

The Non-Neutral Next Incumbents

November 24, 2026

"Sitting in a small theater with President Obama and the new members-elect," incoming freshman Rep. Don Leonard (D-Ohio) posted last week on X. "Someone asked him about Elon Musk. [Obama] told us that now is the time to amend our constitution. Now is the time. We are the people."

Next year's House Speaker Hakeem Jeffries immediately confirmed to *MS Now* host Jen Psaki that, yes, indeed, the former president was encouraging amending the First Amendment's prickly guarantee of freedom of speech.

And not a tiny tweak, either.

The First Amendment currently begins "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging freedom of speech." The whole idea is to block the Congress from regulating what people can say. Especially what we can say politically.

House Joint Resolution 122, a constitutional amendment introduced by Joe Neguse (D-Colo.), with 114 cosponsors, all Democrats, takes the opposite tack. It empowers government control:

Congress and the States may regulate and impose reasonable viewpoint-neutral limitations on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections.

"Reasonable"? "Viewpoint-neutral"? Who decides which viewpoints to include and what neutrality could possible be?

The same U.S. Supreme Court that the Left has been excoriating for its *Citizens United* decision, that's who.

Imagine granting to incumbents the power to regulate the campaigns of their political challengers? *Reasonable*, you say?

HJR122's abridgment of speech freedom is so great that Neguse felt the need to explicitly declare: "Nothing in this article shall be construed to grant Congress or the States the power to abridge the freedom of the press."

Isn't that special?

The incoming Speaker announced that scratching out political free speech rights is "something House Democrats plan to do and do very early in the new Congress."

We have been warned.

This is Common Sense. I'm Paul Jacob.