

**TESTIMONY AGAINST SJ-0002  
AN AMENDING CONVENTION—TO OVERTURN  
THE SUPREME COURT RULING IN CITIZENS UNITED**

**OPPOSE SJ 0002**

**Linda Liotta**

**Hearing Date: MARCH 5, 2020**

DEAR CHAIRMAN PINSKY AND MEMBERS OF THE SENATE EDUCATION, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,

I COME BEFORE YOU TODAY TO ASK ALL OF YOU TO **VOTE “NO” TO SJ 2.**

MY NAME IS LINDA LIOTTA. I AM CURRENTLY A RESIDENT OF BETHESDA, MARYLAND AND A MARYLANDER BY BIRTH.

I GREW UP IN A CIVICLY MINDED, POLITICAL FAMILY. MY FATHER, WALTER BROOKS BRADLEY, NOW DECEASED, WAS A BUSINESSMAN. HE WAS AWARDED A BRONZE STAR AND LEGION OF MERIT FOR HIS SERVICE IN WWII. HE WAS INVOLVED, AS A MEMBER OF THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN THE POST-WWII URBAN RENEWAL OF BALTIMORE CITY, INCLUDING BEING INVOLVED IN SUPPORT FOR BUILDING MEMORIAL STADIUM AND CONTRIBUTING THE SAND FROM THE D-DAY, NORMANDY BEACHES, WHICH USED TO BE IN THE BRONZE URN AT THAT STADIUM. HE HELD ELECTED OFFICE IN BALTIMORE COUNTY AND WAS ASKED TO RUN FOR MARYLAND GOVERNOR IN THE 1960s.

I HAVE BEEN ACTIVE IN MY OWN COMMUNITY OF BETHESDA/POTOMAC, SINCE 1976 AS: PTA PRESIDENT & MATH-SCIENCE LAB COORDINATOR; HEAD OF AN ART APPRENTICESHIP GROUP WITH MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA ARTISTS; JURIED ARTIST-IN-RESIDENCE AT THE ARTS BARN IN THE KENTLANDS; SIGNATURE MEMBER OF THE BALTIMORE WATERCOLOR SOCIETY; ART DESIGNER/COORDINATOR OF A 155-CANVAS COLLAGED (8'X15') MURAL MADE FROM CHILDREN'S ARTWORK FOR A BETHESDA CHURCH; PRESIDENT/VICE PRESIDENT OF THE FALLSBERRY HOA FOR 12 YEARS, HELPING TO AVERT 2 COSTLY LAWSUITS FOR THE HOA; FREELANCE JOURNALIST AND POLITICAL ACTIVIST IN U.S. AND AT INTERNATIONAL MEETINGS (ex.: Gorbachev State of the World Forum in San Francisco and the United Nations Habitat II Conference in Istanbul and follow-up meeting for local elected officials at the UN in NY) COVERING INTERNATIONAL POLICIES AND HOW THEY BY-PASS CONGRESS TO BECOME PART OF LAW IN THE U.S. AND STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS; ADVISOR TO A MARYLAND LEGISLATOR AT AN ALEC MEETING ON A CONSTITUTIONAL MATTER; GRASS-ROOTS LOBBYIST OPPOSING ARTICLE V CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTIONS, and SMART GROWTH AND RURAL LEGACY, etc., since 1994.

Thank you for this opportunity today to provide important information on why I oppose SJ 2, as well as any calls for an Article V Constitutional/Amending Convention, including HJ 5, HJ10 and HJ11—as not only unnecessary, but, much more importantly, very dangerous to the very existence of the United States of America, itself.

Please see my more detailed testimony AGAINST SJ 2, which follows. Thank you.

**REMEMBER:**

THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT IN USE IS VITAL TO EITHER PROTECTING THE WELL-BEING AND FREEDOM--OR CONTRIBUTING TO THE POVERTY AND LOSS OF FREEDOM--FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE UNITED STATES' FORM OF GOVERNMENT IS A CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLIC WITH BUILT-IN CHECKS AND BALANCES—IT IS NO ORDINARY DEMOCRACY, AS MANY REFER TO IT TODAY--NOR IS IT A PARLIAMENTARY FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

**There are two categories of reasons to oppose SJ Res 0002. “The Democracy Amendment.”** The first is Surface. The second is deep and very serious. The first is the window dressing to distract from the real reason. The second category is the real reason.

### **CATEGORY ONE**

So, Let’s begin with the first category:

The stated, **Surface (face-value) objectives** of SJ Res 2 are to:

**#1 Make elections free of the influence of excessive campaign spending by outside interests and fair enough that any citizen can run**

*(Consider: Just this week, Michael Bloomberg who spent ½ of a billion \$ in a month lost all the super Tuesday primary races and dropped out. The people self-regulate. More of a problem is the media and its promotion of certain candidates.)*

**#2 Reserve constitutional rights to natural persons** (overturn Supreme Court’s decision in Citizens United)

*(Consider: Non-person companies and corporations contributing to candidates is centuries old. You yourselves received such monies to get elected to the Maryland Senate. Money always finds a way because it’s necessary to running an election campaign.)*

**#3 Authorize the regulation of contributions and expenditures intended to influence elections**

*(Consider: Sitting here, today, we have absolutely no way of knowing what this means, nor how damaging it could be to the rights of regular Americans and our election system.)*

### **The Surface Problems with Category One:**

**\*Structure of Wolf-PAC clearly shows hypocrisy and deceit in light of the legislation its pushing.**

**\*Cenk Uyger admits that Wolf Pac is a SUPER PAC!**

Wolf Pac is run by Cenk Uyger of Young Turks.

Both organizations receive funding from George Soros.

The kind of special interest money that funds Super Pacs is what Wolf PACS’ legislation (via the extreme measure of an Article V “amending” convention) is what they claim to want to stop.

The term “*Young Turk*” is now used to signify “*a progressive, revolutionary, or rebellious member of an organization, political party, etc, especially one agitating for **radical reform**.*” From Dictionary.com (10<sup>th</sup> ed.)

**\*Money will always find a way to buy influence.** That phenomenon cannot be squashed.

When, since the beginning of politics, millennia ago, has this not been true?

Does anyone believe that George Soros is actually upset about Citizen United?

**If it floats a rightwing boat, his will float too. The Wolf PAC Super PAC proves that.**

\*If an amendment were to be passed to permit the federal government to “regulate contributions and expenditures to influence elections”, there is no way that this would be drafted to protect citizens, since wealth always find a way to influence outcomes.

\*Granting the Federal Government, via a Constitutional amendment, any extended power over 1<sup>st</sup> amendment rights would GROSSLY EXPAND THE POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT!  
You could make the case, perhaps, that the Supreme court “legislated from the bench”, by giving legal entities the rights usually given to human beings. However, under the Constitution the Federal Government has NO AUTHORITY to meddle with 1<sup>st</sup> amendment rights.  
**Therefore, this amendment can have no standing in the federal government and the Congress, who is the body who calls the convention, has no authority to consider it under an Article V convention call.**

\*Overturning Citizens United is a smoke screen for calling an Article V “Amending Convention.  
A myriad of politicians, who lost elections due to big money influence, could pool their money and file a **class action suit**, which could make its way to the Supreme Court.  
Surely some set of attorneys would happily take the case pro bono.  
**This is the normal process.**

\*The Citizens United decision is NOT really the problem and WolfPAC knows it.

Uyger reports in one of his videos about forming Wolf PAC that everything was going swimmingly from 1930-1978, during the period called “The Great Society”.

(That’s when Marxism got a real toe-hold in the U.S.: all of FDR’s programs including Social Security, Medicare/Medicaid under LBJ, the UN, UNESCO, IMF, WORLD BANK w/ U.S. tax payers paying the largest share, just to name some of the notable ones.)

Then in the mid 1970s Big Money got involved and began to target the U.S. Supreme court.

Remember- there was very BIG Money during The Great Society period, as well.

Translation: The wrong flavor of Big Money began to push in.

But did it really?

**As I have said, Big Money influencing politics is nothing new at all.**

**People only complain when they feel that Big Money is hurting the issues they care about.**

WE’RE NOT IN KANSAS ANY MORE, DOROTHY.

WE LIVE IN A NEW WORLD TODAY.

A Prince of Wales Business Leaders Forum report states at we are now seeing the “*merger of communism and capitalism*”, which they expound as a great thing. Their view point is trending.

The big money behind all the pro-Article V Convention groups know all about this new philosophy and the following facts, as well.

\*Corporations are already a key player in the new global “governance scheme” of public private partnerships (PPPs)—so opposing them is passé and surely Soros and Uyger know that.

Corporations bring the money to the economics of keeping things going and making wealth for Big Money.

Communist governments fail without corporations generating cash flows and wealth. So the USSR was allowed to fail to end communism. China has permitted corporations.

Everyone is pushing PPPs from the UN to national governments to state and local governments, and formerly communist countries are too—so is the World Economic Forum.

PPPs reduce and diminish the power of the People by diluting our representative government.

In this way:

PPPs resemble the three-ring design of Pretzels:

Elected officials---Corporations---Nonprofits (which are funded by corporations)

Now, with 3 “stakeholders”, 2 of which are not unelectable writing legislation and funding it, too, voters are left impotent to stop or prevent corruption.

This is precisely how ALEC and NCSL operate.

PPPs were the main focus at the UN in its New York follow-up to the UN Habitat II meeting in Istanbul in 1996.

**Do you see the deceit behind the Wolf-PAC, et al?**

Voting for SJ Res 2 would be very unwise and might have all sort of other consequences, when trying to institute any of its amendments, leading to Category 2.

**WHAT’S BEHIND THE DECEIT?**

### **CATEGORY 2:**

The REAL reason to vote “NO” on SJ Res 2 and all calls for an Article V Convention.

(A.) Our legal system operates under **precedent** and the **Rule of Law**, defined as:

1.) *...rule according to law, under law, or rule according to a higher law...The rule of law requires the government to exercise its power in accordance with **well-established** and **clearly written rules**...and **legal principles**...(legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary).*

2.) *Key **legal principles**, which are germane, here, were established from the beginning of our country*

(B.) We all must assume that any Article V “Amending” Convention would possess the legal power to do exactly what the “Amending” Convention of 1787 did: which was to—

- throw out our existing Constitution (instead of amending it, as was the directive)
- create an entirely new constitution
- create a new form of government
- overthrow the old government. (essentially, a coup d’etat)
- establish a vital **legal precedent** for all future Constitution conventions

1.) This **legal precedent** was based on a key, pre-existing principle undergirding the entire existence of the United States of America from then, ‘til now. It was the very Founding Principle that justified and fueled our right to overthrow the throne of England in our Revolutionary War in 1776.

It is the Founding Principle, which by the 1787 Constitutional Convention, had already been declared in the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence, which put words to and enshrined this **Founding Principle: self-evident Right of the People to throw off their government and set up a new government.**

As they did in declaring war in 1776, many of the same Founders, now being delegates to the 1787 “Amending” Convention, itself, used that same the *legal precedent*, philosophical underpinning, key to rule of law, and *legal precedent*, which would apply to any Article V “Amending” Convention of today.

2.) Interestingly, Madison often stands upon the Declaration of Independence to make his arguments, when defending the right of delegates to the proposed 1787 Constitutional convention to draft a new document, rather than to amend the old. In Federalist 53.2 he wonders why, “The important distinction so well understood in America, between a Constitution established by the people and unalterable by the government, and a law established by the government and alterable by the government, seems to have been little understood and less observed in any other country”.

And in Federalist 40.19 he wrote about the citizens that, “*They must have reflected, that in all great changes of established governments, forms ought to give way to substance; that a rigid adherence in such cases to the former [Articles of Confederation], would render nominal and nugatory the transcendent and precious right of the people to “abolish or alter their governments as them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness,” since it is impossible for the people spontaneously and universally to move in concert towards their object; and it is therefore essential that such changes be instituted by some informal and unauthorized propositions, made by some patriotic and respectable citizen or number of citizens*”.

3.) Today’s philosophy of Government has radically changed from that in 1787. In 1787 it was the Rights of Mankind over the Divine Rights of Kings. People were throwing off the ragged mantle of suppression of one ruler to subjugate them.

4.) However, soon, two other concepts arose. Even as the new United States was getting going, the ink barely dry on the Constitution, already the forces seeking to undo the U.S. constitutional republic were being birthed. Alexander Hamilton, an orphaned raised and school in Europe, proposed our first bank, modeled after those in Europe. It was our first public-private partnership (PPP). The U.S. was a minority shareholder. The other shareholders were private individuals. That bank did not last (1791-1811). The deep-pocketed Federal Reserve Bank was created, eventually, by the U.S. Senate in 1913.

5.) Then, Karl Marx wrote his Communist Manifesto in 1848. The United States was only 72 years old. Whereas the U.S. used it’s Constitutional Republic and Constitution to permit and encourage free enterprise, through the prowess of the individual and, through another rebellion of the People, overthrew slavery, Marx’s ideas called for the opposite. They were like a return to the old subjugation under kings. This time Marx called for people to think of themselves as a collective, not individuals. Their worth predicated upon what they could produce for society. What was good for society was determined by government. The promise was that their hard work for the collective would lead equality and harmony.

6.) Philosophically:

Nation States are viewed by globalists as *passé*. Regionalism is *du jour*. Representational, elected government is out. Appointed officials are in. Small government (like our sovereign States) is out. Big government is in.

7.) Today, the United Nations global government and philosophy is based on Marxism. All secretary generals are required to be members of Socialists International. Socialism, especially creeping kind, such as Fabian Socialism, has replaced the bloody Communist (socialist) takeovers in Russia and China. It's marketed in people-friendly ways and taught in schools and universities and colleges, as though that's the way it should be.

To illustrate my point a colleague, journalist Joan Veon, interviewed Mayor Schموke, then mayor of Baltimore, after he testified in Annapolis for Smart Growth and Rural Legacy (SG&RL), Marxian land-use policies. Smart Growth puts a "belt" around cities and regions to prevent outward growth. Rural Legacy trades full property values and rights to development for owners of farms in exchange for lower tax rates. Often public private partnerships are struck with the land owners and NGOs like the Nature Conservancy. I'm sure that all Maryland legislators are very familiar with this legislation.

We had seen Mayor Schموke at the UN Habitat II meeting on Sustainable development in Istanbul in 1996. He seemed eager for the interview, once Joan said that she'd been at Habitat II. Back then, there was a lot of new jargon about how the UN was implementing its socialist agenda: Sustainable development, public/private partnerships, human capital, social capital, governance. While UN and other officials were open to answering questions at the overseas meetings, back in the U. S. it was swerve and avoid. However, Mayor Schموke very openly explained that under SG&RL "private property rights had to yield to collective rights" for the sake of sustainable development.

8.) It's become all too normal and commonplace to hear the U.S. criticized and trashed, daily IN the U.S. People who want to keep the United States intact are openly mocked.

9.) People, judges, elected officials ignore and/or frequently violate the Constitution. Citizens and State legislatures seek ways to undo the electoral college. The State legislatures have and are already seriously wrecking the balance of power between the federal government and States: the Constitutional amendment that changed how U.S. Senators are elected—from by the State legislatures to by the people. Now, the States have no representation in Congress. That's a terrible thing! Another terrible thing is how States agree to be bribed into taking federal money in exchange for adopting unconstitutional programs into their States. This alone is heavily responsible for the gross and unconstitutional expansion of the size and reach of the federal government.

10.) Federal elected officials are negotiating and passing dreadful treaties, which undermine national sovereignty: NAFTA, its replacement-the USMCA-which is even worse at subjugating U.S. laws to International laws, U.N. bodies and courts, The Free Trade of the Americas (FTAA)- being implemented out side of congress, through the executive branch-homogenizing policies and practices, the North American Union-seeking to merge U.S., Mexico and Canada.

11.) New States Constitution already drafted, as sample of what WE MIGHT EXPECT.  
Eliminates States and creates regions.

12.) Alvin and Heidi Toflers book, *Creating A New Civilization*; preface by Newt Gingrich;  
published by (Ted) Turner Publishing:

*To the Founding Parents: You are the revolutionists dead...Listening to the sounds of tomorrow, you sensed that a civilization was dying and a new one was being born. You are the inventors of a future that became our present...That piece of paper with the Bill of Rights added in 1791, is clearly one of the stunning achievements of human history. We conclude that you were driven to it—were compelled, carried along by the tidal force of events, fearing the collapse of an ineffective government paralyzed by inappropriate principles and obsolete structures. Even now your principles move us...the Constitution of the United States needs to be reconsidered and altered—not to cut the federal budget or to embody this or that narrow principle...to create a whole new structure of government...we thank Mr. Jefferson, who helped create the system that served us so well for so long and that now must, in its turn die and be replaced. Chap. 9, pp 89-99.*