

Our Framers were all about “checks & balances” because they understood human nature. “Checks & balances” are the reason our Constitution is the longest lasting governing document in force in the history of the world.

In Article V, our ingenious Framers gave present-day America 51 sources that could initiate the process to propose constitutional amendments, or “useful alterations” as Madison called them in Federalist 43 (50 states + Congress).

Those who want to dismiss the Framers’ Article V convention provision are satisfied with reducing the options available for initiating proposals of useful alterations from 51 to just 1—only 1—Congress.

Such a position eliminates all checks & balances for initiating amendment proposals by giving the national legislature sole discretion and full control—the power to propose and the power to refuse to propose. This is what opponents of an Article V convention effectively endorse—a 98% reduction in the “checks & balances” for proposing amendments.

Now, Nevada’s citizen legislators deserve our gratitude and respect for their service. And we want them to benefit from the same sort of checks & balances the Framers knew government needs. So I am compelled to ask, what could cause some representatives in the Nevada Assembly and Senate to withhold their support for the Article V convention provision of our Constitution?

You may or may not have been aware of this, but it is the declared platform and position of Nevada Republicans that, up until even our present day, the information necessary for them to support Article V of our United States Constitution in its entirety has eluded them and persists in eluding them. These poor souls are so haunted by an elusive clarity about our Constitution, they have permanently etched their confession of it in the annals of their 2022 party platform and in their e-mail replies to this constituent.

And to make sure this is crystal clear, I want my fellow Nevadans to know their position is not a mere difference of opinions with others on what issues should or should not be addressed in an Article V convention. The consequence of this elusive clarity is that they altogether reject the Framers’ provision—they reject this part of our US Constitution entirely out of hand.

Since that’s the case, this Nevadan would like some further clarification of my own.

Why would some of our elected officials who belong to the state party that wants us to consider them our “conservative” option; who made an oath or affirmation to support, protect and defend the US Constitution—to bear true faith, allegiance and loyalty to the Constitution—why do they claim this same document is insufficiently clear to trust, follow and support as written regarding Article V?

Since they effectively reject 98% of our Article V checks & balances, I have become a living, breathing “check” on my elected representatives by asking Nevada State Legislators to provide us further clarification:

1. Are there any other parts of our Constitution you only support conditionally?
2. Exactly how many more terms of office do you plan on seeking while lacking the clarification needed to support our entire Constitution?
3. What are you actively doing to obtain the clarification you say you need?
4. If you’re eventually able to obtain the clarification you need to support our entire Constitution, do you have the courage to propose an amendment to the 2022 Nevada GOP platform to remove lines 88-89, and will you do so?

Human nature resists checks & balances. Let’s be the check we need in Nevada to ensure their support of our Constitution isn’t mere lip-service.