

Left-Wing Journalist Tries to Paint Attempted Trump Assassin as Christian 'Offended by Trump's Blasphemy'

Now that we have the full manifesto of the man who tried to assassinate President Donald Trump at the White House Correspondents' Dinner in Washington, D.C., on Saturday, we know what we probably could have known from the start: He was an unsound man who was egged on by the conspiracy theories of the left.

Calling Trump "a pedophile, rapist, and traitor" – clearly, ideas taken from the fever swamps of the Jeffrey Epstein-baiting podcast class – Cole Tomas Allen, in the missive sent to family and friends, wrote that he was "no longer willing to permit" the president "to coat my hands with his crimes."

I am giving Mr. Allen more credit for sense than he deserves by adumbrating his violence-excusing blather. After all, one cannot take seriously a manifesto that ends with "Can't really recommend it! Stay in school, kids." Allen, who was a teacher and engineer before he almost certainly signed himself up to spend a hefty chunk of the rest of his life behind bars, probably isn't going to inspire too many people with those words, or with this sort of thing.

Thankfully, both the president and the one law enforcement officer that Allen managed to shoot will be OK. Trump was rushed out and the officer was wearing a bulletproof vest. However, the fact that this is the third serious attempt on Trump's life in less than two years is troubling, as is the

fact that it appears he was encouraged by the maniacal conspiracy theories of the left into committing the act.

But oh no, not to Jeet Heer. A writer for left-wing outlet The Nation, Heer has a different theory as to why Allen chose to target Trump: Allen was just too pious of a Christian.



Order Jonathan Cahn's New Book, "The Altar of Pergamon" on !

Heer was responding to conservative commentator Stephen L. Miller's response to former President Barack Obama's statement that "we don't yet have the details about the motives behind last night's shooting at the White House Correspondents Dinner." As Miller noted, "He posted this 20 minutes ago when we have all the details and known motive and have for hours." (The manifesto had been posted on the New York Post's website at a little past 11:30 a.m. Eastern on Sunday, roughly five-and-a-half hours before Obama's statement.)

But no, Heer said – there was a different reason than most people thought!

"Looks like guy was a Christian who was offended by Trump's blasphemy," Heer wrote, linking to an article by Substacker Ken Klippenstein that stated that Allen was a member of the Christian fellowship at the California Institute of Technology, that his "reported Bluesky social media account also contains repeated reference to Christianity [sic]" and that he made "repeated comparisons of Trump to the Antichrist," among other things. Heer also claimed that the manifesto was based largely around Christian talking points.

Now, aside from the fact that "repeated comparisons of Trump to the Antichrist" don't really fit hermeneutically with any kind of reasonable interpretation of scripture, the fact that Allen was once involved in Christian fellowship at college a decade ago and was described as "studious, devout, and polite"

by fellow students, as per Klippenstein, doesn't really say much. What does say a lot, however, is his manifesto and his Bluesky account, neither of which show being "offended by Trump's blasphemy" as a plausible interpretation.

First, the manifesto itself spans 1,051 words; it is not especially coherent and to the extent that it returns to any theme repeatedly, its echoes of left-wing talking points. Out of this, charitably, 146 words involve Christianity to some extent. And when I say "to some extent," what I really mean is that I am being extraordinarily charitable to Klippenstein and Heer's theory that his animus was religious in nature.

Allen first brings up faith after he apologizes for what he's about to do and why he's about to do it, which I've already explained. He then lists "rebuttals to objections," of which there are five. Two deal with Christianity, both are theologically bankrupt.

Objection 1: As a Christian, you should turn the other cheek.

Rebuttal: Turning the other cheek is for when you yourself are oppressed. I'm not the person raped in a detention camp. I'm not the fisherman executed without trial. I'm not a schoolkid blown up or a child starved or a teenage girl abused by the many criminals in this administration.

He is here referring to Matthew 5:39: "But I say to you, Do not resist the one who is evil. But if anyone slaps you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also." His rebuttal also refers to things that aren't happening, or at least aren't happening the way he frames them. By "a schoolkid blown up," I am assuming he is referring to the alleged American missile that hit a school during the Iran conflict. Leaving aside the fact this is unintentional, Iranians have killed tens of thousands of their own people intentionally, including plenty of school kids, and former President Obama's administration also managed to blow up wedding parties. Bad things happen in

wars. Every adult knows it.

In short: No, no blasphemy there.

Objection 5: Yield unto Caesar what is Caesar's.

Rebuttal: The United States of America are ruled by the law, not by any one or several people. In so far as representatives and judges do not follow the law, no one is required to yield them anything so unlawfully ordered.

We again stay in the book of Matthew, here 22:21: "Therefore render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." Allen here claims he gets to decide whether or not the duly elected and appointed "Caesars" of the United States are ones he will render the right to stay alive to. That's his blasphemy, not Trump's.

And the rest of the 146 words that I counted as being part of the religious aspect of the manifesto: "Thank you to my family, both personal and church, for your love over these 31 years." Again, I am being as charitable to the Heer/Klippenstein theory of Cole Tomas Allen's motivations as possible.

As for the religiosity he displayed on Bluesky, he was so deeply faithful that almost all of the accounts he allegedly liked posts from over the past month were ... basically secular liberal commentators or outlets.

It's bad enough to say that we don't know the motivations of an attempted assassin, as Barack Obama did. It's far worse to know and to actively blame ... Christianity, which had nothing to do with this.

Every sick Epstein truther, every reflexive fool lazily labeling Donald Trump a "traitor," owns this. If you want to keep quiet about it, keep quiet about it. But don't blame Christian "blasphemy" and expect not to get called out for

dangerous and insulting lies.

This article originally appeared on The Western Journal and is reposted with permission.