



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 16, 2022

Glenn Beck Joins Other Conservatives to Oppose a Constitutional Convention

“We should not stain that document,” popular conservative radio host Glenn Beck said today during his broadcast of “Media Praises Biden for Solving Problem He Created.” The document that Beck said we should not “stain” is the Constitution of the United States, which he said would be the case if we went through with the calls for a Constitutional Convention — or as some supporters of the Con-Con idea call it, an Article V Convention of States.

“I have been a supporter of the Article V Convention of States,” Beck said. “I’ve been a pretty big supporter, vocal supporter. I’m reversing that today.”



AP Images
Glenn Beck

Beck’s reversal from supporting the Con-Con idea is a huge defeat for the effort to call a convention to consider changes to the U.S. Constitution, as advocates for the Con-Con often cite Beck and other people known to be devotees of constitutionalism as reasons to back the Con-Con.

Beck explained why he has come to realize that calling for a convention to consider amendments to the Constitution is a bad idea, at least at this time. “After some thought and prayer, we are not the people to open up this sacred document. We are not the people — that was a God-inspired document.” Beck added that even Benjamin Franklin — considered perhaps the least religious of all the Founding Fathers — viewed the document as “divinely written.”

After arguing that the “very hand of God was involved in the writing of that document,” Beck noted that today we do not have the giants of the Founding generation: “Do you believe that we could send delegates to a convention today that would have that kind of inspiration, that when we got to an impasse, somebody would be there like Ben Franklin that would say, ‘Let’s pause and all go to church and pray.’ They didn’t politick, they prayed.”

This echoes the sentiments of the late Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, who opposed holding a constitutional convention in our present political environment, contending that this was a poor century in which to write a Constitution.

In fact, Beck has now joined a long list of conservative figures who opposed holding a convention, including Phyllis Schlafly, the founder of Eagle Forum; Senator Barry Goldwater; and former President Ronald Reagan. In fact, James Madison himself, often called the “Father of the Constitution” due to his immense contributions to the document, was quite explicit that he feared for the country were we to have another constitutional convention.

Continued Beck, “I’m not for opening that Constitution anymore. When the people [are moral again], I’ll be for it again. And I’m afraid it’s just going to take a massive beatdown of our country to get to that place. Someday we will be humble enough, we will recognize God, we will not be an enemy to God.”



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 16, 2022

He went on, “We will not be so arrogant. And when we’re the people I will support the Convention of States. But I withdraw my support. And I’m sorry to say that, but I withdraw my support.... This Constitution is wholly inadequate for anyone other than a religious and moral people. We are not those people and we should not stain that document.”

Glenn Beck has been a staunch champion of the Constitution and conservative causes for several years, and has been very effective. Who can forget his use of a white board to demonstrate the evils of the early 20th century “progressive movement,” when he documented the multiple ways that Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt abandoned the principles enshrined in our Constitution?

This is why Beck’s support for what he called a “convention of states” was so damaging and contrary to the philosophy of limited, constitutional government he otherwise espoused day after day on his radio program and his TV network known as Blaze TV, and in his many bestselling books. Beck’s reversal will hopefully lead other prominent conservative commentators to follow in his repentance. He is to be commended in that he did not allow professional pride to keep him from renouncing his previous position.

Apparently, Beck had previously bought into the pro-convention argument that this provision was put into the Constitution as a way for citizens to “rein in” the federal government. But we already have plenty of provisions in the Constitution that limit the power and scope of the federal government. We don’t need an amendment to make sure that members of Congress follow their oath to our present Constitution. They simply need to follow the Constitution.

Beyond that, calling a convention in this present political atmosphere is actually dangerous to the liberty that the Constitution was designed to protect. How could any supporter of limited government really think that holding a convention today is a good idea? While there would undoubtedly be some good people at the convention, a quick look at our present Congress should tell us that there would also be plenty of delegates who hate many aspects of our federal Republic — perhaps even a majority. The same electorate that chose our present Congress would likely be choosing the delegates to any such convention.

And many of our precious liberties could be in the crosshairs of these left-wing delegates, including the Second Amendment. In our present environment, with so many Americans having abandoned all pretense at morality, an amendment to create a national “right” to abortion would no doubt be on the agenda. We could expect there to be an effort to abolish the Electoral College, the filibuster, and perhaps even the Senate itself, in which each state is equally represented. Some on the Left have even said that they support a constitutional convention for the purpose of writing an entirely new document.

The amendment process was designed not to “rein in” the federal government but to provide a way for “defects” — unforeseen problems — to be corrected. For example, the 25th Amendment was enacted in 1965 to handle a situation such as when President John Kennedy was assassinated. What if he had lived and been incapacitated? At the time, there was no provision in the Constitution to deal with such a situation.

One difference I would have with Beck’s announcement, however, is that he said he would support a convention under circumstances in which the American people were restored to a proper moral grounding and respect for limited government. But if that were to happen, and members of Congress were held to their oath to support and follow the Constitution, then why would we even need such a convention?



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 16, 2022



BEWARE OF THE CON-CON

[CLICK HERE TO STOP THIS URGENT THREAT TO YOUR RIGHTS!](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.