



Communist Sympathizer Mag “The Nation” Backs Convention of States

It’s finally happened: The radical Marxist left has realized that they can implement their agenda by amending the Constitution through an Article V convention. Still think a convention of states is a good idea?

The archliberal rag *The Nation* magazine, known for its historical denial of communist atrocities — such as the Cambodian genocide — and not knowing a Marxist-Leninist dictator that it didn’t heap with adulation in its pages, has just published a [screed](#) with the subtitle, “To fix our broken system, we need a new constitutional convention.”

The article begins by taking note of the recent “Balanced Budget Amendment Planning Convention” (BBAPC) held at the State House of Representatives in Phoenix, Arizona, and touted by its event planners — the BBA Planning Convention Committee — as the first of its kind in over 156 years.

“In recent years, states have called conventions on various topics from the monetization of silver to free trade. However, the delegations were not required to be authorized by both Houses to speak and vote on behalf of the State,” the BBAPC said on its [webpage](#), hosted by the Arizona state legislature. “The last convention to have that level of authority was the Washington Peace Conference of 1861, where the states attempted to avert the Civil War.”

Like many on the left, *The Nation* is no particular fan of the BBA, believing that it would lead to the “almost immediate contraction of the federal government” and make it “Powerless to borrow its way out of a recession.” In fact, the opposite is true — as *The New American* has previously [explained](#) — since virtually every proposed version of the BBA includes escape clauses that would make it constitutional for federal expenditures to exceed revenue during a time or state of emergency, such as the 32 separate states of emergency that are currently in place. Furthermore, no proposed BBA addresses or prohibits unconstitutional spending, which is the real issue with the budget that needs to be addressed. If anything, the so-called conservative BBA would likely result in either constitutionalized unbalanced budgets during times of national emergency or tax hikes if the amendment’s mandate of balancing the budget is actually adhered to.

Nevertheless, writers at *The Nation* go on to scold their own ideological brethren at the left-leaning watchdog group Common Cause for their reasonable opposition to a Con-Con. Regarding Common Cause’s concern that such a convention “could open up the Constitution to radical and harmful changes,” the vehemently anti-constitutional *The Nation* scathed, “Apparently, in order to criticize a particularly egregious proposal for amending the Constitution, one must also swear off one of the few democratic provisions already in it.”

In other words, for *The Nation*, a BBA is bad, but not a Con-Con. *The Nation* asks, if the original 1787



Written by [Christian Gomez](#) on November 3, 2017

Constitutional Convention turned out well in producing a better constitution than the pre-existing Articles of Confederation, “why assume that updating it wouldn’t turn out just as well?”

The Nation sees a Con-Con as a platform to propose radical progressive and Marxist changes to the Constitution. Among the amendments to the Constitution that *The Nation* suggests could be proposed or brought up at a Con-Con are campaign finance reform, in order to curtail political free speech by way of overturning the Supreme Court’s 2010 decision in *Citizens United*; abolishing the “antidemocratic” Electoral College, relying solely on a national popular vote for the election of the president and vice president; non-renewable 18-year term limits on Supreme Court judges; free universal healthcare, education, and housing; and a guaranteed living wage.

“Other issues now pressed by the left — the right to health care, education, housing, the vote, even a basic income — could also be raised in a convention of states,” *The Nation* writes.

The Nation’s arguments for a Con-Con illustrate the very reasons why The John Birch Society has opposed such a convention for decades. “The left shouldn’t be afraid of a ‘runaway convention.’ It should welcome one,” *The Nation* boldly touts.

In order to satisfy its radicalized goals of eviscerating the Constitution and moving the country more toward a communist democracy, *The Nation* entertains the notions of working together for a “grand bargain” with Republican state legislators to promote the Con-Con and amendments that some on the Right want.

Just like the old adage, “you scratch my back, I’ll scratch yours,” *The Nation* suggests letting Republican state legislators push for their Con-Con and that as a stipulation for proposing the BBA or other ostensibly small-government amendments — such as those the Convention of States Project (COS) wants — they would have to be willing to consider some of the Left’s wishes from the aforementioned litany of Marxian proposals.

The Nation makes this point clear by quoting from liberal Con-Con supporter Lawrence Lessig’s 2015 book *Republic, Lost: The Corruption of Equality and the Steps to End It*, where he writes, “The key is a simple compromise. We get to consider our proposals if you get to consider yours.”

Republican state legislators may argue that either the BBA or COS Con-Cons are limited to a single amendment or subject, but once an Article V convention is underway, it would be entirely up to the delegates to make the rules for the convention, including whether or not to go beyond their original mandate and entertain other amendment proposals such as those *The Nation* desires.

As for the second typical Republican pro-Con-Con argument that the ratification requirement of three-fourths of the states for any amendments proposed at the convention will serve as some sort of safeguard against any radical alterations or amendments, the current Article V threshold for, or even method of, ratification could be discarded and replaced by a new one, just as at the original 1787 Constitutional Convention. *The Nation* also notes this in its article.

As for *The Nation’s* political leanings, it should be noted that it is closely affiliated with The Nation Institute, a pro-“social justice” nonprofit media organization that is funded in part by George Soros’ Open Society Foundations, according to David Horowitz’s Discover the Networks (DtN) [website](#).

According to its [Facebook page](#), *The Nation’s* mission is to “shift paradigms, to broaden public discourse, to open minds and inform opinion, and to take an active part in constructing a more progressive society.”



Written by [Christian Gomez](#) on November 3, 2017

The current editor of *The Nation* is Katrina vanden Heuvel, a member of the deep state, globalist Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). In the past, *The Nation* has featured articles by Cuban Communist Party dictator Fidel Castro and many others sympathetic and supportive of mass-murders Joseph Stalin and Hugo Chávez.

In 1957, the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act, Committee of the Judiciary United States Senate, otherwise known as the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (SISS), wrote in its report on the [Scope of Soviet Activity in the United States](#):

The Nation and the *New Republic* have long records as liberal publications. They cannot be described as Communist, but they are so infiltrated with the Communist Party policy that they serve the interests of the Communists and confuse liberals on many issues, much more so than some of the Communist publications.

If a publication with such strong communist leanings as *The Nation* coming out in favor of an Article V convention of states isn't enough to convince an individual that a convention would be a terrible idea, then what will?

The late Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia was right when he warned in 2014, "I certainly would not want a Constitutional Convention. I mean whoa. Who knows what would come out of that?" Thanks to *The Nation*, we now have a pretty straightforward idea of what the Left would like to see come out of it.

Related articles:

[Working Together to Rewrite the Constitution](#)

[Republicans and Democrats Working Together to Rewrite the Constitution](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.