

Joe Scarborough on Kimmel suspension: <https://youtu.be/ayvOhnFPfxE>

My short answer: there were multiple factors in Kimmel's suspension, but it seems that Carr's action violates Kimmel's free speech. Still, I don't think that would hold up in court (see details below). What Kimmel said was an abhorrent lie, and he knew it, but I don't think the FCC has the authority (nor should it) to revoke the license on this basis.

Carr (and likely Trump) are banking on viewers excusing the illegality because of how disgusting Kimmel was with his lie. Kimmel is banking on viewers being ignorant and hating Trump.

## Context Outside the Video

Regarding Jimmy Kimmel's cancellation in particular, some more context is important:

- His claim that Kirk's assassin, Tyler Robinson, was a member of MAGA is an overt and deliberate lie (video of his claim: <https://x.com/amuse/status/1968362204404777347>). Jimmy Kimmel thinks you are dumb: this was anti-Trump propaganda aimed at people who only read headlines and watch left-leaning media. I say overt and deliberate because of the evidence widely available at the time:
  - The inscriptions on the bullet casings indicate far-left ideology (source for the inscriptions: <https://x.com/scrowder/status/1966536895925477634/photo/3>), such as "hey fascist! CATCH!", "Oh bella ciao, bella ciao, bella ciao ciao ciao". The former is pretty obvious, but the latter is less widely known, and is "probably the most important rallying song to Antifa militants for decades". More context here: <https://x.com/MrAndyNgo/status/1967174900096889242>. Andy Ngo does a lot of reporting on Antifa and is very much worth following.
  - Robinson's boyfriend, Lance Twiggs, is a trans furry (<https://x.com/bennyjohnson/status/1967018417351004227> and <https://x.com/bennyjohnson/status/1967018417351004227>)
  - Per Utah's county DA, Robinson's mom confirmed that he became "more left" and "more gay and trans-right oriented" over the past year (<https://x.com/nicksortor/status/1968020750285389835>)
- After Kimmel's comments regarding Kirk's assassin, ABC officials asked him to "tone it down" and he stated that he would "double down". They gave him an opportunity to correct course. The station's affiliates (the ones who pay the bills) were who objected to his statements. <https://x.com/me061287026/status/1968873848255787309>
- Kimmel's ratings have been falling off for a long time. 129k viewers in the key demographic is very, very low for a national-level show. <https://nypost.com/2025/09/18/media/jimmy-kimmels-ratings-were-slipping-before-abc-suspended-him-for-charlie-kirk-comments/>
- Ultimately these shows need to be financially viable. An argument can be made (and often is) that financial loss is acceptable if the goal is to not to make money but rather to influence the public. See the purchase of satirical paper The Onion in January 2016 by Univision, in an effort to influence the election, as best evidenced by Isaac Lee,

Univision's Chief News and Digital Officer: "Comedy is playing an expanding role in our culture as a vehicle for audiences to explore, debate, and understand the important ideas of our time. It has also proven to be an incredibly engaging format for millennial audiences, and is expected to play a key part in the 2016 presidential election process via our robust content offerings in Spanish and English. The Onion has been, and continues to be, a leading force of this phenomenon of intellectual, social, cultural and satirical commentary online." However, this only works if the population doesn't know they're being propagandized, especially if it's built upon overt lies. This may seem like a niche reference but I think it's directly related to Kimmel (and Colbert and Fallon, for that matter) because they do not run comedy shows, per se - they echo the message of the DNC, but with a laugh track. Their political commentary doesn't stand up to the least bit of scrutiny, but rather thrives on viewer emotion and ignorance.

- Kimmel openly celebrated the firing of right-leaning people, including Roseanne Barr and Tucker Carlson.

It's worth stating upfront: *I do not believe far-left commentators and politicians when they look at Kimmel's cancellation and decry it as an attack on the 1st amendment.*

This is not a 1st amendment issue simply because Kimmel's show is getting suspended: private businesses are allowed to stop conducting business with their employees. That being said, when government agencies get involved, that's where it gets more tricky (and dangerous):

- If taxpayer dollars are being used to fund an agency, then the taxpayer has a say. (This is only tangentially related to Kimmel's suspension because federal funding does \*not\* go to ABC, but I still bring it up because the termination of funding for NPR and PBS were also decried as a 1st amendment issue by left-leaning media.) For instance, I wholeheartedly agree with terminating federal funding for NPR and PBS on the grounds that they are highly ideological in their content. Another example is Planned Parenthood: I wholeheartedly agree with terminating federal funding that goes toward abortions. Another example is NGOs such as USAID and the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), which whose funding go toward far-left causes, including riots and bailing out criminals in the USA: I wholeheartedly agree with terminating their federal funding.
  - Video Elmo and Oscar the Grouch pushing young kids toward gay & tranny garbage: <https://x.com/bennyjohnson/status/1929523539427656004>
  - This thread has a bunch of references to NPR publications, including educating the public on "white privilege", advocating "gender-affirming care" for minors (chemical castration), a "children's program" featuring a drag queen, praise of obesity (chastising of "healthism"), investigations into how the thumbs-up emoji is racist, and the idea that "limited scientific evidence of physical advantage" exists between male and female athletes.  
<https://x.com/RapidResponse47/status/1918134384638513313>
  - **USAID Grants to Ukrainian "Disinfo" Org Doxxing U.S. Journalists and Trump Officials:** A Ukrainian NGO, 42% funded by NED startup capital, doxxed U.S. journalists and called for sanctions/prosecutions against Trump allies, as part

of broader USAID/NED efforts to control narratives in Ukraine (e.g., \$5B+ in civil society grants for Maidan Revolution). Benz ties this to 330+ NED grants since 2014 for anti-Russian propaganda and judicial influence.

<https://americarenewing.com/primer-the-national-endowment-for-democracy-and-an-ngo-ecosystem-actively-undermining-america/>

- **USAID Funding for Censorship NGOs and Advertiser Boycotts Targeting**

**Conservatives:** USAID's SAVS program (97-page document referencing "advertiser" 31 times) funded NGOs pressuring platforms and advertisers to boycott "misinformation," often code for conservative/Trump-aligned speech. Benz claims this includes \$20M to the Organized Crime and Corruption Reporting Project (OCCRP) for "dirt" on Rudy Giuliani, aiding Trump's 2019 impeachment push.

[https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2025/02/13/mike\\_benz\\_usaid\\_pushes\\_internet\\_censorship\\_funds\\_ngos\\_that\\_get\\_foreign\\_governments\\_to\\_pass\\_laws\\_to\\_stop\\_misinformation.html](https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2025/02/13/mike_benz_usaid_pushes_internet_censorship_funds_ngos_that_get_foreign_governments_to_pass_laws_to_stop_misinformation.html)

- **When the \*government\* uses its power to suppress our rights, such as that recognized by the 1st amendment, that is a \*big\* problem.** Here are some examples of this, for context:

- Officials like White House Director Rob Flaherty emailed platforms (e.g., Facebook, YouTube, Amazon) demanding removal of "misinformation" on vaccine efficacy, origins, and policies. NIH's \$22.4M in grants funded progressive groups to flag content; threats of Section 230 revocation were implied.
- Examples of this are when the Biden administration pressured Facebook to censor information, which was even confirmed by Zuckerberg himself:  
<https://x.com/DavidShafer/status/1877798095649415433>
- The Twitter Files: Among other things found in these files, the FBI and other federal agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), regularly pressured Twitter to moderate content, particularly around the 2020 election and COVID-19. The FBI's Foreign Influence Task Force flagged accounts for suspension, often without evidence of foreign ties. Twitter's "Partner Support Portal" processed thousands of government requests, with 43% of flagged tweets showing no policy violations. Weekly FBI-Twitter meetings pushed for action on "misinformation," including domestic political speech. The files also reveal the DHS-backed Election Integrity Partnership influenced Twitter's handling of election-related content. (For more information, see Michael Shellenberger's X threads from Dec 19th, 2022 and Lee Fang's reporting, as well as Bari Weiss's)
- Suppression and censorship of the Hunter-Biden Laptop story.
- NSF and Other Agency Grants for "Misinformation" Research and Censorship Tools: The National Science Foundation awarded \$66M+ (2021–2023) to universities and NGOs for "disinformation" studies, funding tools that flagged conservative media (e.g., via NewsGuard, Global Disinformation Index). Pentagon (\$979M) and State Department AI partnerships with Big Tech (e.g., Google, Meta) aimed to restrict speech. Examples are blacklisted outlets like The Gateway Pundit; targeted figures like Robby Starbuck during 2022 midterms.  
<https://www.heritage.org/sites/default/files/2024-03/IB100-The-Weaponization-of-the-National-Science-Foundation.pdf>

- Pressure on Amazon to Censor Books Critical of COVID Policies: White House advisor Andy Slavitt emailed Amazon in 2021 to remove books questioning vaccines or lockdowns, calling them "crazy." This extended to broader "anti-vax" content, influencing search demotions. <https://judiciary.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/republicans-judiciary.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/Biden-WH-Censorship-Report-final.pdf>
- The FBI's Foreign Influence Task Force and DHS's CISA flagged thousands of posts for removal via "Partner Support Portals," targeting conservative views on 2020 election integrity, January 6, and Ukraine. Over 100 instances documented, including domestic speech not tied to foreign actors. (For more info see Twitter Files (FBI coordination) and Senate Commerce Committee probe (December 2023))
- This article is VERY much worth looking through: "The Biden Administration Waged War on Free Speech with 57 Censorship Initiatives": [https://cdn.mrc.org/static/pdfuploads/BidenCensorshipInitiatives\\_Report\\_FINAL\\_DIGITAL+%281%29.pdf-1741964285292.pdf](https://cdn.mrc.org/static/pdfuploads/BidenCensorshipInitiatives_Report_FINAL_DIGITAL+%281%29.pdf-1741964285292.pdf)

I bring up the above examples and context because, again: I do not believe far-left commentators and politicians when they look at Kimmel's cancellation and decry it as an attack on the 1st amendment.

## Breaking down the video

### Brendan Carr's comments

Alright, onto the FCC chair (Brendan Carr) comments on the MSNBC video you linked: those comments are very disconcerting, albeit vague. I'm not inclined to agree with Carr's actions, nor the legal precedent he seems to ride on.

He's probably basing this on Section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, which gives the government a ton of control over information. Licenses can be revoked for "deliberate falsification", which I **do** think Kimmel did. However, time and time again, broadcasters get away with it because they simply need to claim that the host was expressing an "opinion", which is protected under the 1st amendment.

If Kimmel or his employer were to fight this in court, he would absolutely win - just look at the court cases surrounding Rachel Maddow's overt and deliberate lies (proved so) about OAN in 2020.

So yes Carr attempted to violate free speech, but no, it would not hold up in court.

### Comments from Ted Cruz and Rand Paul

Ted Cruz has repeatedly been in favor of censorship of anyone with anti-Israel sentiment; he is not an advocate for the 1st amendment. They plucked his comments because he is a Republican and he agreed with MSNBC on this particular point.

I'm not surprised about Rand Paul's comments: valuing the first amendment is consistent with the values I've seen him express over the years.

MSNBC is clearly pulling these quotes together from prominent right-wing people to establish that Joe Scarborough is conservative ("As a conservative") - which he is absolutely not (see below). I highly recommend watching the lead-up to these quotes in the video again: it's designed to set up Joe Scarborough to the viewer as a representative of conservative views.

## Joe Scarborough

"As a conservative"

This dude is **not** a conservative. For example, in March 2024, long after Biden was clearly senile, Scarborough said, "This version of Biden, intellectually, analytically, is the best Biden ever.", and repeatedly repeated the DNC line "sharp as a tack" about Biden.

Scarborough is there to give the image of balance to their reporting - a strawman.

This reminds me of many examples of church leaders in Soviet Russia. Their tyrannical government could have easily extinguished all of Christianity in their country, doing away with all of the leaders, silencing the cause. Instead, they put Ivan Stragorodsky in as the de facto head of the Russian Orthodox Church. The case is worth reading up on: he was put in place to hollow out the church by turning the people that were gullible enough to think him a legitimate representative of their views. It's the same with MSNBC: if they put a husk in place and call him a conservative, they will trick a non-zero number of viewers into thinking they are getting a balance of viewpoints.

Scarborough spends a few minutes claiming that Trump and friends are crossing a line and that this will be wielded by left-leaning politicians in the future. This ignores all of the previous actions by the FCC targeting conservatives (see actions taken against Sinclair Broadcast Group 2017-2018). MSNBC is assuming its viewers are ignorant and are setting the precedent: Trump is doing this now, so be sure to look the other way when the targets are reversed in a couple years. Again: I disagree with Carr's actions, but they would not have held up in court and this is now being used to lay the groundwork for attacks on right-leaning figures in the future, construed as retaliation.

## Jeremy Peters

"what goes around, comes around"

Again, they want you, the viewer, to be okay with this weapon being wielded against right-leaning people.

“Donald Trump is very overt. If you disagree with me, we should yank your broadcast license.”

Trump did basically say this ([transcript](#)).

On the FCC side though, the issue was never that Kimmel disagreed with Trump - Kimmel deliberately spread an overt lie. But when they re-frame it as “disagreement”, they can then justify censoring based on disagreement in the future when they’re in power.