



Freedom of Organizational Speech

June 24, 2026

Is it okay to speak freely when you're just one person but wrong when you're organizationally cooperating with others?

The latter speech is the target of a Center for American Progress “Plan to Beat [Citizens United](#)” launched in 2025.

The hope is to stomp our freedom of speech when we speak as members of incorporated entities — unless the corporation is a news media company. Think tanks, trade groups, and others would be prohibited

from using funds to engage in election or ballot-issue activity. They would enjoy little scope to discuss issues or legislation “that may be associated with candidates or ballot measure campaigns.”

Sounding the alarm is People United for Privacy, which [reports](#) that CAP’s proposal is being promulgated in 15 states. One state, Hawaii, has already enacted a CAP law. It is being challenged in court.

People United for Privacy has successfully challenged a CAP ballot question in Colorado; officials decided that the measure violated a single-subject requirement.

The bumped [ballot title](#): “Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado Constitution removing the power of artificial persons to spend money or anything of value to influence the outcome of an election, and, in connection therewith, defining ‘artificial person’ as an entity, including a corporation, whose existence is conferred by Colorado law or that otherwise transacts business . . . in Colorado. . . ?”

The troubling phrase “artificial person” simply refers to a legally constituted organization formed by real people with a real right to freedom of speech.

This is Common Sense. I’m Paul Jacob.