

Charlie Kirk Conspiracy Theories That Lead to Death Threats with Seth Dillon

(November 4, 2025)

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, why am I and other people associated with Charlie Kirk getting threats as if we had something to do with his murder? What's going on? Why are conspiracy theories so interesting and attractive? And what's the difference between the right to free speech and the responsibility not to speculate in such a way without evidence so that people, innocent people, are put in harm's way? What is also the difference between a possibility and evidence for a possibility?

And why isn't the FBI telling us more about the Charlie Kirk murder? Why aren't they coming out with evidence? Why aren't they quelling these theories that are all over the internet right now? That's really suspicious. And isn't it kind of suspicious that the government is telling us one line of things when we know the government has lied to us before? Maybe they're lying again.

We're going to get into all this, and we're going to get into all this with my friend Seth Dillon, the CEO of The Babylon Bee, who, by the way, and this is no joke, Seth has gotten death threats himself. And in fact, Governor DeSantis of Florida stepped in. They arrested someone. So, Seth, tell us a little bit about what's going on in your life, and why are you getting death threats?

SETH:

Well, kind of wild. Right? You wouldn't think-- It's certainly not one of those things that I predicted would ever happen when I started running a comedy website on the internet, you know, that satire, first of all, that we were going to end up in this fight for free speech, which has been something that was also unexpected.

But then of course that we would be caught up in so many of these other things that are just unrelated to what we do. But everyone's looking for a line and angle of attack. In my case, the







PODCAST

guy that you're mentioning, his name is Nicholas Ray. He's a Texan. He lives in Houston, Texas, 28 year old, was accusing me and others. It wasn't just me by the way, it was a number of other, several other conservative influencers who, you know, I don't even know if it's, if it's important or necessary to name them because that only draws more negative attention to them potentially.

You know, where people are going to start targeting others, continually. But he was threatening several different people along the lines of the argument that you know, there's complicity. There's stuff that's being hidden. You know, there is, you know, a dishonest attempt to portray ourselves, me and these other individuals, a dishonest attempt on our behalf to portray ourselves as being close friends of Charlie when we were actually traitors.

We were actually, you know, pressuring him, and blackmailing him behind the scenes. All of this comes back of course to Israel. You know, these theories are usually rooted in Israel and what the Jews are doing behind the scenes. And so, you know, it was, it initiated at the start following this retreat that myself and a bunch of other conservative influencers—

I put that in quotes because I don't consider myself an influencer. You know, I run a media company. I happen to have a large following online. But I'm not one of those people that's just like a social media influencer.

Not that there's anything wrong with that, but I don't consider myself an influencer. But I was invited by Charlie to this retreat. It was called an influencer retreat. And the idea of this retreat was focused on the problems, the threats to Western civilization. The theme of the retreat was, you know, saving the West. And you know, Charlie as you know, because you know him very well, knew him very well. Man, it sucks to say that doesn't it? To

[FRANK: I know.]

SETH:

--switch from saying you know him to you knew him. You know, Charlie was deeply concerned about threats, to Western civilization, you know, from wherever they come. You know, whether







PODCAST

they're coming from ideology on the left, you know, whether it's communism or, you know, Islam, or whatever the threat may be.

He wanted to talk about what these threats were, get a handle on where we all stood, have a conversation. We draw a bunch of people together and talk about a wide range of topics and get everybody's feedback and input. I think he was looking to influence our thinking with his positions, but also hear from us and understand, you know, where we were coming from and get our insights. He was. He seemed very, you know, genuinely open in hearing from us and what we had to say. He kept, you know, he threw it to me several times when I was keeping my mouth shut during these meetings. He's like, you know, Seth, what do you have to say?

You know, you've been quiet for a while. Chime in. Say something. What do you think about this? So he was seeking feedback, and input, and wanting to find out how we can best address these issues and how we can get the message out to speak the truth and defend Western civilization against its greatest threats.

So that was really the purpose of this retreat that was being set up in the Hamptons back in August. And I was invited there by Charlie. What it's been characterized as-- And this initiated originally, I think there was some report in a publication called the Gray Zone.

And you know, Candace Owens picked it up and started talking about it on her show. You know, there was somebody at this retreat that began talking about what happened there. And I don't know. This is something that I don't know. And I'm not going to speculate as to what actually occurred behind the scenes and in the, you know, revealing of what happened at this retreat.

But somebody that was there started, you know, talking to sources about what took place there. And either they misrepresented it horribly, dishonestly, grossly, or the people who received the input from this person, the report from this person, exaggerated and distorted it themselves. I'm not sure which is true. I don't know. Because, you know, it hasn't been-- It hasn't been publicly known yet who it was that was, you know, leaking this information to reporters or whatever.







PODCAST

FRANK:

But whoever it was, that person was [Trump]: wrong. [Laughter]

SETH:

Well, they were very wrong because here's what they said. They said that what happened at this retreat was, you know, an intervention was staged for Charlie where people who have more alliance and allegiance with Israel than with the United States, people who care more about, you know, Israel first, not America first people, were, you know, very concerned about some of Charlie's comments or some of the people that Charlie was having on the stage at Turning Point USA events.

And because of those concerns, they wanted to have an intervention with Charlie and say, hey, look. You know, we don't like this. We consider this antisemitic. You know, you need to get back on board with supporting Israel, no questions asked, and strong-armed, and blackmailed him at this intervention. And the whole point of this thing was to get Charlie back in line. And when even, it was even, it's alleged, there was even an offer of money, a substantial offer. I think the figure that Candace put out there was \$150 million, apparently. You know, BB himself was on the phone.

There was these heated conversations behind closed doors. I was named as being a part of these conversations. And all this money was thrown at Charlie and Charlie turned the money down. And then he winds up dead. And, you know, so what do you make of that, Frank? You know, what do you do with those dots?

How do you connect them? What does that mean? You know, and of course the spotlight of suspicion is cast on people who were at this event, at Charlie's invitation. No one staged an intervention with Charlie. It's just ridiculous to suggest that that was what was happening there.

You know, I didn't know this event was happening until Charlie told me it was happening and he asked me to be there. So everybody was there at his request. It was a Turning Point event. And so, you know, but it was the conspiracy theory itself that there was something nefarious going on here, malicious intent on the part of some of these participants, including myself, that has







PODCAST

led to, you know, all this animosity and hatred towards me. You know, if Charlie is feeling all this pressure, and he's being blackmailed, and he's, you know, under duress in his last days.

And then, you know, he winds up dead because he didn't go along with what we wanted. Of course people are going to start looking at me and thinking, you know, I had something to do with that, and that you know, I'm like complicit in his murder. And so people who bought into some of this stuff, which is just wild and outlandish, you know, distortions of what happened, you know, they've-- Some of them have started to level threats. So I've been receiving a number of threats. Many of them have been reported. That one guy has been arrested so far. Thankfully, he has.

You know, I have a wife and kids at home. You know, I don't want to put anybody in danger. I certainly haven't said anything to deserve that or done anything to deserve that. But, of course, that's kind of the natural outworking of some of these wild, speculative, conspiratorial claims, is that you get people riled up, and they get angry. There are a lot of people, as you know, Frank, a lot of people, millions of people, who love Charlie. They loved Charlie. And when they come to learn, and some of them, not everybody is perfectly, mentally healthy.

There's people out there who are deranged. And when they learn that there's a name and a face of somebody who may have played a role in Charlie's death, it enrages them, and they feel like they need to do something about that, either to intimidate, harass, or to threaten them. And so that's really kind of the long and short of it.

FRANK:

So who was it that publicly said that this happened in such a way that Charlie was offered \$150 million to do something for Israel and he denied? Who was it that put that out there? Is it known?

SETH:

I think the first time that was reported—

I'm not sure if that dollar figure was reported by Max Blumenthal or Candace Owens first. I think she may have gotten that from him. But I'd seen him do some interviews where he was







PODCAST

talking about this. And, yeah, there's this fabricated story that there were these heated discussions. Charlie was pressured, Charlie was coerced, Charlie was dragged into these private meetings, these personal meetings between myself, Bill Ackman, you know, BB Netanyahu's on the phone, and we're throwing money at him, and he's refusing it, and then he winds up dead. That's kind of the—

FRANK:

They're throwing that money at him to do what?

SETH:

Throwing money at him to get him back in line with his support of Israel. There's, you know, the-- I guess what the theory is, is that people like me because I'm a supporter of Israel-- Of course I'm a supporter of them in the sense that I defend them and their right to defend themselves.

FRANK:

Right.

SETH:

Their right to not be wiped off the map. Right? You know, people like me, as the story goes, are so concerned with Israel that we're willing to do anything that it takes to punish anybody who is not on board with supporting them, and will want to coerce them, and will want to blackmail them, and whatever.

And it's like, you know, it's also ridiculous. If I have disagreements with Charlie, and there were a couple of things that I disagreed with Charlie on. There were things I disagreed with him on at this retreat in the Hamptons. But the whole purpose of that retreat in the Hamptons was to have discussion and debate. Charlie wasn't afraid of debate. You know that.

FRANK:

That's what he was all about.







PODCAST

SETH:

That's what he was all about. He loved having discussions with people that didn't necessarily see eye to eye with him. And he saw it as a way not just of trying to persuade them, but also to kind of sharpen himself in his response to some rebuttals and objections.

And so, you know, he invited us there and challenged us. And when he wasn't getting challenged enough, like I said, he would pick people out of the room and say, what do you have to say about this? What do you think? Give me your input. Let's talk about it. And so, you know, he was inviting this debate. There was no sense in which, you know, he was being pressured on anything.

FRANK:

This was in August or late July of this year, because I remember that. And I saw Charlie right after that in August. We were together in California, and then he and I went to Phoenix together to do some more training. And then let me add to this. The day before he was murdered, I was with him for the three days, his last three days of his life.

And we were in a meeting, a Zoom meeting right there at TPUSA. Josh Hammer was one of the people who was on Zoom and a couple other folks from Israel. And we were talking about, Charlie wanted to know how could he better answer questions on campus, that he got about the Israeli Hamas situation. And he wanted to know from the Israelis what their perspective was. He was asking them. He wasn't turning on Israel. He was asking them for their opinions on questions he might get.

SETH:

Yeah.

FRANK:

So the idea that somehow Charlie was turning on Israel is nonsense. Charlie helped elect the most pro-Israel president in U.S. history. And you can speculate all you want, but is there any evidence that this took place? And you were an eyewitness in this meeting, and you say it never happened.







PODCAST

SETH:

No. And there were a lot of other eyewitnesses that spoke up. Of course, Bill Ackman put out his own statement. I put out a lengthy statement about this, several others. I think there were at least eight or nine others that were in attendance there who said there was none of these heated, you know, back and forths.

There was nobody coercing or pressuring anybody. I didn't see any of that. I personally didn't witness any of that and didn't partake in any of that. You know, even if you can see the point-Let's for example-- Let's say, for example, that Charlie was reconsidering his position on Israel and having a conversation about that with people in the room, and they're giving him arguments and saying, well, have you thought about this?

Or, you know, this is my opinion on it. You know, that's debate and discussion. It's still not coercion, and blackmail, and some kind of egregious and unethical, or evil pressure campaign being applied to somebody.

Everybody has a right to give their opinion, Frank. And when you're invited to, and you're asked to be there to give your opinion, you're going to give your opinion. But the conversation wasn't one where Charlie was like, I'm against Israel now. Try to change my mind. It wasn't like that at all. And we did discuss the topic of Israel, and there was some discussion about that. You know, one of the things that Charlie and I did disagree on during these discussions, and I talked about this some.

But there was like, you know, he was concerned about the fact that there is right now, in the discourse, like a price to be paid for from his perspective at least there's a price to be paid for criticizing Israel. You know, if you're critical of Israel, then automatically people snap to this line of, okay, you're being antisemitic.

FRANK:

Yeah, some.







PODCAST

SETH:

Yeah, yeah, right. Some do. Yeah, you're being antisemitic. And apparently, Charlie, you know, I didn't see or I'm not aware of anybody who was calling him an antisemite. But apparently, Charlie, of all people was being called an antisemite, which is just as you know, ridiculous.

FRANK:

You know what that did? That hurt him personally.

SETH:

Yeah, I'm sure it does.

FRANK:

Yeah, because you know it wasn't true. Charlie was trying to, rightfully, as anybody would. And here's what I said to him about this whole bless Israel thing. I said, Charlie, let's assume that's true. We need to bless Israel. Bless doesn't mean you agree with Israel on everything. Just like if you're going to bless your son or your daughter, you don't agree with your son or daughter on everything, or a friend. You tell them what they need to hear, not what they want to hear.

You correct them when they're wrong. And he said that's-- He said that was worth the price of the whole trip when I went out there. Because people, they misunderstand what bless. It doesn't mean you agree on everything. If you're going to bless somebody, tell them the truth, correct them when they're wrong. You know, there's that proverb that says enemies multiply kisses, but wounds from a friend are helpful.

CE.	т	L	1	•
JL		г	1	٠

Yeah.

FRANK:

You need wounds from a friend when you're out of line.

SETH:

Right.







PODCAST

FRANK:

And so, Charlie was fair-minded. He was trying to work through issues. Go ahead.

SETH:

Yes, he was. Yeah. And this was the one point of disagreement where we really kind of went back and forth, and not in an extended way, but only for a couple of minutes, was on this issue of, you know, do you pay more of a price for, for criticizing Israel or for criticizing the critics of Israel? Because that was my argument.

You know, I was like, well, look, Charlie, you know, of course, depending on the context, you know, if you're running a large nonprofit organization, if you do happen to have some large donors who are Jewish or supporters of Israel, and you come out, you start being very critical of them, you know, of course, you know, you're going to face pushback from people who are like, well, Charlie, you're no longer aligned with our views or values or something like that.

You know, you might get pushback. And depending on your content, the context that you're in, yeah, you're going to see some negativity and pushback on those things. You may even get called an antisemite, which is ridiculous, but you might. And that happens. Sure. In my case, and I told him, you know, in my case in particular, I've received most of the pushback, and hatred and, you know, cancellations of subscriptions, and threats, and all of these things because I've criticized the people who are criticizing Israel.

Not Israel. I haven't criticized Israel. I've criticized the people who are criticizing Israel in an unfair way where they're not actually criticizing Israel. They're actually going far beyond that in many cases, and actually being antisemitic themselves, you know, where they're just looking for any excuse they can to blame Jews or Israel for every bad thing that happens in the entire world.

You know, if I push back on those people, they turn on me. You know, they've attacked me. They've called me a betrayer and a traitor. And they keep bringing my name up and trying to drag me through the mud, and smear me, and lie about me, and accuse me. Of course, like the conspiracies that we're talking about, they've done all of that. And so I've paid a high price for doing the opposite of that. And so it's really-- It's just a matter of any time that you take a stand







PODCAST

on a controversial issue on either side of it, yeah, you're going to get pushback. So that was one of the things that we disagree on.

But, you know, one of the things that I was accused of was calling Charlie antisemitic, which is ridiculous. I would never do that. I didn't. I've never even considered the possibility that there might even be an antisemitic bone in his body.

FRANK:

So, ladies and gentlemen, if you don't believe in spiritual warfare, you haven't been paying attention. What's been going on at Charlie's murder and since, people are at one another's throats, and they're often saying, well, we just care about who really killed them. We're going to get into the FBI and what they have revealed and reasons why they might not be revealing certain things.

But I want to deal with this issue of the difference between a possibility and evidence for a possibility. I got asked a question last week at a Bible study I was doing about Candace Owens, and I said, there is a difference between a possibility and evidence for a possibility. And if you don't have evidence for this possibility and people are implicated in it, shut up. Okay? Because you're —

I don't mean shut up that you don't have the right to speculate on possibilities, but when you go beyond possibility and you're insinuating that someone who is innocent is guilty, and you have no evidence that they're guilty, I think you've crossed a line. Certainly a line in Christianity, if not a line in just human decency. What are your thoughts on that?

SETH:

Well, yeah, I mean, the word I used when I was talking about this on Piers Morgan's show the other day was despicable. I find it despicable to do this. I think it's-- I don't know, ultimately, what motivates some of these things. It's hard to guess at that. You never know what someone's motivations are unless they tell you what their motivations are.







PODCAST

FRANK:

However, that's what Candace Owens is doing. She's questioning everyone's motivation.

SETH:

Yes. Yeah, yeah, that's what she's doing. Yes. But I don't like to do that with other people. I don't like to question their motives. But I do see that there is a lot of—

There's a lot of incentive. Let's just say that. There is incentive to putting out wild conspiracies. You know, first of all, let's take a step back and just talk about why conspiracies are so attractive to people. You know, people are very, I think, susceptible right now, to conspiratorial thinking. Because, I mean, we've seen conspiracies come true, Frank. It's-- Yeah, I mean, we've seen conspiracies come true.

FRANK:

By the government.

SETH:

By the government. We've also seen things that, you know, were treated as wild conspiracies, like, oh, the lab leak theory, you know, we bring up. That's a good example. You know, like things that you would—

That people were putting out there as that were perfectly reasonable that were treated as conspiracy theories, that turned out to actually have validity to them to be true. You know, we've seen a lot of that. So there is a lot of distrust. There's a lot of skepticism when it comes to narratives that come from the government, that come from official sources, that come from the media.

I get it, Frank. You know, like, I-- The Babylon Bee has been the subject of a lot of misinformation. You know, when the New York Times said that we were trafficking and misinformation under the guise of satire, they were actually trafficking and misinformation under the guise of journalism. You know, we've seen a lot of this stuff over the years where the media is dishonest, the government is dishonest. Less so with the Trump Administration, you







PODCAST

know, than when the Democrats are in control and they're just trying to shape their own narratives, in my opinion. But we've seen a lot of it.

So I do think there's justification for having some skepticism. I've always been a believer, though, and I'm sure you would agree with me on this, that there's a crucial difference between rational skepticism, where you're like, I want to have good reasons for believing that this is true.

If I'm not going to believe that it's true, if there's reasons to doubt that it's true, there's got to be good reasons for that. Skepticism can be perfectly rational. But there is an extent that you can go to where you reach-- You start driving off this path into very irrational skepticism where you become skeptical of everything.

FRANK:

You're cynical of everything.

SETH:

Cynical of everything, you know? And you hear it a lot. I'm sure you've heard this, where people have said, you know, everything you've ever been told is a lie.

FRANK:

Is that a lie?

SETH:

Everything? Yeah. That's not. [Laughter] No, that's not. Everything else besides the statement I just made that you've been told ever in your life is a lie. And that's, you know, of course that that extends to historical record, all the history that you've been told. Oh, well, you know, that was just a narrative propped up by so and so, you know, whether it was the Jews.

FRANK:

You know, something. Can I stop right there? And I just want to make two quick points. First, in order to say that-- In order to say everything that you've been told is a lie, you'd have to know what the truth is, because you can't detect a lie unless you know the truth. And secondly, this





I don't have enough FAITH to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

entire discussion shows another reason to believe the Bible. Because the Bible is the only religious book in the world that gets depravity right. In other words, everybody thinks, and even many Christians, a majority of Christians think people are inherently good. Yet when you look at this situation, people are rightfully questioning the FBI.

They're rightfully saying, well, there could be a conspiracy out there because we know human depravity is true, right? We know that people will do crazy things for sex, money, or power. We know they will do that. And yet, part of the reason these conspiracy theories are fueled to such an extent on the internet is because we personally enjoy thinking about evil from afar. I mean, why are the top podcasts out there all these crime podcasts? Why are people fascinated with evil from afar, but as soon as it happens to them personally, they're horrified by it?

Evil is attractive from afar, but up close in real life, it's horrible. So those of us who were at the murder, we're horrified. I can't watch the videos. I can't look at them. You know, when I had J. Warner Wallace on, my cold-case homicide detective, I said, Jim, there's so many different conspiracy theories out there.

Would you watch all the videos and give me your opinion? People can go watch the podcast from about three or four weeks ago with him on. I can't watch them. But people who weren't there, they're fascinated by this. And by the way, it's just showing that there's something inherently wrong with our nature.

We're fascinated by evil and we're ho hum at good. We don't report good things in the newspaper. It's always evil. If it bleeds, it reads. Right? And so, those two observations should also make us skeptical of people who are coming up with wild theories about how Charlie was actually killed. We're going to get to the reason why you haven't heard from the FBI here a little bit later in the program. But it's not because they're not looking into these things. There's another reason for it. But sorry I interrupted. I just had to make that point. Go ahead.

SETH:

No, no, it's fine. It's a good point. Where I was going was just to say that I think that because of the skepticism and the distrust that's there, there are people who see an opportunity in that. There are people who see an opportunity in exploiting the distrust. And when I say that, what I







PODCAST

mean is they realize that they can say, look, because everything you've ever been told is a lie, you can't trust the narrative.

And I'm going to be the one who's going to open your eyes and enlighten you to the truth, and I'm going to drop these little breadcrumbs along, and tease these things. And one episode after another, you know, I'm going to take you on this journey to the truth and expose all of the lies.

FRANK:

So we have to distrust everybody but you then?

SETH:

Right. Yeah.

FRANK:

The person doing that.

SETH:

You become that. Yeah. And that's where it's very cult like is you become the trusted source that people rely on for the truth, to the point where, you know, they don't trust anything else. They just trust that one voice. And that's a very dangerous thing, especially if, you know, if there's the possibility that somebody's exploiting your distrust of everyone else to take you down these dark paths and these speculative paths. What you're not getting is an honest search for the truth.

Because what you see with a lot of these conspiracies is that they're not stringing together things that are, you know, that actually make sense. They're kind of picking out of the air all of these different potential dots, these points, you know, that they're trying to map together, that don't necessarily have much of a connection, if any. But if there's even a possibility of a connection, then that's floated as a probability that there likely is a connection.

And then make of what you will of that. And so, you know, I've likened it to, you know, like the inverse of Occam's Razor, which is the simplest explanation is probably the best, right? In most cases. Yeah, usually that's the case. It's not always the case. We know that it's not always the





I don't have enough FAITH to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

case, but it's a great place to start when you're interested in the truth. To go to the radical extreme of that, where the most outlandish and improbable, and wild, and speculative explanation that is most difficult to falsify, by the way.

Extremely difficult to falsify because of how crazy and outlandish it is. But that also happens to just cast suspicion on all the people you don't happen to like. You know, those types of theories, there just isn't any reason to find them credible. But there is a captive audience for it for the reasons that you gave. You know, the depravity of ourselves, our hearts, you know, the types of things that get our interest. You know, the true crime thing is a good example because those shows are, like, wildly popular, and it's all about like, these dark and terrible crimes and people just can't look away.

You know, they want to hear about these things and read about these things. And, you know, that's what you're giving people with that. So I think there's an exploitative element to this. And it's not about, you know, I'm not trying to guess at people's motives. I'm just trying to reach the most rational and plausible explanation for why anybody would do this. Especially when you're casting suspicion on people like yourself, or myself, or even other than me. You know, people like you and others who are really close to Charlie. Close friends to—

FRANK:

Mikey McCoy. Yeah, Mikey McCoy.

SETH:

Close friends of Charlie's who were there with him at the end, there with him every day. Colleagues of his were with him every day. His own family. You know, a lot of suspicion has been cast on Turning Point and Erica.

And these are things that just compound the grief when people are mourning the loss of a loved one and you're casting suspicion on them. You better have a really good reason for doing that. And not just because you want clicks and engagement, because people are eager to hear stuff like that.







PODCAST

FRANK:

I would bet my life Mikey McCoy has nothing to do with any of this. And yet, he is being falsely, I think, insinuated that he had something to do. People are insinuating things, particularly Candace, it seems, are insinuating that somehow Mikey didn't act a certain way. So somehow, he's guilty. We're not quite sure how. In fact, I want to play a clip here. This is from—

SETH:

Before you do, though, just real quick, that somehow, he's guilty. We're not sure how. If the allegations are made and you don't respond, or even if you don't respond quickly enough, it means you're hiding something.

If you do respond, you didn't respond in the right way. There's always some way that you can try to twist something. Even the conversation that we're having right now. Oh, your eyes are darting around too much while you're talking, Frank. What can we make of that? You look a little, you look a little nervous. Why are you nervous, Frank, while you're talking about this stuff?

Do you have something to hide? If you really want to, you can find any reason, any reason to try to cast suspicion on somebody. But why would you want to do that? Why wouldn't you want to look for, you know, the truth by being, not just charitable to people who are close to Charlie?

Because I think they're owed that charity, right? If Charlie trusted them, shouldn't we at least have some trust in them? Like, is Charlie really such a deceived, and idiotic, and blind person that he's surrounded by traitors who are just looking for an excuse to kill him?

You know, like, you know, there should be a little bit of trust and charity there. But beyond that, even if you don't have that and aren't willing to offer that, you still need good reasons. You still need good reasons other than just, you know, your eyes were a little shifty while you were talking just now.

FRANK:

Yeah. You got on the phone as soon as he was shot. Yeah. Because that's what he was told to do.







PODCAST

SETH:

Right. Right.

FRANK:

And Mikey, for five years, had been drilled by Charlie on certain procedures. That's true. I know that's true. And Candace said something like, well, well, we'll get into it.

SETH:

Yeah, well, I didn't-- I didn't make a statement, initially. I didn't respond to Candace when she first reached out to me asking for a statement on what happened at the Hamptons. And, of course, that was an indication to her that I had something to hide.

And then, you know, I put out a statement. They're like, oh, well, this statement's too well-crafted. It sounds like attorneys were involved in this. You know? Or it came out too late. You know, you waited too long to make this statement. You know, why did you wait so long? It's like, you know, it's heads, I win. Tails, you lose.

FRANK:

No matter what you do, you're guilty. You're already—

SETH:

Exactly. It's a predetermined. And that's the problem with these really crazy conspiracies like I'm talking about. It's not just the inverse of Occam's Razor, where it's so, you know, it's the least probable or whatever. It's just, you're not-- You're just not seeking the truth. You're not seeking the truth.

FRANK:

And under the guise that you are.

SETH:

Right.







PODCAST

FRANK:

But look, let me be as graceful as I can with Candace. Maybe she is seeking the truth. I just think the way she's going about it is unnecessarily putting people in danger. And Mikey's one of them. I might be next because some of the emails and phone calls I'm getting are, "You know, you never know what could happen to you."

You know, that kind of stuff, and you need to repent. And if you don't call me back, that's suspicious. You know how many phone calls, and texts, and emails I've gotten from people I don't know? You know, you need to call me. You need to-- How come you're not looking for Charlie's real killer.

SETH:

Right. Like, do you not care? Why are you trying to move on? Have you forgotten about him already?

FRANK:

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

SETH:

I heard you say the other day, you know, when you wake up in the morning, you're thinking of Charlie. When you go to bed at night, you're thinking you wake up in the middle of the night. You know, it's-- You went through something traumatic, Frank. I don't think a lot of people—

I think some people have heard your story, but not everybody has heard the story of, you know, your proximity to this. Not just your proximity to the event, to his assassination, but your proximity to Charlie as a friend of yours. You know, I don't think a lot of people really understand, or have taken that on board, or know that.

Certainly not people who are just now being introduced to you through podcast. They've never heard of you before. You know, you're just some character who was there. So they don't understand that.







PODCAST

FRANK:

Yes. And it's causing a lot of stress and pain in lives of people that love Charlie and would never do anything to hurt Charlie. We were there to help Charlie. And so, if you want to speculate about certain things, you have the right to do that, but I'm simply asking that unless you have evidence, please don't insinuate anybody who is innocent until proven guilty is guilty by insinuation.

SETH:

And I think you're being generous with the truth. You know, maybe she, you know, maybe she is seeking the truth. You know, this isn't how truth seeking works.

FRANK:

Yeah, it's not.

SETH:

You don't start with a predetermined conclusion, Frank. When you start with a predetermined conclusion that something is wrong and then try to find anything that you can-- Oh, you know, someone didn't behave appropriately. That validates my predetermined conclusion that something is wrong. You know, that's not how truth seeking works. Yeah, it's not honest truth seeking.

FRANK:

Yeah, that's true. You have a predetermined conclusion. All right, let me play a clip from-You're going to hear first Alex Marlowe on The Charlie Kirk Show from late last week. He's on with Andrew Kolvet and Blake Neff. And Blake is going to talk about, essentially, what Candace has done. And he first says, look, I don't know why she's doing this. It could be this. And then Candace is going to respond, and then we'll comment. This is a probably about a two-minute clip. Here it is.

ALEX:

There's a suggestion online that Mikey, Charlie's chief of staff, one of the most sincere people you'd ever meet, brilliant, Christian, kind to everyone who he's ever met in his entire life, couldn't hurt a fly, was part of a conspiracy to murder Charlie. That's what's going on? BLAKE:







with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

It's vile. It's utterly vile. ALEX: Who would do this? What type of individual? Just to create content, do we think? Or is there some--? What's the--?

BLAKE:

I don't know. I think a lot of this mindset just sort of fuels itself. It's sort of addictive in the same way a lot of social media stuff is addictive or in the way like, honestly, something like pornography is addictive or something. Like they get really, they almost get-- They get a high off of like the idea of like that they're doing something that's daring or out there.

CANDACE:

So that right there is a psychological operation. And because we're reading about Sigmund Freud, they diagnose you. When they don't want you to look into something, they diagnose you. So right there he's going, oh my. Are they just doing this to create content? Are these people akin to drug addicts?

They're just high on the conspiracy theory? They're gaslighting you and then they're diagnosing you. So we all just watched Charlie die. We were having a perfectly rational response to watching that, and then watching the strange reaction of his peers, or the non-reaction of his peers who just want our money.

Right? And are asking for Susie Wiles. It's the craziest part of his whole thing for me. It was like, why is Susie Wiles? I don't know, it just feels really weird. Like a weird pick for her to eulogize him. But yeah. And not maybe his parents maybe didn't want to.

Actually they were quite private people. But all this happens and we're having a natural reaction, which is we feel alarmed. We feel suspicious. And they're going, oh, you're a drug addict. You know what? I get it. You kind of like porn. You're into that. You're into the porn thing. Oh, I get it. No, I get it. If you want to watch porn all day, you want to watch porn all day. That, my friends, is psychological operation. Steel yourselves against this.

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, do you happen to notice that when Candace said they're diagnosing you, that's exactly what she's been doing to Mikey McCoy. She's trying to diagnose him from afar.







PODCAST

And psychologists will tell you it's hard to diagnose somebody when they're on your couch, much less one five second piece of video at a murder scene. She's diagnosing Mikey McCoy from that and she's claiming that Blake Neff is diagnosing her when he initially said, I don't know, but it could be this. What's your response to this, Seth?

SETH:

Yeah, well, it's all diagnostic. The entire response that she just gave was a diagnosis of the commentary that she had just listened to. And what is it psychological--? What is the game that's being played here? You know, what are their true--? And she's trying to get at their true intentions and define them from what was said.

You know, it's kind of-- It's beyond disingenuous, I guess is the right word. Because she's hoping, I guess, that maybe nobody notices that, right? That she's doing the very thing she's accusing others of doing. And it's not that we can't-- It's not that we can't ever speculate as to what somebody's thinking or intending or what their motives are.

It's not that we can't do that. But I just think it's a very dark place to go to, to start with that predetermined conclusion, that nothing that anybody says can be trusted, that there has to be something else there. And then you try to nitpick and find anything that they say or that they do that will confirm that. That's a little bit different. It's a little bit darker and a little bit different.

FRANK:

Okay. As I mentioned earlier, at our Bible study, someone brought up Candace Owens. I haven't spoken about Candace open, about Candace Owens at all recently, until someone asked me the question. So I responded to the question. And on her show, she played some of the clip, not all of it, and then she responded. Here's that clip.

CANDACE:

Then we have Frank Turek, who engages in this same sort of act of psychological manipulation, in my viewpoint, and he defends Mikey McCoy. I think this is on his own show. Here's what he had to say.







PODCAST

FRANK:

There's a difference between a possibility and evidence for a possibility. You can speculate on anything you want, but unless you have evidence, shut up. Okay? Because all you're doing is causing dissension among the brothers, which is something the Lord hates.

If you want to present a possibility and say, well, this could be true, okay. It could be true. But don't accuse people for doing something for which you have no evidence. I heard today, I guess I hadn't seen it myself, but I heard today she was judging people who didn't act the right way. I don't know if anyone did. Anyone seen this video? According to Candace Owens, these people did not act the right way after Charlie's death.

Like my friend Mikey McCoy, the brilliant 24 year old who at the time when Charlie was shot, was 23 and was a hero that day. He apparently didn't act the right way according to Candace Owens. He didn't act normal. News flash, there is no normal when you're in shock. There is no normal when an abnormal thing happens. Some people are going to act one way, other people are going to act another way. You don't know how you would react. I didn't know how I would react.

The only reason that I did what I did is because I thought about it beforehand. I was afraid somebody would take a shot at Charlie. And I thought to myself, if it does happen, what am I going to do? Decide now. What I wanted to do was do anything I could to save him.

CANDACE:

Couple of psychological manipulations happening there. First is like the academic one, where he's trying to present himself as an authority on the topic, and saying to you, like, there is no, you know, everybody can do anything when shots are fired.

We don't know. When you're shocked by shots being fired, some people just, you know, start doing the hokey pokey, you know. I mean, look, some people literally, they hear shots fired, they get on a table, and they start dancing, and singing, and saying, shoot me, shoot me. You know, like George Zim-- That's, hey, we don't know. He was in shock. George Zimm, I did. I did. That's a normal, hey, we don't know. Right? Like, we do actually know that we all have a baseline response to danger.







PODCAST

You run towards it because you want to rescue people. These are the heroes in the story. Or you run away from it, or that's a baseline. Or you freeze. You literally just are paralyzed by fear. Kind of. Maybe I'd say three baseline things that you can expect, right? I don't know what to do.

I'm running away from this, or I know exactly what to do and I need to rescue other people. So don't do that. The other thing he's doing, of course, is the biblical manipulation, which seems to me to be that there has been a military infiltration into the churches. I think we've covered that enough this year. I've termed that operation mocking pastor, where they just try to find some scripture and justify it. And he's a pastor, he's earned trust. Who he's saying, she's judging people. The Lord says this. The Lord says she shouldn't look into the trust—

The Lord says she shouldn't ask questions. The Lord thinks that people should just shut up. Right? That to me is like the sickest form of manipulation. The sickest form of manipulation is to try to present it, via the lens of what God would want. You don't have to do that. Just say what you think, say what you mean, and try to manipulate people the old school way. Okay?

FRANK:

Yeah. We wouldn't want to bring any Scripture into this, and we wouldn't want any academic information into our analysis here. We've got to go just with our gut or maybe a dream we had, Seth.

SETH:

Yeah, I mean, doesn't she cite Scripture, and what God wants, as justification for a lot of what she's doing? I think that she does that all the time. She invokes Christianity as the reason for her animosity towards Israel and the Jews all the time. The other thing that struck me as I was listening to that is, you don't know how people are going to behave.

People are very unpredictable, especially in situations where they're in shock, and there's something really traumatic that's happened. You know, I've been in situations where something crazy happened and I didn't know how to respond and wouldn't have been able to guess how I would respond ahead of time. Especially if you're not prepared for it, you know?







PODCAST

The more preparation you have, I guess, the more it's likely that you're going to respond in the way that you prepared to respond. But that's not necessarily the case. Right? Like, it's still, a wild and panicked situation. I would say, you know, it's-- I would have never guessed if you asked me how I thought people who were close to Charlie would respond when he died. I would have never guessed that anyone would respond the way that Candace has.

FRANK:

Interesting.

SETH:

That's very unusual, and wild, and unpredictable. I'm using the most charitable terms I can think of. Behavior in the passing of your friend. What's going on right now. Who would have ever predicted that somebody close to Charlie, who calls him a friend, would be doing what she's doing right now? Could you have predicted that?

FRANK:

Seth. Let's do a thought experiment here. Seth. What if we were to say that, look, we're connecting the dots, and we think that Candace had Charlie killed.

Do you know why? Because she was mad that Charlie wasn't inviting her to the big events anymore, and she thought that with him out of the way, maybe she could even take over TPUSA. Because early on, Charlie always used to talk in glowing terms of Candace, like she is the model of what we're trying to develop here. And I think Candace—

We could say we think Candace is investigating this so intently and casting suspicion on everyone else in order to cover her own tracks. Now, Seth, if we had said that, and we're not saying that. We would be completely out of line, because there is absolutely no evidence for that. And then if Candace began to get—

SETH:

But to your point earlier, it's possible.





I don't have enough FAITH to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

FRANK:

Of course it's possible.

SETH:

It is a possibility.

FRANK:

Yes.

SETH:

But that's not enough.

FRANK:

No, it's not enough. And, friends, listen to me. I'm not saying that at all. This is a thought experiment. Do not. Do not threaten Candace Owens. I don't think she had anything to do—

SETH:

Wait for that to get clipped, Frank. They'll clip off the first part of that where you say it's a thought experiment, and the last part where you reiterate that it's a thought experiment, and present it as your theory.

FRANK:

Right, right, right. Which is nonsense. I'm just saying, this seems to be what she's doing because there's no evidence that Mikey McCoy—

And by the way. By the way, she said there are three ways to respond. You can run toward the danger, away from the danger, or freeze. No, there are several other things that can happen, and Mikey did exactly what he was told to do.

The fourth thing you can do is in an emergency procedure, which Charlie drilled into them all the time, is call Erica immediately. That's what he was supposed to do. Why did he not run to the body, to Charlie? Because that was the role of his security team, who was already there. That's why I didn't get to Charlie. I was 25 feet away. I took one step toward him. His security







with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

team was on him. Then I ducked, because I thought, oh, maybe there's going to be more shots. And then within a second, I was running to the back of the tent, and the security team was coming around on the other side of the tent with Charlie.

You can see that on video. And to suggest that you have the only three ways people could have reacted, and anybody that doesn't react in one of those three ways is somehow complicit, perhaps in his murder, is unconscionable. And that is what I think she's been doing.

And maybe she doesn't know she's doing it. I'm trying to give as much grace to Candace as I can. Candace, you need to pull back on this. Mikey's getting death threats. I'm getting threats, and none of what you're saying is true. Now, could there be another shooter? Yeah, there could be. And in a minute, we're going to talk about why the FBI hasn't told you anymore. But comment on what I just said there.

SETH:

You know, any effort to say that, you know, you need to stop what you're doing, you need to back off, will be met with, no, I'm going to double down because you want me to back off. You know, like, the fact—

FRANK:

I want you to back off from the fact that—

SETH:

You want me to back off means that I need to keep digging and dig harder. That's the response.

FRANK:

You can dig as hard as you want, but don't insinuate people are guilty without evidence.

SETH:

Yeah. I'll give you a quick personal anecdote of situation. Nowhere near as dramatic, traumatic, or tragic as what happened with Charlie. But there was a situation that my brother and I got into. We were at a movie theater when we were teenagers. We were watching a movie, and there were some rowdy people in the theater that kept, like, kicking our seat behind us, and we







PODCAST

were upset by that. And we had some back and forth with them, and they were kind of getting rowdy, and like, we'll see you outside when the movie's over. We'll see you outside.

And it was like this, we're gonna fight you outside. Let's go, kind of thing. You know, and this is how kids are. These were older kids, too. And so, you know, we knew when we were walking out of theater that they might-- We waited after the movie ended so that we wouldn't—

We're not confrontational. First of all, I was a scrawny little kid. There was no way I wanted to get into a fight. You know, I wasn't looking for fights. I weighed all of like 118 pounds, you know? But, you know, so we wait for these guys to leave because we don't want a confrontation. And of course we come out and we don't see them.

We're looking around for them, and we start heading towards these escalators that take us down to the lower level where the parking is. And as we're getting closer to the escalators, they kind of come out of nowhere. You know, they were kind of like waiting for us, and they kind of come out of nowhere, and they crowd in behind my brother.

I was off to the side a little bit. They crowded in behind my brother on the escalator, and I hadn't gotten on yet. So I was behind them. And there's a stairwell that I could see, you know, out in front of me a little ways. And so, I bolted for that stairwell to try to get to the bottom of the stairwell so that I could be there at the bottom when my brother got to the bottom with these guys coming behind them.

Frank, to anybody who was watching that, it looked like I was just running away. If you didn't have like a wide enough angle lens where you could see that I was running to the stairwell, and if you didn't have a camera at the bottom where you saw that I came and met them at the bottom, it looked like I was just scared and was bolting after they crowded onto this escalator behind my brother.

So, you know, there's ways that things can be perceived when you don't have the full picture, when you don't know, just seeing a little piece of something. Well, yeah. If you saw a video of me running, wouldn't you reach that conclusion that I was scared and I was running away? What else would you conclude?







PODCAST

FRANK:

Yeah. Well, what happened? You've got to tell us what happened now. Did you make it down there? Did you?

SETH:

Well, we'll leave that for another day. Nobody got arrested. It didn't end up turning into a physical altercation. It remained verbal, thankfully. But I did make it to the bottom of the stairwell, and my brother, and a couple of my friends who were also there thought that I was running away. That's what they thought.

And so, they were actually surprised to see me at the bottom when I was down there because that's what it looked like. It's the impression that it gave. And so, they actually still give me a hard time about that. My brother's joked about that over the years.

Remember that time when those guys were trying to fight us and you ran away? Like, I was running for the stairwell! [Laughter] But that's, I think it's a good illustration of exactly how things can be, you know, can appear one way when they're really another way. And if you don't know, Frank, you don't know.

FRANK:

That's right. And you would have to have a whole ton of evidence to suggest that Mikey McCoy was complicit in Charlie's murder, other than him just being on his phone immediately after the murder.

SETH:

Do you think these things require response, Frank? I think, you know, I understand the desire to address it, and deal with it, and say, you know, this is what really happened. I know him really well. You know, it's not like this. I guess I felt the need to issue a response after this Hamptons thing.

I'll tell you why I felt the need to respond, because, you know, first of all, Charlie was a friend of mine. As you know. I did know him personally, and I had just seen him recently, when this







with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

happened. And, you know, to be accused of something like that, you want to clear your name for a number of reasons, because, you know, it's such a heinous thing.

If it were true, it would mean that you are a despicable, terrible, evil person, a traitor, to someone who is supposed to be your friend. If it were true. And so, letting that hang out there, I can see how that is like, you know, we feel this strong need to address it. But with the extent to which these things are just so outrageous and so unfounded, I wonder sometimes whether or not it requires a response. What do you think?

FRANK:

Yeah, it's so absurd that it probably doesn't. And for somebody to say, well, you haven't said anything, therefore it shows you're guilty. That's just nonsense. I mean, I'm getting people calling me, or emailing me, and leaving me voice messages. If you don't respond, it looks suspicious. Nonsense. Okay?

SETH:

Those people, I promise you this, Frank. If you do write them a message and explain to them your response, they won't accept that either. They won't accept. They've already reached their conclusion. The conclusion's baked into the conspiracy itself. That's the starting point of the conspiracy.

And so, it doesn't matter. Any evidence that you present, it doesn't matter. It can be dismissed. They'll pick and choose, cherry pick whatever they want to latch onto that confirms the theory. And they will reject and dismiss and downplay as dishonest, or deceptive, or whatever, anything that contradicts it.

FRANK:

Also, people need to know there have to be motives, which you can't judge from afar. What motive would anybody within TPUSA have to get rid of the most inspirational leader that built this amazing organization?







with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

By all, accounts, a very well-loved man. Why would anybody within that organization want to kill Charlie Kirk? It makes absolutely zero sense. And yet, to even insinuate those people were involved is just beyond the pale. And yet—

SETH:

Well, you can come, up with possibilities, can't you?

FRANK:

Always possibilities.

SETH:

You can imagine possibilities. You know, financial reasons. Oh, well, the Jewish donors were giving so much money, and he was turning off the Jewish donors. And so, you've got to get rid of him if you want to keep that money coming in. I mean, you can come up with stuff, but you need evidence.

FRANK:

We could come up that Candace killed him, right? You could come up with that. But of course she didn't. I'm not suggesting that, but you could come up with—

SETH:

You can make the argument, Frank, Turning Point has grown, substantially. How many chapters are there now compared to how many there were? You know, I'm sure donations are rolling in. You know, if you order something for the store right now, it's backlogged for months because so many people are buying these shirts, you know, and it's like, you can make the argument that there's, you know, there was a financial incentive to get rid of—

You make Charlie a martyr and the organization goes through the roof. You know, you draw this attention to the organization and then we'll be bigger and more profitable than ever. And like, yeah, you can come up with anything that you want to.







PODCAST

FRANK:

Well, let's talk about why the FBI hasn't said much. And this is from my friend J. Warner Wallace, the cold-case homicide detective who we had on the program a few weeks ago because he has prosecuted many murders, some of them cold case murders. And he pointed out, which it appears, people don't seem to realize, that the job of law enforcement is not to quell every possible conspiracy theory.

The job of law enforcement is to prosecute and get a conviction on the real killer. If they were to come out and reveal everything they have right now, they would do several things that would hamper their ability to get a true conviction. Number one, if they were to come out and say, we're investigating a second shooter, if a witness then comes forward and says, oh, I saw the second shooter, they don't know if that witness really did see the second shooter or just wants to make a name for him or herself because the FBI said, we're looking for a second shooter.

So they have to keep that close to the vest. Also, they don't want to taint the jury pool, and they don't want to tip off the defense. They have to keep things close to the vest. You know, people are saying, as Jim rightfully said, all this is going to be revealed by the autopsy. And an autopsy is always done on a homicide. It's state law. The autopsy will tell you from what angle he was shot, how many times he was shot. And they're not going to reveal that either until they get to a pretrial hearing, or they get to the trial.

There is no motivation for the prosecution to reveal any of this stuff. Now, if all of these questions do help reveal something that the FBI is not aware of themselves, they're going to look into it. How do I know? Because they already looked into me. Because you remember the crazy conspiracy theory that I was signaling the killer? You know, it was all over the internet.

SETH:

I think I was the first person to falsify that and say, I know that guy.

FRANK:

Yeah. Thank you.







PODCAST

SETH:

That's Frank, by the way. And Frank loved Charlie to the point where he would have put himself between Charlie and that bullet if he could have. Frank's not your suspect.

FRANK:

So, I was with Charlie's attorney, who flew in right after the murder, and he facilitated a conversation with the FBI. Because after we were at the hospital, the FBI showed up, and first of all, they interviewed me and everybody else as they're supposed to do. And then the next day, this theory came out that I learned about when I first got back to Phoenix. I don't know, 36 hours or so after the murder, 30 hours after the murder, we got back to Phoenix after J.D. Vance took Charlie and Air Force Two to Phoenix.

And my wife goes, do you know you're the subject of a conspiracy theory? I'm like, what? What are you talking about? And she told me the whole thing. A couple of days later, I get a phone call from Jeff, Charlie's attorney. And he said, the FBI just wants to ask you a couple of questions about this, and they need to do that to track down every single possible situation out there. And Jim later said—

SETH:

Well, yeah. I mean, you were a close eyewitness. Yeah. You had your phone up. You were recording, weren't you? I mean, it's like—

FRANK:

I was not recording. I was Face Timing. I was Face Timing my son-in-law. I mean, my son and daughter-in-law. So, there's nothing on my phone. There's no recording of it. So the FBI is on the phone with me and Jeff, and he just asked me, were you signaling the shooter? Of course not. It's stupid. I mean, and why would anybody 200 yards away need somebody to point out, oh, this is Charlie Kirk. Shoot him. He can't even see me anyway. I'm 25 feet off his right elbow.

So the whole thing is stupid anyway. It shows you how stupid these conspiracy theories are. So, they will track down some of these conspiracy theories and ask questions about people because the prosecution-- Let me put it another way. The defense, when you get to the trial, is







PODCAST

going to bring these up. Well, did you check into the second shooter? Did you check into the guy in the truck? Did you check into this? Because maybe—

SETH:

That's to raise any kind of doubt that they can.

FRANK:

Right. And so, the FBI and the police are checking into all this right now, but they're not going to reveal what they found because that's going to jeopardize the case. So, you know, some of these people think it's up to them to find Charlie's killer.

SETH:

Right. Well, and it's also interesting too when you talk about-- Because there's other issues at play right now. You know, there's a conflict on the right. You know, the infighting that's happening on the right.

FRANK:

Yes.

SETH:

And it's my understanding that this man that decided to kill Charlie, there were messages that were exchanged, text messages that they have, that have been released that we've seen, where he talks about his hatred for Charlie. Right? He talks about how much he hates—

Well, he believes that Charlie is hateful. And so, that was the primary motivation that he stated in writing for killing Charlie. Right? Correct me if I'm wrong.

FRANK:

Yeah, he's a fascist. Right? Because he comes to college campuses and gives the microphone to his opponents. Obviously, a trait of fascism.





I don't have enough FAITH to be an ATHEIST

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

SETH:

Right.

FRANK:

You know, that's what fascists do. They give their opponents a microphone and let them talk. Right?

SETH:

Right. But I guess my point is, you know, this is not a person. This is not an individual. The suspect that's in custody that's being tried right now for this crime, was not somebody who was on our side of the aisle who agreed with Charlie on these issues.

This is somebody who had so much personal animosity for Charlie because of the differences of viewpoints and values, that he felt the need to take him out. And so, to cast suspicion on people who are in agreement with Charlie, not just in agreement with Charlie on the issues, but are actually friends and family of Charlie and whatever, it only fuels more of this discord amongst people who should be aligned in the opposition to, you know, one of the issues that we face right now is the rise of left wing violence in response to speech.

They think that Charlie's speech is violent and harmful, and so they respond to it with actual violence. Violence is violence. Speech isn't violence, but they respond to it that way. And that's an issue. And you distract from and detract from, you know, the responsibility that this individual has.

And the issue that you have with this becoming a recurring thing. You know, we have a lot of these trans shooters, you know, shooting up schools and stuff like that. Like, these are real issues. And when you take the attention away from what the actual issue is and cast suspicion on other people, I mean, that doesn't-- That compounds the problem. Right? Doesn't it multiply the problem? Because then you're not even looking at real problems. You're creating fake ones while ignoring real ones.







PODCAST

FRANK:

Well said. Yeah. That is what appears to be going on. Now, I'm totally open. I want to find Charlie's real killer, too. And it probably is this guy, Tyler Robinson. If it's not, okay, the truth's going to come out at some point.

SETH:

Yes.

FRANK:

But to insinuate that friends of Charlie are somehow responsible for this, unless you have amazingly strong evidence, I'll say it again. Shut up. All right? I'm doubling down on shut up on that. I'm not doubling down on asking questions. I'm not saying shut up, stop asking questions. I'm saying shut up.

Stop insinuating innocent people are guilty, because those people don't deserve that. They're in enough pain already. And it's dangerous because there are unstable people out there who think they actually had something to do with Charlie's death. And they didn't. They liked Charlie.

SETH:

Why isn't it acceptable? It's of course, a good point. Why isn't it acceptable to believe that somebody on the left who's deranged would want to kill Charlie? Isn't that who Charlie thought was most likely to kill him all along?

FRANK:

Yeah.

SETH:

That's what he feared. That was the most likely thing that would happen. If it was going to happen.







PODCAST

FRANK:

I don't know if I told you this, but on May 22, I texted him. There was some violent act that occurred in society. And I said, Charlie, I hope you've upped your security detail. And he texted me back, he said, big time. I know they want me dead. This is May 22.

SETH:

Right. And who's the they he's referring to? Is it his colleagues at Turning Point? I mean, come on Yeah

FRANK:

So, Candace, a personal appeal. Keep asking questions, but please don't insinuate that innocent people are guilty because they're not guilty. And if they are guilty, the authorities will find out. Okay? But Mikey McCoy's not guilty. I'm not guilty. We're hurting. Erica is not guilty. Erica, especially. For somebody that poured so much of his life into Candace Owens, to have her somehow insinuate that the widow of Charlie Kirk is somehow suspicious in this, implicitly even suggesting it is inhumane.

Yeah. FRANK: Stop it.

SETH:

SETH:

Yeah. I feel for her.

FRANK:

Yeah. Well, brother, maybe we should end with something from The Babylon Bee, because this has been a heavy conversation. By the way, I really—

And I've told you this personally, but people need to know. I think The Babylon Bee is one of the most important websites out there. Because what The Babylon Bee can say with humor, even people on the other side of the aisle can appreciate. If you say it directly in a didactic way,







PODCAST

people would reject it. But when you say things like this, this is the government shutdown. "Democrats vow to starve as many food stamp recipients as it takes to get free health care for illegal immigrants." [Laughter] That's the implication of what they appear to be doing, anyway. And it's so absurd, but it's-- There's some truth in it.

SETH:

Yeah, well, yeah. That's the-- The reality is so absurd. It really is. It does seem to be the highest priority, doesn't it, at times?

FRANK:

That's right.

SETH:

You can. Yeah. And it is good to— It's good to joke about these things. You know, not everything that we write satire about is necessarily something that's funny, that's happening. And it's not necessarily funny. But you can look at it in a different way. You can look at it through the lens of humor or satire, you know, parody what's happening to really just draw out the absurdity of it.

FRANK:

Here's another one. "Prodigal Son returns after snap benefits expire." [Laughter]

SETH:

I'm back.

FRANK:

That's right. And then here's one. This is good for Halloween. "The nightmare is over. Supreme Court outlaws candy corn." [Laughter] Who likes candy corn? Come on.

SETH:

Somebody, apparently. It always tastes stale and expired to me. I don't know. Yeah, it's not a pleasant experience. I mean, maybe dentists like candy corn.







PODCAST

FRANK:

Oh, here's one.

SETH:

Maybe that's a conspiracy, Frank. It's dentists.

FRANK:

It's dentists who push this stuff. Every dentist I go to for trick or treating you, they throw candy corn in the bag, right? "Here's the toughest survival challenge yet. Bear Gillis attempts to survive weekend in Chicago." [Laughter] This is great stuff. You and your team are great at this stuff. So check out The Babylon Bee, ladies and gentlemen. And, by the way, pray for everybody involved in this. Pray for Candace Owens. Pray for TPUSA. Pray for Erica.

Pray for Seth. Please pray for me, and for Mikey, and Andrew Kolvet, and Blake Neff. I mean, these people are, they're struggling right now. Their best friend and their leader has been murdered, the people at TPUSA. And we need to come around them, and support them in any way we can, especially through prayer.

SETH:

Yeah. Pray for their safety. Because safety is becoming more of these things. Everything that we just talked about, you know, at the--

Really, one of the primary reasons that it's an issue is not just the fact that it's hurtful, because it is. It's deeply hurtful. But it also raises the risk. It raises the risk for other people. And then the threats start coming from another direction. You know, it's not—

I've been threatened by the left for years, you know, with my involvement in the Babylon Bee. For a while there, I owned Libs of TikTok, which, you know, enrages the left.

You know, so I've faced death threats for a long time, and now they're coming from other angles that they never came from before. And it's because of this nonsense. It's because of these conspiracies. It's dangerous stuff. You never want to make accusations, or allegations, or even the word that you were using, insinuations. I think that's a mild word for what's happened







PODCAST

in a lot of these cases. But you never want to do that, irresponsibly, if you don't have a really good, really good reason for thinking that somebody's guilty of something that serious, with a figure that loved, because all you're doing is putting a target on other people's backs.

FRANK:

That's right. That's right. All right, friends. Thanks for being with us. I want to mention this weekend we'll be with Natasha Crain and Alisa Childers at Stonebriar Church for the Unshaken Conference in Dallas, Texas. Frisco actually. Then I'll be at the Sunday morning services. And then Lord willing, I'll be with Rob Schneider at UC Berkeley. This is going to be the 10th, November 10th. We were going to be there with Charlie, but he'll remain in glory. So, Rob and I will be there. Hope to see you there if you can make it. That will not be livestreamed. Video will come out later.

Then University of Alabama on the 13th. that will be livestreamed. And then let's see, we're going to be at Boise State on November 20th. Happens to be my birthday. I'll be 64. When I'm 64, I'll be at Boise State. We're doing 'If God, Why Evil?' at all of these events. Tribute to my friend Charlie Kirk. Plenty of Q & A.

Hope to see you guys there. Thanks for all your support as we come to the end of the year. As you know, due to what we've been talking about today, our costs when we go to a college campus have tripled from \$5,000 to about \$15,000 because we have to bring security.

So anything you can do to help us continue these events is appreciated. Go to crossexamined.org. Click on donate. A hundred percent of your donations go to ministry, 0% to buildings. We don't have buildings. We're all virtual. We come to you. You don't come to us. And it's tax-deductible as well.

So thank you so much. Thanks to my friend, easy for me to say. Seth Dillon, who does such a great job and is a great thinker by the way. He's very skilled in apologetics and cultural events. He's not just funny. He knows what he's doing. So check out Seth. By the way, Seth, other than The Babylon Bee, where else can people find you?







PODCAST

SETH:

Well, on X at SethDillon.com or not dot com, @sethdillon. That's my handle. Babylonbee.com and of course, all of the social media where we live there.

FRANK:

Okay, great stuff. Check out Not the Bee as well. Not the Bee. NotTheBee.com has great stories that are you-- When you're reading it, you're thinking, this is The Babylon Bee. No, these are true stories that are just crazy.

SETH:

Not the Bee has always been the backup plan for when the world is so insane it's impossible to satirize. We'll just, you know, publish those stories highlighting the madness.

FRANK:

That's right.

SETH:

Plan B.

FRANK:

That's right. Your brother Dan runs Not the Bee. Not the bee. Check it out, friends. All right. Great being with you. Please pray for everybody involved. Let's move forward to make heaven crowded. God bless.



