

La Vista 4 Opinion

Kimmel removal sparks controversy

By VANESSA MASTERSON
EXECUTIVE FEATURES EDITOR

On Wednesday, Sep 17, ABC pulled commentator Jimmy Kimmel’s late-night talk show, “Jimmy Kimmel Live!”, off air after comments Kimmel made regarding the death of conservative political activist Charlie Kirk. The move sparked outrage across the nation, with people from all political affiliations advocating for Kimmel, asking the same question: Why is Kimmel being punished for exercising his right of free speech?

For decades, Kimmel has been not just a late-night host, but a voice for American citizens and a cultural commentator who uses comedy to touch on controversial topics. Whether you agree with his views or not, anyone can see that he has used his First Amendment rights in the spirit of what the amendment protects: freedom of speech, and the right to express opinions.

In a country that so proudly proclaims the First Amendment as a cornerstone of our democracy, pulling Kimmel off air sends a shocking message to anyone who dares to voice their thoughts on controversial topics. American citizens should be able to express their opinions without the fear of removal from a job, political violence, or any other harmful repercussions.

Comedy is meant to be provocative, turn heads, and make some listeners occasionally uncomfortable. And many in favor of Kimmel’s forced exit have never hesitated to take their “comedic” jokes to a much harsher level than Kimmel ever did.

For example, on Oct 28, 2022, David DePape broke into the home of former Speaker of the House and current Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, attacking her husband Paul Pelosi with a hammer, leaving him in the hospital for six days with a fractured skull and other injuries. Conservatives and Donald Trump himself took to Twitter just a few

hours after the news, posting memes of a pair of underwear and a hammer next to the caption: “Got my Paul Pelosi Halloween costume ready.”

This double standard was highlighted in June, when Melissa Hortman, the 61st Speaker of the Minnesota House of Representatives, and her husband, Mark Hortman, were shot and killed in their own home.

Although Hortman was an elected official, and died in a similar way to Charlie Kirk, there was no outrage or public mourning about her death. When Hortman was murdered, Trump did not order the American flags at the White House to fly at half-mast as he did when Kirk died, stating he was “not familiar” with what happened when asked by a reporter.

Interesting.
I’m a 16 year old girl and I knew about this as soon as it was on social media.

Utah Republican Senator Mike Lee had two very different reactions to the shootings of Hortman and Kirk. When Kirk was shot, Lee wrote on social media platform X that he was an “inspiration to countless young people”, and at a gathering at Utah Valley University, he said “the terrorists won't win, Charlie will.”

When the Hortmans were shot just three months prior, Lee wrote on X that “this is what happens when the Marxists don’t get their way” and referenced the incident as the “Nightmare on Walz Street,” trying to link the murder of the Hortmans to the 41st Governor of Minnesota, Tim Walz, as well as Democrats, calling them “Marxists.”

Obviously, Kimmel’s comments were made in far better taste than these conservative’s ones.



PHOTO COURTESY OF
@JIMMYKIMMEL ON
INSTAGRAM

Kimmel never even called out Kirk directly. His words denounced Trump supporters as a whole, stating they “tried to characterize the alleged shooter as anything other than one of them.”

This refers to how some conservatives tried to distance themselves from gun violence and the shooter in the aftermath of Kirk’s murder. Kimmel’s comment tend to jump to conclusions and categorize criminals as primarily people of color or LGBTQ+ individuals. Kimmel’s comment was a critique on conservatives

Jimmy Kimmel being censored for comments so similar, if not less disrespectful, to those who condone his removal is a blatant example of the inconsistency of the Trump Administration.

When freedom of speech is curtailed based on political convenience or personal offense, it weakens the very democratic principles our nation stands upon.

Kimmel’s removal, while temporary, sets a precedent going forward about who is allowed to say what in public, as a period of restriction and repression seems to have begun.

New federal policy threatens academic freedom

By IZZY KIM
STAFF WRITER

The Trump Administration sent a controversial 10 page letter regarding academic excellence in higher education to nine prestigious universities on Oct. 1, 2025.

These schools include Vanderbilt, University of Pennsylvania, Dartmouth College, University of Southern California, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Texas, University of Arizona, Brown University, and the University of Virginia.

The letter stated that schools must now put a cap on the number of international students allowed at each institution. Specifically, only 15% of the school's students can enroll from outside of the United States, and no more than 5% can come from a single country. "Universities that rely on foreign students to fund their institutions risk, among other things, potentially reducing spots available to deserving American students," the document says.

The statement is ironic, consider-

ing the scarce availability for foreign students to be accepted into American colleges in the first place. These new restrictions jeopardize qualified international students' from receiving a top-notch education that they deserve. This policy is a major harm to those individuals who deserve the chance to be there. Trump's “better state” is truly just eliminating diversity and different perspectives entirely.

The second request in the letter is that universities ensure their campuses are a “vibrant marketplace of ideas” where no single ideology is dominant, the compact said. They would have to evaluate views among students and faculty to ensure every department reflects a diverse mix of views.

In theory, this sounds like a good thing. A mix of different perspectives allows for more viewpoints and voices to be heard, therefore benefitting the college atmosphere. Because it eliminates a singularity, it promotes a more diverse campus ideologically.

However, his next statement completely contradicts this one, revealing bias as his administration

states “the universities must take steps in transforming or abolishing institutional units that purposefully punish, belittle, and even spark violence against conservative ideas.”

While the compact promises increased federal funding and opportunities to the universities that accept it, it also creates a major shift in how these universities deal with diversity, including restrictive policies, and changes to each school’s free speech curriculum.

As these adjustments take shape, questions continue to arise about how much these federal expectations will change campus culture in the years to come.

To say the Trump Administration strives to promote political diversity is nothing short of untrue, and this request is proof of that. He's only taking steps to stop violence against conservatives, or in other words, what he believes in.

What about the other parties' inputs? Are those not accounted for or protected by his administration's contract?

READ MORE ON LAVISTAMCHS.COM