



## Stop Deceptive Federal Con-Con Resolutions in Iowa

**URGENT:** COS Con-Con resolution HJR 2004 has been advanced to the House floor, and a floor vote could happen at any time with little notice. Additionally, another Con-Con resolution, SJR 2011, has been introduced. **Contact your state legislators, and urge them to oppose these dangerous resolutions!**

Iowa state legislators are seeking to pass resolutions applying to Congress to “call a Convention for proposing Amendments,” under [Article V](#) of the U.S. Constitution, otherwise known as a federal [constitutional convention](#) (Con-Con) or “convention of states,” as some erroneously refer to it.

House Joint Resolution 2004 ([HJR 2004](#)), Senate Joint Resolution 2011 ([SJR 2011](#)), Senate Joint Resolution 2 ([SJR 2](#)), and House Joint Resolution 11 ([HJR 11](#); formerly numbered [HJR 6](#)) follow the wording of Mark Meckler’s Convention of States (COS) Project application to Congress to call a constitutional convention. An explanation of the resolutions, contained in SJR 2, reads:

This joint resolution constitutes an application requesting the United States Congress to call a constitutional convention in order to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States to impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for federal officials and for members of Congress. The resolution constitutes a continuing application to call a constitutional convention.

House File 654 ([HF 654](#); formerly numbered [HF 438](#)) and Senate File 350 ([SF 350](#)) have also been introduced. These bills are designed to give false assurance that a convention won’t get out of control, doing this by ostensibly regulating the appointment and conduct of delegates. Such a bill would be [completely useless](#) at preventing a runaway convention — for example, the bills don’t regulate delegates from other states, and it

# The John Birch Society

Author: [Peter Rykowski](#)

Date: January 24, 2025



doesn't prevent delegates from proposing an entirely new constitution (in the 1787 Convention, states [also attempted](#) to limit delegates' authority).

These vaguely-worded resolutions claim that the constitutional convention is only "for the specific and exclusive purpose of proposing amendments" about the topics mentioned, reiterating "and no amendments on any other topic" may be proposed beyond the topics listed. However, ***in reality, any Article V constitutional convention cannot be limited, resulting in a runaway convention that would reverse many of the Constitution's limitations on government power and interference.***

In other words, ***any Article V convention could accomplish the same goals that many of its advocates claim to be fighting against.*** As evidence, both a [2016](#) and [2023 simulated "Convention of States"](#) resulted in amendments massively increasing the federal government and expanding its spending powers.

**When speaking to your legislators, emphasize the following irrefutable facts about an Article V convention for proposing amendments:**

1. There is no constitutional authority for a limited convention.
2. There is no guidance on how delegates would be selected.
3. There is no guidance on who could qualify as a delegate.
4. There is no guidance on how many delegates each state could send.
5. There is no provision for stopping a runaway convention.
6. There is no provision for how rules would be established.
7. There is no provision for how rules would be enforced.
8. There is no role provided for the people to play in the process.
9. There is no power provided for the people to stop a convention once it starts.
10. There is no description of the ratification conventions Congress could choose to call.
11. There are no rules governing the ratification conventions Congress could choose to call.
12. There is no means provided for either the states or the people to challenge Congress's choice of the method of ratification.
13. There is no test provided for a qualifying application submitted by a state.
14. The acceptance by one Congress of a state application for a convention does not bind subsequent Congresses from accepting that application.
15. Application for a convention submitted by one state legislature does not prevent subsequent state legislatures from revoking the previous application.
16. All these issues would be challenged in court and would take years to be decided.
17. The issues to be addressed at a convention to propose amendments would likely be moot by the time the challenges reached the U.S. Supreme Court for final adjudication.
18. If 100 percent of registered voters opposed an amendment proposed by a convention, but the requisite number of state legislatures or ratifying conventions (according to the process determined by Congress for consideration of proposed amendments) supported it, then that amendment would become part of the Constitution regardless of the will of the people.
19. The same scenario is true if a proposed amendment were approved by 100 percent of registered voters but rejected by the ratification conventions or state legislatures (according to the process determined by Congress for consideration of proposed amendments).

The late Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia [understood](#) the danger of a constitutional convention. In 2015, Scalia reiterated his opposition to an Article V convention, stating "**this is not a good century to write a constitution.**" Furthermore, ***what kind of delegates would Iowa send to such a convention? Constitutionalist conservatives or RINO moderates and liberals?***

In 1979, then-U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona correctly warned about an Article V convention:

If we hold a constitutional convention, every group in the country — majority, minority, middle-of-

# The John Birch Society

Author: [Peter Rykowski](#)

Date: January 24, 2025



the-road, left, right, up, down — is going to get its two bits in and we are going to wind up with a constitution that will be so far different from the one we have lived under for 200 years that I doubt that the Republic could continue.

Goldwater considered an Article V Convention threatening to the continuity of the United States' republican form of government. It would be foolhardy and downright reckless to disregard these and other legitimate concerns.

An Article V convention possesses the inherent power to propose **any** changes to the U.S. Constitution, including drafting and proposing an entirely new "modern" (i.e., socialist) constitution. Instead, ***the Iowa General Assembly should consider [Article VI](#) and [nullify unconstitutional laws](#).***

Furthermore, ***state lawmakers should also consider rescinding any and all previously passed Article V convention applications to Congress, regardless of the desired amendment(s).*** Passing rescission resolutions will help prevent aggregating past Article V convention applications with those from other states to force Congress to call a convention.

Above all, **urge your state representative and senator to oppose HJR 2004, SJR 2011, SJR 2, HJR 11, and all other pro-Article V convention resolutions and to instead consider [nullification](#) as a safe and constitutional means to limit government.**

The Harsh Reality of a "Convention of States"