. In short they intend to do the very

thing they say a convention will do but can never prove. Using the convention as a scapegoat for unproven fears is simply a means to an end for these advocates.

Of course, the states will be conflicting with the 1939 Supreme Court ruling, *Coleman v Miller* 307 U.S. 433 (1939) in which the court allowed for the replacement of state legislatures by order of Congress by use of military force in order to affect a ratification vote. Clearly, neither Congress nor the president will stand ideally by and watch this passively. Force will be used and those advocates will then watch 61 million Americans die for an idea that should have been consigned to the permanent dust of history after its last attempt.

This is why Article V does not permit rescissions of applications. This is why the Constitution does not allow rescissions anywhere else in our form of government so that if people wish to change something, they have to bring it anew so that a fresh debate and another decision can be rendered on the issue at a new time. Yes, previous decisions, where allowed in the Constitution can be changed. New legislation can remove or alter previous legislation; a new lawsuit can allow a judge to issue a new ruling terminating or alliterating an old court order, voters can elect a different person in a new election. However, nowhere is it permitted that except by prescribed constitutional means, can anyone simply rescind a previous decision arbitrarily. The foundation of trust between the people and the Constitution rests on this principle. Were it otherwise we would quickly descend into chaos and this is what these advocates want.

For the preservation of the Constitution these advocates must be rejected by the American people.