



Have you ever considered, what would a convention look like today in today's political environment?

First, who would choose the delegates? If I'm the one handpicking the delegates to the convention, I think it would be a very different outcome than if Nancy Pelosi were doing so. He who chooses the delegates chooses the outcome.

So, who chooses the delegates? It's generally assumed that our state legislatures will choose the delegates. And even in the most conservative states that I've toured, I ask them this question, Would you be comfortable with your state legislature picking the delegates? And the answer I most commonly get is no. We may have a Republican majority in our state legislature, but we do not have a conservative majority.

So, what kind of delegates do you think they would support? The answer always comes back. Moderates or liberals. Do you think your state legislature would choose true constitutional, limited government conservatives to represent your state at an Article V convention? No. Even in the most conservative states, the answer I always get is no way.

So, what can we expect to come out of a convention that is dominated by moderates and liberals getting together and talking about the future of our Constitution?

Do you think that the changes that would come out of that convention would move us closer to the views of Marx or Madison?

The obvious answer there is we would move closer to Marx than Madison. In today's political environment, we can't possibly hope for changes to the Constitution that were as conservative as what we already have.

Next, do you think lobbyists would have any interest in the outcome of this convention? Of course they would! This would be the biggest event in the history of lobbyists! So obviously, the amount of money spent seeking to influence (or bribe) delegates to a convention would be significantly more than in an ordinary legislative session.

Do you think the convention will be live-streamed or will it be a closed-door session? Honestly, I see problems with both. Obviously, with a closed-door session, like the 1787 convention, who knows what would be happening in there? There would be no accountability.

The John Birch Society

Author: [Olivia](#)

Date: January 17, 2024



But what if it were live-streamed? Would that make it better or would that make it more contentious? Suppose the convention was live-streamed, are delegates who do not uphold the values of Marxism going to be doxed?

For those not familiar with term “doxed” or “doxing” it is when they publish your personal residence or address so that the angry mobs know where to show up with their torches and pitchforks. Does that EVER happen in today’s political environment?

That happened not too long ago to U.S. Supreme Court justices. Absolutely. That’s part of the political reality we’re facing today.

And with that in mind, do you think Antifa, BLM and other extremist organizations would have any interest in the outcome of a convention? Of course, they would. And of course, they would probably be the ones involved in the doxing, threatening, and protesting.

And speaking of protests, do you think their protests would be peaceful or just mostly peaceful?

And just by some random chance, if there happened to be some mass shooting around the time of the convention, do you think that would be used to try to influence the delegates of the convention? Absolutely.

And do you suppose the media would try to use that to influence public opinion?

Next, what about foreign interests? Would Russia, China, the United Nations, or others have any interest in the outcome of the convention? What outcome would they be seeking?

Given today’s political environment, how can we expect any kind of improvement to come out of a convention held today?

The first time there was a movement for an Article V convention was right after the U.S. Constitution was written and ratified. At the time there were states, such as New York or Virginia, that wanted a Bill of Rights. These states looked to Article V of the newly ratified Constitution and saw that there were two ways to propose amendments. One of them being the convention method.

Both New York and Virginia applied for what they referred to in their respective applications as a “Convention of Deputies from the several States,” or a constitutional convention, in order to get a Bill of Rights. This was the very first Article V convention movement in America and James Madison got out in front of that movement to stop it!

He wrote several letters explaining the dangers of having an Article V convention. In one of those letters, written to George Tuberville, on November 2, 1788, Madison wrote: *“Having witnessed the difficulties and dangers experienced by the first Convention ... I should tremble for the result of a Second, meeting in the present temper of America.”*

Isn’t that the same circumstance we’re in right now? Likewise, today, we haven’t seriously used the Constitution for quite a few decades, perhaps well over a century! Let’s try using it for a few years first, **before** proposing any changes to it. After all, how would you know that it’s not working if we’re not even using it?

Lastly, do you think the “present temper of America” in 1788 was better or worse than the current “present temper of America” in the 21st century?

It’s a lot worse today and it was pretty contentious even then. To propose a convention today, under all of the circumstances we’ve outlined, would be suicidal.

Learn more about Article V and the amendment process by visiting [JBS.org](https://www.jbs.org).