

The Radical Left Killed Charlie, So Joe Kent Blames Israel

THE LIE

Israel killed Charlie Kirk because he opposed U.S. involvement in a war with Iran.

THE TRUTH

Israel did not kill Charlie Kirk, who remained a staunch supporter of Israel until his death.

BACKGROUND

- On March 17, 2026, Joe Kent resigned as Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, reportedly over his opposition to a war with Iran. ([Joe Kent](#))
- Kent publicly claimed that Iran did not pose an imminent threat to the United States and argued that U.S. involvement in the war was driven by Israeli influence.
- Hours after resigning, Kent appeared on Tucker Carlson's podcast and suggested that Israel may have been responsible for the death of Charlie Kirk because Charlie opposed U.S. involvement in a war with Iran. ([Tucker Carlson](#))
- The accusation, first advanced by Candace Owens immediately after Charlie's death, relies heavily on private text messages in which Charlie expressed frustration with pro-Israel donors.
- Candace Owens tried to frame donor disagreements as proof of motive, but when the claim failed to hold up, she shifted her focus to other alleged culprits, including Charlie's own widow and other foreign countries. ([CNN](#))

TRUTH EXPLAINED

- Charlie's own security chief Brian Harpole told Shawn Ryan there is no evidence whatsoever linking Israel to Charlie's murder: "How you can derive Israeli hitmen out of that, I have no idea," he said. ([The Shawn Ryan Show](#))
- The disputes between Charlie and Turning Point USA donors were about internal political disagreements—who Charlie platformed, and how that reflected on his organization—not about his position on war with Iran. Donor disagreements are routine. They are not a hidden roadmap to murder. ([Dinesh D'Souza](#))
- Charlie's actual positions don't match the theory. He remained publicly supportive of Israel, continued working with pro-Israel voices, and was actively preparing to address criticism of Israel the night before his death. ([Newsweek](#)), ([J-TV](#))
- The day before he died, Charlie publicly criticized Islam. If Kent's logic is applied consistently, that would implicate many Muslim countries, especially given that criticism of Islam has frequently led to violence. ([Charlie Kirk](#))
- The timeline is another major problem. Charlie had already opposed U.S. involvement in conflict with Iran at the start of the June 2025 "12-day war," when the issue was far more central. If Israel wanted to kill him over his opposition to war with Iran, that would have been a more opportune time. ([Charlie Kirk](#))
- When Trump actually ordered strikes on three Iranian nuclear sites (Operation Midnight Hammer), Charlie's stance shifted – he applauded it, writing "America stands with President Trump" and saying Trump "could potentially declare victory." ([Charlie Kirk](#)), ([Charlie Kirk](#)), ([Charlie Kirk](#))
- If Israel were targeting critics in this way, then far more prominent and persistent critics like Tucker Carlson or Joe Kent himself would be obvious targets. But none of the influential anti-Israel voices have been assassinated.
- Joe Kent and Candace Owens are avoiding the most straightforward explanation. The individual accused of carrying out the killing, Tyler Robinson, is a radical Left-wing activist with ties to gender ideology. Charlie was killed while he was speaking about the dangers of gender ideology. There is documented evidence that the Left supports political

The Radical Left Killed Charlie, So Joe Kent Blames Israel

assassinations, and Charlie's murder was widely celebrated by the Left. ([The Federalist](#)), ([YouGov](#)), ([New York Times](#)), ([The Gateway Pundit](#))

QUOTES

"And you might say, 'Charlie, do you support or oppose this?' I support President Trump. That's my answer. I know the man...He's the man for the hour...So in a situation like this, I support my friend. And he's had my back, and I have his." – Charlie Kirk

TAKEAWAY

The theory promoted by Joe Kent and Candace Owens is absurd in how far it bends over backwards to force Israel into a story where the evidence points elsewhere. They take routine donor disagreements, ignore Charlie Kirk's continued support for Israel, and then try to reframe everything through a single obsession: making Israel the answer no matter what the facts say. Meanwhile, they dismiss the most direct explanation—a known Left-wing suspect and a clear ideological motive—in favor of an international conspiracy with no proof.