

Frank Addresses Candace Owens' Conspiracy Theories

(July 7, 2026)

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, someone by the name of Brianna wrote in to me and said, why have you said on multiple podcasts that you performed CPR on Charlie Kirk in the car en route to the hospital? But Brian Harpool, Brian Harpool was one of the security guys in the car, said on the Sean Ryan show that no CPR was performed and you were only praying in the back seat.

This is kind of rocking me as I have followed you for many years for your theology but recently unfollowed with all of these discrepancies in your story. Hope to hear back. Then Stacy emailed me the other day, quote, you were involved with the killing of Charlie.

I can't trust anything you have to say. You were caught in lies, unquote. All right, ladies and gentlemen, let me ask you a question. Does every difference or even contradiction between eyewitnesses of a murder automatically mean that, number one, someone is lying, and number two, that someone must be also guilty of murder?

Does that follow? Do you really think that every disagreement between eyewitnesses means one of them is lying and must be in on the murder? I mean, that is an absolutely bizarre mind virus logic. It doesn't follow.

In fact, as we'll unpack a little bit later, eyewitnesses always disagree on the minor details. They agree on what happened overall, but they disagree on minor details. That is to be expected, and I'll unpack that further as we go.

But if you were to say that every difference in testimony implicated an eyewitness in the crime they witnessed, who would ever testify? It's ridiculous, this kind of thinking. Actually, it's not really thinking, it's feeling, is an attack on our blind justice system that is designed to protect innocent people from being wrongly convicted.



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

When you assume someone is guilty without evidence or without a trial, there is no presumption of innocence. You know that our system is built on innocent until proven guilty. There's no burden of proof. There's no need to collect evidence and to build a case that shows that the person is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

You just short circuit all that stuff when you start claiming that people who witness the murder are somehow implicated in the murder just because they disagree with another witness of the murder. If you think that's how to treat people involved in this case or any case, let me just be direct.

You're extremely naive. You're easily manipulated. You're an irrational person who needs more thinking and less feeling. I'm sorry to be so blunt, but that's just the case. You certainly shouldn't be trusted on a jury.

Your hunches, your vibes, your dreams. This is stuff Candace Owens brings out. I had a dream. I just have a vibe. I have a feeling. Your hunches, vibes, dreams, and feelings are not evidence that someone has committed murder. In fact, I got an email this week from someone claiming that some man of God who had some sort of dream or vision told her that, quote, Candace Owens is involved in the murder.

And that is why she's made up conspiracies and false accusations to deflect people away from Tyler Robinson. She has and still is instigating people against Erica and TPUSA, unquote. Now, much of what was said in that quote is true, but there was no evidence provided that Candace Owens was involved in the murder.

Is it possible? Of course it's possible. Anything's possible. But without evidence, it's just possible. I would never take somebody who just emailed me something and said, this person's involved, has given no evidence and say, okay, must be true, that person's involved.

Anything's possible. But possibilities are not evidence. Now, I'm gonna get to the so-called CPR contradiction in just a minute. But first, I know that what I'm gonna say on this program, on this show isn't gonna convince anyone who is following a personality rather than the evidence.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

You ought to be following the evidence, not a personality. Not Candace, not me, not anyone else. You ought to be following the evidence. For people who have their minds made up because everything they see is interpreted to confirm what they want to be true, there's nothing that I'm going to say that's going to change your mind, because no matter what I say, it's going to be confirmation of what you already believe.

It's called confirmation bias. And we see this in Candace Owens. For example, no matter what she thinks she sees, Candace always or can always interpret the evidence in such a way that it advances whatever conspiracy theory she's advocating that particular day.

And by the way, I'm going to put videos of Candace saying most of what I'm about to tell you in the show notes. We don't have time to play all the clips. We're going to play enough clips today. But I can't play every one of these clips. But you've seen that Candace, on one hand, has said Erica is too emotional. On the other hand, she's not emotional enough.

For example, Candace says that Erica can't-- Erica can't be CEO because she's too emotional. But then Candace insinuates and actually puts in a tweet that everyone has betrayed Charlie. Anyway, Candace insinuates that Erica is in on the murder because she was too calm talking to her team about their goals about 10 days after the murder.

Well look, is Erica too emotional or is she too calm? Which is it? Well, it depends on what conspiracy theory or claim Candace is peddling that day. If it's Erica ought not be CEO, if that's the claim Candace is making, well, then obviously Erica's too emotional.

If it's Erica is complicit in the murder, if that's her theory, then Erica is too calm, see? Because she should have been more emotional if the murder occurred and she had nothing to do with it. So no matter what Erica does, Candace can interpret it to confirm whatever she wants to confirm.

Candace has spent multiple weeks focused in on the allegation that no donors heard Charlie appoint Erica as his successor. But not only has TPUSA now released the video clip of him saying that very thing at an event, but Candace admitted earlier that two donors, and they happen to be a couple, do remember him saying that Erica would take over for him and if he were to pass

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

on, but now Candace considers the couple conflicting witnesses because of their various ties to Turning Point, and she thinks the video of Charlie actually saying that must be AI generated.

Now, it just goes to show you she can interpret and reinterpret no matter what evidence you provide, in whatever direction she wants to, to fit whatever claim she wants to make. She can keep moving the goal posts, she can reinterpret evidence to fit whatever conspiracy theory that she's peddling that day.

Also, Candace has said that Charlie was shot from the front, and then she said, no, he was shot from behind. Then she said he was shot from below. And now currently, apparently, Charlie was somehow killed by a proximity bomb that killed him.

And another... Another problem with that, of course, or another accusation associated with that is that those of us that actually had tried to help Charlie afterwards and brought him to the hospital, we had to take off our clothes to get all that evidence of the residue from the bomb off, and we had to destroy all that so nobody would discover it.

That's her claim, apparently. But look, which is it? Was Charlie shot from the front, from behind, from below, or was it some proximity bomb? Well, it depends on what conspiracy theory she's peddling that day. Again, we're going to put the videos for all this in the show notes.

Candace also said that Charlie was a boy genius, but apparently Charlie wasn't really a genius because according to Candace, all the people that Charlie handpicked to be in his family and on his team betrayed him. So was Charlie a genius or was he a dummy?

Which is it? I think it really depends on what conspiracy theory she's peddling that day. She also said that either Brian Harpool is lying about the drone over the event, or Frank Turek is lying about the drone over the event.

So she at one point said, well, Frank's a military man, and military men don't really lie about these things. So Frank's not lying about it. But now when we have this so-called CPR difference, Candace says that I'm the one, Frank is the one telling lies.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

Look, is Frank honest or is Frank a liar? Which is it? It depends on what conspiracy theory that Candace is peddling that day. Now, I realize that some people can sometimes tell the truth and sometimes people can tell the lie, but it isn't inconvenient that she thought I was trustworthy about the drone, but I'm not trustworthy about CPR. So it really just depends on what conspiracy theory she's peddling.

It doesn't matter what the evidence is. It's always interpreted in such a way as to confirm whatever she wants to confirm that day. This kind of reminds me, for those of you who are older like I am, years ago, Monty Python, put a movie out, the group of comedians known as Monty Python called The Life of Brian.

And it was kind of a spoof on the story of Jesus where people mistake Brian for the Messiah rather than Jesus. And at one point during the movie, all these people who are following Brian say to Brian, "Brian, are you the Messiah?

Are you the Messiah?" He says, I'm not the Messiah. He keeps denying he's the Messiah. And then one of them says, it's just like the Messiah to deny that he's the Messiah. And then Brian says, okay, I am the Messiah. And they all go, he is the Messiah!

It doesn't matter what evidence is given. The people are always going to conclude that Brian is the Messiah. It doesn't matter what evidence is given. Some people who are following Candace right now are just going to conclude that whatever she says is true, regardless of the fact that there's no evidence.

So I know I'm not going to convince people who think everything is evidence of a conspiracy. But hopefully a few of you out there who have sort of drunk the Kool Aid in that direction can hopefully what I say here can help you realize that you're being manipulated.

And I'm going to show you how you're being manipulated as this program unfolds. All right, now let's talk about the drones for a minute. I already mentioned this previously on a show several months ago, but the so-called drone contradiction is the fact that when we were driving into Utah Valley University that faithful day, September 10th, Charlie got video on his phone that looked like it was from a drone.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Looked like it was from above of the crowd that was waiting. We were an hour out and you know, wow, look at all these people there. That's when I said to him, Charlie, I don't like this place. There are too many buildings. But Charlie just shrugged that off because he was brave and he knew he had to put himself, at least in some harm's way if he was gonna love people.

He can't completely wall himself off. In any event, it really looked like drone footage. And I said it like five days after the murder on the podcast about Charlie Kirk. I said, we got drone footage. I just assumed it was drone footage. You see something from above? Oh, it's gotta be a drone.

That's what you think in today's society, because drones are everywhere. But then it turned out Brian Harpool at some point later, may have been the Sean Ryan podcast. I don't know when he said this, but he said there were no drones up. We couldn't have drones up.

And in retrospect, especially when I went back to UVU in March, and I think I realized this even prior to that, was there was a walkway above us, that there was a breezeway that went out into this amphitheater like area.

And there was a building above us. So you could kind of walk under the building, looked like it was like a hallway. And then on top of it you could stand up there. And there were people standing up there. And so what probably it was, was someone with an iPhone from his team just taking an aerial shot from that top of the building there to show us how big the crowd was.

I just assumed it was a drone. But Brian was probably right. It wasn't a drone. It was an iPhone just up on that building. Now that contradiction, nobody was lying. I was just misinformed.

I thought it was a drone, but it apparently it wasn't. Either that or it was a drone early on that maybe someone from the team had there. Not the security team, but the marketing team, and then they brought it down before the event occurred. That's possible, too. But every difference in a case between eyewitnesses doesn't mean it's a contradiction.

Doesn't mean it's a lie. Sometimes it's just one person was misinformed or one person noticed something another person didn't. Now, what about the CPR difference? Well, I'm going to let Candace explain that. Here she is.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

CANDACE VIDEO:

If we continue to look at the actual evidence of the car, we then have to ask ourselves what could account for Frank Turek's...

And it has to be a lie. According to Brian Harpel, it's a lie. Frank Turek says that he himself, Frank, tried to start CPR. And to be clear, we can immediately determine that Frank Turek is likely the one lying in that scenario and not Brian Harpole.

Because Charlie was lying across the seats, okay? His middle section was therefore not flat. You cannot conduct emergency CPR on a person that is laying across two captain chairs with their midsection in the air.

Brian, both of his hands are occupied. He would be... It's not an ideal position at all, but he's the person that would be in the position to address Charlie's chest area. It's not possible. Okay? You need a flat surface to do CPR. Everybody knows this. And Brian has already admitted that it was him that was on the floor down on one knee beside the chair, because Charlie's legs were dangling off. Okay?

FRANK:

Candace doesn't know what she's talking about. Candace wasn't there. It wasn't just Brian in the back seat. It was also Rick. In fact, Rick was sort of holding Charlie's head. All right? I was over the top. So there was a...

I was from the third row, if you will. And Charlie was laid out from my left to my right, where his legs were out the door, as Candace just said, because he was too tall. And to my right was Brian.

To my left, where Charlie's head was, was Rick. Okay? Most of his back was on the left seat. Okay? And Brian is correct that most of the ride we weren't doing any CPR.

We couldn't do CPR. We're trying to stop the bleeding. So no CPR was done. It wasn't until the last, say, 30 seconds of the ride that I thought to myself, we gotta be nearing like eight or nine minutes, and he's not breathing, and there's no heartbeat.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

I've gotta at least try. It's probably gonna be futile, but I gotta at least try to start his heart and get some air in him. So I tried that for like 20 or 30 seconds at the very end of the ride when we're pulling into the hospital parking lot, and we're yanking and banking our way there.

Now, it turned out it was futile because he was still bleeding. You can't really do CPR when somebody's still bleeding. Of course, I didn't know any of this at the time. The only thing I'm thinking about is if there's any way he's going to make it, we've got to do something to get air in him.

So I tried it for like 20 or 30 seconds, but his eyes were fixed. He wasn't looking at me. He was looking right past me into eternity. Now, if you saw Brian on Sean Ryan's show, he had doll eyes. Yeah, he had to have doll eyes.

Now, I don't know Brian's history. I don't know if he was in the military or he had combat experience. He probably has. I don't know Brian very well. I was in the military, but I never saw anybody shot. I never saw anybody shot and bleed out. I never saw...

Well, Charlie, he didn't just bleed out. He was... According to the surgeon, he was killed instantly. And I, in the back of my mind, I thought that was true. But am I going to try? Of course I'm going to try. And we were all trying. We were trying to stop the bleeding the whole way.

So it's not a contradiction. Brian is generally right. Yeah, we weren't spending time on CPR because we were just trying to stop the bleeding. But at the very end I said, I've got to try it. I just, I couldn't live with myself if say, they did revive him and he had, say, brain damage.

Gotta try and get air in him. So we tried and as you know, when we did get to the hospital, they did get his heart started. And the surgeon later said, you can do that in a healthy person, they could already be dead. But if he's a healthy person, young person, strong heart, you can restart the heart.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

When they restarted the heart, we thought maybe there's hope. Rick and I were praying out loud the whole way. Brian's right about that. We're praying out loud the whole way. Oh, and one other thing. Some people are saying you said you were on FaceTime for nine hours.

I never said I was on FaceTime for nine hours. I was Face Timing my son and daughter-in-law when the shot rang out. I put the phone in my pocket, not even remembering they were there because as soon as Charlie shot, I'm heading toward him and then running with him, I just put it in my back pocket. They heard the entire thing until we got to the hospital.

When I pulled it out of my pocket, they were still there. I, you know, talked to them and said goodbye. That's when I called Jack Hibbs to pray. And I... Seth Dillon called me because he had heard what had happened. So I'm talking to him on the phone. I wasn't talking for nine hours.

Somebody online said I said I was on FaceTime for nine hours until we got to the hotel. No, to the hospital. It was in my back pocket. It's amazing how misinformation just goes everywhere. Now let me say something about eyewitness accounts.

There is no verbal or written account that is a complete account. It always takes longer to describe an event than experience it. In fact, we know this. You know this if you go to work and you come home and your spouse says, hey, how was your day, honey?

It would take you longer if you work for eight hours, it would take you longer than eight hours to explain everything that happened that day than to just live the eight hours. It would take you longer to describe even a play in football than it would just to witness the play.

This is why every written account and every oral account is fragmentary. It's not complete. And people are going to emphasize different things about an event that they witnessed. They're not gonna...

They're not gonna say exactly the same thing. They may say the same thing essentially about the big event, just like in the New Testament documents. There was a resurrection. They may emphasize different details about that resurrection.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

Who got to the tomb first, how many angels were there, that kind of thing. That doesn't change the main fact that there was a resurrection. Everybody agrees on that. Everybody agrees we were in the car taking Charlie to the hospital, and yea we were all trying to stop the bleeding.

I mentioned CPR because I was the one trying it the last 20 or 30 seconds of the ride. It's not a contradiction. Now, maybe as we're yanking and banking into the parking lot, Brian was preoccupied thinking or talking to somebody else or whatever because it was a lot of commotion, as you could imagine.

He didn't see me trying for 20 or 30 seconds. Maybe he did. I don't know. In fact, he's got a lawsuit against Candace Owens right now, so I don't think he can even talk about any of this. But someone could call him and ask him if they want to. But it's not a contradiction.

We're just emphasizing different details at different times. In fact, eyewitnesses disagree on details for various reasons. That's the mark of authentic eyewitness testimony. They all agree on the essentials. They disagree on the minor details.

In fact, disagreeing with others on these minor details can not only be explained, it is to be expected. If you have any judge in a courtroom hear testimony from two eyewitnesses about a given crime, and they give exact word for word testimony about what happened, including every detail, what does that judge immediately assume?

Collusion. They got together to get their stories straight. No, there's no collusion here. Brian and I, we've hardly talked since it happened. Okay? We may exchange a text or two here or there, but not... We haven't tried to get our story straight, so to speak.

We're just telling you what happened from our own perspectives. And no matter what perspective that is, it's going to be fragmentary, and we're going to mention different things that stuck out to us. Now, it's one thing to contradict others.

Brian and I appears to be, have contradicted over this. But in reality, it wasn't a contradiction. He's generally right. Most of the ride, we didn't do any of this. I just tried it at the very end.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

That's to be expected. We're going to have these differences. But what if you continue to contradict yourself?

That seems a bit more... A bit more of a serious blow to someone's credibility. Now look at how often Candace Owens disagrees with herself. This is a video Nathan Livingstone put together on X. Here it is. Check this out.

CANDACE VIDEO:

What about his, burial? How come we haven't seen anything about his burial? We saw so much, and then we saw nothing. And the reason that's like a big hush hush secret is because Charlie had a Catholic funeral mass and he is buried in a Catholic cemetery.

PIERS MORGAN:

But pre the meeting with Erica, you repeatedly questioned why we weren't being told where Charlie Kirk is buried or even if he has been buried yet. Did you get those answers?

CANDACE:

That's, you have the wrong commentator. Who questioned that? I think that was Milo Yiannopoulos.

PIERS:

You've never questioned? You've never asked where Charlie's buried?

CANDACE:

Nope.

BEN SHAPIRO:

But if this were on the left and somebody were accusing Charlie Kirk of his wife having murdered him, I assume that you would be talking about it.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

MEGYN:

Is that what Candace is accusing Erica of?

BEN:

Yes.

MEGYN:

Of murdering her own husband?

BEN:

She's accusing TPUSA insiders and other members of the right wing, including Seth Dillon, of being involved in the murder of Charlie Kirk. Yes.

CANDACE:

It's just-- I don't even know how to respond to it because it just never happened. Realizing that nothing in Charlie's life is real, it's just something that keeps me up at night. Just nothing in his life was real. The assassination of Charlie Kirk was something akin to a regicide.

Right? The assassination of a king to install a new ruler who the king would have never approved of. It's so crazy.

BLAKE NEFF:

She has accused us of lying about Charlie wanting Erica to take over for him if he died.

CANDACE:

Never happened. And it just so happened that Charlie Kirk kept notebooks and diaries. He was so diligent that he wrote down his succession plan featuring who he wanted to take over for the organization in the event of his untimely death.

He just... In the third notebook, he was oh, and if I accidentally get shot on campus, here's what you should do. Call Erica. And then after you call Erica, come find this notebook. And if during this process of our imagination, common sense comes on and we're like oh, but wait, Charlie, wasn't he like a boy genius?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

He's a pretty bright kid. Wouldn't he have maybe formalized that succession plan outside of like a diary? But no, he wanted to put it in these notebooks. And then the plan was to guilt us, I think, to try to haunt us with the ghost of Charlie's notebooks that were never going to be allowed to read.

But we're supposed to accept that they most definitely read. For sure. Never happened. I knew it was big. I didn't have the players. I certainly didn't suspect Turning Point USA would be, as I believe, involved in a cover up.

And we can talk about what the motives are of that. They could be financial, it doesn't necessarily mean they weren't involved in plotting to kill him. And I've never said that. Cam Higby is on the payroll of Turning Point USA beginning in August of this year. So in theory, Cam Higby, who was laughing off the idea of an assassination attempt, is being paid by the very organization that just had its leader assassinated in broad daylight in front of the entire world.

It doesn't necessarily mean they were involved in plotting to kill him. And I've never said that. Because I was in this aggrieved stage. And I really didn't poke my head up until weeks later when I could like stop crying about it every second. Charlie Kirk, my friend, is dead. First, this is fantastic that Preborn is doing this. To remind you guys about Pure Talk. [Cash Register Ding] Also remind you guys about American financing.

Also remind you guys about GNO Land. Also telling you guys about Just Thrive. You can head over to our website, CandaceOwens.com. You can sign up, buy yourself a hat. I'm not going to stop unless Erica Kirk asks me to stop.

ERIKA:

We were told that if we said stop, they would stop. And we said stop. And I'll say it again. Please stop.

CANDACE:

Please stop. Please stop lying. But as soon as she tells me what it is I've lied about, I will cease lying immediately.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

FRANK:

Well, there appear to be a whole list of lies right there.

I mean, ladies and gentlemen, if differences or contradictions make someone untrustworthy, why are you listening to Candace? Now, maybe she can explain all these. Well, please go ahead and explain them all. I'll be very charitable. Explain what you meant.

Were all those taken out of context, Candace, or do you just kind of change your tune when you're trying to sell a new conspiracy theory? You just keep moving the goalposts. Look, we understand why people have different viewpoints of an event they witnessed.

They may contradict or give a different viewpoint than somebody else who witnessed that same event. But when you keep contradicting yourself over and over again, that can cause us to say, you know, maybe you're not all that trustworthy.

Now some of you are going to say, oh no. Candace is just asking questions. Ladies and gentlemen, even if she's just asking questions, questions are not evidence. My friend J. Warner Wallace, the cold-case homicide detective who has investigated and solved many cold-case homicides, has a book called 'Cold-Case Christianity.' And in the book, he talks about this. He says, a presentation is not a piece of evidence.

He says jurors are advised that the words of the attorneys are not considered evidence. Quote. And this is from... He's actually quoting from section 104 of the Judicial Council of California Criminal Jury Instruction.

So every state, and in this case California, gives the jury certain instructions on how to come to a conclusion based on the evidence they've seen. And what they're about to say here is that questions from anybody, in this case, an attorney in a courtroom, do not constitute evidence.

Quote, nothing that the attorneys say is evidence. In their opening statements and closing arguments, the attorneys will discuss the case, but their remarks are not evidence. Their questions are not evidence. Only the witnesses' answers are evidence.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

The attorney's questions are significant only if they help you understand the witness's answers. Do not assume that something is true just because one of the attorneys asks a question that suggests it is true, unquote.

Let me put the appropriate name in here. Do not assume that something is true just because Candace Owens asks a question that suggests it is true. And by the way, she's not just asking questions, she's asking complex questions.

A complex question is an attempt to get you to accept an assumption that hasn't been proven. If I were to say to you, when did you stop abusing drugs? What does that question assume? It's a complex question. It's assuming that you're already doing drugs and you had to stop abusing them.

It assumes you were a drug user at one time. So it's complex. It's assuming without proving a particular point. And this is what Candace Owens does when she says, "Who is lying about the drones?" or "Who is lying about CPR?" Is it Frank or is it Brian?

This assumes what hasn't been proven, that every disagreement about what happened means someone must be lying. We've already talked about it. No, we're not lying. We just had different perspectives. Maybe one of us was mistaken, but it doesn't mean we're lying.

Or maybe one of us talked about the fact that yea, the car ride wasn't about CPR. It wasn't. It was about stopping the bleeding. It's not until the last 20 or 30 seconds. I said, I've got to try it. Candace also commits a logical fallacy known as poisoning the well.

That's the... This is... By the way, ladies and gentlemen, this is why we should be teaching logic in every school in America. We don't teach logic in public school anymore. Instead of teaching kids what to think, we're teaching them... Or let me say it another way. Instead of teaching kids how to think, we're teaching them what to feel.

And that can be dangerous, because if you start following your feelings without reason or without moral restraint, you're going to wind up in a very bad place, and you're probably going to not only hurt yourself, you're going to hurt a lot of other people. And that's what's going on in this case here.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

She's hurting a lot of innocent people by fallacies, by not thinking clearly, by relying on feelings rather than evidence. But let's talk about this fallacy known as poisoning the well.

That's the fallacy where you find one problem in a person's past or one inconsistency in a person's testimony. Frank said there were drones. Brian said there wasn't. Oh, they can't be trusted. And you conclude that everything that person says must be untrustworthy.

Now, it's not poisoning the well if a person has repeatedly lied about important matters, like it appears Candace has. Now, as I said, maybe she can explain those contradictions. She's free to go through that video and explain why they're not contradictory.

The video that we played earlier, we'll put that video by itself in the show notes as well. But if not, it might be wise not to believe everything she says. You say, oh, no, no, no, wait. Candace is just pursuing justice for Charlie. Ladies and gentlemen, in order to pursue justice, you always need evidence.

You can't get justice without evidence. So if this is about justice, how is it just to insinuate without evidence that Charlie's widow murdered her husband? You know, as I've said before, God takes a very negative view of abusing widows and orphans.

Exodus 22:22 basically says, if you're abusing a widow or an orphan, and that widow or orphan cries out to me, to God, God says, I'm going to hunt that abuser down with a sword and kill them. In Deuteronomy 19, it says, if you accuse someone, this is in the Old Testament economy, the Old Covenant in ancient Israel, if you accuse someone of a crime falsely and you're found out, you get the penalty of that crime.

In other words, if you accuse somebody of murder, a capital offense, falsely, and you're found out, you get executed. Man, that would shut down the internet. That would shut down Candace Owens' podcast because she seems to be accusing people left and right without evidence.

So if it's about justice, how is it just to insinuate Erica is guilty? If it's about justice, how is it just to accuse the people Charlie personally picked for his team as complicit in his murder? Without

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

evidence, by the way. If this is about justice, how is it just to accuse Charlie's friends without evidence that they were complicit in his murder?

Remember the tweet she put out? Everyone betrayed Charlie. Where is the evidence, Candace? Possibilities are not evidence. Anything's possible. You could have killed him. That's possible. Any one of us could have killed.

Possible. But that's not evidence. Or had something to do with the killing. I mean, the people closest to Charlie, those people not only had no motive to murder Charlie, they'd had everything to lose if Charlie was suddenly gone.

Erica. Everything to lose. Mikey, everything to lose. TPUSA, the entire team. Everything to lose. People say, oh, no, it was Israel behind it. Ladies and gentlemen... First of all, there's no evidence for that. And those of you may know, Candace Owens has been in a Jew hatred mode for several years now.

That's what ultimately got her fired from several organizations. Well, at least, certainly one. The Daily Wire, it seems. I'm assuming that's why she was let go. She obviously didn't see head to head, or eye to eye with Ben Shapiro.

But Charlie was not turning on Israel, and "oh, Israel killed him." In fact, we were in a meeting together the day before of his murder with knowledgeable Israelis over in Israel and one Israeli here in America, all on Zoom, to help Charlie better answer questions related to Israel, Hamas, and the entire region.

He was not turning on Israel. He was doing his homework. He wanted to know what was going on in Israel and how to better answer questions related to the conflict. What points could they provide him so he could better answer questions.

That's why Charlie and I were working together, by the way, so we could fine tune one another on how to better answer questions on a college campus. In fact, I tell all about that. I just got this yesterday. You know, after you spend over a year writing a book, when you finally get a copy of it...

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Just got this yesterday. This is a real copy of the book, 'The War on Reality: Recovering Truth in a World that Celebrates Lies.' When you first get it, you go, finally, it's done. I kind of forgot what I wrote because it takes so long to write a book. But the first chapter is 'Murder on Campus' and it tells everything that I experienced that day and even prior to that day with Charlie, including the meeting with the folks from Israel.

It also deals with some of these conspiracy issues, and the memorial service, and what was really concerning Charlie the last few days of his life here on earth. We know where he is now. He's absent from the body, present with the Lord.

So he's still alive, he's just not with us. And then we cover a whole number of other topics about reality because there's a war on reality, ladies and gentlemen. Charlie was sort of a physical casualty of the war on reality, it appears anyway, and the pretrial hearing's coming up.

In fact, as this thing is being released, the pretrial hearing's going on and we're going to see more evidence, I think that Charlie was a victim of people that were warring against reality. People that thought, transgenderism was right, good, and normal and anybody that speaks against it is some kind of fascist and needs to die.

We're going to see this come out in the trial. Anyway, this book's now available in pre-order and just so you know, it really helps a book for other people to see it if it's pre-ordered on Amazon in particular because then Amazon orders more copies and they promote more of the book, so more people see it.

So if you're open to getting this book, I hope you are. It's got great stuff in it because it's not just me. Phoenix Hayes, who's very witty by the way. She has worked with Cross Examined for a long time. Now she's out on her own, but her and I got together to write this book.

She's very witty. This book not only covers serious issues, but it also does so in kind of a fun, may I say slightly snarky way, because we cover some heavy issues and it's hard to get through them sometimes without going, oh, this is awful.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

So we tried to make it at least an enjoyable read and I think it is. So check out The War on Reality, pre-order it if you would. Also, you know, we're just coming off our 250th anniversary as a country. Was America really founded on Christian values?

What about the separation of church and state and so many other objections you see? Well, we actually created a two page or three page handout that answers a lot of that. It's very colorful. If you go to our website, get the America 250 guide for free. In fact, we'll put the link to it in the show notes.

But if you just go to crossexamined.org on the homepage, it should come up and you just put your email address in there. We don't give your email address to anyone. And we email you the 250 guide. And you're going to want to have it because it'll help you interact with people on the fact that so many people say, oh, we weren't founded on Christian values.

They were all deists and all this nonsense. This little handout will help you. Also want to mention PastorsBrief.com. Go to PastorsBrief.com if you're a pastor or just a leader in ministry, or you're the leader of a small group, or you're the leader of a Sunday school, or just a Christian business leader, that kind of person.

Because we've noticed that Christians are having difficulty answering some difficult cultural issues. And this Pastor's Brief, we're going to do the work for you. We're going to give you sort of a brief on some of these difficult issues such as immigration, Islam, Israel, and several others.

And then we're going to have time for Q & A. It's not just me, it's Lucas Miles of TPUSA. It's Jason Jimenez of Stand Strong. We're coming together and we're going to try and help pastors and other Christian leaders.

But this is by invitation only. You've got to give us your email address. Again, we do not give your email address to anyone else. We will email you the details. It's coming up in August if you want to be a part of this live zoom where we're going to interact on these issues and you can get some handouts that can help you talk about these issues, then go to pastorsbrief.com and sign up.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

Also, finally, The Bible You Never Knew is about to start. The course, 13 weeks. You've seen some of the videos on YouTube when we first recorded these sessions. The Bible You Never Knew points out how there are so many aspects of the Old Testament, so many characters, so many events, so many patterns, so many prophecies that point forward to Jesus, and they point forward to Jesus in ways that once you see them, you can't unsee them.

And that's why Jesus said, look, the entire Old Testament is about me, so it's all pointing forward to me. And that's what The Bible You Never Knew is all about. The course starts in August. And if you want to be a part of it, I hope you do, go to crossexamined.org, click on online courses.

You will see it there. There are limited seats for the premium version. If you take the premium version, we are going to be live together on Zoom sessions for Q & A. So check all that out. All right, let's get back to the topic. As we were talking about, just before, let's see...

We were talking about the fact that a lot of what Candace has said about people that were closest to Charlie makes absolutely no sense from a motive perspective. First of all, there's no evidence and there's no... There's no motive and no evidence for a motive that any one of these people would be involved.

They would lose more than they would gain. The same is true, by the way, of the New Testament writers and apostles. They would have everything to lose by saying Jesus rose from the dead. Why? Because by saying Jesus rose from the dead, they got kicked out of the synagogue.

They were all Jews, by the way, the writers of the New Testament were all Jews. They got kicked out of the synagogue, and then they got beaten, tortured, and killed. Last time I checked, that was not a list of perks. The last thing they wanted to admit was a resurrection, but they admitted it anyway because it really happened.

The last thing any of the people closest to Charlie wanted him or wanted to happen to him was him suddenly vanishing, killed, just gone. Because that not only obviously personally was a loss, but professionally, it was a loss.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

There's no way of replacing Charlie. And yet, Candace and others are out there insinuating that the people who loved him the most, the people that were closest to him, the people that had everything to gain by continuing to support him, were somehow in on his murder, and there's no evidence for it.

So... Now what Candace does and other conspiracy theorists, they speculate. They speculate about our possibilities, but possibilities are not evidence. Candace has speculated that any one of a number of groups, people, or governments had something to do with Charlie's murder, either directly or indirectly.

I mean, she's had Israel, Egypt, France. She said, Erika TPUSA, Mikey, me, FBI, Kash Patel, Seth Dillon, Bill Ackman, Brian Harpole. All these people somehow had something to do with it or at least are lying about it.

Now, Candace can put forth name after name, without evidence. Notice one name she's not putting forward, Tyler Robinson, to whom the evidence is actually pointing. Now, for some reason, Candace knows it can't be some radicalized person on the left in a trans relationship getting violent.

Because you know, that's never happened before. No, never happened before. In fact, the question Charlie was being asked when he was murdered was a question about taking weapons from trans people. Because per capita, people who identify as trans have a higher rate of violence using guns than other people.

And so that was the question being asked. That's ironic that he was being asked that question when he was shot by someone allegedly in or an alleged shooter in a trans relationship. You can't make this up, ladies and gentlemen.

Yet Candace seems to suggest that, oh, no, we got to look elsewhere. It can't be him. You guys, I'm sure, have heard of Occam's Razor. William of Occam. Occam's Razor says you don't multiply causes beyond necessity. I mean, when people investigate crimes, they usually try and

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

investigate a crime and come to an at least a theory of who committed the crime by making the fewest number of assumptions given the evidence.

I mean, what's probably the right answer as to who murdered Charlie Kirk, given the evidence that we have now? That a radicalized leftist in a trans relationship decided to murder a prominent and effective Christian who was against the transing of children and was also falsely tarred as a fascist?

And apparently, that's who Tyler Robinson, given the evidence we have now, thought Charlie was a fascist. And what are you supposed to do to fascists? Oh, they deserve to be killed, right? At least that's what he thought. Is that the most likely cause of this murder?

The most likely explanation? Or is it that all the evidence implicating the shooter was staged by a vast conspiracy of sinister forces, disparate forces, that normally don't work together, that somehow got the shooter, his lover, his parents, the police, the forensic investigators, the judge, several foreign governments, and all the people who love Charlie the most to conspire together to murder him.

Is that the most likely scenario? I mean, you can investigate that, you can suggest that, but to say that that's more likely when you don't have any evidence is just foolish. Now, as I say, the trial hasn't even happened yet.

We're going to see what happens when the trial comes. But I remember Chuck Smith saying this many years ago. Chuck Smith, a pastor out in California, talking about doubts about the Christian faith. Are you really sure it's true?

And he said this. Don't let what you don't know cause you to doubt what you do know. Don't let what you don't know cause you to doubt what you do know. What do you mean by that? Sure people have doubts, nobody has all the answers.

But don't let the doubts that you have about a particular aspect of Christianity cause you to doubt what you do know about other aspects of Christianity. Some people will say, well I can't believe in God because there's too much evil in the world.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

We've talked about that a lot on this program. But that doesn't disprove Christianity. In fact, Christianity is the answer to the problem of evil. If there was no evil, there would be no reason for Jesus to come. He came to solve the problem of evil.

And evil wouldn't exist unless good existed. And good wouldn't exist unless God existed. So just because I can't explain every or why every evil thing occurs doesn't mean there's no God. Because I do know that the universe had a beginning.

I do know that it's fine tuned. I do know that there's a moral law written on our hearts that only can come from a moral law giver. I do know that life requires some kind of intelligence because not only the code in life requires a coder, but the little machines in life require some sort of engineer, some sort of designer.

I do know the laws of logic are best explained by a mind, as are the laws of mathematics. And the fact that the universe is mathematically describable points to a being like God. I do know there's really good evidence that Jesus died and rose from the dead.

And the people who were closest to him never would have invented this because by inventing it they got themselves beaten, and tortured, and killed for no reason. That these were Jews who never would have invented a Messiah who claimed to be God and rose from the dead after he was crucified on a Roman cross.

They never would have invented this. I do know all these things. So even if there are things I don't know, that shouldn't cause me to doubt the things I do know, the same thing appears to me is true in this case. You do know that there's evidence that Tyler Robinson shot Charlie?

We have evidence from video, we have evidence from ballistics, we have evidence from his own testimony from his parents, telling him to turn himself in. I mean, do you think if Tyler Robinson had nothing to do with the murder or isn't involved at all, that his parents wouldn't be screaming right now?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

"You've got the wrong guy!" Would they have turned him in to begin with? Would he be screaming right now? Would the judge keep him in jail right now if there was no evidence that he was the killer, if all this evidence didn't exist? With the ballistics report... Oh, the ballistics report was inconclusive. The ballistics report just said we couldn't definitively say it was that gun.

They didn't rule out that gun. They know it was a 30 06. They just couldn't rule it. They couldn't say it was that particular gun because apparently the round was too destroyed. And that's not uncommon, by the way. And we're going to find more out as the hearing...

I don't know how much we'll find out in the pretrial hearing. But the trial itself is not until probably February. Yeah. Talk about swift justice. It's not happening. So don't let what you don't know cause you to doubt what you do know.

If you think this grand conspiracy is more likely than Tyler Robinson, disgruntled as a radicalized leftist, decided to take a shot at Charlie, if you think the conspiracy is more likely, I just don't think you're thinking properly.

You don't have any evidence for that. Is it possible? Anything's possible. It's possible aliens killed Charlie. Possible. But what evidence do you have for it? A possibility is not evidence for that possibility. Just like I read earlier from the California instructions to juries, just because someone asks a question or insinuates something, that is not evidence.

You need evidence to support the answer to that question, or that insinuation, or that claim. I mean, the truth is that in Candace's approach, there's no presumption of innocence. There's no burden of proof. There's no proof beyond a reasonable doubt. It's just speculation.

And she's making connections that aren't there. Manipulating her audience into thinking she's getting really close to solving the case. In fact, she's been doing this since September, all the way through June. She's been getting, she's been getting really close to solving the case. She's stringing you along, ladies and gentlemen. You're being manipulated. Check this out.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

CANDACE VIDEO:

Getting close to something. Keep going. And we are definitely getting closer to what took place on that day. And we are getting closer. I think we're close. We are definitely getting closer.

We're getting close. We're getting close. Very close. We're inching ever closer. We are now, I believe, extremely close to solving this thing. As I get inch closer and closer to discovering the truth, I've got a feeling about that. We're close. We're getting closer to something.

And that something is pretty big. I just sense that we're getting close. I sense that we are getting very close. And we are getting closer. Getting very close to something. We're getting closer because we are getting close. We are definitely getting closer.

Very close. We are very close. We are close. We are dangerously close to something. We are dead close to something. And I think every day we are inching closer. Who killed Charlie Kirk? You know we're getting close. We're inching ever closer. We are inching closer.

A little closer to solving the Charlie Kirk murder. And I'm getting very close. And we are getting very close. But I'm getting closer. I'm getting real close. My prayers are with you, Candace. You are close. We are close. And we're getting closer to the truth.

We get closer. We are getting close. We are getting very close. Attacks from every possible angle they can think of shows how close you are. But we're getting close to the truth. And we know we're getting close to the truth. Now I'm getting closer. We are getting close to truth. What are we getting close to?

That's my question. What are we getting close to? Candace, I feel you are so close to exposing it all. I think we are inching closer.

FRANK:

Getting closer. She's been getting closer to September. What have we learned from Candace? What evidence have we gotten from Candace about her conspiracy theories?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

No, you're being manipulated, ladies and gentlemen. You think you're getting inside knowledge and that you're smarter than everyone else, and you're just too smart and too insightful to fall for the evidence that the cops, and the judge have seen, including the text confession, what the parents of Tyler Robinson did and what the video shows.

There's something far more complicated and conspiratorial going on here. That's what... You're on the inside. You're too smart to fall for the obvious. Now, is it possible there's something conspiratorial going on?

Yeah, it's possible. That's what a trial's for. But no evidence has been presented for any such conspiracy. Only wild speculation and possibilities. And possibilities are not evidence. You know, Proverbs 18 says this.

The words of a gossip are like delicious morsels. They go down into the inner parts of the body, unquote. Isn't it great? Like you're getting inside information and you're in this parasocial relationship with Candace, and you guys are a team, and you're in this together, and you're going forward trying to find justice for Charlie Kirk, and nobody else is doing it.

Meanwhile, innocent people are being accused, including Charlie's widow, leading to death threats, ruined reputations, loss of jobs, loss of trust, an increase in conflict. Yeah, I'm not buying it, ladies and gentlemen. You're being manipulated.

Jeremy Boreing, who at one point hired Candace and later had to fire Candace, has talked a lot about this. I want to play a short video from Jeremy. Very bright man. He was the CEO for a while of, for many years, actually, of The Daily Wire with Ben Shapiro.

He's since gone out on his own and created a new podcast. I was privileged to be on his show about a month ago. Myself, Allie Beth Stuckey, and David Limbaugh. That video we'll put in the show notes as well. Fascinating conversation. He's very bright. Check out this video here from Jeremy.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

JEREMY VIDEO:

What Candace is doing is evil. It's not edgy. It's not provocative or contrarian. It's evil. It's the deliberate, sustained, monetized infliction of harm on a grieving widow for views, and money, and personal vendetta. The Apostle Paul in 2 Timothy warned us about people like Candace, calling them, quote, the kind who worm their way into households and captivate gullible women who are weighed down with sins and led astray by various passions, always learning, but never coming to a knowledge of the truth.

And even more pathetically, in our hyper feminized age, she's captivating gullible men, too. Now, I don't know Erika Kirk personally. Maybe she's a terrible person. I don't know. Maybe she's a wonderful person. Maybe she was a great wife. Maybe she was her own brand of toxic femininity. Honestly, it's none of my business and it's none of yours.

Yes, she is a public figure, and yes, as the CEO of TPUSA, she deserves scrutiny. But here's the thing. The people currently attacking Erika are not, by and large criticizing her in her capacity as CEO of TPUSA. They're criticizing her as a person. They're picking apart her facial expressions and old photographs, how much she cries or doesn't cry.

They're speculating about her childhood and her family. They're dissecting how much her dresses cost or who she poses for photos at public events with. It's disgusting, it's immoral, it's un-Christian, and it's wrong. If you're behaving this way as a woman, you are giving in to the worst impulses of your sex. And if you're behaving this way as a man, well, you aren't succumbing to toxic masculinity. You're being a B****.

FRANK:

Jeremy Boreing, ladies and gentlemen. Notice how he quoted the scripture. Always learning but never coming to a knowledge of the truth. We're getting closer, ladies and gentlemen. We're getting closer. We're always learning but never coming to the knowledge of the truth.

Ladies and gentlemen, Jesus and the apostles called Satan a murderer, liar, accuser and slanderer who seeks to steal, kill, and destroy. I want you to notice something. That after the murder on 9/10, we had a wonderful memorial service for Charlie, where more people saw the gospel than at any time in history.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

But since then, what have we had? We've had lies, accusations, and slander, seeking to steal, kill, and destroy. And people out there don't believe in the demonic. How could it be more obvious? This is spiritual warfare.

This is demonic. Jeremy's right. What she's doing is evil. She's dragging a widow through the mud. Rather than supporting a widow and trying to comfort a widow, she's accusing and slandering a widow and the people that love Charlie the most, without evidence.

She's lying. She's accusing, and she's slandering, and she wants to destroy. She wants to destroy TPUSA, that's what I think her goal is. Now, maybe I'm wrong about that, but she sure seems to be by doing what she's doing, trying to drag the reputation, the legacy of TPUSA down.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'd rather let the guilty go free than to punish the innocent. In fact, it's morally better to suffer evil than to do it. Whether it's intentional or not, Candace is punishing the innocent while simultaneously making it more difficult to punish the guilty.

The best and overwhelming evidence at this point is that Tyler Robinson is guilty. Was he acting alone? Maybe not. Maybe he was. Seems like he was, but maybe not. We'll find that out in the trial. And of course, he's presumed innocent until proven guilty.

But it's difficult to get an unbiased jury when you're doing what Candace is doing when you are confusing so many people, manipulating so many people, always learning but never coming to a knowledge of the truth. Throwing lies, slander and accusations around without evidence and claiming people are involved, who had every motive to not be involved.

Every motive to keep Charlie alive because they love Charlie and Charlie actually helped them do what they wanted to do with their lives. So as I'm recording this, it's July 3rd, so by the time this airs, the pretrial hearing will be underway. So keep in mind there may be new evidence coming to light that I don't know about as I'm recording this. And we will deal with that after the hearing.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

We'll address it later. But I want to end on something that Seth Dillon, my friend Seth Dillon said. Seth Dillon, as you know, the CEO of The Babylon Bee had a speech at the ARK conference in London a week or so ago. I think that's Jordan Peterson's conference.

Tragically Jordan couldn't be there. He's still sick. But apparently it was a great conference. And we'll put his speech in the show notes. But he was pointing out how free speech alone won't save us from tyranny and error. We need people who will exercise their free speech by telling the truth, not use their free speech to kill and destroy.

And that's what evil is, ladies and gentlemen. Not used by way, their free speech, just for clicks, just for sensationalism, to throw lies, accusations, and slander around. But free speech to build people up. Creation is building something up, creating something good.

Evil is tearing something down. It's hard to build up, it's easy to tear down. Evil is anti-creation. And much of what I see out of Candace Owens and other conspiracy theorists is tearing people down who don't deserve to be torn down.

They deserve to be ministered to. They deserve the benefit of any doubt. They deserve our love, and our care, and our concern. They don't deserve to be slandered. They don't deserve to be accused of things that there's no evidence for, and there's no motive, no reason they would ever want to be involved in such a thing.

Yet tragically, that's what Candace is doing. Now, as I said on a recent program, I pray for Candace. I have nothing personally against Candace. I wish her success doing the good, and the right, and the true. But I will oppose her if she continues to tear people down unjustly.

And we all should, we should call out evil being behavior when we see it. So thank you for listening to this. I don't expect it to change anyone's mind who's following a personality rather than truth, but I hope it was helpful. Lord willing, we'll see you here next time. God bless.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**

