

Why did the right respond so strongly to Charlie Kirk's Assassination?

Answers because my liberal sister asked

Tom Currie, September 16, 2025

Opening statement

How to read this material

- This presentation is intended to show how the right views Charlie Kirk and his assassination.
- Liberal viewers will benefit from this insight
 - However, don't try to refute the claims here
 - Refutations are moot for this presentation
 - because it would be like saying “you don't feel that way”
 - Sorting correct from incorrect is another topic entirely
- It was written within a week of the assassination, emotions are still high. This presentation is written in a highly personal style, less technical, more revealing of perception.
 - Read blunt statements with that compassionate filter.

Introduction

- The Charlie Kirk assassination hit the political right very hard. Folks are emotionally devastated.
 - WHY? We'll explore that here.
- My sister, a liberal democrat, explained to me that most of her friends on the left don't understand the strong reaction.
- This Micro Lesson will try and fill in some of the gaps by showing how the right sees Charlie and the assassination.
- There are many factors
- This presentation will give a practical overview, but not an in depth or detailed analysis.
- If you disagree with any content, let's talk. Find the truth together as friends.

Who was Charlie?

- Charlie never went to college
- Out of High School he immediately entered the realm of political activism and commentary
- He founded Turning Point USA in 2012
- He was a devout Christian who is not shy about mentioning his faith in public debates.
- He was a loving husband and father of two toddlers (3&1)
- **He was a mentor to millions of High School and College students, specifically showing them how to respectfully and publicly debate political topics**
- His political point of view is conservative
 - NOT “far right” he was mainstream right.
- Charlie was well read and knew details about all the issues brought up in debate.

How did the right view Charlie

- Charlie was a wildly popular figure on the right
- His campus debates, podcasts, radio show and media appearances were very popular across age groups
- He popularized respectful debate
- He TALKED, emphasized intellectual examination of issues
- He was a strong free speech absolutist
- He was famous for saying **“If you disagree with me, come to the front of the line”**
- He was our brother, our friend, our mentor
- His assassination was personal, he was a family member

The Right was not so mad about other political violence

- Charlie was our hero, our brother, a leader on the political right
 - Everyone knew him and loved him
- Political violence has been universally condemned by the right
 - Without fail, without exception
- Example: The state politicians that were murdered in Minnesota were unknown figures to most of the country.
 - The crime was well publicized, openly discussed and condemned, and the news cycle moved on.
- Charlie was so much more than a celebrity or politician, he was a leader

Was Charlie controversial?

Yup.

- Charlie was not shy about debating difficult and taboo topics, publicly
 - Topics were prompted by student questioners, not Charlie, he responded to their questions
- He would take any question brought to him by a student
- The left is unhappy with his political views
 - The left not just “disagrees with” but also “angry at” his views
- Charlie welcomed the dissent and met it with a respectful debate response
- In general, the left gets angry when people disagree with them
 - This is my observation, I present it as an obvious fact based on years of watching social media, traditional media, and people in my community

What is TPUSA?

- See for yourself: <https://tpusa.com>
 - The web site will give an accurate view of their organization
- From an outsider's point of view
 - They had thousands of chapters at colleges and high schools
 - They have educational material
 - They are a conservative political club
 - They give students an alternative to the liberal orthodoxy taught in school
 - They are wildly popular in the high school and college age group

Media & others say he's a bad person

Racist, Fascist, Homophobe, anti-Trans

- HOGWASH, balderdash, bollocks, nonsense
- **Watch as many of his debate videos as you can** (YouTube, YouTubeShorts, Instagram Reels, TikTok, etc). **See for yourself**
- These insults are unfounded attacks based on inaccurate quotes and fabrications
- Carefully review the quote and the context
 - The negative quotes you read are usually false, altered or incomplete.
 - The context for the negative quotes is usually omitted
- See Micro Lessons and resources on “How to Spot Fake News” (natickgop.com)

Charlie was not a Racist

- This is very easy to debunk
- Watch any of his videos where the topic comes up
- He says that DNA differences between the races are almost non-existent.
- He boldly speaks out against racism
- Calling him a racist is foolish and not based on reality.

Charlie was not a Fascist

- The left uses the insulting label “fascist” a lot.
- The right finds it meaningless and detached from reality
- The reality is Charlie was a kind, polite and confident debater among other things
- As a person on the right, after years of hearing the accusation of “fascist” I still don’t know what they mean. This is because it is so disconnected from reality.

Charlie was not a homophobe

- Charlie had religious views on sexuality that he openly stated and debated.
- Charlie has said that he does not care what you do in private, what counts is your strength of character
- Charlie has a long history of working with gay people as friends and allies.
- Charlie had views, but his actions showed that he respected and worked with all people
- Saying he is against gays is not a supportable position

Charlie was not anti Trans

- Charlie would say “I am not anti trans, I am pro truth”
- His position does not affirm trans ideology but is reasonably defensible
- A large portion of the population does not concur that a biological man can be a woman. His views aligned with this.
- So this topic is worthy of debate, especially on a college campus in a public debate. Charlie engaged in this debate.
- Those of the left that can't keep calm about Charlie and his views show more about themselves than Charlie's views.
- Remember, **Charlie encouraged debate** and encouraged those who disagree to come to the front of the line.

Fallacy: The killer was a nut, acting alone

Nope, the entire left is implicated

- For many years (9+) pundits on the right have been saying that the use of certain terms will guarantee someone will take the shot.
 - He's Hilter, a Threat to Democracy, Fascist, Democracy is on the ballot
 - If true, then any good citizen should consider taking action against them
 - **It's not true**, but the use of the terms hypnotized many
- There have been at least three such proofs of this
 - Two Trump assassination attempts
 - Charlie's assassination
- The Democrat politicians, left leaning media, pundits and podcasters all used these dangerous terms
 - They all were splattered by Charlie's blood. (That comment may sting a bit, but it fits the facts, if you disagree, let's talk)
- We must all condemn violence and return to the best practice of open and respectful debate - TALK

What traits did the killer have?

- This was written 1 week after the incident. My opinion may change as information is released and the truth becomes more clear.
- It was obvious from early on that he is
 - Far left
 - Influenced by Antifa
 - Influenced by the radical violent trans subculture (a specific subculture that is visible on line in social media, it heavily influences Antifa)
- He is not MAGA, not a DJT supporter, not your average insane person, not a “gun nut”
- He is not a “lone wolf” he was heavily influenced to kill by many others both on line and in person

Fallacy: The motive is unknown

- News commentators still say the “motive is unknown” or there is “no apparent motive” even a week after the event
- **Oh please, it’s quite obvious that it was a left-motivated political assassination**
 - His demographic
 - His social media
 - His romantic partner
 - The left’s reaction
 - Celebrating
 - Saying Charlie Kirk deserved it
 - Slurs & insults
 - Misquoting and lies about Charlie to smear him
- The philosophy that the left must silence dissent
- The motive is obvious and was never in doubt, from day 1

Fallacy: It shows we need gun control

- **No, it shows the left needs to learn self control**
- No gun control law would have stopped him
 - He had no arrest record, hence eligible for a gun license
 - He had no mental health history or arrest record, not a prohibited person
 - He had good grades in school
 - The gun was a common bolt action deer rifle

Fallacy: there is political violence on both sides

- This trope is an attempt to deflect or diffuse blame.
- The left came up with a false statistic that 76% of the political violence is on the right and 4% on the left. This is not credible to anyone. It does not need to be debunked. Ignore it.
- There is indeed examples of violence on both sides, much more so from the left. We all need to improve.
- The right wants to talk to folks about political differences, MAGA rallies welcome liberals
- The right's protests are non violent and rallies leave the park clean
 - Jan 6 was an exception, however, the violence was condemned by the right, including Trump. Both sides were there in defense of the constitution (that thought provoking statement can be debated at another time).
- The left is well known for violent protests and riots (Antifa, BLM riots, responses to Charlie memorials and vigils, etc), it's all too common
- The left commonly uses violent and threatening language on social media
- Antifa is a militant and violent organization that is solidly on the far left. They have been rioting in Portland and Seattle consistently for many years.
- **The right has no violent equivalent to Antifa, none.**
 - The Patriot Front is viewed by the right as a fake white supremacist organization, likely populated or organized by feds
 - This is why conservatives mock them by yelling "fed, fed, fed !" Whenever they march
 - It is also indicated by the fact that we have not seen them since Trump was inaugurated.

What is it the outcome?

- Peaceful prayer vigils and rallies
- Conservatives are inspired to peaceful action to encourage and support Republican and Conservative policies
- People are researching TPUSA and learning about Charlie
 - As such they learn how to respectfully debate
 - They hear an alternative to liberal orthodoxy
- People are going back to church
- People see the value in family, marriage and children
- TPUSA has gotten thousands of inquiries on opening new chapters
- The Conservatives are motivated and becoming more active

Tom's predictions for the future

- The right is motivated into political action
 - Voting, registering voters, getting involved in town politics, running for higher office, etc
- There are rumors of folks leaving the democratic party (if true, the evidence will be seen in future elections, so wait and see)
- The government will audit money trails, donations, supporters of violent groups and on line chatter. Dismantling of dangerous or corrupt organizations is likely
- TPUSA will grow and continue to prosper
- I predict no violence or revenge from MAGA Republicans
- We'll see if I am right, only time will tell.