



YOU ARE INVITED TO VISIT THE LEX REX WEB SITE AT WWW.LEX-REX.COM



CAN A "CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF STATES" BE CONVENED LEGALLY AND WITHOUT CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL?

It seems that a lot is being said these days about a so-called "Constitutional Convention of States", along with out-of-the air semantical distortions, half truths, and free-lance unfounded legal interpretations; but we find nothing in the U. S. Constitution that provides an indisputable foundation at law for it.

Reading Article V below unequivocally provides only two procedures for amendments to the Constitution, to wit:

Method 1. Congressional Enactment by **Congress** when "two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary," **OR**

Method 2. Convening a Constitutional Convention by **Congress** to consider **Amendments** in response to "the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several states."

Thereafter, Article V below unequivocally provides similarly for two procedures of ratification of the resulting amendments from one or the other of the two methods of amendments so stated above, to wit:

Method 1. Ratification by the Legislatures in three fourths of the States, **OR**

Method 2. Ratification by Conventions in three fourths of the States.

Note that the words "States" and "Conventions" are solely related to "Mode of Ratification" and in no way comes close to circumventing the exclusive authority given to **Congress** to provide for amendments by convening a Constitutional Convention. Note also that even the choice between the two prescribed Modes of Ratification of any resulting amendments from the two prescribed methods of Enactment is specifically left to that "proposed by the **Congress**." How much semantical distortion of the English language; or "bouncing off the wall of legalize" does it take to create a "Convention of States" that ignores the authority given to Congress by the specific language of Article V stated below?

Accordingly, we respectfully seek the assistance of any reader of this question in pointing out where it is legally written to the contrary, providing justification for the so-called "Convention of States" now being aggressively supported jointly by those seeking only specific amendments and those seeking to replace the entire Constitution with a Communist-style document of privileges granted by the state. Strange bedfellows in a "common cause" but for different objectives. Opinions that differ are always welcome.

ARTICLE V

The **Congress**, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, **or**, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, **shall call a Convention** for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths of thereof, **as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress**; Provided *[that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and]* * that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage to the Senate.

*Obsolete