

THE ARTICLE V **MOVEMENT:**

A COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT TO DATE AND
SUGGESTED APPROACH FOR STATE LEGISLATORS
AND ADVOCACY GROUPS MOVING FORWARD

authored by David F. Guldenschuh
July 31, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>Introduction</i>	1
<i>I. The Primary Article V Convention Advocacy Groups</i>	2
A. The Balance Budget Amendment Task Force	2
B. The Convention of States Project	4
C. Wolf PAC - Free and Fair Elections	6
D. Compact for America	6
<i>II. Educational Efforts</i>	7
A. The Prolific Work of Prof. Rob Natelson	8
B. The Article V Debates and Educational Efforts	9
C. Media and High Profile Endorsements	12
D. Friends of the Article V Convention	13
E. The Article V Library	15
F. The Article V Convention Legislative Progress Report	15
<i>III. The Work Among Article V State Legislators</i>	16
A. The State Legislators Article V Caucus	16
B. The Assembly of State Legislatures	17
C. The Federal Assembly of State Presiding Officers	18
D. Faithful Delegate Limitation Bills	18

<u><i>Section Title</i></u>	<u><i>Page</i></u>
<i>IV. The Successes and Disappointments of the Primary Advocacy Groups</i>	19
A. The BBA Task Force	19
B. The Convention of States Project	20
C. Wolf PAC - Free and Fair Elections	21
D. Compact for America	22
E. An Overall Recap of Legislative Progress Through 2015	22
<i>V. Individual Legislators and Other Roadblocks Within Specific States</i>	24
A. Sen. Majority Leader Andy Biggs of Arizona	25
B. Sen. Bart Davis in Idaho	26
C. The South Carolina Minority Report	26
D. Threats of Filibuster in West Virginia House	27
E. Wyoming Fears Loss of Federal Subsidies	27
F. Oklahoma - One Resolution's Impact on Another	28
G. Kansas - Speaker of the House Ray Merrick	28
H. Texas - GOP Senator Craig Estes Threatens Filibuster	29
I. Louisiana Sen. President John Alario Accused of Sabotaging CoS Bill	29

<u><i>Section Title</i></u>	<u><i>Page</i></u>
<i>VI. A Suggested Approach for State Legislators and Advocacy Groups Moving Forward</i>	30
A. Specific Suggestions For Coordination And Cooperation Among The Advocacy Groups	32
B. The Role of the State Legislator Groups	34
<i>Conclusion</i>	36
APPENDIX A: The Article V Convention Legislative Progress Report	37
APPENDIX B: BBATF Map of Successful and Targeted States	38

THE ARTICLE V MOVEMENT:

A COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT TO DATE AND SUGGESTED APPROACH FOR STATE LEGISLATORS AND ADVOCACY GROUPS MOVING FORWARD

authored by David F. Guldenschuh
July 31, 2015*

Introduction

In early November, 2013, this author hosted a telephone conference of all the major stakeholders in the Article V movement. It was not the first time that leadership of the various groups had ever spoken with each other, but it was certainly one of more well-attended meeting of the groups. After an hour and a half's discussion in which each group put forth its vision for successfully pursuing an Article V convention, we discussed whether there were ways for the groups to work together and support each other. The consensus was that it was too soon to begin merging efforts. At that point, four major groups - the Balanced Budget Amendment Task Force ("BBATF"), the Convention of States Project ("CoS"), the Compact for America ("Compact"), and Wolf-PAC Free and Fair Elections ("Wolf-PAC") - were each in their relative adolescence. Each group desired to test the landscape to see how successfully they could bring their individual Article V applications to passage within their targeted states. While all agreed to continue their education of state legislators and the public on the safety of the Article V movement, it was the consensus that it would take a couple of years of efforts to determine the effectiveness of each group's strategy as well as the success of the entire Article V movement.

The time has now come for reassessment. Each of the four major groups has had more than two years in which to test their strategy. There were initial successes, but each group has likewise faced struggles. This article is intended to

** David Guldenschuh is an attorney and native of Rome, Georgia, and is the publisher of the Article V Convention Legislative Progress Report, the only nationally recognized tracker of the status of all Article V legislation in the country. He is the former Legislative Liaison Director for the Convention of States Project where in 2014, he led Georgia to become the first state in the country to pass the CoS Article V application for a convention of states. He presently serves as Special Counsel to the Balanced Budget Amendment Task Force, and was recently named to the Board of Policy Advisors of the Heartland Institute, where he will concentrate on constitutional reforms. Perhaps more than any other individual in the country, Mr. Guldenschuh has established working relationships with virtually all groups and individuals working within the Article V movement. Mr. Guldenschuh is a 1981 cum laude graduate of the University of Notre Dame Law School, a member of the Bar of the United States Supreme Court, and has on multiple occasions been named one of Georgia's "Top Lawyers" by Atlanta Magazine.*

provide a comprehensive assessment of the Article V movement in general and of each group's success to date. It concludes by proposing a strategy for the Article V movement for the next twelve to twenty-four months.

I. The Primary Article V Convention Advocacy Groups

The starting point requires identification of the principal players in the movement. There are in fact some ten groups that this author has been able to identify that purport to be advocating for an Article V convention of states on one or more subjects.¹ Only five of these groups are actively identifying sponsors for their respective amendment convention proposals, and only four of them have actually succeeded in getting their resolution passed by three or more states. These four major players are identified below.

A. The Balanced Budget Amendment Task Force

The Balanced Budget Amendment Task Force is a collection of national and state organizations and individuals dedicated to adding a Balanced Budget Amendment (BBA) to the Constitution of the United States by way of a convention convened under Article V. In addition to multiple state legislators from all over the country, among its many "co-founders" are the following prominent leaders:²

David Biddulph, a semi-retired entrepreneur and citizen activist, perhaps best known until recently for leading a citizen's initiative in

¹ In addition to the four set forth in text above, the others include: (a) Citizens Initiative, a group founded and largely operated by long time Article V advocate Charles Kacproicz, which seeks a countermand (or nullification) amendments convention [<http://citizeninitiatives.org>] (although active, CI has been unsuccessful in getting their resolution passed to date, and they are therefore not included with the other primary players above); (b) Americans for Congressional Reform, a relatively new organization founded by several prominent Texans promoting a package of two amendments for proposal via Article V: one for equal application of the laws to Congress as to the people and one for term limits for Congress [<http://americansforcongressionalreform.org>]; (c) Single Subject Amendment PAC, a super PAC promoting an amendment providing that a law cannot be enacted by Congress unless it pertains to a single subject which successfully passed a resolution in Florida [<http://singlesubjectamendment.com>]; (d) Term Limits for Congress, a grassroots group seeking signatures for on-line petitions for a 12 year term limit amendment to be submitted to individual state legislatures seeking an AVC application on same [<http://singlesubjectamendment.com>]; (e) Term-Limit Convention, another on-line term limits oriented advocacy group [<http://termlimitconvention.org>]; and (f) RestoringFreedom.Org, Inc., a group founded by retired North Dakota Sen. Curtis Olafson which passed a national debt limit amendments convention resolution in North Dakota and Louisiana in 2011 [www.restoringfreedom.org]. Sen. Olafson has since joined with Compact For America to promote their legislation. At least two other groups view the Article V convention process as a useful tool in their efforts to amend the Constitution: The Act 2 Movement [<http://www.act2movement.org/>] and The American Opportunity Project [<http://www.americanopportunityproject.org/>].

² <http://www.bba4usa.org/meet-our-team.html>

Florida that capped the rate of increase in property taxes through passage of a state constitutional amendment;

Pete Sepp, President of the National Taxpayers Union, author and frequent television political commentator and guest;

Barry W. Poulson, a Professor of Economics at the University of Colorado, an Adjunct Scholar of the Heritage Foundation, and Senior Fellow of the Independence Institute.

Scott Rogers, Executive Director of the BBATF, a West Virginia native with 15 years of experience in government affairs and campaign management;

Bill Fruth, President of Policom Corporation, an independent economics research firm located Palm City, Florida, which specializes in studying the dynamics of local economies. Fruth is author of the book, *10 Amendments for Freedom*³ and in 2010 led a nationwide effort to pass a 10 amendment Article V resolution;

Lew Uhler, a California attorney, former Reagan confidante, and founder and President of the National Tax Limitation Committee, one of the Nation's leading grass roots taxpayer lobbies;

Fritz Pettyjohn, a California lawyer, former Alaska state legislator, political columnist, radio talk show host and writer of a blog at reaganproject.com;

Lou Marin, and *IAMAmerican.org*, Florida businessman and leader of a nationwide organization supporting a balanced budget and fair tax amendment, which provide the grass roots support for the BBATF in targeted states;

Loren Enns, is a network engineering instructor and author of an Article V novel, *The Sword of Liberty*.⁴ He was a leader in the successful campaign to get Florida to adopt a BBA resolution;

³ Fruth, William H., *10 Amendments to Freedom* (publisher not available 2010).

⁴ Enns, Loren, *The Sword of Liberty* (publisher not available 2008).

Michael Stern, former Senior Counsel to the U.S. House of Representatives, and a published legal scholar on the Article V convention of states process;

Stu MacPhail, a small businessman, community leader, and conservative activist in Denver, Colorado and editor of *The State Legislators' Article V Caucus Newsletter*; and

Mark Guyer, a former legislative assistant to the U.S. House of Representatives, an author and Director of BBATF Donor Fundraising.

The BBATF came together in 2008 at an Article V conference hosted by David Biddulph in Florida. The original co-founders were Biddulph, Rogers, Sepp and Poulsen. Simultaneously, Bill Fruth was promoting his concept for a multi-amendments convention set forth in his book, *10 Amendments for Freedom*. Following a series of ALEC meetings where different Article V resolutions were considered, the groups came to merge their talents and efforts to focus primarily on a single subject balanced budget amendment. Through their efforts, Florida passed a two-subject resolution to address federal mandates and a balanced budget in 2010. In 2011, Alabama passed the first new generation single subject BBA resolution. Ten states have since followed.

The affiliation of BBATF with such national and grass roots organizations as I Am American.org,⁵ the National Federation of Independent Businesses,⁶ Tea Party Express⁷ and the National Tax Limitation Committee⁸ have provided it with a formidable ground game to lobby its targeted state legislatures.

B. The Convention of States Project

The Convention of States Project⁹ is the brainchild of constitutional lawyer Michael Farris and former Tea Party leader Mark Meckler. Farris is Chancellor of Patrick Henry College in Virginia and Chairman of the Home School Legal

⁵ <http://iamamerican.org/>

⁶ <http://www.nfib.com/>

⁷ <http://www.teapartyexpress.org/>

⁸ <http://limittaxes.org/>

⁹ Information regarding the Convention of States Project comes from the author's personal discussions with Michael Farris as well as the CoS Project's website at <http://www.conventionofstates.com/>.

Defense Association. He is the founder of both organizations.¹⁰ Meckler is a California attorney and was a co-founder of Tea Party Patriots (TPP) national organization. Meckler split from TPP in 2012 to found Citizens For Self Governance (CSG) with the mission of broadening the philosophical reach of the idea of "self-governance" outside of the Tea Party movement.¹¹

In 2014, CSG announced the start of the Convention of States Project (CoS). Having considered the different single issue Article V advocacy groups in place, Farris concluded that the problems existing within the structure of the federal government had become so serious that a single subject amendment application was insufficient to address the concerns. Thus, CoS was designed to come up with "a solution big enough to solve the problem," which consisted of calling a convention on the *topic* of reining in and limiting the power and jurisdiction of the federal government.¹² To accomplish this task, CoS began promoting an Article V application for adoption by 34 states on three related subjects: "to impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials."¹³

Coincidentally, the CoS Project was launched at roughly the same time that conservative radio host, Mark Levin, published his best seller, *The Liberty Amendments*, which called for the adoption of some 11 constitutional amendments designed largely to reduce the power of the federal government through the Article V convention process.¹⁴ The book and project, though formulated independently of each other, quickly became synonymous, and Levin's nationwide radio show quickly endorsed and became a vast marketing resource for the CoS Project.¹⁵

As both Farris and Meckler came from huge grass roots organizations, the strategy of CoS was to develop citizen leadership and volunteer teams in at least 40 target states.¹⁶ In 75%, or 3000, of the House Districts within each of those states, District Captains were recruited who in turn were responsible for recruiting an additional 100 volunteers within each district to make telephone calls, send e-mails and personally appear at the various state legislative committee hearings and rallies

¹⁰ http://www.conventionofstates.com/national_leadership

¹¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark_Meckler

¹² <http://www.conventionofstates.com/strategy>.

¹³ <https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/conventionofstates/pages/142/attachments/original/1410009563/Application-for-a-Convention-of-States-v.5.pdf?1410009563>

¹⁴ Levin, Mark, *The Liberty Amendments: Restoring the American Republic* (Simon & Schuster 2013).

¹⁵ <http://www.conventionofstates.com/endorsements>

¹⁶ <http://www.conventionofstates.com/strategy>

to promote and support the CoS resolution.¹⁷ With generous funding provided by CSG and the equivalent of 300,000 grass roots supporters nationwide, the perception was that state legislators would be hard pressed not to support the CoS resolution.

C. Wolf PAC - Free and Fair Elections

Wolf-PAC is the "super-PAC to end all super -PACs" established by progressive political activist and talk show host, Cenk Uygur.¹⁸ In late 2011, after seeing the momentum of Occupy Wall Street, Uygur decided to launch a long term project of his, a political action committee named Wolf-PAC, which through an extensive online network of volunteers, is lobbying state legislators to pass resolutions calling for an Article V convention of the states to overturn that portion of the Supreme Court's campaign finance decision in *Citizens United v. FEC* protecting corporate contributions.¹⁹

Since its establishment, Wolf PAC has rebranded itself as "Free and Fair Elections." It claims to have more than 20,000 volunteers in every state in the nation.²⁰ It provides these volunteers with a "tool box" consisting of educational materials and suggestions for contacting state legislators to inquire as to their openness to an Article V convention and the WP-FFE resolution.²¹ Volunteers can record each of their legislative contacts online and the information is used to target specific states where success is most likely. Uygur provides regular updates on WP-FFE's progress through his internet talk show, *The Young Turks*.²²

D. Compact for America

The Compact for America is a hybrid Article V convention movement, or as they like to describe themselves, "Article V 2.0."²³ The initiative condenses four state legislative acts (the Article V application, delegate appointment, prohibition on an invalid convention conducted without authority, and ratification) into one legislative act – the Compact for America.²⁴ It consists of two pieces of

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ http://www.wolf-pac.com/the_plan

¹⁹ *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 876, 175 L. Ed. 2d 753, 558 U.S. 310, 78 USLW 4078 (2010)

²⁰ <http://www.wolf-pac.com/states>; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bur32yOxmg8>

²¹ https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gBwusEsdUgrrqYA1i_bfUqtu1BhPqGiKjffViQsOJOg/edit

²² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sCtZKOkqpBI>

²³ <http://www.compactforamerica.org/#!Compact-for-America-Asks-Are-You-Ready-to-Upgrade-Article-V-20-is-Here/c213a/971A0C4D-110E-4546-A3D4-3FD9CCBE5197>

²⁴ <http://www.alec.org/model-legislation/resolution-to-effectuate-the-compact-for-america/>

legislation.²⁵ The first is a state legislative bill that calls for an Article V convention for the limited purpose of proposing a specific balanced budget amendment, the text of which is in the bill.²⁶ It simultaneously appoints the Governor as a delegate to the convention, and adopts the rules of the convention which preclude any deviation from an up-or-down vote on the specific BBA proposal.²⁷ Finally, it ratifies in advance the BBA assuming it is referred out to the states by the convention and Congress.²⁸ The second piece of legislation is a Congressional resolution which approves the States' use of the compact mechanism to propose the amendment, calls the convention upon adoption of the compact by a 38th state and then refers the BBA to the state legislatures for ratification, assuming it is adopted at the convention of governors.²⁹

This state compact approach to Article V was designed principally by Nick Dranias, the former General Counsel and Constitutional Policy Director for the Goldwater Institute. Unlike the other Article V movements, the Compact is not triggered at the 2/3rds or 34 state application threshold for calling a convention, but rather at the 3/4ths or 38 state threshold for ratifying a constitutional amendment. The "all-in-one" concept was intended to put to rest the concerns of the John Birch Society and Eagle Forum regarding the alleged "runaway convention" scenario and to offer up front a very specific, effective BBA that would rein in federal spending without the unintended consequences of a massive tax increase or destruction of the economy. The Compact is designed to give the states a more convenient, targeted and powerful vehicle to originate constitutional amendments than the ordinary Article V process. It is intended to resolve many of the scholarly disputes and minimize court interference by providing a clear legal framework to govern the Article V process regardless of the observer's jurisprudential view on the process.³⁰

II. Educational Efforts

With the growth of the Article V movement, the need for educational efforts to develop grass roots support and legislative passage has similarly grown. Below are highlights of the educational efforts we have seen.

²⁵ <http://www.compactforamerica.org/#!solution/c1flq>

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ <http://www.alec.org/model-legislation/resolution-to-effectuate-the-compact-for-america/>.

A. The Prolific Work of Prof. Rob Natelson

Perhaps more so than any other individual, Professor Rob Natelson is most responsible for the re-emergence of the Article V convention movement in the 21st century. Natelson is especially known for his studies of the Constitution's original meaning and he is widely acknowledged to be the country's leading scholar on Article V of the U.S. Constitution.³¹

As a Senior Fellow at the Goldwater Institute, Natelson researched and published a series of three articles in 2010-11 that brought new light and perspective on the safety and propriety of an Article V convention, such that state legislators and advocacy groups were willing to give it a renewed look.³² The latter article led to Natelson's authorship of *Proposing Constitutional Amendments by a Convention of the States: A Handbook for State Lawmakers* for the American Legislative Exchange Council in 2011.³³ Through ALEC, state legislators have come to learn more about the Article V process, and advocacy groups have had the opportunity to network with them, thereby bringing the movement to its current pace.

Since his entry into the Article V arena in 2010, Prof. Natelson has moderated, spoken or served on panels at numerous Article V convention seminars and symposiums.³⁴ He has continued to research and write extensively on the subject and to debunk many of the opposition arguments posed by such groups as the John Birch Society and Eagle Forum.³⁵ One of his more recent and prominent efforts is the legal treatise, *State Initiation of Constitutional Amendments: A Guide for Lawyers and Legislative Drafters*, prepared in 2014 and since updated for the Convention of States Project.

³¹ <http://www.i2i.org/robnatelson.php>

³² Natelson, *Amending the Constitution by Convention: A Complete View of the Founders' Plan* (Goldwater Inst. 2010) *copy available at* https://goldwater-media.s3.amazonaws.com/cms_page_media/2015/4/30/091010%2C%20Article%20V%20Policy%20Report%20FINAL.pdf; ---, *Learning from Experience: How the States Used Article V Applications in America's First Century* (Goldwater Inst. 2010) *copy available at* https://goldwater-media.s3.amazonaws.com/cms_page_media/2015/4/30/Final%20110310%2C%20Article%20V%20Part%202%20FINAL.pdf and ---, *Amending the Constitution by Convention: Practical Guidance for Citizens and Policymakers* (Goldwater Inst. 2011) *copy available at* https://goldwater-media.s3.amazonaws.com/cms_page_media/2015/2/2/PB%2011-02%20Article%20V%20Part%203%20of%203_0.pdf.

³³ <http://www.alec.org/docs/ArticleVHandbook.pdf>.

³⁴ A Google and YouTube search of "Rob Natelson Article V convention" results in hundreds of hits reflecting the many seminars in which Prof. Natelson has participated.

³⁵ A sampling of Prof. Natelson's research is listed at <http://www.articlevinfocenter.com/researchresources>. His continuing updates on Article V can be found at <http://www.articlevinfocenter.com/>. His most updated rebuttal of the frivolous claims of the naysayers can be found at: <http://constitution.i2i.org/2013/02/15/a-response-to-the-%E2%80%9Crunaway-scenario%E2%80%9D/>.

Prof. Natelson is the Independence Institute's Senior Fellow in Constitutional Jurisprudence and heads the Institute's new Article V Information Center, a website designed to provide journalists, state lawmakers and other citizens with up-to-date, accurate and unbiased information on the Article V movement.³⁶ He was a law professor for 25 years, serving at three different universities. He is also the Senior Fellow in Constitutional Jurisprudence at the Montana Policy Institute.³⁷

B. The Article V Debates and Educational Efforts

With the renewed interest in the Article V convention process, many advocacy groups, think tanks and law schools have sponsored seminars and debates designed to discuss and educate the public and state legislators on this constitutional process.³⁸ It would not be possible to list or describe all such efforts here; however, three are notable for the presenters and organizations involved.

The first occurred at the Council for National Policy meeting in St. Petersburg, Florida on February 7-8, 2014. The CNP is an exclusive organization of many of the wealthiest conservative individuals in our country.³⁹ The Article V debate occurred between Michael Farris of CoS and Trent England of the Freedom Foundation.⁴⁰

The debate was first notable because, at the outset, Mr. England virtually conceded that the likelihood of a "runaway" convention was remote. His chief argument against an Article V convention was that the Constitution was a sacred document that should not readily or easily be amended; therefore, to hold a convention to propose multiple amendments to the Constitution was not in the best

³⁶ <http://www.i2i.org/robnatelson.php>; <http://www.articlevinfocenter.com/new-article-v-information-center-helps-federal-reform-efforts/>.

³⁷ <http://constitution.i2i.org/about/>.

³⁸ Among the many not addressed in the text above are: The Cooley Law School Article V Symposium on September 16, 2010 (http://www.cooley.edu/news/2010/091710_ArticleV_Symposium.html); Conference on the Constitutional Convention at Harvard Law, Sept. 24, 2011 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ivdncxVS5U0>); Goldwater Institute Article V Seminar, September 25, 2011 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IR1nY-t-Cws>); Colo. First Committee Article V Symposium March 27, 2014 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P3hHSv0nC7Q>); Federalist Society Debate on an Article V Convention of States, April 15, 2015 (<http://www.fed-soc.org/events/detail/a-debate-on-an-article-v-convention-of-the-states>); and Hillsdale College, "The Practicality and Desirability of an Article V Convention," Sept. 8, 2014 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JhzgA_k6XrE).

³⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council_for_National_Policy.

⁴⁰ Because of CNP's exclusivity, there is no available video or audio of the debate; however, this author was present to hear the presentation.

interests of the document or the country. A most telling comment of Mr. England came in response to a question from the audience requesting him to identify "the worst case amendment that he believed an Article V convention could realistically adopt and that could get ratified by 38 states." The worst case scenario that he was able to project for the audience was an amendment eliminating the electoral college.⁴¹ Given the presence of two of the finer constitutional scholars in the Article V area, one would have expected the runaway convention scenario to have been fully explored, but the effective concession that it did not exist resulted in it never materializing.

A second notable debate occurred in Norman, Oklahoma in March 2014 between Michael Farris and Oklahoma Senator Rob Standridge on the pro-Article V side and Oklahoma John Birch Society leaders, Bob Donahoo and Charlie Meadows, on the anti-Article V side.⁴² At the outset, both sides described the problems facing this country and its federal government as "severe;" however, as is typically the case, they differed over how to solve them.

The JBS argued in favor of nullification, despite conceding that nullification has never systemically succeeded among the states. JBS argued that the people are the ultimate check and balance on the federal government, but again conceded an important point that voters are not sufficiently engaged to exercise the needed check on federal government. In a surprising final argument, JBS argued that if nullification were not effective, then the next step would be secession.

The primary argument opposing an Article V convention was that Congress would interject itself into the process and take control of the convention away from the states: "whoever sets the rules controls the convention." The primary support for that argument was a citation to 41 different bills regarding Article V that had unsuccessfully been introduced into Congress during the late 20th century. JBS did not address the fact that none of those bills came close to passing in a primarily Democratic-controlled Congress and would be much less likely to pass in the present Republican-controlled Congress. In the absence of further explanation, JBS failed to persuasively argue that the present Congress would intervene in a convention's proceedings.

⁴¹ Of course, it is highly unlikely that liberals or progressives would in the current environment push for the elimination of the electoral college. In the last six presidential elections dating back to 1992, 19 states totaling 242 electoral votes have voted for the Democratic candidate, just 28 votes shy of the amount necessary for election. *See* <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2014/12/07/1349409/-Democrats-have-a-built-in-edge-in-the-Electoral-College-But-it-guarantees-them-nothing-for-2016>. With such a stranglehold on the electoral college, the left would be foolish to propose such an amendment. Thus, even Mr. England's worst case scenario does not presently seem plausible.

⁴² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5HBVzS9c8ZQ>.

In summary, the JBS offered no plausible argument as to how to solve this country's "severe" problems, nor could they offer a politically realistic argument as to why a convention would not be controlled by the states. Nevertheless, their implausible arguments have for the time being played a role in Oklahoma not voting to support an Article V resolution to date.

The third most notable debate regarding the efficacy of the Article V convention process occurred in Hillsborough, New Jersey on May 13, 2014 when Michael Farris squared off against Andy Schlafly of Eagle Forum.⁴³ Schlafly argued, as did England earlier, that the Constitution is a magnificent document crafted by Christian conservative men of a character that no longer exists today. He too claimed that Congress would assert itself into the process and choose the delegates for the convention, write the rules, and appoint retired Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens⁴⁴ to be convention chair. He argued that liberals with the support of the media would hijack the convention, that voice votes would be used to push the liberal agenda and that Republicans and conservatives would wilt under the media bright lights. He cited the 17th Amendment and the Arizona governor's veto of religious freedom legislation as evidence of how the GOP are simply unwilling to take on the media. He argued that if conservatives fought back, the media would perform background checks and run smear campaigns against such persons. The momentum, he claimed, would cause the states to ratify amendments repealing the Second Amendment and guaranteeing abortion on demand.⁴⁵

Farris systematically pointed out the errors in Schlafly's arguments: Congress has never successfully passed an Article V bill; a conservative Congress will not interject itself into a convention called by the conservative states; historical and legal precedent establish that states control a convention; Congress' authority under Article V is purely ministerial; and that the ratification requirement eliminates pragmatically any chance of a harmful amendment ever passing.

⁴³ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xHd1xUo-_XE.

⁴⁴ It is ironic that Schlafly would cite Justice Stevens who as an appellate judge interpreted Article V to hold that conventions thereunder are responsible for setting their own rules and are not subject to the kind of external interference Schlafly claimed a Stevens-chaired convention would invite. *See Dyer v. Blair*, 390 F.Supp. 1291, 1307 (N.D. Ill. 1975) ("Article V identifies the body—either a legislature or a convention—which must ratify a proposed amendment. The act of ratification is an expression of consent to the amendment by that body. By what means that body shall decide to consent or not to consent is a matter for that body to determine for itself."). While *Dyer* addresses ratifying conventions, the same rule applies to a proposing convention.

⁴⁵ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xHd1xUo-_XE..

Of course, what Schlafly never offered was a realistic solution to the serious problems everyone on the right agreed existed within our federal government. Instead, Schlafly held to the tried and failed practice of winning supermajorities through elections and implementing change a small step at a time. In closing, Farris perhaps fortuitously called for the solution which all Article V advocates need to support and which this article ultimately proposes. In explaining what needs to happen with the movement to resolve first the political problems facing our country and then subsequently the social ills, Farris proposed the following:

The best thing we can possibly do is to validate this process on something the American public is united behind: People want to fix the fiscal problems, and then we can come right back after it. Once we validate this process, we can use it again to fix [other problems].⁴⁶

Indeed, the best way to eliminate the argument against an Article V convention is to get a popular single subject amendment to the 34 state threshold, call and then convene a convention, and show the world that it can stick to task: one state/one vote/one amendment.

C. Media and High Profile Endorsements

Perhaps the single greatest boost to the Article V movement over the last few years has been the publication of Mark Levin's best seller, *The Liberty Amendments*, which called for the adoption of some 11 constitutional amendments designed largely to reduce the power of the federal government through the Article V convention process.⁴⁷ Levin's book burst onto the scene at the same time that BBATF was picking up steam passing its resolution among the states, when CoS and Compact were kicking off their efforts, and when the educative efforts of state legislators at ALEC and through other efforts were reaching a critical mass. The resulting convergence of these events brought the Article V movement into the forefront.

That was then followed by its endorsement by numerous high profile politicians and conservative pundits. CoS of course got the endorsement of Levin, but also received the support of then Fox television host, Gov. Mike Huckabee.⁴⁸ Others offering support include: Glenn Beck, former Oklahoma Sen. Tom Coburn,

⁴⁶ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7xUXQvOTkr4> [at 1:31:08 mark].

⁴⁷ Levin, Mark, *The Liberty Amendments: Restoring the American Republic* (Simon & Schuster 2013).

⁴⁸ <http://www.conventionofstates.com/endorsements>.

Sean Hannity, Sara Palin, and Wisconsin Sen. Ron Johnson, among others.⁴⁹ In September 2014, CoS established a Legal Board of Reference consisting of several highly-recognized legal figures in the country who signed what is known as The Jefferson Statement, a document endorsing the use and safety of the Article V convention process.⁵⁰

The BBA resolution has similarly received the support and endorsement of several high profile politicians and public figures. Among its endorsers are: Governor John Kasich of Ohio, Governor Bobby Jindall of Louisiana, Sen. Rand Paul of Kentucky, Dr. Ben Carson, and nationally syndicated talk show host Herman Caine.⁵¹ And of course, it received its most significant endorsement in the 1980's from President Ronald Reagan.⁵²

Finally, the Compact for America effort has been endorsed by opinion leader George Will, judicial analyst and scholar Judge Andrew Napolitano, Fifth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals senior judge Harold DeMoss, national radio personality Mike Church, senior fellow in constitutional studies and editor-in-chief of the Cato Supreme Court Review, Ilya Shapiro of the Cato Institute and Dr. Kevin Gutzman, author of New York Times Best Seller, *James Madison and the Making of America*.⁵³

D. Friends of the Article V Convention

It would not be possible to record the development of the Article V movement without reference to one of the seminal groups formed to promote its benefits: Friends of the Article V Convention. FOAVC was founded in 2007 by several political activists, including the following (in alphabetical order):

Judge Thomas Brennan - former Chief Justice of the Michigan Supreme Court and a founder and first Dean of the Thomas M. Cooley Law School, the largest accredited college of law in America. Judge Brennan has advocated for the calling of an Article V convention since publishing his seminal article on the topic in 1982.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ *Id.*

⁵⁰ http://www.conventionofstates.com/the_jefferson_statement.

⁵¹ <http://redmillennial.com/2014/06/06/conservative-figures-unite-around-convention-of-states-movement/>

⁵² *Id.*

⁵³ <http://www.compactforamerica.org/#!Compact-for-a-Balanced-Budget-Now/c213a/F5AAFF64-D733-4916-A47D-914B44072BA1>.

⁵⁴ Thomas E. Brennan, *Return to Philadelphia*, 1 COOLEY L. REV. 1 (1982), available at http://www.article-5.org/file.php/1/Articles/return_to_philadelphia.pdf.

Given the number of state applications which have been submitted to Congress and Congress' failure to count, much less call a convention, Judge Brennan has more recently begun leading an effort to organize a virtual Article V Convention on the internet. That parallel effort is known as ConventionUSA.⁵⁵ Most recently, Judge Brennan authored the book, *The Article V Amendatory Constitutional Convention*.⁵⁶

Byron Delear - CEO of Energy Equity Funding, LLC, an energy equity funding service. He is a national columnist for the Examiner.com, a past candidate for U.S. House, an independent media producer and political activist on multiple other projects.

Joel Hirschhorn - author of *Delusional Democracy - Fixing the Republic Without Overthrowing the Government*,⁵⁷ which advocates the calling of an Article V convention. He is a former senior staffer for the U.S. Congress and for the National Governors Association.

Dennis Murphy - a Nebraska business owner and longtime political activist. He has served as state director of the Nebraska Minutemen, chairperson of the Nevada Reform Party, and is an active member of the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary.

Bill Walker - a former journalist and newspaper publisher. He graduated from Washington State University with a BA in journalism. He has brought two federal lawsuits, *Walker v. United States* (2000) and *Walker v. Members of Congress* (2004), the last appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. Both lawsuits sought to compel Congress to call an Article V Convention. The courts never reached the merits of his claims. Walker is the face of FOAVC and has been a guest speaker at numerous symposiums concerning Article V.⁵⁸

FOAVC is a non-partisan organization which does not support any specific subject matter or topic for the call of an Article V convention; rather, it believes that the 34 state threshold was long ago met and it therefore advocates for

⁵⁵ <http://www.conventionusa.org/>

⁵⁶ Brennan, Thomas E., *The Article V Amendatory Constitutional Convention: Keeping the Republic in the Twenty-First Century* (Lexington Books 2014).

⁵⁷ Hirschhorn, Joel E., *Delusional Democracy - Fixing the Republic Without Overthrowing the Government* (Common Courage Press 2006).

⁵⁸ See, e.g., Cooley Symposium Sept. 10, 2010: part 1 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tNZxlpxyxSg>; Harvard Conference on the Constitutional Convention 2011: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UO5I0isDEtY>.

Congress to immediately call such a convention. For the first time in history, FOAVC has gathered into a photographic collection taken from official government records the actual texts of hundreds of applications for Article V conventions from 49 states. Its website provides a wealth of articles, videos and other information for Article V activists.⁵⁹

E. The Article V Library

Still another excellent resource for Article V information has been provided on line by Robert Biggerstaff, a South Carolina attorney and Article V researcher. Biggerstaff has created an enormous repository of Article V information known as the Article V Library.⁶⁰ The Library contains a searchable database of virtually every Article V application known to have been passed. It likewise contains links to a wealth of Article V bibliography.

F. The Article V Convention Legislative Progress Report

In January 2015, it became apparent that before the legislative season was over, more than 200 Article V pieces of legislation would be introduced in the 99 different Senate and House chambers throughout the country. While each of the advocacy groups were quick to tout their successes, it was unclear what successes and failures were in fact occurring within the movement. Accordingly, this author undertook to research and identify every Article V piece of legislation pending in any and all of the 50 states in the country. The time and effort to track down that volume of legislation was not inconsequential and requests to several of the advocacy groups for their cooperation went unanswered. Nevertheless, by the end of January, The Article V Convention Legislative Progress Report began to publish weekly updates on the status and progress of each of the Article V advocacy groups.

The Progress Report provides a listing of all states where each advocacy group's resolution has been either introduced or passed. As to pending legislation, it tracks its movement through both committee and floor votes in each chamber. Finally, in an effort to provide meaning to each group's progress, the Report attached a total score and percentage of completion score to each group's efforts. As of the date of publication of this article, the major groups compare as follows:

⁵⁹ <http://foavc.org/file.php/1/Amendments>.

⁶⁰ See <http://www.article5library.org/>.

<i>Group</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Pct. to Goal</i>
BBATF	172	83%
CoS	53	26%
WP-FFE	39	19%
Compact	28	14%

The AVC Legislative Progress Report is the only nationally recognized tracker of the status of all Article V legislation in the country. It is now published by the State Legislators Article V Caucus,⁶¹ the Independence Institute's Article V Information Center⁶² and Friends of Article V Convention.org.⁶³ A copy of the AVC Legislative Progress Report is attached to this article as Appendix A.

III. The Work Among Article V State Legislators

At the same time that different advocacy groups have arisen within the Article V movement, state legislators, no doubt spurred on by the workshops and training provided by ALEC, have begun to coalesce to discuss and plan for an eventual Article V convention. At present, three groups have formed or are in the process of forming, with a number of legislators participating in all three.

A. The State Legislators Article V Caucus

The State Legislators Article V Caucus was founded in 2013 following the annual meeting of ALEC in Chicago, the same week that the CoS Project was announced. Its stated purpose is to encourage state legislators to "re-establish federalism as our Founders intended, and limit the runaway growth of the Federal Government."⁶⁴ It is the oldest of the three established state legislative groups. The founding members include: Senator Kevin Lundberg (Colorado), Senator Bill Cowsert (Georgia), Senator Bill Coley (Ohio), Rep. Yvette Herrell (New Mexico), Rep. Lori Saine (Colorado), Rep. Lynne Riley (Georgia), Rep. Manny Steele (South Dakota), Rep. Gary Banz (Oklahoma), Rep. Robert Thorpe (Arizona), Rep. Chris Kapenga (Wisconsin), Rep. Jordon Ulery (New Hampshire) and Rep. Andrew Welch (Georgia). The Caucus is co-chaired by Colorado State Senator Kevin Lundberg and New Mexico State Representative Yvette Herrell. It has grown to number more than 90 state legislators from 32 states.⁶⁵

⁶¹ <http://articlevcaucus.org/?p=148>

⁶² <http://constitution.i2i.org/files/2015/06/AVC-Progress-Report-6-15.pdf>

⁶³ www.foavc.org/reference/file62.pdf

⁶⁴ <http://articlevcaucus.com/about/>.

⁶⁵ *Id.*

The Caucus believes an Article V convention is the most efficacious means of meeting its goals, and it is encouraging the States to adopt resolutions to call for an Article V convention. It also believes that a convention is only the means to that end, and thus, its focus remains on the goal of federalism and limited government.⁶⁶ The Article V Caucus seeks to encourage state legislators to uphold its founding principles with web-based information, model legislation, and strategic meetings.⁶⁷ It publishes a monthly newsletter updating its members and the public on recent developments in the Article V movement.⁶⁸

B. The Assembly of State Legislatures

The Assembly of State Legislatures was formed in December 2013 at the call of five state legislators: Indiana Senate President Pro Tem David Long, Wisconsin State Rep.[now Sen.] Chris Kapenga, Ohio Speaker Pro Tem Matt Huffman, Oklahoma State Rep. Gary Banz and Kansas State Sen. Caryn Tyson. It considers itself a bipartisan group of currently serving state legislators from across the country who recognize that the states have a responsibility under federalism to work together to solve problems of national concern.⁶⁹

Just over 100 legislators from 32 states initially met at Mt. Vernon in December 2014 where they adopted a resolution putting into place committees to plan for an anticipated call of an Article V convention. Among other things, the committees are assigned to draft model rules for the convention, examine the status and content of applications passed by the States to date with a mind toward notifying Congress as appropriate when they believe the threshold of 34 state applications has been met, and plan for credentialing, scheduling, financing and facilitating of such a convention.⁷⁰

The ASL has since met twice in June 2014 in Indianapolis where 33 states were again represented and in December 2014 just outside Washington DC where 29 states were represented.⁷¹ Its Executive Committee met in Denver in June

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ *Id.*

⁶⁸ <http://articlevcaucus.com/news/>

⁶⁹ https://www.facebook.com/mountvernonassembly/info?tab=page_info ; <http://howeypolitics.com/Content/HPI-News/HPI-News/Article/Sen--Long-calls-for-bipartisan--Mount-Vernon-Assembly-/39/123/10497>, <http://www.theassemblyofstatelegislatures.org/index.html>

⁷⁰ <http://www.theassemblyofstatelegislatures.org/resolution1.html>

⁷¹ <http://howeypolitics.com/Content/Default/Lead-Story/Article/-Assembly-of-State-Legislatures--plots-Article-V-Convention-in-Indy/-3/346/11483>; http://www.thewheelerreport.com/wheeler_docs/files/1205kapenga.pdf

2015, and the next scheduled full meeting will be in Salt Lake City in November 2015, where ASL is expected to adopt a set of model rules for any future Article V convention.⁷²

In order to avoid any appearance of bias or political affiliation, the ASL has steadfastly declined any efforts from advocacy or other groups to interject themselves into the work of the ASL.⁷³ Although it remains a heavily conservative assemblage, it has actively reached and recruited across the aisle to maintain a bi-partisan appearance. Three Democrats sit on its Executive Committee.⁷⁴

C. The Federal Assembly of State Presiding Officers

The National Tax Limitation Foundation, in coordination with BBATF, hosted a special day-long series of meetings for state legislative leaders on Saturday, July 25, 2015 directly following the ALEC three-day Annual Meeting at the Manchester Grand Hyatt Hotel in San Diego.

The BBA-focused event, as announced by Ohio State Senate President Keith Faber, extended a personal invitation to the Senate President and House Speaker in all 50 states; hence, it was labeled as the Federal Assembly of State Presiding Officers. The principle purpose of the meeting was to begin to get state leaders from 26 or more states to go on the record in favor of a "one state/one vote/one amendment" resolution should an Article V convention be called to consider a BBA. The collection of signatures will continue through the fall to be used in lobbying the final 7 states needed to call a BBA convention in 2016.⁷⁵

D. Faithful Delegate Limitation Bills

In an effort to further assert their control over the Article V process, many states have adopted or are considering enactment of "delegate limitation" or "faithful delegate" legislation. It is widely acknowledged that states may limit the authority of their delegates to an Article V convention. During the founding era, a

⁷² <http://www.theassemblyofstatelegislatures.org/>

⁷³ <http://redmillennial.com/2014/12/08/state-legislators-lay-groundwork-for-a-convention-of-states/> ("The Assembly of State Legislatures is not aligning itself with any particular Article V organization or movement").

⁷⁴ <http://howeypolitics.com/Content/Default/Lead-Story/Article/-Assembly-of-State-Legislatures--plots-Article-V-Convention-in-Indy/-3/346/11483>; *see also* <http://www.examiner.com/article/state-legislators-lead-effort-to-diversify-article-v-convention-movement>.

⁷⁵ At the same ALEC meeting, CoS announced the organization of its own state legislative group to be known as the COSCaucus. *See* http://www.conventionofstates.com/convention_of_states_project_launches_legislator_caucus.

state would typically provide its delegates with a commission setting forth the scope of authority delegated. These delegate bills are geared to address the concerns of a runaway convention and to enforce the legal obligation of delegates to act only within the scope of their commissions. These acts typically bind a delegate to act only on those matters within the scope of the call of the convention and to support the one state/one vote mechanism for voting at the convention. If a delegate acts outside the scope of his commission, then he is automatically recalled and in some case replaced with a substitute delegate. To date, at least 6 states have adopted some form of a delegate limitations bill.⁷⁶

IV. The Successes and Disappointments of the Primary Advocacy Groups

Each of the primary Article V advocacy groups have experienced success and failures over the past two years. Here is a quick glance into their efforts.

A. The BBA Task Force

Thanks to 16 BBA resolutions still alive from the Reagan era push for a balanced budget amendment in the 70's and 80's, the BBATF had a healthy start toward reaching their designated goal of 34 states submitting applications to Congress on the same or similar subject, in this case, a BBA.⁷⁷ With 11 modern era applications having passed, BBATF is well on its way toward 34.⁷⁸ Attached hereto as Appendix B is a map designating states where the BBA has passed and targeted states.

There are multiple successes which BBATF has experienced. It has by far passed more modern era applications (11) than the next closest group (4). It passed applications in both Ohio and Michigan in 2013 and 2014, two states which had declined to pass BBA resolutions during the Reagan era push. It passed with

⁷⁶ Georgia: O.C.G.A. § 50-1-30 *et seq.*; Florida: Fla. Stat. § 11.93; Indiana: IC 2-8-1-1 *et seq.*; South Dakota: HB 1069 (signed March 8, 2015 per http://www.sdsucollegian.com/news/article_01d6f6a4-c5f9-11e4-8e78-3fa7e568e58b.html); Tennessee: Tenn. Code Ann. § 3-1-1801 *et seq.*; Utah Code 20A-17-101.

⁷⁷ There exists the issue of whether these 16 applications will aggregate with each other and with modern era applications. Congress will have the duty of initially making that assessment. To date, we have limited indications of how inclusive Congress will be in its counting of applications. Rep. Bob Goodlatte, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, which has been assigned the task of tracking state applications, has been quoted as at least unofficially agreeing with the BBATF's count of 27 to date. See http://www.breezejmu.org/news/virginia-house-representative-bob-goodlatte-visits-jmu-sga/article_7547c20e-d877-11e4-b877-5f3e9a9813c8.html.

⁷⁸ In 2011, Alabama passed the first new generation single subject BBA resolution. New Hampshire, which had rescinded its applications just two years before, passed a BBA in 2012. In 2013, Ohio, having rejected a BBA resolution three times, passed the BBA. Five states (GA, FL, LA, MI & TN) passed the BBA resolution in 2014 and three more passed in 2015 (ND, SD & UT) bringing the count to 27, including all non-rescinded resolutions passed during the 70s-80s.

overwhelming bi-partisan votes in Tennessee and Louisiana, and it is the only group to have garnered significant bi-partisanship in other states as well. It was successful in getting its application passed in South Dakota and Utah where other groups failed. It has passed at least one chamber in six other states: Arizona, Oklahoma, South Carolina, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. It appears to have the votes to pass in Idaho, it is very close in Virginia, and despite the strength of the John Birch Society in Montana, its prospects there remain attainable. Thus, BBATF's path to 34 remains realistic and easily represents the best opportunity among the advocacy groups to reach a convention.

B. The Convention of States Project

CoS rang in 2014 with a bang. During their first full year of legislative activity, CoS introduced its resolution into approximately 15 states. Its initial success came in Georgia, where in just 52 calendar days, the resolution swept through both chambers of the legislature as Georgia became the first state in the country to pass a historic call for an Article V convention to rein in the power and jurisdiction of the federal government. Before the year was over, Florida and Alaska had similarly passed the CoS resolution.

Of perhaps greater significance, CoS spent much of that first year establishing grassroots organizations within eventually all fifty states. Its interactive website and numerous educational events throughout the country did much to advance the cause of the entire Article V movement. It received numerous endorsements from high profile politicians and pundits, and as evidenced by the consistent support shown for the CoS at state legislative committee hearings, CoS made its grass roots presence known throughout the country.

In 2015, Alabama became the fourth state to pass the CoS resolution. Additionally, the CoS application was filed in 35 other state legislatures. Of those 35 states, 19 passed initial committee votes. Three state Senate chambers and eight House chambers passed the resolution on a floor vote.

Despite the successes of its first two years of efforts, CoS had its setbacks. It dramatically failed to meet its very lofty and optimistic goal of getting 34 states to adopt its convention resolution by the end of 2015.⁷⁹ Of greater concern is that on

⁷⁹ CoS projected reaching the 34 state threshold by passing its resolution in 14 or 15 states in 2014 with 19 or 20 to follow in 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EGQ1DEPJL4c&list=PLnUqWRINGMAjCVIXFT6Yw9c1uxndE-rlp&index=68> [30:25 - 30:50].

multiple occasions in states like Texas, Louisiana, North Dakota and other states which have shown friendliness toward the Article V Convention movement, CoS found itself coming up short.

The most consistently cited hesitation about CoS is the fact that its application seeks to do too much at once. Given the existing fear of the runaway convention, legislative opponents of CoS have in several states been able to successfully argue that its general call on the subject matter of reducing the power and jurisdiction of the federal government is nothing more than smoke screen for an open convention.⁸⁰ However unfounded the criticism, it has slowed down the initial momentum established by CoS.

C. Wolf PAC Free and Fair Elections

With money and power creating scandal in the federal government every day, WP-FFE's campaign finance reform resolution would appear to be gaining momentum. Working with volunteers on a shoe string budget and making optimal use of the internet, WP-FFE has passed its resolution in four states, large and small, east and west, but all Democratically-controlled. It has taken a very low key, under the radar approach to advocacy, which to date has proved every bit as successful as that of the higher profile advocacy groups.

It appears to be part of the group's strategy to gather momentum as Washington self-destructs, and again, there is some wisdom in this approach. To get ultimately to 34 states anywhere in the near future, WP-FFE is going to have to find ways to build coalitions in more moderate and conservative states where campaign finance reform is likely popular among the citizenry, but less so among the politicians. It has the opportunity to build those coalitions in the next two years as BBATF approaches its 34 state threshold. Hopefully, WP-FFE's leadership will see fit to take that step.

⁸⁰ See, e.g., Hearing before Louisiana Senate Judiciary Committee B on June 2, 2015 at http://senate.la.gov/video/videoarchive.asp?v=senate/2015/06/060215JUDB_0; Hearing before Texas Senate Committee on State Affairs on May 25, 2015 at http://tlcsenate.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=30&clip_id=10305 (commencing approximately at 7:45 mark); Oklahoma House debate on SJR4 on April 21, 2015 at http://okhouse.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=57&clip_id=1838.

D. Compact for America

In October 2014, Nick Dranias left his position at the Goldwater Institute to work full time for the Compact For America Educational Fund, Inc.⁸¹ This was undoubtedly the most important move forward for the Compact since its founding. Dranias is the architect of the Compact and his fulltime attention to the cause is critical to its ultimate success.

As for the legislative landscape, the Compact has spent much of its first two years organizing grass roots and educating legislators about its concept. Because of its all-in-one approach, the Compact requires far more educating of state leaders than do the other Article V resolutions. Of course, the energy and time put in on the front end with the Compact stands to reap tremendous benefits on the back end where concerns of a runaway convention, the drafting of an amendment and the difficulty of ratification are all put to rest.

As is discussed in more detail below, the Compact has taken a more targeted approach to its introduction into the states. It has passed in four of 16 states where it has been introduced. As this article points out, however, it faces numerous institutional difficulties in "must have" states⁸² that will be difficult if not impossible to overcome. There is a significant and narrow road ahead for the Compact to get to its ultimate goal of 38 states, one which would appear to be many years down the road.

E. An Overall Recap of Legislative Progress Through 2015

The Article V movement had an encouraging run through the various state legislatures in the first half of 2015 with potentially a success or two left to come in the latter half of the year. At least one Article V resolution was introduced into 47 of the 50 states in 2015. One inactive state, Georgia, passed three Article V resolutions in 2014; thus, it had nothing left to address this year. A second state, Colorado,⁸³ considered but elected to postpone action on two Article V resolutions during 2014. The third state, Wisconsin, passed a BBA resolution in 2014 in its

⁸¹ <http://www.compactforamerica.org/#!/Nick-Dranias-Joins-Compact-for-Americas-Educational-Foundation-as-its-Vice-President/c213a/788E1806-766D-417F-B2F4-E6AE76217A45>

⁸² <http://www.compactforamerica.org/#!/solution/c1flq>.

⁸³ Colorado considered two different Article V resolutions during 2014 and voted to postpone both indefinitely: SJR 14-023, the CoS resolution sponsored primarily by Sen. Kevin Lundberg and HR 14-1016, the National Debt Relief Amendment resolution sponsored by Rep. Lori Saine. See <http://www.leg.state.co.us/CLICS/CLICS2014A/csl.nsf/BillFoldersAll?OpenFrameSet> and <http://www.leg.state.co.us/CLICS/CLICS2014A/csl.nsf/BillFoldersAll?OpenFrameSet..>

House⁸⁴ and it is likely to have at least one resolution introduced before the end of the year. Thus, all 50 states have engaged in Article V activity over the last two years.

Six different states passed 7 Article V resolutions or bills in 2015. BBATF led the way passing in North Dakota, South Dakota and Utah. The Compact passed in North Dakota and Mississippi. The CoS resolution passed in Alabama and the WP-FFE resolution passed in New Jersey.

Each of the Article V advocacy groups had successes in getting its resolutions passed in at least one chamber of a legislature with the opportunity to hopefully finish passage in 2016 in those states where legislation carries over.

BBA, which needs only 7 more states to meet the 34 state constitutional threshold for calling a convention, passed in the West Virginia Senate and in the Oklahoma and Wyoming Houses, although only the first two will carryover to 2016. CoS passed and will carryover in the Iowa House and likely in the New Mexico House, and in the Oklahoma and Tennessee Senates. CoS passed in one chamber in 7 other states, but it will have to restart its efforts in those states in 2016. The Compact passed in one chamber in 5 states, but none carry over to 2016. WP-FFA passed different versions of its resolution in both the Maryland House and Senate, but because they could not iron out the differences before the legislative session concluded, they will have to start over in 2016. WP-FFA also passed and will carry over in the Hawaii House and the Delaware Senate. Thus, 8 resolutions remain pending at the end of 2015, having passed one chamber and requiring but passage in the other chamber to become final.

In the final analysis, it was a productive year in terms of *introducing* Article V resolutions, but significant challenges remain as evidenced by the overall success or "passage rate" of resolutions.

Since 2010, 17 different states have passed a total of 26 Article V resolutions. Over the last two years, CoS introduced its resolution in 40 total states where it passed in four. That gives CoS an overall passage rate of 10% . Given the "low hanging fruit" which one would have expected CoS to pluck during its first two years, particularly given its initial successes in Georgia, Florida and Alaska, the one state gain in 2015 suggests that the hurdles contemplated at the announcement of the project in 2014 are proving to be much higher than originally

⁸⁴ <http://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/2013/proposals/ajr81>.

anticipated. The same holds true for both the Compact and WP-FFE. The latter has been introduced in 30 states so far and passed in four for a passage rate of 13%. The Compact has been much more targeted in its efforts passing in four of 16 states for a 25% passage rate.

Unquestionably, BBATF, with the benefit of the momentum established by 16 applications surviving from the Reagan era BBA surge, has led the way in successfully passing its single subject resolution. Since Alabama passed the first new generation single subject BBA resolution in 2011, BBATF has targeted 23 states and obtained passage in 11 of them for a passage rate of 48%. This is particularly impressive given that BBATF had far fewer jurisdictions to choose from with the available states being the more difficult ones in which to obtain passage. For example, passage in Arizona is virtually impossible as long as anti-Article V Senate Majority Leader Andy Biggs remains in authority, although it remained on the targeted list of states.

Thus, while each of the groups has enjoyed successes over the last two years, it is undeniable the BBATF has shown the most resiliency and acceptability within the movement and that has translated into success in getting its Article V resolutions passed.

V. Individual Legislators and Other Roadblocks Within Specific States

The roadmap to passing an Article V convention resolution is one steeped with hurdles and pitfalls. The starting point is finding one or more key legislators willing to introduce and carry the legislation through their respective chamber and across the capitol building to their fellow chamber. It requires educating fellow legislators and obtaining co-sponsors for the resolution. Once introduced, the resolution goes through one or more committees where an affirmative vote is usually required to move the resolution to the floor. Often times, legislative maneuvers by a single individual or threats of filibuster can keep the resolution from coming up on the calendar for a vote. Because these are resolutions, they are often viewed as secondary pieces of legislation and they have to take a back seat to more pressing budget, transportation and other matters. Assuming a resolution gets to the floor and obtains a favorable vote, it must then start the process over in the corresponding chamber. All of this has to be done within a limited number of days on a legislative calendar containing crossover and other potentially killer deadlines. Thus, it is truly remarkable that the Article V movement has enjoyed the success

that it has over the last few years. While the momentum is building, the opportunities for failure are numerous.

During the past year, the movement experienced these pitfalls in multiple states. There remain several legislators in important positions of leadership who for a variety of reasons - some good and some not so good - were unwilling or unable to allow debate and an up-or-down vote in their chambers. Set forth below is a sampling of the concerns these legislators have raised about Article V which the advocacy groups must ultimately address to continue their successes.

A. Sen. Majority Leader Andy Biggs of Arizona

No legislator in the country has proved to be a more determined skeptic of the Article V movement than Arizona Senate Majority Leader Andy Biggs. The BBA, CoS and Compact have all successfully passed their legislation in the Arizona House with seemingly the requisite votes needed for passage in the Senate only to be thwarted by Biggs. As Senate Majority Leader, Biggs is responsible for assigning bills to committee and for deciding what resolutions come up for a vote. He has steadfastly refused to allow any Article V legislation to be finally considered in the Arizona Senate.

Biggs is a retired attorney who has scored well with conservative groups, having been designated “Champion of the Taxpayer” by Americans for Prosperity for his cumulative service in the state legislature. He has similarly been honored by the Goldwater Institute as a “Friend of Liberty.”⁸⁵ He is well respected and admired by his colleagues. When it comes to Article V, however, he strongly opposes a convention citing fears of its potential harming of the Constitution.

Indeed, in 2015, Biggs authored the paperback "The Con of the Con Con," wherein he argued against Article V using the argument that if the Constitution isn't the problem, then why fix it, and that if it is the problem, then don't trust its own provisions to fix it.⁸⁶ Biggs is likely immovable, but there is overwhelming support in Arizona and in his district for, at a minimum, a federal balanced budget amendment. The hope is that with all of the efforts to eliminate the chance of a runaway convention through delegate limitation bills and model convention rules,

⁸⁵ http://www.azleg.gov/MembersPage.asp?Member_ID=88&Legislature=51&Session_ID=110.

⁸⁶ Biggs, Andy, *The Con of the Con-Con: The Case Against the States Amending the U. S. Constitution* (Free Man Press 2015). Reviews of the book have alternatively described it as "silly rhetoric" and "unseemly" and "misleading." See *Arizona Daily Independent* review at <https://arizonadailyindependent.com/2015/07/02/review-andy-biggs-the-con-of-the-con-con/> and *Western Free Press* review at <http://www.westernfreepress.com/2015/06/15/book-review-of-the-con-of-the-con-con-by-arizona-senate-president-andy-biggs/>

he will eventually allow at least one of the advocacy groups to obtain a test vote in the Arizona Senate.

B. Sen. Bart Davis in Idaho.

In Idaho, resolutions such as those involving Article V often do not get introduced into either chamber unless it can be shown that the votes exist to pass them first. In the Idaho House, it appeared as if there were ample votes to pass both the BBA and CoS resolutions in 2015. On the other side of the capitol, Senate Majority Leader Bart Davis is a well respected, thoughtful lawyer from Idaho Falls.⁸⁷ He is viewed by his colleagues as a reliable study on matters of constitutional significance. Thus, his support for any Article V resolution is critical to its success. In 2015, however, the advocacy groups were unable to provide Sen. Davis with sufficient comfort about the safety of the Article V process and the ability of the states to control the convention to allow their resolutions to come up for vote. Hopefully, the efforts of such groups as the ASL and Federal Assembly, as well as continuing educational efforts, can convince Sen. Davis to allow a vote in 2016.

C. The South Carolina Minority Report

South Carolina appeared ripe this past year to pass at least one of the Article V resolutions. It is the only deep South state which has not passed a BBA resolution, having come close in 2014 when it passed the House but fell short in the Senate. In 2015, BBA and CoS introduced applications in both chambers. Both resolutions passed in the Senate Judiciary Committee, but Democratic Sen. Bart Hutto pulled a legislative maneuver by assigning a "minority report" to the votes, thereby removing the resolutions from further consideration in the Senate absent a super-majority "special orders" vote.⁸⁸ Thereafter, arguments in the Senate over an ethics bill and a transportation bill effectively killed the resolutions for the remainder of the session. Senate President Hugh Leatherman either declined or simply could not find a way to place the resolutions on "special orders" before the session ended.

In the House, the resolutions were assigned to a Judiciary subcommittee which held 5 separate hearings, yet the subcommittee chose not to vote on the

⁸⁷ <http://www.senatordavis.com/about.html>.

⁸⁸ See BBA SCR30 at <https://legiscan.com/SC/bill/S0030/2015>; CoS SCR198 at <https://legiscan.com/SC/bill/S0198/2015>.

resolutions.⁸⁹ Despite a promise from House leadership to vote on the resolutions in 2015, it appears that the lack of a clear path to passage in the Senate spilled over to the House making what was perceived as a controversial vote by some as undesirable and ultimately unnecessary.

D. Threats of Filibuster in West Virginia House

For the first time in 80 years, the West Virginia House convened in 2015 under the control of a Republican majority. Spurred on by the strong support of neighboring Ohio Governor John Kasich,⁹⁰ the BBA resolution passed the Senate on a voice vote and moved over to the House where it was assigned to the Judiciary Committee.⁹¹ The West Virginia House has 100 delegates, 64 of whom were Republican in 2015. Of those, 56 had expressed support for the BBA resolution. On the last day of the session, SCR 13 came before the Judiciary Committee where Democrats threatened to filibuster other legislation if the BBA resolution were brought to the floor for a vote. Thus, Speaker of the House, Tim Armistead, had to make the decision not to allow the BBA resolution to go to vote, despite overwhelming support for it.

E. Wyoming Fears Loss of Federal Subsidies

Wyoming is a conservative western state under GOP control which makes it a likely target for success among the conservative advocacy groups. In 2015, CoS was unsuccessful in getting its resolution out of Senate committee with attorney and Senate Majority Leader Phil Nicholas being the crucial swing vote against CoS.⁹² The BBA resolution was introduced in the House where it sailed through committee and passed on the House floor by a 44-16 vote.⁹³

The Wyoming Senate consists of 26 Republicans and 4 Democrats, so success for the BBA resolution in the Senate should have been high. In the Senate committee, however, Sen. Nicholas moved to amend the resolution to attach a series of riders providing that Wyoming's participation in a BBA convention would not be used to penalize the state in its federal subsidies, which make up a substantial portion of Wyoming's annual budget. Although the resolution passed

⁸⁹ See BBA HCR3096 at <https://legiscan.com/SC/bill/H3096/2015>; CoS HCR3177 at <https://legiscan.com/SC/bill/H3177/2015>.

⁹⁰ <http://www.morningjournal.com/general-news/20150220/john-kasich-touts-federal-balanced-budget-amendment-in-west-virginia>.

⁹¹ See SCR 13 at <https://legiscan.com/WV/bill/SCR13/2015>.

⁹² See SCR4 at <https://legiscan.com/WY/rollcall/SJ0004/id/403696>.

⁹³ See HJR4 at <http://legisweb.state.wy.us/2015/Digest/HJ0004.pdf>.

out of committee, the amendments effectively killed the resolution and it failed in a 22-7 vote.⁹⁴

F. Oklahoma - One Resolution's Impact on Another

Oklahoma in 2015 proved to be an example of how one group's success or failure can directly impact another. Both the BBA and CoS were actively pursuing their resolutions, the CoS having filed in the Senate under Senate sponsor Rob Standridge⁹⁵ and the BBA filing in the House under the sponsorship of Rep. Gary Banz,⁹⁶ a national leader among legislators in the Article V movement. Each resolution passed a test vote in their respective chambers of introduction and moved to the opposite chamber for a record vote.

On Tuesday, April 21, 2015, each chamber was scheduled to debate and vote on their respective resolutions, but the Oklahoma House got to the CoS resolution before the Senate reached the BBA. The CoS narrowly lost in the House appearing to fall approximately 4 votes shy.⁹⁷ Even though the whip count in the Senate showed 32 of 48 Senators in favor of the BBA resolution, Senate leadership pulled the BBA from further debate and carried it over to the 2016 legislative session. Ironically, a motion to reconsider the CoS resolution passed the House two days later,⁹⁸ thus leaving both efforts with nothing tangible to show for in 2015, but both alive for 2016.

G. Kansas - Speaker of the House Ray Merrick

According to the CoS, Kansas Speaker of the House, Ray Merrick, individually chose to dooms its chances in Kansas in 2015.⁹⁹ CoS sponsored resolution HCR5010 was introduced into the Kansas House with 41 co-sponsors, including most of leadership.¹⁰⁰ After receiving a favorable committee report recommendation, Merrick, a former Chairman of ALEC, refused to allow HCR 5010 to come to a vote on the House floor and apparently offered no reason to CoS

⁹⁴ *Id.*

⁹⁵ SJR4 at <https://legiscan.com/OK/bill/SJR4/2015>.

⁹⁶ HJR1018 at <https://legiscan.com/OK/bill/HJR1018/2015>.

⁹⁷ The final recorded vote on SJR4 was 56-42 against; however, the Yea votes reached 47 of the 51 required votes for passage before some 5 representative changed their votes to No, presumably for political cover, before the final vote was locked out. *See* Oklahoma House Floor Debate and Vote of April 21, 2015 at http://okhouse.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=57&clip_id=1838 [2:46:20 mark].

⁹⁸ *See* CoS SJR4 at <https://legiscan.com/OK/bill/SJR4/2015>.

⁹⁹ http://www.conventionofstates.com/call_to_action_kansas_american_patriots.

¹⁰⁰ *See* HCR5010 at <https://legiscan.com/KS/bill/HCR5010/2015>.

state leadership.¹⁰¹ Despite endorsements from the Kansas National Federation of Independent Business and the Kansas Association of Counties, no vote was taken, causing CoS to conclude that Merrick was simply "running out the clock."¹⁰²

H. Texas - GOP Senator Craig Estes Threatens Filibuster

One of the longest serving Senators in Texas personally threatened a filibuster to shut down the Texas Senate if the CoS resolution were allowed to go to the Senate floor.¹⁰³ As a result, the State Affairs Committee left the resolution on the table and refused to vote on it.¹⁰⁴ GOP Senator Craig Estes claimed he was convinced that such a convention could not be controlled again succumbing to the fear mongering of the naysayers.¹⁰⁵ How ironic that a single legislator was able to control the agenda in Texas using the argument that the agenda could not be controlled at an Article V convention.

I. Louisiana Sen. President John Alario Accused of Sabotaging CoS Bill

Louisiana is a conservative state that in 2014 passed the BBA resolution by a virtual unanimous vote. Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindall has endorsed the Article V convention movement. Thus, Louisiana should have been one of the low hanging fruit states for CoS.

In 2015, CoS resolution HCR2 was introduced in the House where it passed comfortably by a 60-38 margin.¹⁰⁶ When it crossed over to the Senate, it was assigned by Senate President John Alario to the Senate Judiciary B committee which is a majority Democrat committee. CoS cried foul reporting: "According to Senate rules, any bills or resolutions dealing with 'intergovernmental relations between the state and the United States or other states' must go to Senate and Governmental Affairs, where other Article V applications in the past have always been assigned."¹⁰⁷ According to CoS, Alario "colluded with Senate Democrats JP Morrell and Karen Carter Peterson to assign the CoS resolution to the Judiciary B committee, so they could effectively kill HCR2 and prevent it from getting to the

¹⁰¹ http://www.conventionofstates.com/call_to_action_kansas_american_patriots.

¹⁰² *Id.*

¹⁰³ *See* Hearing before Texas Senate Committee on State Affairs on May 25, 2015 at http://tlcsenate.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=30&clip_id=10305 (commencing approximately at 7:45 mark).

¹⁰⁴ *Id.*

¹⁰⁵ *Id.*

¹⁰⁶ *See* HCR2 at <https://legiscan.com/LA/bill/HCR2/2015>.

¹⁰⁷ http://www.conventionofstates.com/louisiana_senate_president_sabotages.

floor, where it appeared there were sufficient votes to pass it."¹⁰⁸ CoS claimed that Senate President Alario, a former Democrat turned Republican, teamed with his former Senate Democratic colleagues, deviated from Senate protocol and killed the Convention of States resolution.¹⁰⁹

The above are by no means the only examples of Article V resolutions seemingly destined for passage being sidetracked by clever legislative tactics or individual power moves. They signify, however, the extreme difficulty which the Article V movement faces in getting any one or several resolutions to the 34 state threshold for calling a convention. They strongly counsel all aspects of the movement that coordination and cooperation are critical among the advocacy groups and with the state legislator groups, if the movement is ultimately to succeed.

VI. A Suggested Approach for State Legislators and Advocacy Groups Moving Forward

Over the last two years, this author has supported all of the active advocacy groups as a volunteer either in a leadership position or by working at the grass roots level on their behalf. I have spent hours testifying and observing committee and floor debates on all of the active Article V resolutions all over the country. I have had the opportunity to listen to numerous legislators and answer the most basic to most complex questions about Article V and the movement. I have made presentations to and listened to the thoughts of literally thousands of activists at the grass roots level. I have spoken with and offered my support to leadership in all of the groups, and my communications have spread across the entire Article V spectrum from conservative to liberal. The thoughts set forth in this section represent not only my own, but those of many other divergent legislators, grass roots activists, and legal experts and scholars within the movement. It might fairly be described as a developing consensus. So to the extent that leadership of the active advocacy groups might read these suggestions, I ask that you do so with an open mind focusing on the landscape of the movement as a whole, not the trees and shrubs that make up your portion of the movement, valuable though they are.

There are several nuggets to be gleaned from the 2015 Article V convention performance in the state legislatures which provide support for the suggestions to come. First, the single subject popular amendment strategy adopted by the BBA

¹⁰⁸ *Id.*

¹⁰⁹ *Id.*

continues to find more acceptance and smoother sailing than the other more complicated proposals. This is likely the effect of the fear mongering created by such groups as Eagle Forum and the John Birch Society regarding the runaway convention scenario. The 70-80% polling support for a balanced budget amendment makes it easier for a concerned legislator to support that simple proposal than the multi-subject strategy of CoS or the more complicated Compact multi-front legislative approach. Second, the average window from introduction to passage of an Article V resolution in a state is longer than some had anticipated as it appears to average out to 3-4 years, even in the "low hanging fruit" states. No group has captured more than five states in any one year, that occurring once by the BBA in 2014, so progress toward 34 is slow. Third, while the different advocacy groups have somewhat supported each other in states where multiple resolutions have been introduced, their multi-resolution presence has caused and is causing confusion among legislators and hurting the effort's overall success rate.

We are now two full years into the Article V movement and there is sufficient evidence available now from which we can draw a more fundamental conclusion. The difficulty of passing Article V resolutions in the states is much greater than was envisioned just two years ago when the movement began full measure. Despite the voluminous legal scholarship establishing the numerous checks and balances in place to avoid a runaway convention, and despite the work of the state legislator groups to exercise control and authority over the Article V process, the fear mongering of Eagle Forum and the John Birch Society still holds a strong grip on numerous state legislators. The naysayers have made even some of the most conservative states, such as Oklahoma, South Carolina, Idaho and Montana, difficult targets for passage of Article V resolutions. Individuals in leadership positions, such as Andy Biggs in Arizona and John Alario in Louisiana, have blocked or killed votes on Article V resolutions that would almost certainly pass but for their personal opposition or concerns.

In speaking with legislators and Article V activists all over the country, there is one recurring theme which appears to be almost universally viewed as the guiding principle to success for the Article V movement:

We need to get at least one of the advocacy groups to 34 states where a convention can be called. We need to have a convention and show America that such a gathering can stick to the guiding principle of one state/one vote/one amendment. If we can show that an Article V convention can meet, stay on task, propose a single amendment and

go home, then it will open the flood gates for the states to exercise their newly discovered Article V powers in the future.

There is only one group that stands a realistic chance of reaching the 34 state threshold within the next two years, and that is the Balanced Budget Amendment Task Force.¹¹⁰ Were the BBA to pass in 7 or more states in 2016 and were Congress to aggregate the applications and call a convention, the entire focus of the 2016 Presidential election cycle would change. Using the state convention method for ratification, it literally might be possible to have a balanced budget amendment measure on the Presidential election ballot in November 2016. If a BBA convention were called, convened and stayed on task, it would be markedly easier for all of the other groups to eventually get to a convention. This is a window of opportunity of sufficient enormity that all groups should consider what efforts they might be able to offer, without significantly sacrificing their own strategies, to make this happen.

A. Specific Suggestions For Coordination And Cooperation Among The Advocacy Groups.

There are several ways the groups can coordinate their efforts to seize the opportunity that exists for the Article V movement. The target states for BBA in 2016 are likely to be: Wisconsin, Oklahoma, South Carolina, West Virginia, Wyoming, Idaho, Virginia, Arizona, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota and Washington. The starting point for coordination would be an agreement between the advocacy groups that in these target states, all the groups will on the record endorse and speak favorably of the other as they pursue their own efforts. Such a

¹¹⁰There are those who will argue that the present 27 applications won't aggregate and will lead to litigation, thus endangering the movement. The fact is that we don't know what Congress will do when confronted with 34 or even 35 or 36 applications. There are reasons to believe that Congress will take an inclusive approach to aggregation. See note 77 *supra*. A review of the BBA applications reflects that there are likely no more than three that may require some modification to aggregate. To the extent that there may be one or more problematic applications, the BBATF strategy needs to clean up the most obvious problematic ones and work to pass resolutions in more than 34 states to moot out any others. Regardless of the outcome of aggregation, the media attention that comes from the focus on such a convention can only help the Article V movement. Moreover, if the aggregation were to lead to litigation, that could turn out to be positive in that would allow for the lingering questions about the role of the courts in the Article V process to be addressed. This would eliminate an argument which is routinely used by the naysayers to downplay a convention. It should further be noted that already there are differences at some level in the applications passed to date for both CoS and WP-FFE. Litigation can perhaps provide a standard that can be used by these groups as they move through the process of getting to 34. Finally, should the BBA call end up in litigation, such would not sideline the other movements. There would be one less player to deal with and the newer movements could focus legislators on the benefits of their strategy which requires the same language in their respective calls. All of these are positive reasons to pursue this strategy.

symbolic showing of support and unanimity can very well make a difference in states where passage might be close.¹¹¹

BBATF and CoS can be mutually supportive of each other in several key states. Both groups have resolutions introduced in Oklahoma, South Carolina, and West Virginia, which carry over to 2016. Both groups will be re-introducing their resolutions in 2016 in Virginia, Wyoming, and Arizona. CoS will no doubt re-introduce its resolution in Mississippi in 2016, which is one state where a BBA specific resolution passed in 1979, but could use some cleaning up for aggregation purposes. In each of these states, it would potentially be beneficial to CoS to add a severability/aggregation provision to their resolution similar to the one that was added by amendment to the CoS resolution in Georgia, the first state to pass the CoS resolution.¹¹² The following language which closely tracks the Georgia amendment should be considered:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this application shall be deemed an application for a convention to address each or all of the subjects herein stated. For the purposes of determining whether two-thirds of the states have applied for a convention addressing any of the subjects stated herein, this application is to be aggregated separately with the applications of any other state legislatures for the single subjects of balancing the federal budget and/or imposing other fiscal restraints on the federal government, limiting the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, or limiting the terms of federal officials.

The addition of such language in West Virginia, Oklahoma and South Carolina would not affect the status of CoS' resolutions currently pending there because CoS still needs floor passage in each chamber in those states. It would however send a powerful, symbolic message of unanimity within the Article V movement. Further, based on debate and feedback in several states where certain legislators expressed concerns about the CoS term limits provision, it might also give CoS an additional argument for support with those legislators voicing those specific concerns because with the amendment, that provision would be severable from the other two amendment topics.

¹¹¹ Unfortunately, at the ALEC event of July 22-24, 2015, the Compact saw fit to challenge the efforts of primarily the CoS and to a lesser degree the BBATF. Based on feedback from the various audiences, such an attack likely backfired. At least one effort by Compact to have its standard bill adopted as a "model application" by ALEC was tabled following one such attack.

¹¹² See Ga. SR 736 (2014), copy available at <http://www.legis.ga.gov/legislation/en-US/Display/20132014/SR/736> [lines 24-29].

Kentucky, Maine and Minnesota are "split states," that is, one chamber has a Republican majority and the other has a Democratic majority. Since BBA support tends to come from the conservative side and campaign finance reform from the more liberal side, such states present an opportunity for BBATF and WP-FFE to pursue passage of a resolution that would be beneficial to both groups. It might very well be possible for each group to use its influence with its respective side of the aisle to adopt a joint Article V resolution that would call for a convention for both a BBA and campaign finance reform amendments convention. If such a resolution contained severability/aggregation language similar to that suggested herein, then it might be possible for both groups to accomplish a "win-win." In closely divided Democratic states, such as Washington, a similar strategy should be considered.

The strategy proposed herein is not intended to permanently commit the advocacy groups to focusing on the BBA; rather, it is merely a suggestion for emphasis for the next two years, and in particular for the 2016 state legislative sessions. Obviously, if it does not work, then a reassessment would be appropriate perhaps as soon as twelve months from now.

B. The Role of the State Legislator Groups

The establishment of state legislator groups has been an extremely positive development for the Article V movement. The willingness of the states to begin organizing for an Article V convention preempts Congress from interjecting itself into the process. Feedback from some in Congress makes clear that many want to see the Article V movement succeed for they recognize that Congress and the federal government are far too broken to fix themselves.¹¹³ There are thus important roles for each of the three state legislator groups to play.

First, the Federal Assembly of State Presiding Officers held its first meeting July 25, 2015 in San Diego, where leaders from multiple states agreed to the one state/one vote/ one amendment proposal for any BBA convention that might be called. The drive to obtain a majority of state commitments will continue through the fall. Agreement by a majority of states can provide important assurances to leaders in the targeted states that BBATF needs to get to its 34 state threshold.

¹¹³ See, e.g., Hollingsworth, "Coburn: Convention of States Needed Because Washington Will Never Fix Itself" (CNSNews.com March 5, 2015), copy at <http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/barbara-hollingsworth/coburn-convention-states-needed-because-washington-will-never-fix>.

Second, it is extremely important that ASL adopt a model set of rules for an Article V convention at its next scheduled November meeting. Such a set of rules can again provide assurances to leaders in states where resolutions are under consideration that any convention will be controlled by the delegates, not Congress, that it will operate on a one state/one vote rule, that it will not allow for consideration of matters not germane to its limited call and that it will be transparent and open to the public in its deliberations.¹¹⁴

Finally, there remains an important role for the State Legislators Article V Caucus. The Article V movement would be well served if a group of state leaders could offer guidance to the different advocacy groups on how they might better present their resolutions in 2016, and in particular in those states where multiple resolutions are to be introduced, how the groups might better work together to be successful. As the Federal Assembly is in its infancy and as the ASL has steadfastly sought not to interject itself into the affairs of the advocacy groups so as to remain accountable only to itself, the more senior Article V Caucus is in a unique position to assist. It is my hope that this article might spur legislators to consider acting in this regard.

¹¹⁴ At the July 2015 ALEC annual meeting, Professor Rob Natelson drafted and released to a group of legislators and attendees (including this author) a set of proposed rules for an amendments convention called to address the subject matter set forth in the CoS application and presumably adaptable to any convention. Those rules are expected to be published shortly for public comment by CoS. *See* www.conventionofstates.com/.

Conclusion

For decades, the American people and the state legislatures have watched as Washington has expanded its power and increasingly asserted itself into the privacy and everyday lives of American citizens. Despite multiple "wave elections," changes in leadership and party control in Washington have not lessened the overreach of the federal government. We continue to spend and borrow money at an ever increasing rate such that this country is approaching bankruptcy and economic collapse. The desire for power and the influence of special interest money has so utterly corrupted Washington that citizens no longer feel that their leaders and representatives are looking out for the nation's best interests anymore. The Article V convention movement may be the last opportunity for this country to right itself. The Founders certainly foresaw a time when our federal government would overreach its authority and impose upon the sovereignty of the states and the privacy and freedom of its citizens. That is precisely why they gave the states the Article V power to rein in the federal government.

The Article V movement has the resources, the grass roots and the ability to accomplish this task. The question is: Can leadership within the movement coordinate their efforts and cooperate with each other to accomplish this mighty goal or will it devolve into a circular firing squad which unfortunately happens all too often among conservative groups?

Time will indeed tell, if it doesn't first run out on us all.

David F. Guldenschuh

APPENDIX A

ARTICLE V CONVENTION LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS REPORT

(as of July 12, 2015)

AYC Group	States Passed	States Introduced and Pending in 2015	House Committees Passed/DNP	House Chamber Passed/DNP	Senate Committees Passed/DNP	Senate Chamber Passed/DNP	Total Score*	% to Completion
BBA Task Force I Am American.org	27: ND SD UT (2015); AL AK AR CO DE FL GA IA IN KS LA MD MI MO MS NC NE NH NM NV OH PA TN TX 4: AL (2015); AK GA FL	4 Active: MA OK SC WV; 8 DNP: AZ ID KY ME MT OR VA WY	Passed: OK; MT WY DNP: AZ ID KY VA	Passed: OK; WY DNP: MT	Passed: OK SC WV; WY DNP:	Passed: WV; DNP: WY	172	83%
# COS Project		18 Active: CA DE IA IL KA MN NC NE NH NJ NM OH OK PA SC TN VT WY 17 DNP: AR AZ IN KY LA ME MS MO MT NV ND OR SD TX VA UT WY	Passed: IA NM OK; AR AZ LA MO NH ND TX UT DNP: ME MO NH NV SD VA	Passed: IA NM; AR AZ LA ND TX DNP: ME MO NH UT	Passed: NE OK SC TN; ME MO DNP: AR AZ IN LA ND NM TX WY	Passed: OK TN; ME MO DNP: ND	53	26%
# WP Free and Fair Elections	4: NJ (2015); CA IL VT	10 Active: DE HI IA NC MA NY OK PA WA WY 15 DNP: AZ CT FL MS MD ME MO MT NH NM ND OR RI TX VA	Passed: DE HI; CT DNP: MO NH DNP: AZ FL ME MS MT ND RI TX VA	Passed: HI; MD NH DNP: ME MO ND	Passed: DE; MD MO DNP: FL ME NH NM	Passed: DE; MD MO DNP: ME	39	19%
Compact for America	4: MS ND (2015); AK GA	3 Active: MI NC OK 8 DNP: AL AR AZ FL MO NM TX WY 7 DNP: MS	Passed: MI; AR AZ MO TX WY DNP: FL NM	Passed: -; AR AZ WY DNP: AL MO TX	Passed: MI; AL MO DNP: AR AZ FL WY	Passed: -; AL MO DNP:	28	14%
Restoring Freedom. Org. Inc.	2: LA ND		Passed: DNP; MS	Passed: DNP	Passed: DNP	Passed: DNP	12	6%
Single Subject Amendment PAC	1: FL		Passed: DNP	Passed: DNP	Passed: DNP	Passed: DNP	6	3%
Citizens Initiative	0	3 Active: AK NJ NC 4 DNP: NH NM ND UT	Passed: AK; ND DNP: NH NM UT	Passed: -; ND DNP:	Passed: DNP; ND	Passed: DNP; ND	4	2%
Term Limits for Congress	0 but note [FL GA] have term limits in the COS resolution	1 DNP: MO	Passed: DNP	Passed: DNP	Passed: DNP	Passed: DNP	0	0%
Americans for Congressional Reform	0 but note that ACR has not begun organizing states yet	0	Passed: DNP	Passed: DNP	Passed: DNP	Passed: DNP	0	-

* Each group receives 1 point for each state into which their Article V application resolution is introduced; 1 point in each chamber if it passes all committees (2 pts for unicameral NE); 1 point in each chamber when it passes on the floor (2 pts - NE); and 1 point when the application completes final vote. Thus, a total of 6 points can be earned in each state. The completion goal is 204 points (34 states passed x 6 pts./state). If an application dies during or at the end of a non-carryover legislative session, then points generated for that cycle are not counted. NOTE: DNP = voted down, tabled, withdrawn, died on calendar, not reached, or otherwise did not progress. Underscored states carry legislation over to 2016. "#" denotes active group which did not respond to contact efforts so scoring is based on available public information and may have some inaccuracies.

copyright 2015 David F. Guldenschuh, Attorney-at-Law, 512 E. 1st St., Rome GA, 30161; (706) 346-3693. To join mailing list or for corrections, contact: dfg@guldenschuhlaw.com

APPENDIX B

