

What Were Pastors Doing While Charlie Kirk Did Their Job? with @jeremyboreing

September 22, 2026

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, what were pastors doing while Charlie Kirk did their job? What? Yeah, we're going to unpack that today with my guest Jeremy Boreing, who did a fabulous monologue, 37 minutes on that very topic. We're also going to address some other issues with Jeremy, who's a great cultural commentator. For those of you that don't know, we had a podcast last week.

Where we talked about his new series, the Pendragon series, that is now on Amazon Prime. It's either one or two, or it's in the top five of shows on Amazon as we speak, because it's a fabulous fantasy series with a Christian worldview running under it, and just about anybody over 13 can watch this and get not just a lot of entertainment out of it, but some great insights from the Christian worldview.

It's very well done. It is Hollywood quality. Only thing without the woke, ladies and gentlemen. So you're going to enjoy that series. But it's great having Jeremy back, of course. He brought his crowd again. Here he is, ladies and gentlemen. The great Jeremy Boreing. By the way, Jeremy, I want to warn you. If you say anything that is incorrect, you might hear this on the program. Okay.

And at the end of all this, if I find this entire discussion boring, you're going to hear this. All right, not Jeremy boring, but Boreing. Okay, but it's not going to be boring because you're Jeremy Boreing. All right, Jeremy, let's go to this talk that you gave a few weeks ago that I sent to several people. I said, wow, he really nailed this. This idea that Charlie Kirk was doing the job of many pastors. Not to broad brush. There are several good pastors out there who are engaged culturally and engaged in every area of life. First of all, why did you feel you needed to do this, and what is the essence of the message?

JEREMY:

Yes, well, I was asked by TPUSA Faith to come and speak to a conference in which they had 600 pastors together in Santa Barbara, and Lucas Miles, who runs that organization and has become a friend this year, you know, I asked him, "What would you like me to speak about?" And he



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

said, "You know, just you know, whatever you, whatever's on your heart, whatever you feel." I thought, well, the opportunity to speak to 600 pastors shouldn't be taken lightly.

I mean, that's an important, that's an important undertaking. And so I gave a lot of thought with my team to what we would say. And I have an old party trick which has helped me to make friends throughout my life, which is always tell people the thing they don't want to hear. So I thought I thought well you know, I'll tell you what's really on my mind and what's really on my mind is this sort of, absence of Christian leadership from the pulpit in this country around the major cultural issues of our time.

To your point, obviously this doesn't apply to everyone, but I think that it's a general feeling that I have about what's happening broadly speaking within evangelicalism, over the last 20 years in particular. And I think that it's premised on a natural reaction to the seeker-sensitive movement, which as I've said before, I believe was a well-intentioned movement, but a deeply flawed one.

And you know the data is in. The church is smaller today than it was at the beginning of the seeker-sensitive movement. So the seeker-sensitive movement is a failure based on its own sort of fundamental criteria, which is that we're going to grow the church by reaching out to unbelievers. And you know when you think about it, there's a real sort of tail-wags-the-dog kind of component to that. If you program your church for the unchurched, then the unchurched determine what the church is.

That's a fundamental mistake in the philosophy of the seeker-sensitive Christian movement, and even churches that don't identify as being so quote unquote seeker-sensitive have been impacted by the seeker-sensitive movement because it's become the dominant sort of philosophical movement within Christianity in my lifetime. It started in the early to mid-70s, and it's run through today.

It's also, I think, that this sort of apolitical church that we find ourselves in today, broadly speaking, in evangelicalism, is also a reaction to, you know, some of the failures of the moral majority. You know, our fathers in the faith formed the moral majority to fundamentally, I think it was about Roe v. Wade. I think fundamentally, it organized around the horror that is abortion in the country, and they had a lot of political success in the 80s and in the 90s.

But over time, it began to feel hectoring and moralizing. You know, some of the sins of its loudest proponents came to light, which is always something that's going to happen in any Christian movement. God only uses broken vessels because those are the only vessels available

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

to him, but if your organization is called the moral majority and you find immoral behavior in it, that's obviously going to give it a black eye. And so I think that between those two things and then in 2016 the ascension of President Trump, which at least superficially made evangelicalism look hypocritical, you know, during the 90s, evangelicalism had taken the position that character is destiny when a Democrat president engaged in infidelity.

And then fast forward to 2016 and evangelicalism is lining up behind a thrice married playboy billionaire. I think that there are good arguments for why it was correct for the evangelical movement to line up behind President Trump. But I think by and large that argument wasn't made successfully. And so we left people to fill the vacuum. You know that's always what happens if you don't provide good arguments for why, then your enemies supply the argument for why, and it will always be the incorrect argument and the least charitable argument for why.

I think that's very broadly true in public life. So for all of those reasons, the church has become increasingly apolitical. Except that apolitical in our times isn't actually apolitical at all. The church sees itself as apolitical, but it quite often is very political when the politics that it can embrace are the politics of the age, so you have a lot of churches that posted black squares during BLM.

BLM is burning American cities to the ground, and a lot of pastors are talking about the horrors of historic racial inequity. Well, that is a decidedly political position in that moment to take. It just doesn't feel political because it comports to the sort of politics of the spirit of the age. And so for all of those reasons, I feel like the most important cultural issues the church has largely been silent on.

And who wasn't silent during that time on those issues? Charlie Kirk. Who was going out into hostile territory and proclaiming the truth of Christian ethics and the gospel itself? Charlie Kirk. He was doing that in a country with a church on every corner, and so it raises the question: What were all the pastors in those churches doing while Charlie was walking onto college campuses and inviting those conversations and proclaiming the truth that those pastors, you know, won't even proclaim in the safety of the four walls of their church?

You know, Christianity has been a dominant philosophical mechanism for shaping politics in this country since before the founding era. It's always been the case that Christians in this country have viewed politics as rightly within their domain, but in my lifetime, increasingly, I've heard pastors say some version of, you know, that is the secular domain, that's a worldly domain, God appoints governments, and so we shouldn't engage in that at all.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

And I only say to that, well, if you believe that God appoints government for the punishment of wrongdoers, which is what the apostle says, then how do you abdicate that responsibility in a country where the people form the government. Did God appoint the government in this country or didn't He? If you believe that God appointed dictators, and you believe that He appointed emperors, and you believe that He appointed kings, you must also believe that in this country He appointed the people.

And therefore, for Christians to sit out the messy work of government is to abdicate the responsibility that God Himself has given us.

FRANK:

Yeah, it makes us two-thirds of a Christian. We may be concerned about the family, we may be concerned about the church, but we're not concerned with the government. And as I mentioned on your show, Jeremy, the three issues Charlie talked about two nights before he was murdered, as we went on this walk through Scottsdale, were basically the government, the family, and the church.

Yeah, those were the big three he was concerned about. He was such a big picture thinker, and he was, I call him the greatest man I've ever known because he was somebody I'd been looking for 30 years. Someone who was engaged politically, but wouldn't compromise on the gospel even before the highest political office in the land.

It was all about Jesus. I mean, people would come to him and say, "Hey, Charlie, we love all this conservative politics you're doing, but can you kind of tone down the Jesus stuff?" And he would say, "Nope, without Jesus, we've got nothing. Give your money to somebody else."

JEREMY:

Yes.

FRANK:

And so, Charlie would always say, you know, politics is not our first responsibility, but it helps us achieve our first responsibility.

That's true, because if you don't have political freedom, you can't do the kind of things that we can do freely in this country, at least right now to this point. But that might go away. I want to go back to something you said earlier, Jeremy. You said, rightfully so, that in the 90s, a lot of evangelicals, myself and others, said, "Hey, character matters, right?" And I still believe that. But

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

then you also said there are arguments to support voting for someone like Trump, even though you still believe character matters. What would be some of those arguments you might make?

JEREMY:

Well, I think that character matters, but character isn't the only thing that matters. And I also think that Donald Trump's character is easy to criticize. Donald Trump is larger than life. He puts his name, you know, in solid gold letters on the side of everything that he owns. He has Trump steaks. You know, he has Trump casinos. He has Trump hotels.

And you know he has a 767, a personal 767 that you know the interior designer of which probably also designed some of Saddam Hussein's palaces. You know, it's gaudy, it's gold, it's rich. He's the quintessential American rich guy in our popular culture for the last 50 years. And so all of Donald Trump's mistakes are made loudly.

And you know, everyone makes a lot of mistakes in life, and most of us endeavor to keep our mistakes very private. We try to make our mistakes the quiet part of our lives and our and our victories the loud part of our lives. Donald Trump doesn't. He's just lived every part of his life at the same volume. But there is a lot that forms character, and you know a lot of the people whom Donald Trump has run against in his political career have also been people of poor character.

They just haven't been as boorish or as boldly; their mistakes haven't been made as boldly as Donald Trump. So I think that even on the question of character, we're sometimes unfair to Donald Trump. But I'll also say that when you elect a president, you aren't just electing the president. You're electing thousands of bureaucrats who are going to form the federal government, and you don't have the opportunity to weigh the character of each one of those people.

And so, what you have to weigh is the practical views, the ideological views, and yes, the character of the person who is going to appoint them or appoint the people who appoint them. In the case of Donald Trump, the main recommendation for voting for Donald Trump, the number one recommendation for voting for Donald Trump is not voting for the thousands of bureaucrats who would be appointed by Hillary Clinton or Joe Biden or Kamala Harris.

Interestingly, we got to see this manifest. I didn't support Donald Trump in 2016. I had concerns about what a Trump presidency could represent. Some of those concerns were proven correct.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

There was a coarsening of our public discourse. There was a hollowing out of what I think is some of the important and structural ideological beliefs of the Republican Party.

There has been a lack of moral and Ideological leadership for now a decade within the Republican Party that I think has cost us and will cost us. Some of the concerns though that I had about Donald Trump were proven false. I thought that Donald Trump was likely to govern very much to the left. He certainly didn't govern to the left. You know, I hosted the president two weeks after he announced for the presidency back in 2015, and he stood on a stage at an organization I was hosting, and said that if he were elected, he would appoint his sister, who was a left-wing Democrat, to the Supreme Court, and that he would give us quote single-payer European-style health care.

So, I wasn't concerned that he would govern to the left for no reason. He was saying that he might govern very much to the left. He didn't, and I'm very glad that he didn't. I think there's a lot of interesting reasons that he didn't. I was also concerned that he might directly empower a lot of the sort of openly anti-Semitic voices who were championing him in 2016, and I will say that one of the downsides of the Trump presidency is that those voices have gotten louder.

But what's not been true is that Donald Trump is one of them. Donald Trump is nothing like one of them. Donald Trump is, Donald Trump is far better than a lot of Donald Trump's most vocal supporters have been. Have been proven to be. And so I say all of that only to say I had deep concerns about ascending Donald Trump to the presidency. Some of those concerns bore out. Some of the worst of those concerns I was just completely wrong about.

And so then I had another opportunity to ask myself the question. Now, based on an actual governing record, would I vote for him in 2020 against Joe Biden? And of course I did. And then I got to make the decision again. Would I vote for him against Kamala Harris? And of course I did. Now, one of the amazing things is we now get to see in action what would have happened if we hadn't elected him in 2016? Because we didn't elect him, but well, because he didn't ascend the presidency again in 2020, and we got four years of what the Democrats wanted the country to look like.

And I think that is a very compelling argument for why evangelicals were correct to support Donald Trump. The Biden administration was detrimental to so much of the character of our country. They were detrimental to the country on the issue of abortion. They were detrimental to the country on the issue of transgenderism, transgenderism and the transing of children.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

They were detrimental economically. And it's easy to say that that the economy isn't a moral or character determined issue. Nothing could be farther from the truth. You're talking about people's livelihoods and therefore their lives, the decisions that are available to them to make, whether or not they have to entrust the raising of their children to the state, or whether or not they'll have the resources to continue to engage in the lives of their children themselves.

Economics is deeply personal. It's deeply human. Policy is deeply human. You know the things that government puts forward deeply impact actual real individual human beings. How can we not engage in that? And so yeah, I think that those and others are good arguments for why evangelicals were correct to support Donald Trump, even though, of course, Donald Trump doesn't even purport to be a moral leader. He, I think, almost charmingly so, doesn't ask us to view him in that way.

FRANK:

Why do you think there's a rise of interest and even advocacy for socialism? Where is that coming from?

JEREMY:

Well, because socialism does a good job of presenting itself as being in the best interests of people and therefore being a fair and moral economic system.

The problem is that, like many things, socialism isn't what it appears to be. You know, socialism purports to concern itself with the have-nots. Well, that's not true. Socialism ends up protecting the haves, probably even more so than capitalism does. Socialism makes everyone poorer, and therefore it makes the poorest the poorer-ist.

Socialism purports to concern itself with justice, but it uses unjust means in order to bring about what it believes are just results. And, you know, theft is not a good way to bring about justice. Injustice is not a good way to bring about justice. But socialism has the benefit of sounding really good on paper in unjust systems.

And all systems made by man are to some varying degree unjust. You know, capitalism is the best system ever conceived of for governing the economic activities of man. But it's still a flawed system that exists in a fallen world, and there are people who are left behind by meritocracy. There are people in a society who don't have merit to bring to bear in the economy.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

You know, there are obvious examples. There are people who are physically incapable of doing work because of injury or because of disease or because of you know the unfortunate circumstances maybe genetically of that they've been born into. What is the answer for how a fundamentally capitalist system should deal with those people who've been left behind by meritocracy?

Well, what socialism and proponents of socialism do is they take those exceptional cases of people the meritocracy leaves behind, and they use them in order to condemn the entire system. And they say, "Well, in an ideal system, no one would ever be left behind." And there is something about that that's true and appealing, because we all long for in our hearts a system that leaves no one behind.

We all long for in our hearts a system that both rewards merit and therefore creates the incentives that bring about growth, and creativity, and creation and yet, does so at no one's expense, does so while caring for people who've been, you know, who who've been subject to those various things that we discussed, you know disease or incapacitation or genetic disability.

We're made to long for that world by God. You know what I say of socialism and most left-wing ideologies is that the left is endeavoring to bring about the promises that we have fulfilled in Christ, apart from Christ. We all long for a world in which no one is left behind. We long for a world in which there's neither male nor female, in which there's neither Jew nor Greek, in which there's neither slave nor free.

We have that world in Christ, but we don't have that world in this world. Socialism says we could have all of those good things that Christ offers right now without Him. So they're appealing to something very real that God Himself has placed in our hearts that we might long for, but they're trying to accomplish it by human means and therefore they're making a mockery of those desires of our hearts.

And I think that what we have in lowercase r republican government, what we have in lowercase c capitalist economic models, market-driven economic models, what we have is the most effective way of dealing with those deep longings of our heart for the largest number of people, but there is no perfect way of accomplishing those things on this side of Christ's return.

FRANK:

And many of those folks want the kingdom without the king.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

JEREMY:

Well, that's right.

FRANK:

I also think, too, that so many of the commands we see in Scripture, and this goes back to your larger point that many pastors are not teaching this. So many of the passages in Scripture that are meant for individuals or are meant for the church are somehow applied as responsibilities that governments have.

So, for example, take care of the poor. Yeah, we're supposed to take care of the poor, but the scriptures never say that's the government's responsibility. That's the church's responsibility. So, if you were a pastor now, Jeremy, because the title of your entire talk is, wait, these pastors, Charlie Kirk's really being more of a pastor than some of you are. What, how would you try and correct this, as a pastor?

How would you try and show people that what Charlie was doing, being a Christian 365. 24/7, 360 degrees in every area of life, applying the scriptures categorically in the right areas. How would you go about doing that? Yeah.

JEREMY:

Well, I would point you to three ideas. One of them, don't fall into the, I'll borrow some language from the left.

Don't fall into the privilege trap of believing that because persecution does in many instances, it is in many instances used by God, to redeem a people. Don't use that as a recommendation for persecution. Don't say, "Well, we don't have to engage in government, and if we lose this country and if we lose our freedoms, that's fine because I've traveled in persecuted countries and the church is thriving in those countries." Well, yeah, that's a recommendation of God.

It's not a recommendation of persecution. And I would say that to fall into the privilege trap of believing that the good blessings that God has given us are not, in fact, blessings, is sort of to spit in God's eye and call it somehow a righteous act. So don't fall into the privilege trap. We have been given something by God in this country that is beautiful, that should be defended, and we shouldn't long for.

You know, it's the same reason we watched The Walking Dead, right? There's a kind of boredom that we have in the West because we're so prosperous and we've been so secure for so long

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

that we all kind of look forward to the zombie apocalypse because then we get to figure out what we're really made of. And I think that pastors sometimes fall to this trap. They almost long for persecution in this country, so that they can see, you know, what the church might actually be made of.

But I mean, I think that is, that is a rejection of many of the great blessings that God has given us. So don't do that. Two, don't kid yourself about what is and what is not political. You know, most churches will occasionally still say that pornography is wrong. They'll occasionally still say that, you know men watching sports on Sundays instead of going to church is wrong.

But they'll almost never deal with the sins of the feminine. You know, one of the things that I think has occurred in the culture and in the church is that all masculine virtue has been redefined as sin, and all feminine sin has been redefined as virtue.

[FRANK]:

Unpack that further. What do you mean by that?

JEREMY:

Well, I mean that even the best things about men we're not allowed to have anymore. You know, the fact that men don't have multicolored highlighters, the fact that men don't make lists, the fact that men, you know, there's been these experiments done where if you put a group of people together and you seat them, man, woman, man, woman, man, woman, woman, in a big circle, the women over time start to lean in, and the men over time start to lean out and check the perimeter.

Like, there are these aspects of being a man that our society begins to define as being antisocial because they aren't feminine. Because they aren't based on emotion, because they aren't based on what obviously appears to be the communal good, but they are in fact the source of all communal good, because they're based on strength, they're based on individuality, they're based on the protection of everything that goes on inside of the circle.

You know, the fact that we medicate every little boy at every public school in America just for the crime of being little boys means that we've decided that the things that those boys are supposed to have cultivated in them, that make them strong men over time, we actually are saying that the strong male virtue isn't desirable if we have to go through the difficulties of little boys in order to get to them. But meanwhile, women are reading pornography at rates similar to the rates that men look at pornography on the internet.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

You know, dark fantasy, dark romance, exotic romance. These are some of the fastest growing genres in fiction. And whereas the average man doesn't have a playboy in his backpack sitting in your pew, you know, when the women's group gets together, those women have those romance novels in their handbag in the church. Do you ever hear a pastor talk about it? You know, if men drank whiskey at the same rate that women are using SSRI drugs, do you think pastors would probably talk about that as a problem within the church?

But they'll never talk about the things that women, the sins that women engage in. I'm not saying that women are worse than men, not by any means. I'm only saying that the times in which we live today refuse to look at feminine sin as anything other than virtuous, and they refuse to look at male virtue as anything other than sinful. And so that's a place where I think pastors are missing the reality of politics.

You know, a third of Gen Z little girls identify as LGBTQ.

[FRANK]:

A third.

JEREMY:

One-third, 33%. Do you ever hear pastors talk about this problem that is preying upon our daughters? You know, so I think that this is a place where politics is a much broader category of issues than America's pastors want to believe that it is.

And the third thing that I would say is you obviously have to invest in all of the places that government has tried to rob you of the traditional role of the church. You know, you bring up this great point that we've always seen historically care for the poor as being, well, as Christians, we believe in a thing called subsidiarity, right? We believe that the smallest unit of government is the first that should act.

We believe that the first governing institution that should come to bear in a crisis is the family. That's the smallest unit of government. The next unit that should come to bear is the community, the church, the town, the county, the state, the federal government. You make your way, you make your way up. The further you get up there, the more divorced the governing institution is from the actual individual who is actually undergoing the problem, and therefore, the more broad the brush with which the institution will have to address the problem, and therefore the less effective the intervention will be.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

You know, people who are living on the streets of Los Angeles and San Francisco have not been failed by government. They've been failed by their families. They've been failed by the church. They've been failed by their friends and their community, and on and on and on and on. It's been easy for the church, as the government, particularly during the second half of the 20th century, because of progressivism, the government has seized and infiltrated and taken unto itself all the responsibilities that used to belong to families, to husbands, probably that's the order, to husbands, and then to families, and then to churches, and then to communities, and then to towns, and then to counties, and then to states.

But it's been easy for the church and the family and the husband to cede that power because responsibility sucks. Responsibility's hard. And so, how do you wrest that power back from government? Well, you start meeting those needs once again, and meeting those needs takes money out of your own pocket, and it takes time out of your own calendar. It's not gratifying and glorifying, and it's not fancy.

It's the meat and potatoes work of being to your point a 360 degree Christian in a 360-degree church. So I think that that's three great areas where pastors could focus their efforts and they would see real returns.

FRANK:

Well said, and even in the Old Testament, ladies and gentlemen, the sort of welfare system was to leave the corners of the field for the poor.

But notice that was a command to individual Israelites. And secondly, it wasn't a complete handout. Why? Because the people, the poor, still needed to harvest those crops. They still needed to work in order to feed themselves, which brings them dignity.

JEREMY:

That's right. You know the Mormons, the Mormons are very good at this, which I also think is kind of a rebuke of evangelicalism in the country.

You know, if you go to a Mormon food bank, the Mormons have food banks, but if you go to a Mormon food bank as a Mormon who needs food. Do you need sustenance? You don't have money. They'll give you food if you work in the food bank. They still understand that dignity is an important part of the struggle of the person who has material need.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

And I actually think that smaller religious communities, obviously, LDS is much smaller than evangelicalism, Orthodox Judaism much smaller than evangelicalism in America. Well, throughout the world, of course. The Amish, much smaller than evangelicalism in this country, but they're still better at these things than we are, because the very nature of being in a more insular community is that you still have community identity.

You still believe, therefore, that some of those issues are your problems and not the government's problems. And we have to take that rebuke from those smaller religious communities as American evangelicals. We have to take the rebuke and remember that's how we're supposed to see ourselves as well, and those are our responsibilities as well for our people.

FRANK:

Paul talks about this in 1 Timothy, where he says, "If you don't take care of your own family, you're worse than an unbeliever." And Augustine picked up on this and came up with what is now called the order of loves.

That your first responsibility is to your family, then to your wider family, then your church community, then your local community, then your state or your nation, then the world. And J.D. Vance actually made this point in February of 2025 when he went over to Europe and tried to point out that if you have this unrestrained immigration of people that do not share your values and do not assimilate, you're actually not following Augustine's order of loves.

Your first responsibility is to your family, not to the immigrant who is from another country. And yet there are people here in our country and people over there who are saying. Well, we're supposed to welcome the immigrant, Jeremy. You're violating the scriptures if you don't welcome them—

JEREMY:

There's a mysterious—

FRANK:

Unpack that further for us, Jeremy. Go ahead.

JEREMY:

There's a mysterious passage in one of John's epistles in which he points out that it's easier to love your brother than to love God.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

And that seems untrue because, in my experience, the people we know are much harder to love than God, and so I spent a lot of time trying to understand how that passage could seem so untrue and yet be obviously true. It's included in the canon. What I've come to realize is that God is only easy to love because we sort of manufacture Him in our own image, and our brother is very difficult to love because it's impossible for us to manufacture him in our own image.

It's very easy to give money to a charity that supports the poor in Africa, because the little children in Africa aren't real people to you. They're an abstraction. You don't have to concern yourself with how they came to be poor, how they contributed to their own economic condition, what mistakes they've made in their lives, what their values are, what their behavior looks like.

You're just able to see these photographs of them with their distended tummies and flies buzzing around their face, and you're just able to reduce them to nothing but tragedy, to nothing but circumstances beyond their control. But of course, the poor in Africa, just like the poor here, are actually real people. Some of them are victims of circumstances far beyond their control. Of course, some of them have contributed to those circumstances.

Some of them make terrible decisions. Some of them, you know, I think people in the West may be surprised about this. Drugs are a huge problem in Africa. People chew khat all day long in Africa. There, we haven't, there have not been inculcated in many African countries things like the Protestant work ethic, a belief in personal agency. Your brother, when he's in need, you know what a lousy SOB he is.

You know that he squandered the money that your parents gave him last Christmas and that he spent it on worldly pleasure instead of spending it on trying to set himself up to have future success. You know that he had a perfectly good job and he quit it for no good reason, just because he didn't like the cut of his boss's jib or because his ego is too bruised by something that someone at work said. You know that he struggles with the bottle or that he smokes too much weed.

You know that he dropped out of college to chase a girl, got a girl, or whatever, or whatever, or whatever, or whatever. He's a very real human being to you. And so, if you think that it's easier to love the great mystery that is God, a God who perfectly balances in Himself and in His Son justice and mercy.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

A God who would send His own Son to hang and die on a tree for crimes that He did not commit. I mean, if you think a God who once wiped out every living person except for the family of Noah. Who wiped out all the animals on the planet except for those who are on a box built by Noah. If you think that God is actually easier to love than your brother, what you're actually saying is that you, you're actually acknowledging something.

You're the thing that's unlovable. Humans are the thing that's unlovable, and I think that for this reason it's easier to, it's easier to see yourself as loving and to put all actual responsibility for other humans on government, so that you can abstract your love, not only abstract it in that it isn't yours to give, but also abstract the recipients of it.

You don't have to know them. You don't have to see them. You don't have to judge them. The hardest thing possible is to love the person right, the person right in front of you. And yet even that is easier than loving God. You know why? Because God's the person who commands you to love that person right in front of you. That's part of what's so unlovable about God. God's the one who says, "If you have lust in your heart, you're an adulterer, and if you have hate in your heart, you're a murderer." I mean, God's a difficult guy.

That's why no one can draw near Him except through His Son. So yeah, I think that it's very easy for us to fashion God after our own image and therefore love Him, and it's very easy for us to fashion the poor after a sort of abstract image and then love them, but it's very hard to love the poor guy right in front of you. And yet I'm telling you that that's actually way easier, than loving God.

That's actually where we're supposed to, that that's actually where we get to find out if we love God or not, is whether or not we can actually love our brother with all of his faults and all of his flaws. It's also the only place we can do any good in the world, because the only place where we can actually meet an actual human at the point of their actual need, also aware of all of their circumstances, also aware of all of their capabilities, also aware of all of their potential, and speak into their actual lives.

But it's messy work. And we often fail. It's often very discouraging work. If you've ever tried to help someone, it's so difficult because you find that most of what you're trying to rescue them from is themselves—

[FRANK]:

Their own habits.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

JEREMY:

And their own habits. And so it isn't work that is obviously rewarding. It's work that can leave you feeling beat up and often feeling despair. And yet it's the place where we're called to do that work.

FRANK:

Yeah, it's much more rewarding to say I sent a check over to Africa. I don't see what happened to that money, but I feel good about it—

JEREMY:

That's exactly right.

FRANK:

Then trying to help somebody right in front of you, who can be difficult to love, and you know that many of their choices have gotten them in that position, but you're the person that could hold them accountable. The government's not going to hold them accountable, right?

JEREMY:

They can't.

FRANK:

And I want to ask you one other sort of phenomenon that's been going on lately, Jeremy. And I'm going to read a passage of scripture and then we can unpack it further. It's this idea that has become prevalent, much more so it seems in the past year, ever since Charlie's murder, that a people I'll just say it whether because I think it's true, not because I'm being misogynistic, but it seems like more women are siding with the criminal than the victim, and this phenomenon appears to be growing.

And I want to get your insight on it, but I want to read something that Paul wrote in his last letter, 2 Timothy chapter 3. And in my view, eschatologically, we've been in the last days since Paul, but we have noticed that some things never change, that people continue to be fallen. But here's what Paul says: 2 Timothy 3:1-7.

He says, "But mark this: there will be terrible times in the last days. People will be lovers of themselves, lovers of money, boastful, proud, abusive, disobedient to their parents, ungrateful, unholy, without love, unforgiving, slanderous, without self-control, brutal, not lovers of the good, treacherous, rash, conceited, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, having a form

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

of godliness but denying its power, have nothing to do with such people." And then he says this, and here's the part that a lot of people are going to have trouble with.

I'm not going to apologize for the Bible. This is what the Bible says: "They are the kind who worm their way into homes and gain control over gullible women. Who are loaded down with sins and are swayed by all kinds of evil desires, always learning, but never able to come to a knowledge of the truth." Unquote.

Now, if I'm reading this properly and applying it to the current day, it seems to me this kind of idea, people who worm their way into homes, right now they wormed their way into homes over social media.

JEREMY:

Yeah, that's right.

FRANK:

And they're weighing down or gaining control over gullible women who may be loaded down with their own sins.

Let's take the Clancy situation for a second. Josh Howerton pointed this out. I think he's right. That at least probably a third of those people on that jury were people who had abortions, women who had abortions. They're loaded down with those sins. How could they convict a woman of strangling her own children because of extenuating circumstances, when they had extenuating circumstances that led them to justify the killing of their own children?

And then maybe this idea, with all these conspiracies theories going around that are implicating Erika, a widow of all people, they're always learning these people. But they're never coming to a knowledge of the truth. Comment on that, if you would.

JEREMY:

Well, first of all, I call this phenomenon that we're witnessing right now true crime Gnosticism.

And it's this idea that a particular cohort of people, primarily women, have the secret knowledge that they're the only ones who really see what's going on. They're the only ones who understand the situation. You know, Candace Owens continues to say this really amazing thing, where you know, I've heard her say it a few times. She'll say, you know, "I thought after Charlie's murder, I thought maybe Erika and I were going to come together, and I thought maybe we

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

were going to, that the FBI was going to come alongside me and help me investigate Charlie's murder." You think, what a remarkable statement.

You thought that the FBI's job was to help in your investigation? No, the FBI is the investigation. The police are the investigation. You are a podcast host engaged in creating entertainment. The idea that you are the central figure who really understands it, and the FBI is just like one more resources resource that should be supporting you in your search for the truth, you're the one who sees it.

That is fundamentally secret knowledge, Gnosticism. And I think true crime has inculcated in a generation of women a Gnostic belief that they are that group, that they are the ones who see the truth plainly. And I think that people like Candace are exploiting that in them. Obviously there are men who fall prey to this too. I think it's a fundamentally feminine impulse, but the thing about feminine sin and masculine sin is that women possess feminine and masculine qualities and men possess feminine and masculine qualities.

You know the gender distinction helps us see things in starker relief. But the problem of man is a, the problem of humans is a human problem, right? There are no sins that are unique to one group of people or another. There's just sins that you can identify more readily in one group of people than another, And so yeah, I think that this Gnostic secret knowledge pride, I mean, the hubris of it, the arrogance of thinking the actual people investigating Charlie's murder can't see it, I can.

The actual police who investigate a murder can't see the truth, but I can. That that's an incredibly dangerous religious hubris that has been released in an entire generation, primarily of women in this country. And to your point about the Lindsey Clancy trial, you know, my only unpopular position on the Lindsey Clancy trial is that when you hear the women say of the holdout juror, you know, there's this famous clip that went around a few weeks ago of one of the women saying, "I think he just couldn't get past the fact that she violently strangled her children to death." And everyone—

FRANK:

He didn't get past it.

JEREMY:

Yeah, but she is actually saying something important that can get lost in the sort of sensationalism and narrative formation that goes around any of these sorts of public issues,

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

which is that the jury was not there to determine whether or not she had killed her children. You know, according to Massachusetts state law, that was not the fundamental question, and in many ways, Lindsay Clancy and her defense had acknowledged that she had done that act.

What they were there to determine was whether or not she was mentally responsible for the crime at the time that she committed it. And so we think that woman can't even hear herself, but she actually more rightly understands what their assignment was. Their assignment wasn't to determine whether or not she had killed her children. We know that she did. They knew that she did. The assignment was to determine whether or not she should be found criminally responsible.

I think they still made the wrong determination, even with that being the basis of it, so I only say that to say I think we have to be fair in how we frame, how we frame these conversations. It's very easy to paint with the wrong brush sometimes in our analysis of these situations. I think Howerton's point though is a good one, which is that to the extent that abortion is ubiquitous, listen, I don't God has a remarkable sense of irony.

It is not, it isn't lost on me at all that Massachusetts passed a state law permitting abortion literally to the moment of birth. And two weeks later, a jury in that same state determines that a woman who strangled her three children to death and admits to it shouldn't be found to have been responsible for the act itself. I mean, I just see that as like, you know, like God pointing a giant neon arrow at the problem of how Massachusetts has treated abortion and how it has treated the idea of a woman's responsibility to her offspring.

So I think Howerton's point in that regard is exactly right. Once you've accepted the fundamental reality that a woman's way of life being threatened is an act of violence against her, then you've determined that the life of the mother is always at stake in every abortion question. Because the life of the mother doesn't just mean the physical life of the mother; it means the way of life of the mother.

And every child changes the way of life of every mother. And once you've made that leap, even if you haven't made it consciously in your mind, once you've made that leap, then every living child is also committing an act of violence against the way of life of every mother. And I think that every woman has a kind of sympathy for that. Maybe it's not even sympathy; it's a kind of empathy for that because they do carry the downside of raising children [unintelligible] of raising children.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

The problem, as everyone from Gad Saad to Ali Beth Stuckey has pointed out, is that we've taken empathy, which should help us to do a better job of helping people who are being failed in those moments, people who are losing those spiritual and mental battles and bring resources to bear to help them, becomes perverted into something that excuses them, that says that the worst acts that they could commit aren't their responsibility.

And I think that that's where the real conversation here, in the Lindsey Clancy, in the Lindsey Clancy case in particular, should be taking place, which is, have we so perverted empathy, that we no longer want to help people who are being, who are rightly enduring the difficulties that sometimes accompany even joyous things like raising children.

They're, they're enduring the very real tragedy of life because life can be very tragic, and even good things can bring about very negative experiences. Instead of, Instead of feeling for them and wanting to help them, we now excuse their worst and most criminal behavior in a way, because we don't want to be held responsible for our own crimes and poor behaviors.

I think that that's the, I mean, I think that's the real failure that we see on display in Massachusetts around the Lindsey Clancy trial. We just don't want to be held responsible for any of our own behaviors anymore, because life is very hard, and the reality is, it's because life is very hard that we have to hold one another responsible for egregious behaviors.

FRANK:

I think part of this too comes from the idea that has permeated our culture ever since we associated a feeling with a behavior as if the feeling just justifies the behavior. So, for example, when someone has a certain sexual orientation, well, we say, "Well, they're born that way. They have to do that," as if there's some sort of justification for an attraction becoming an action.

And once you make that leap, then you can say, if somebody has some sort of feeling or some sort of difficulty not doing a particular action, that suddenly that is approved. That makes the action approved. So we've jumped from love means seeking what's best for another person based on the will of God to love means approval.

Whatever I need to do, and this goes back to your earlier point, Jeremy, I think that we want to, we want to have a God that approves of everything we want to do, not a God that is actually going to be concerned about our long-term well-being. Just approve of everything I want to do. I want to do this now, and my God, that I concoct in my mind, is going to allow me to do it because that's what love is and it goes back to the idea that we feminize, it seems, what is good

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

and right in a church to believe that being Christ-like means approving of everything and everyone. Any comment on that?

JEREMY:

I have deep, I have deep sympathy for Lindsay Clancy. I don't know that she was failed by the system. I know that what she has done is, yes, commit this horrible, horrible crime against her three beautiful and innocent children. Committed this horrible crime against her husband. Committed this horrible crime against society, but she has also committed the most unthinkable of crimes against herself.

When I try to imagine what it must be like to be Lindsey Clancy today, my heart breaks for her. I also think that they should take her behind the courthouse and hang her by the neck until she's dead. You know, I have sympathy for the reality of human beings in a fallen world, for the reality of the human condition, but that doesn't justify every behavior. And, you know, the truth is, the worst behaviors I feel the worst for.

You know, there's nothing more. Most sins I can relate to. I can relate to murder because I know what it is to have anger and hate. I can relate to adultery because I know what it is to have lust. I can relate to theft because I know what it's like to covet what isn't mine. There's, there's one thing that I think is not common to the human experience.

It's a perversion at such a level that most of us can't relate to it at all, and that's to be sexually attracted to prepubescent children. When you, when you see an interview with an actual pedophile. I don't mean someone, a coach who slept with a 15-year-old sexually mature girl in a high school, because we've used this word pedophile now, like we do so many words.

We've made it so broad that it no longer means what it actually means. But when you see an interview with an actual pedophile, you're looking at a person so fundamentally broken that you're, I don't know what to feel for them except deep grief. Also, we cannot allow them to live. Like, I'm sorry.

You, there are some things that we can't have around this neighborhood. There are some things that we can't have on this block called life. You can't be here anymore. I couldn't feel worse for you. Thank God in heaven that I don't know what it is to even be tempted toward this horrible thing that has overtaken your mind. I mean, I kind of want to just like let you go.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

You know, you're this is a classic example. We're going to throw open the gates of the prison and let you walk toward the rainbow and shoot you right in the back of the head because we cannot have it. The fact that I sympathize with you, that I grieve for you, that I lament the reality of the fallen world, does not mean that you are not responsible for your behaviors and does not mean that we as a civilization can tolerate those behaviors.

And so, to me, I don't see any tension between those two points. But there is probably a reason that the scripture does say, "Don't show pity to the murderer." I don't, I don't think that it means don't lament and grieve the human condition. It's speaking about exactly this phenomenon. It's saying, "Don't let your empathy preclude justice. Don't let your empathy preclude punishing the wrongdoer," which is the entire reason that government was appointed by God to exist in the first place.

FRANK:

Yeah, when you fail to punish the guilty, you wind up punishing the innocent.

JEREMY:

That's right.

FRANK:

Which is what we're seeing over and over again. From Candace Owens to the Clancy jury, they're punishing the innocent, and in many cases, trying to get the real criminal off the hook.

JEREMY:

That's right. And when you punish the innocent, you yourself are a criminal. You know, Candace Owens, yes, is punishing the innocent and is trying to get the guilty off the hook, but Candace is also guilty because that in itself is a crime. What Candace has done to Erika is a crime. It's a moral crime and it's a legal crime. It's defamation at the highest level.

What Candace has done to so many others is a moral crime and a legal crime. And what the jury did in the Lindsey Clancy trial may not be a legal crime because our legal system, particularly in Massachusetts, has become corrupted and confused, but it's still a moral crime. Not punishing Lindsey Clancy is punishing the rest of society by making the world a less just place.

FRANK:

You know my co-author on The War on Reality, Phoenix Hayes, brilliant lady said, you know, what we ought to start doing with these conspiracy theorists is just asking them to bring all

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

their evidence down to the DA. And say, "Why don't you go arrest Erika? Why don't you go arrest Mikey? Why don't you go arrest Frank? Why don't you go arrest whoever on this evidence and see what kind of response you get?"

JEREMY:

I will tell you one thing.

You know, when you were on my show a few weeks ago, you know, we had a great conversation, and I think my team put out a clip from the show, and the clip made the point that if what Candace was saying was true in any way or even plausible, then Tyler Robinson, the accused killer, his defense team would echo some of those arguments and yet they didn't.

And I actually think that's a trap. I think that Tyler Robinson's defense team very well may use some of Candace's argument when the actual trial gets here. And I don't want us to have set ourselves up for Candace to get to take that victory lap. You know, so far all that the Tyler Robinson defense team seems to be doing is trying to get the death penalty taken off the table.

Once you're at an actual trial where that isn't the goal, now the goal is to prevent a guilty verdict. Who knows what theories they may reach for to try to create reasonable doubt in the minds of a jury. And if they pick anything that Candace has even alluded to, Candace is going to take the victory lap of all victory laps.

So I just want to be very careful that we not, that we not, set ourselves up or set Candace up to get to take that victory lap. You know, I don't, I don't know what the defense department, what the defense team is going to do. I think this point is the better point. Why aren't you going to the prosecution and giving them your evidence if you think you're so right? And of course the answer there is because you're not right.

FRANK:

Because there isn't evidence. It's fine to ask questions, but accusations require evidence. And we don't see evidence. We see possibilities, but possibilities are not evidence.

JEREMY:

And all conspiracy theories throw out all of the actual evidence. You know, there's more evidence for what actually happened on 9/11 than for probably any similar act that's ever occurred in all of human history.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek PODCAST

What the conspiracy theorist does is they set all of that evidence aside and say, "Well, none of that counts. And here are the 10 mysterious questions that we need you to answer." And they start gish-galloping all these questions at you that have no answers because they, in many cases, aren't even real questions or answerable questions. But there is there is a lot of evidence about what happened to Charlie Kirk at UVU on September 10th of 2025.

Candace sets all of that evidence aside and presents instead all of her questions about the innocent.

FRANK:

Yeah, that's slanderous, tragically.

JEREMY:

That is slanderous,

FRANK:

And you've spoken quite eloquently about that, so thank you for doing that. So many people are, or seem to be reticent to point out the obvious.

JEREMY:

Well, Candace is very loud, very talented, has a very large following, and attacks ferociously. And I think a lot of people just don't want her coming after them. They've seen what it's like when she goes after you. They see what Erika's life is like right now, what your life or Mikey McCoy's life have been like, and they just don't want that burden.

FRANK:

Yeah, when my grandkids get death threats that's a problem.

Now some people may not know this, Jeremy, as we're coming to the end of the program here. You can speak with authority on Candace because you actually employed her for a while. Can you—

JEREMY:

I did.

FRANK:

Shed some light on that for us?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

JEREMY:

Yeah, you know, like. PragerU before me and like TPUSA before them, I saw in Candace enormous talent.

She has the most star power of anyone I've ever personally interacted with and I functioned in Hollywood for a long time. She's very bright, very capable. And I believed at the Daily Wire that, you know, I knew I had some misgivings about her, but I believed that we could keep her on the right path and help harness her great talents for good. I used to say of Candace to my team, she's like, she's like nuclear fission.

Properly harnessed, she can power a city. But if you get a runaway reaction, she'll level the city. Now, never in a million years did I see all of this. I didn't see the anti-Semitism. I didn't see the willingness to defame good people, to promulgate total falsehoods. What I saw was just that, you know, she had a real desire for wealth and fame, that those that those were her animating desires.

But you know it's an industry of people who desire wealth and fame. I mean that's that is part of what it means to function in media is to have something of that desire. So, I had misgivings about it but didn't understand the extent to which it would become all consuming and defining for Candace. I wish I had seen it sooner. I, you know, people tried to point it out to me, and I defended her.

I defended all of my talent. I saw it as part of my job was to defend my talent, who often came under very unfair attacks, as everyone in public life does. So I always endeavored to be a bulldog on behalf of my talent. And in the case of Candace, I think in most instances, that was the correct posture for me to take. I think in my relationship with Candace, it blinded me for too long from taking the appropriate actions that I ultimately did take when I fired her.

But you know my interactions with Candace were not all unpleasant. She can be incredibly charming, incredibly winsome. She's got an electric personality. Part of the tragedy of watching the great evil that Candace is doing in the world is knowing what great good she is capable of. It is.

Yeah, we've all talked about it. All of us who have employed her in conservative media have talked privately to one another about it that she really is that good. That talented. Yes, she really is that talented if only she were good. That's a good way of saying it.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

FRANK:

Last thing, Jeremy, you transitioned. You were with Daily Wire for 10 years at least. And now during that time at Daily Wire, you were doing the Pendragon series, which by the way, ladies and gentlemen, if you're just tuning in, is one of the top shows, if not the top show on Amazon right now. Amazon Prime, you should check it out.

Seven episodes in season one. Here's one problem, Jeremy. Before I get to my last question is, well, this would be another question. It's so successful they're going to want season two. So, you ready for that?

JEREMY:

Well, the show belongs to Daily Wire. You know, the nature of the kind of divorce that I went through with the Daily Wire, which you know, I co-founded and—

FRANK:

Built.

JEREMY:

The first step, the first episodes were shot in my house and yeah, of the Ben Shapiro show and the Andrew Klavan show and many of my personal friends were among the first employees, and I led the company for a decade. But when you go through, when you go through a divorce, you know, the custody arrangements aren't always the ones that you would prefer, and the Daily Wire retains *The Pendragon Cycle*. You know, they retain a lot of great content.

They continue to produce a lot of great content. And my friend Dallas Sonnier is still there. Their show *Run, Hide, Fight: Infidels* comes out, I think this week. They still produce so many great shows, including the Ben Shapiro show and the Matt Walsh show, Michael Knowles, Andrew Klavan. They still produce great journalism, but some of my personal projects that I, that I sort of created out of my own mind, still are there, including *The Pendragon Cycle*.

And so a second season would be challenging, because we'd have to figure out between us, how we would work together to effectuate that. I don't think that *The Pendragon Cycle* is part of Daily Wire's forward-looking strategy. I think it was somewhat orphaned when I left because it was so mine. I think that they struggled to know what to do with it and how to release it after I left, not from any sort of malice.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

I think that there were still people there who loved the show and believed in the show, but what do you do with it after that kind of a, how do you take Jeremy's, you know, vision and continue to advance it in a post-Jeremy world when the company necessarily is pursuing a new vision and trying to demonstrate actively that Jeremy isn't, you know, the driving leader of the company anymore.

So I think this show was orphaned in that environment, which is why it's so gratifying to see it finding success on Prime Video around the world, to see an audience being able to find it, including a lot of people who I believe would have watched it at Daily Wire, but under different circumstances, but under the circumstances that actually played out, that that just stopped being really plausible.

So I think probably even for a lot of the guys at Daily Wire, this has been a really gratifying experience to see an audience find the show. For a second season, could it happen? Yes. Do I hope that it happens? Yes. Have I made overtures to the Daily Wire for ways of doing it? Yes. I offered to acquire the rights from them. And you know, those are very complicated kinds of conversations that have to take place.

Is that the only way it could happen? No, there may be other ways that a second season could happen too. Do I think we deserve a second season? Man, I think this cast deserves a second season. I think Tom Sharp, who plays Merlin, is Merlin for this generation. I think no one has ever been better in the role. I think we still have Arthur's story left to tell. I think the writing and the writing team would love to come back.

Ryan Whittaker and Rose Reed in particular who also produced and directed on the show would love to come back. So I'm very hopeful that we'll find a way forward. It isn't obvious to me today what that's going to look like, but the success of the show on Prime Video doesn't make it less likely. It makes it much more likely. So I'm very grateful to the audience for investing in season one of the show, for finding it, for watching it, and for helping it to achieve this amazing success.

[FRANK]:

So, if people do want to see season two, how do they make their voices known?

JEREMY:

You know, I'm seeing so many people reach out on social media and ask us for a second season, and I think that that's terrific. Someone created a petition. It's not me, but that makes it even more fun to have seen it out there. So I would encourage that. And the best thing that you can

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

do to see a second season of the show is to support the show economically. It's not a want-to-want-to. It's not a show that you support, but don't enjoy. What I would say, though is that if you saw it and enjoyed it, there are some steps you could take to further support it.

[FRANK]:

How do you do that?

JEREMY:

One is go ahead and pay Prime that extra four bucks a month to take out the ads and make the first thing you watch, watching The Pendragon Cycle again because that tells Prime that there's economic upside in a second season of the show, or buy the show on Prime.

You don't have to just watch the free stream. You can pay 10 or 12 bucks and actually own it. And that's another way of showing there's actual economic value in a future season. Go over to Daily Wire. Even if you just watched it for free on Prime Video, go over to Daily Wire and get a subscription. You'll get a lot of other great content at Daily Wire too. But make sure the first thing you do is click on Pendragon so that they know that the reason you subscribed is because of this show.

And that indicates to Daily Wire that there's an appetite, an economic upside, and a potential second season. And continue sending us these great notes online because obviously we'll we'll aggregate all of those as we continue to have this conversation. And also they're just incredibly edifying and rewarding for all of us who bled to bring this show to the audience.

FRANK:

All right, last question for Jeremy ladies and gentlemen, I think you can see why I love Jeremy. He's so insightful and of course, he shares our worldview, but now the new endeavor, other than maybe season 2 is the Jeremy Boreing Show. By the way, ladies and gentlemen, B-O-R-E-I-N-G, you can find it on YouTube. We're going to link to it in the show notes. Tell us overall, what is the mission? What is the purpose? What are you trying to accomplish on the Jeremy Boreing Show?

JEREMY:

Well, my mission has not changed in these last 15 years, and my mission remains. I've said for my decade at Daily Wire that the mission was to fight the left and build the future. The conservatives too often criticize the culture and don't create the culture. I believe in human agency. I believe that it's for freedom that Christ has made us free. I believe that we've been

**CROSS
EXAMINED
.ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

given the opportunity to be forgiven for our failures, so that we can have the confidence to even try, to even try to live a virtuous life, to even try to create good things in the world.

You have to first know that your failures aren't going to be held against you by God. And that's part of what God's given us in Christ. And so, you know, my mission is to promote the belief in agency, to battle against this idea of despair and nihilism that permeates our politics, to not only be a critic of the world around us but a creator of a future for the world around us. The only change, if there is one, to my mantra, is that whereas for most of the last decade, fighting the left and building the future was enough, now there's so much of this nihilism and despair even on the right.

And so, I would only say that the mission has expanded somewhat. It's really fight for freedom and build the future, or fight the spirit of the age and build the future, not just fight the left. The left still has to be fought, absolutely. But it's really we have to fight against all of the voices of the enemy that would tell us that the future, that our best days are behind us, that the future belongs to the enemy, that nothing good remains before us, that there's nothing that we can do, that we're victims.

You know, if you on the right have accepted the fundamentally left-wing notion that we are only victims of our circumstances and that we have no agency with which to go combat those circumstances, please listen to the Jeremy Boreing show. We will endeavor every episode to disabuse you of that notion, to remind you of the freedom that you have, to remind you that the future is God's to unfold, is God's to unfold.

And that one of the beautiful blessings that we have as human beings is that He's given us a role to play in that unfolding. He's commanded us to be fruitful, to multiply. That requires having hope for the future. He's given us the command to have dominion over the earth, to subdue the earth. That is premised on a belief that there are things that we can actually do that can actually have effect, not because of our greatness, but because God in his his mercy and in his grace, has decided to allow us to participate in that most divine act, which is the act of creation.

And so we should get out and get busy doing it.

FRANK:

Jeremy, do you have a website or is it just a YouTube channel? Where do you want people to go?

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

JEREMY:

Go see us on YouTube. You can visit us at jeremyboreing.com. It's all under construction, but you know there will be updates coming there in the not too distant future as well.

FRANK:

Okay, Jeremy's in my rotation for podcasts, ladies and gentlemen. He ought to be in yours too. Is it also a podcast or is it just YouTube?

JEREMY:

Yep. It is a podcast. You can get it on Spotify, Apple Podcasts, and YouTube.

FRANK:

Okay, either place, ladies and gentlemen. Jeremy, it's a great pleasure having you on these past two sessions. Thank you for the work you're doing. Thank you for the work you've done. It's great being a friend and an ally of yours. Thank you.

JEREMY:

Thank you, Frank.

FRANK:

Great, Jeremy. Boreing, ladies and gentlemen. By the way, one last thing, Jeremy. Are you speaking anywhere soon where people can come out and see you?

JEREMY:

I am. I'm going to be in Detroit with TPUSA Faith on the 26th, I believe, at another pastors conference, and then I'm getting to speak at NatCon in Jerusalem, October 6th, and then speaking for PragerU out in LA in November. So, making the rounds at the moment.

FRANK:

It'll be on the website. Your website?

JEREMY:

It'll be on the website.

FRANK:

Okay, check him out there. You're going to see my friend Matt Faraci out there. I just talked to him yesterday in—

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



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

with Dr. Frank Turek

PODCAST

JEREMY:

You can't call Matt Faraci your friend. Matt Faraci is everybody's friend.

FRANK:

Everybody's friend. That's right. That's right, ladies and gentlemen. All right, that's the great Jeremy Boreing. Also want to mention I'm going to be out in Tucson at a church just south of Tucson this coming Sunday.

Then Arizona State University on the 28th. That's a Monday night. Following week, Baylor University. All of the information's on the website. They'll all be live streamed, so check that out. And don't forget about the new online courses. We have an online course by Dr. Brady Blevins that will help you better interact with Mormons, with Jehovah's Witnesses, and Muslims. It's called Conversations with the Faith.

Check all that out. It's been great being with you. Great being with Jeremy. And don't forget, check out the Pendragon series on Prime, and do what Jeremy said. If you really like it, maybe we'll get season 2 out of them. All right, friends, great being with you. God bless. See you next time.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**

