

Let's Leave The Constitution "As Is"

Exposing The Fallacious Argument

By Bill Walker

"We have problems in this country caused by government officials not obeying the Constitution. We don't need a convention. All we have to do is obey the Constitution AS IS."

This statement is said repeatedly by countless opponents to an Article V Convention as the basis for opposing a convention. A discerning person can easily spot the fallacy in it.

The problem with this statement is that if we obey the Constitution "as is" this includes a call for an Article V Convention. Article V exists within the Constitution "as is." Article V mandates Congress shall call a convention "on the application of two-thirds of the several state legislatures" which means if the states have submitted applications for a convention call, Congress must call a convention. Thus, there are two states to the Constitution vis-à-vis Article V, a state where the Constitution mandates a convention call and a state where it does not mandate a convention call. Both are part of the Constitution "as is". However, the choice of what state the Constitution is in depends not on the whim or caprice of an individual or movement, but on whether or not the states have exercised their Article V rights to compel Congress to call an Article V Convention. It is irrefutable the applications to cause a convention call exist, indeed, [more than exist](#). Those who advocate the above statement of obeying the Constitution "as is" while simultaneously urging a convention not be called when the Constitution mandates it be done, deliberately ignore the fact that because of the number of applications, the current state of the Constitution "as is" is that Congress must call a convention. Once Congress does so and a convention is held are the applications discharged.

Once the applications are discharged, the Constitution automatically reverts to its "non convention" state (until the states again apply) at which time the "as is" argument presented by these opponents becomes valid. Then the question would be, "shall we hold another Article V Convention?" and those opposed to doing so and having the states submit new applications for a convention call would say, "the Constitution is fine as is. We don't need a convention." Then they would not be disloyal to the Constitution as they are now by urging its overthrow, they would simply be suggesting the states not submit new applications, which automatically precludes a convention call. Moreover, there is nothing disloyal in that given that the state of the Constitution is in the "insufficient number of applications to cause a call" state.

Therefore when one of these Article V opponents states we should obey the Constitution "as is" but then says we do not need a convention they are in clear and obvious conflict with the present state of the Constitution. The states have already determined we do need a convention. Otherwise, they would not have applied for a call in such overwhelming numbers. Given these facts it is clear these opponents really don't want the Constitution

obeyed “as is.” What they mean to say is, “We don’t want to obey the Constitution as is. We want the right to veto the Constitution “as is”.” In the final analysis what these constitutional hypocrites seek is the Constitution obeyed, not “as is” but as they see it and what they see is a Constitution where the language is outright ignored and vetoed by the government. They seek the destruction of the Constitution of the United States by establishment that it be disobeyed “as is” but as they (or someone else) wants to be “obeyed”.

They are right about one thing. Congress has vetoed the Constitution and that is very wrong as well as a federal crime. We need to obey the Constitution, all the Constitution, “as is” and in this case that means forcing Congress to call a convention because the Constitution, “as is” says they have to do it. Obviously, those who urge the Constitution be obeyed “as is” while saying “we don’t need a convention” are misstating real support for the Constitution. The conclusion is obvious. These so called supporters of the Constitution really do not want the Constitution obeyed “as is”. They want it obeyed as THEY see the Constitution, ignoring whatever provisions of it they do not agree with. Thus they are identical to the very people they condemn for doing the exact same thing. They are constitutional hypocrites and as such, must be rejected least we travel down the path not of constitution obedience but anarchy for if each may choose that which they will obey, the ultimate will be all will obey none.