

## Which way now Bob? By Bill Walker

One thing that amazes me in the Article V movement is how Robert Natelson can, without shame, shed his position on an issue like a snake shedding his skin and how people let him get away with it without calling him on it. I'm not one of them; though in this case I am happy to endorse his new coat.

Many people who support Robert Natelson say they love the Constitution but in practice want nothing to do with it. At its most fundamental the Constitution is the physical representation of the people of this nation having the right to control their own destiny. None of the Article V Convention advocacy groups that I've come across so far, Convention of the States, Compact for America, Citizens Initiative and so forth actually believe this. As the Supreme Court once said, "A simple read proves this true." Take time to actually read their work, not what they say on their websites, but the actual written proposals they either want to pass as amendments, or the proposed procedures for a convention they wish to impose. You may have to dig for those as they generally keep them well hidden. Their proposals all share a common trait.

Not one supports the people electing the delegates to an open convention, i.e., a free, open democratic election with the people choosing who will represent them and through that election determining what issues will be on the agenda of the convention. This means allowing the people to freely choose their own destiny based on open public debate on the merits of various amendment proposals. As all the advocacy groups want tyranny and thus oppose election on this issue I appear to stand alone. No matter how these groups pretty their proposals they all want a pre-determined convention with the single goal of imposing whatever political agenda they have dredged up from the swamp of tyranny on this nation.

This is why all these proposals must be rejected: they will end democracy in this nation as we know it by establishing dictatorship of the amendment process and through that, total control of the Constitution. Nevertheless the Constitution must be obeyed. This means calling a convention, indeed several, openly elected conventions. The terms of Article V have been satisfied by the states with their 766 applications from 49 states several times; hence several conventions are mandated. So, those who want to retain their right of vote, those who believe in the Constitution and want a convention held in conformance with that Constitution need to begin pressuring Congress to issue a call based on the basic precept of a freely elected, open convention so those problems which can be redressed by constitutional amendments can be implemented.

Perhaps this pressure is already being applied and those groups mentioned above are beginning to get the memo from the people. There are several reports floating about indicating all these groups after gaining initial success are beginning to falter as people begin to read and study their actual proposals and reject them.

Maybe Robert Natelson is one of them. [In a recent article](#) Robert Natelson appears to dump his [previous position of state legislative control of the convention](#) with the ability of pre-determination all questions related to the convention. Suffice to say Mr. Natelson has finally gotten something right. He correctly states, citing correct and relevant case law from the

Supreme Court, which make it clear state laws regulating the convention, pre-determining its agenda, creating its rules for the political advantage of one political group, prohibiting delegate election by the people, arresting delegates for not following “instructions” from a few select state legislators and so forth are unconstitutional.

As Natelson notes, the Supreme Court has ruled in several cases (*Hawke v Smith*, *Lesser v Garnett* and *United States v Sprague*) that states operate under the federal constitution when involved in amending the federal constitution. It is simple as that. Yet Natelson has spent the past [five years advancing a master/slave theory of law](#) which advocates the exact opposite. So it is proper to ask: Which way now, Bob?

I’m not going to rehash Natelson’s article or parse it here. Overall it is accurate and correct. Besides I’ve written many articles (not to mention at least two lawsuits taken to federal court using the cases Natelson cites in his article all of which are online at the FOAVC website) on this issue and was doing so two decades before Robert Natelson ever heard of the Article V movement. Suffice to say he appears (for the moment at least) to be falling in line with the correct interpretation of the Constitution and intent of Article V. So if it ain’t broke—don’t fix it.

Now I do not expect this bliss of accuracy to last however. Natelson is bought and paid for and has admitted the same in print. No doubt his handlers, who are the same political vampires mentioned at the top of this article, will disapprove of Bob stabbing them in the back with the truth—that their proposals for a tyrannically controlled convention are unconstitutional. No doubt they will inform him if he wants to see another fat paycheck he’d better figure out a way to renounce this aberration of truth and democracy and fall back into line. No doubt he will do so. Still it is refreshing to see Robert Natelson finally get it right for once.