

Kirk

Mostly written in September 2025

Relatable

This month felt heavy for many people, including me. The assassination of Charlie Kirk brought many ideas and thoughts to mind. Charlie promoted the pro-life message more than most pro-lifers ever will. I only speak to a few people, and only occasionally. He spoke to thousands of people per year, and shared those interactions with millions of people around the world using the internet.

Whenever I plan to speak to fellow pro-lifers in a public space, I always consider the way there could be violent opponents, but I also know it's unlikely there will be any violent acts. Yet, we know there are occasions of violence, and sometimes lethal cases of it, like Charlie faced. Again, our events tend to be quite safe, and we have even hired police to provide extra protection during events like our Life Chain. Charlie seemed very relatable to me.

No Power Over Us

One thing that makes Charlie more relatable, aside from being pro-life, is that he wasn't a lawmaker. He also wasn't the CEO of some major manufacturer or retail company.

Some people dislike the laws some lawmakers impose on them. We've seen assassinations and attempted assassinations over many decades. They aren't justified. Some of them are very mentally ill. Some of them feel justified because of what the lawmakers pass into law, or fears of what they think might get passed into law.

Even CEOs of companies that provide products or services many people use tend to have a major impact on the public. We saw something concerning last year when the CEO of United Health was killed. Too many people at that time seemed to think that was justified, but it wasn't. All human lives are valuable.

The thing about Charlie is that he lacked such positions of power. He was NOT a lawmaker. He didn't provide goods and services that the typical person would need. In that way, he was very much like us. The main difference was the reach of his ideas.

Speech as Violence

There are people who have referred to speech as violence for many years. This makes sense if someone was verbally bullied or otherwise abused. However, words are how we can avoid violence. As adults, we should hopefully have healed from or seek healing from any verbal matters of one's childhood, if one had any of that. When it comes to verbal abuse as an adult, the main areas of concern are within households and workplaces, due to the amount of time people spend in such places and the tendency to not move out of a home or change jobs in some circumstances. Beyond those venues, if someone says bad things to you, then you can usually avoid that person. The people who take issue with Charlie are people who could easily avoid him, but choose not to avoid him.

First Amendment

When our nation formed, our forefathers had reasons to create the amendments to the U.S. Constitution. The Declaration of Independence listed grievances, while also making it clear that governments should not

be changed for light and transient reasons. Many of the issues they listed suggested they didn't feel heard or represented. That played a major part in seeking independence. Such declarations are rarely accepted without the violence of war resulting to try to maintain unity.

A constitution traditionally provided the legal foundation of a government, identifying what constitutes the government in terms of structure, roles, powers, etc. Our founding fathers wanted to create a lasting government, which needed to adapt, so they incorporated an amendment process. They also wanted to prevent an overreach of governmental power, but enumerating rights of people didn't fit the normal content for a constitution. Amendments provided a good mechanism for limiting the powers of government.

The first of the amendments have five rights that I see as being distinct rights, but three of them can also support the other two. For instance, if you don't feel heard by your government, the right to petition your government is important. How might one do that? One might write (press), speak (speech), or gather people (peaceful assembly). Religious texts (press), proclaiming the texts (speech), and gathering to worship (peaceful assembly) also support the freedom of religion.

Note the need for assembly to be peaceful to meet the constitutional protection. There are also limits. One cannot shout things that cause people to die, like shouting, "Fire!" in a crowded theater.

If a government ignores these rights, violence is common. We've seen

governments around the world ignore some of these, and it is foolish for them to do so. It tends to lead to violence and/or the end of those governments, or a splitting of governments like when our nation formed.

We should seek peace, and that works best when communication flows smoothly. Knowing that our nation's founders knew that what they put in the first amendment was a cause for problems, they created the second amendment.

Yet, I often fixate on the passage from the Declaration of Independence that I mentioned earlier. We should work within the system, seeking what is best for the people of our nation, so we should maintain the government as the founders intended. "Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes."

Vile/Hate

Many people who didn't like what Charlie had to say claimed what he said was hateful, hate speech, and/or vile. Most claims turned out to lack anything citable, while counters to those claims are numerous where we see Charlie saying things that contradict the claims of evil. In many cases, people take things out of context, where Charlie was nuanced and had reasons for his stances that people leave out. They may say he opposed something popular, and that popular thing did some good, but he opposed the harms, and not likely the good.

I'm not sure that people can really point to anything being authentically hateful. But what if they could find something hateful? Let us consider controversial topics, since he talked about such issues, often.

If a pro-lifer says something against abortion, someone on the other side of the issue can consider that as oppressing women. That seems hateful and dangerous. Yet, someone saying something in favor of abortion can be seen as supporting the killing of innocent children. That can also be seen as hateful. Thus, stances that each side of a controversial issue could be seen as hateful, and being silent allows evil to continue.

The ability to talk with people on the other side of such an issue is important. Charlie and many pro-lifers have been willing and able. Yet, too often, others don't want to talk with "haters" who defend life over death.

Talk About Politics and Religion

Many decades ago, a serious shift in the culture took place. People sought a false sense of peace through politeness by avoiding discussing politics and religion. There are two things that matter more than just about anything else. Religion ties us to our creator and helps form our morality. Politics is how we work together to achieve the public good.

There are very different views on each area of life, but it's important to talk about these things. By talking about such things, we also learn how to disagree with someone, while remaining friends. We have lost too much of that, and people spanning several generations are out of practice.

Teaching Diminished & Empowered Media

As people stopped talking about the issues with others who think differently, it created a void that was filled by the media. The media feeds the views of many people.

Sadly, the media has stopped focusing on facts and shifted more toward speculation and opinions. The news used to be quick to report on many things, because they stated the facts. When CNN provided a 24-hour news source, it seemed like it would be hard to fill that much time with facts that people would care about.

The 1990s brought us the embedded reporting on Desert Shield and Desert Storm. People were drawn into frequent consumption of excessive news coverage. When things returned to normal, the national news sources (not just CNN) started to speculate about who will win the big game, what will happen in the stock market or economy in the near future, or even political speculations.

Now, the national news channels often feature programs with numerous people on camera from various sites, all teleconferenced together to discuss topics the way people used to do in local barber shops, cafés, and similar businesses. People used to engage people they knew in these venues, using facts they heard from various sources, but now people just consume what they hear from selected people to discuss it without the ability for us to join into the discussion. The providers of the information also try to provide a way to interpret it with their bias.

Lacking Trust in the Media

In the 1990s, there were a few anti-abortion people who resorted to violence. The media continues to cast pro-lifers with a bias that assumes the worst of us. It comes out in some TV shows, where pro-life activists are usually associated with violence.

When abortionist George Tiller was killed in 2009, I wrote a letter to the editor of the Cedar Rapids Gazette. I had written letters on various topics prior to that, having editors altering as little as a single punctuation mark. But the letter I wrote in 2009 was extremely different.

I knew the media didn't tend to report the violence against pro-lifers all that much. In that letter, I mentioned issues on both sides, and concluded with a call for all of us to be peaceful. The letter that was published should NOT have had my name attributed as the author. They stripped out fully 1/3 of the content, reorganized parts, and altered words. They can edit for length and make some tweaks, but they stripped everything that made their side look bad. Oh, wait. The media shouldn't have a side, but they gutted the letter of the facts of violence against pro-lifers. In the end, the letter's call for all of us to be peaceful now appeared as if it was only aimed at pro-lifers, as if we were typically violent. It completely altered the message. The Gazette lost my respect from that day forward.

About a year later, I saw a video on YouTube entitled "Media Malpractice at March for Life". I had attended the National March for Life for the first time not long before that video came out, so I knew what the media could report. The video points out how much the media tended to avoid covering the National March for Life, despite it being the largest annual march in Washington D.C. There are numerous marches, but it is the largest, and addresses a matter of life and death. But the video also points out how several major media sources diminished the numbers or otherwise biased their reports. One couldn't even tell the difference between the number of hundreds of

thousands of pro-lifers and the single-digit number of abortion advocates.

This combination drove me away from most of the legacy news sources, and I paid much more attention to pro-life media sources, since those reported things as I saw them. Years later, the term "fake news" became popular, and it rang true to me. In 2020, I felt bad for the people who allowed the media to drive them to be fearful, since the news kept repeating fearful messages so often and consistently.

Twist Perspectives

Brainwashing incorporates repetition, and repetition is common when people want to alter the thinking of other people. Too often, it is done to make people look bad or to demonize their stances on issues.

One clear example is the way the trans-gender topic is used to make people who are religious or conservative appear hateful. Nuance is rarely included, and the real concerns never seem to be made clear.

If someone thinks that certain religions or political parties will hate them, they will keep a distance and never find out how things really are. We know that when a person's thinking doesn't align with reality, that's the typical symptom of a mental disorder. One should seek to treat mental disorders, because aligning with what is true will make things work out for the best.

Rather than affirming their true gender, there are "doctors" who affirm the disordered thoughts that don't align with reality. Affirming a disorder rather than reality is not just bad for the individual, but for society as a whole. Those who engage in such malpractice are a major concern. If

anything, people can feel bad for the patient.

An exception is when someone demands things of other people. If someone insists on pronouns that don't align with what is true, many of us don't like being told we must lie. We don't want to have to remember different pronouns per person, many of which are just made-up terms.

Pronouns are rarely used in the presence of the person being referred to by the speaker. They are intended to provide us a way to refer to a person without having to know them. If you see a man robbing a store, you can refer to "him" and what "he" did, even if you don't know them. But people insist that you know whatever terms he may use for himself. If referring to a person you haven't met, but they have an ambiguous name, then Mr., Mrs. or Miss can help a person use the correct terms. I often wish people would focus less on pronouns and focus on reading more Proverbs.

The other thing people tend to dislike are imposters. There are people who will claim to be trans, which allows them to enter into some restricted areas, such as women's restrooms or women's prison areas. Some businesses also try to accommodate those who merely claim to be a gender other than what is really true, even if they claim it only for a few minutes. This enables criminals and perverts to commit horrible acts.

I particularly remember when Target decided they cared more to allow potential imposters into any bathroom they wanted, at the risk of their other customers. They had already supported abortion providers for many years, which led to many pro-lifers boycotting them. But when they

disrespected their customer's safety and privacy, many more people stopped doing business with them. Then, they doubled down. They said they were making a bathroom that could accommodate an individual person.

Before finishing reading what they were planning, I figured this made sense, because it could allow people who have special needs or young children to handle a wide variety of situations. Many public places like airports have such rooms, and they are very helpful for many people.

But Target didn't create the room for the wide range of issues. They made it clear that if you were afraid of using the normal bathrooms because they allow anyone who wants to go into either room to use any bathroom, then this single room is for YOU. Their doubling down and inverting what works everywhere else made it easy for people like me to never step foot in a Target ever since. With their past support for abortion, they had plenty of reasons to not get my money, even if they had a nice feel (likely because of the finished ceilings, unlike many other big-box stores).

Such people need help and treatment, not confirmation of a mindset that rejects reality. Mental disorders are recognized by the way one breaks from what is clearly observable, such as the gender a person is, and when that person firmly believes they are not that. When such a break leads to the inability to function well in society, that's when it reaches the point of disorder. Sadly, there's an industry that has grown by creating a lifetime dependency on pharmaceutical drugs. That's not the healthcare industry, because health restores proper function. It doesn't create

dependency while creating disordered function.

One Way

Many people called Charlie and like-minded people “bigots”. A bigot is someone who thinks their way is the only way. In many aspects of politics and life in general, there are multiple ways we can approach/solve issues. Yet, when it comes to truth, something is either true or false.

Jesus is the Truth, and He said He is the ONLY way to Heaven. People have to be careful about calling people bigots when it comes to facts, which are true or false. It’s one thing to apply to policies and approaches, but if applied to truth claims, then one would categorize Jesus as a bigot, which I would hope people would realize is not appropriate.

Prove Me Wrong

Classical liberalism is open to many viewpoints, and then keep what is good and true. Charlie may have had a chance to speak a great deal, but he gave people of all sorts of views a microphone where millions of people could hear their views. He would have the chance to counter or agree with those views.

There are people who claim Charlie used the “Prove Me Wrong” approach as a way to get his message out, without considering their views at all. This makes no sense. His responses grew very nuanced over time. One adapts when one faces so many people with so many situations. It leads one to realize that the original stance might work in most situations, but may need some tweaks for some others. If he didn’t consider what people said, then it would be easy to prove him wrong, repeatedly. More

and more people would come forward with the same arguments they know would prove him wrong. But he adapted, because he listened.

Courage, but Limited Time

It takes courage to present your views in front of others. It takes even more to do so in front of large crowds. It takes even more to do so while everything you say is being recorded, not only by your own cameras, but many other people record content.

It takes even more to do so where other people are invited to ask ANY question on ANY topic, including topics you may have never thought about or studied. You can always say you haven’t looked into certain subjects, but then it’s best to learn about that topic, assuming you continue doing such things.

I really like the respectful approaches to dialogue that organizations like the Equal Rights Institute use. Yet, if one is in a political debate, or if you have limited time to talk to as many people as possible, time is limited. Charlie usually respected people, but could sometimes have some zingers.

Financial Support of Violence

When people don’t respect others, things can get a bit out of hand. Unfortunately, there is growing evidence being gathered that suggests a wealthy billionaire has been funding many of the violent and divisive things that have happened in recent years. It sounds like a lawsuit could be forthcoming, and we will know more when that happens.

Abortion Breeds Violence

Violence between people was predicted many decades ago by Mother Teresa. She

recognized that if people kill their own children in the womb, we should expect violence and killing outside of the womb.

We have seen the culture of death spread from abortion to assisted suicide to euthanasia, and even people trying to justify violence against people with other views on grave matters.

Death Permeates Our Culture

Early in 2025, surveys showed concerning things. Among people who consider themselves left of center, approximately half of them considered the murder of Elon Musk and Donald Trump to be at least somewhat justified. It's one thing to hold opposing views with other people, but disagreements should not justify killing. Cultures do not thrive where disagreements result in violence and death.

Thinking Things are Better

After the death of Charlie Kirk, some surveys indicated that over 25% of people under the age of 30 considered things better, now that Charlie was dead. Good and bad ideas resurface throughout time. It's always important to be able to preserve that which is good, and to counter that which is bad. Even if one believes there is a person or group of people who promote bad ideas, it gives us an opportunity to improve our abilities to convince others of what is good and true. It's wonderful when those who promote bad things are able to become convinced of what is good, repent, and believe what is good. But their deaths while believing what is bad does not make the world a better place. If they had good ideas and promoted those, then it's even more tragic that their voices are silenced.

Anarchy

Many people oppose capital punishment. When those same people support the killing of someone by random people or vigilante groups, it is a form of anarchy. The responsibility of government supported most consistently by people across the political spectrum is the need to protect people and establish justice. Justifying killing by individuals, but not the government is anarchy and dangerous.

Cancel Culture

Cancel culture has changed a great deal over the years. I remember a time when people could say just about anything and keep their jobs. About ten years ago, people could say true things that were unpopular with some groups of people, and there would be enough coercive power applied to employers that those people would be fired.

This makes it harder for people to make a living. Even if bad ideologies are being censored using cancel culture, the ideas don't go away; they go underground. We stop having a sense for how many people think in those ways. Evil ideas from centuries ago still resurface at times, no matter how hard society tries to squelch those ideas.

When a society incorporates a culture of death, the "cancel" part of cancel culture takes on new meaning. If people don't agree with someone, enough of them seek to remove a person from society to bring about death. This is evil. The ends to NOT justify the means.

Respect for the Recently Deceased

Another thing that has changed is the respect for the deceased. People who were

diametrically opposed to each other in my youth would still offer respect for their opponents during a time of mourning after death.

Now, there are people who will say their opponents deserved it or had it coming. They push hatred for the deceased. In some sense, it can even seem like a threat to anyone who is likeminded to the deceased.

Chance to Repent?

People should be given a chance to repent—to change their thinking. This may take them years. They shouldn't lose their lives because of their way of thinking. Most jobs shouldn't be lost due to the way one thinks, either. Granted, there are some jobs where promoting violence and death as a solution seems inappropriate or harmful. For instance, if one educates children, and you promote violence as a solution to problems, this is dangerous. If one acts out the taking of lives and one is responsible for saving lives in the medical field, that's also a bad combination.

Influence the Public / Next Generation

The recurring thought is the need to instill a culture of life, and a culture of speaking through differences with respect, with a goal of seeking what is good and true. The people who engage the culture get to shape the culture. We cannot stand by. We are our brother's keeper. If we don't instill a culture of life, we end up with a culture of death. That doesn't end well for anyone.

Conclusion

We have a long way to go to build a culture of life. We have made great advancements in combating abortion. But we can't ignore the many threats to our culture that come from the culture of death.

Afterward

I wrote this within days of the assassination of Charlie Kirk. In the past day, I mostly skimmed through it and looked at the general outline. Some things have changed in the past year.

We have seen a bit of correction in society, with some of the bad things being rejected by more people again. But some things continue to go in a bad direction. People still seem open to inflicting death as a solution to what they don't like. More recently, we've even seen people defend a woman who killed her three children, while there was a remarkably similar case a few years ago when a man did the same thing, and the reaction was very different. A far larger percentage of the people who knew of that case thought the man did something horrible. We now see millions of dollars raised for the mother who killed her children.

Some people were challenged by others who asked them if they had ever watched Charlie Kirk debate college students. Many said they hadn't watched any of them. When they did, they often realized he was very respectful, and many of his ideas weren't as crazy as they were led to believe.

I also wish to add that an absence of intentional death doesn't necessarily mean people adopt a pro-life stance. There are many women who sought tubal ligation and other means to avoid pregnancy. We need a culture of LIFE!

Pray for the immediate and total victory of the culture of life.