

## TRANSCRIPT

An Undeceptions podcast.

John Dickson:

In 2017, I was in Jerusalem filming scenes about the crusades for a documentary called For the Love of God. There's a link in the show notes. We were given permission to film at the al-Aqsa mosque, the third holiest site in Islam, which sits on the massive plaza known as the Haram al-Sharif or Temple Mount. Sharing the plaza is the Dome of the Rock that's the beautiful golden dome that appears in every Jerusalem postcard. Almost 30 American football fields would fit into this giant 150,000 square meter open air court. On July 15th, 1099, something like 10,000 European crusaders burst through Jerusalem's protective walls. They marched through the narrow streets of the city and fought anyone who resisted. They made their way up to the Haram al-Sharif where they discovered thousands of residents cowering in fear, hoping against hope that their sacred precinct would provide them with protection, practical or divine. But these fighting men, these pilgrims, as they called themselves, had been marching for two years. They had journeyed 2000 miles from France to Jerusalem. They had been besieging the city for a month. They were not about to let a victory go to waste.

The crusaders whipped themselves up into such an unholy frenzy that they slaughtered men, women, and children. They threw some victims over the plaza's high walls to their deaths three storeys below. They butchered the rest with swords, daggers, fire, arrows, and spears. They even gave chase to those who'd climbed the roof of the al-Aqsa mosque and had them killed on the spot. The blood reportedly filled the great promenade between the mosque and the dome. We have eyewitness accounts of the events with gruesome glee and obvious exaggeration, Raymond of Aguilers, a leader of the first crusade wrote about this fateful day in the odds of July, here's Director Mark putting on his best Raymond.

Mark:

But now that our men had possession of the walls and towers, wonderful sites were to be seen. Some of our men cut off the heads of their enemies, others shot them with arrows so that they fell from the towers, others tortured them longer by casting them into the flames. Piles of heads, hands and feet would be seen in the streets of the city. It was necessary to pick one's way over the bodies of men and horses. In the temple in Porch of Solomon, men rode in blood up to their knees and bridal reins. Indeed, it was a [inaudible 00:03:04] splendid judgment of God that this place should be filled with the blood of the unbelievers since it had suffered so long from their blasphemies.

John Dickson:

The next day, 16th of July, the pilgrims held a Thanksgiving service in Jerusalem's Church of the Holy Sepulchre, just 500 meters away from the site of the massacre the day before. Again, Raymond of Aguilers tells us.

Mark:

How they rejoiced and exalted and sang a new song to the Lord. This day, I say will be famous in all future ages for it turned our labours and sorrows into joy and exaltation.

John Dickson:

It's a confronting fact of history that a church originally designed to mark the place of the unjust and brutal crucifixion and resurrection of the humble man from Nazareth, became the venue of jubilant songs and prayers to celebrate a ruthless military victory in Jesus' name. I had to stand in the sacred Plaza outside the al-Aqsa mosque and retell these horrible events to camera over and over until I got them right. And in my eye line, was our Muslim guide and she was disturbed. This brutal slaughter marked the end of the first crusade. They had recaptured Jerusalem and parts of the holy land they'd regained control and care of the church of the Holy Sepulchre, probably medieval Christianity's most sacred sight. Most of the crusaders packed up and went home bolstered in their belief that God had been with them and given them this great victory, job done. So why the need for a second crusade or a third, fourth or fifth for that matter?

I'm John Dickson. And this is Undeceptions. Undeceptions is brought to you by Zondervan's brand new book, Bullies and Saints an honest look at the good and evil in Christian history by some guy called John Dickson. Every episode, Undeceptions explores some aspect of life, faith, history, culture, or ethics, that's either much misunderstood or mostly forgotten. With the help of people who know what they're talking about, we'll be trying to undersea ourselves and let the truth out.

This is the second in our two part series on the crusades. And we are speaking with the incomparable Christopher Tyerman professor of the history of the crusades at the University of Oxford. In the English speaking world, there's probably no more widely recognized expert in the field. Now, if you missed part one, stop now and find it in your podcast app. We'll wait here for you. Won't we, Mark?

Mark:

Indeed, we will.

Speaker 1:

The holy land in the dark days of the Third Crusade from the flower of all Europe's knighthood under the command of Richard of England, Richard the Lionheart swept over the plains of acre, the valley of Zora on their mission to redeem the Holy Sepulcher only to be challenged at the very gates of Jerusalem by the living God of the Sarasins Saladin the Magnificent, leader of a thousand desert tribes.

John Dickson:

That's the 1954 Epic King Richard and his crusaders starring Rex Harrison, Virginia Mayo, and George Sanders. It's a terrible film, whatever Director Mark says. It's actually listed in a book called The 50 worst Films of All Time, but you get the vibe. The Third Crusade is painted as an adventurous romp with figures like Richard the Lionheart on one side and Saladin the Magnificent on the other. The Second to the Fifth Crusades take place on and off from a generation after the First Crusade, 1145 to be precise, for about 80 years until 1229. Despite the legends, especially around King Richard, the crusades were mostly a failure.

I want to ask you to do the impossible. Can you sum up the success or otherwise of the Second to Fifth crusades?

Christopher Tyerman:

Well, I think the obvious answer in terms of taking Jerusalem or achieving military success in the near East, if you look at other crusades, it's obviously less successful. The Second Crusade, some crusaders take Lisbon from the Moors, what's now Portugal, but in the Levant itself, their attempt to take Damascus fails. So in a sense, the geopolitical balance is not influenced by the Second Crusade. The Third Crusade, 1188 to '92 takes place after Jerusalem's been lost to Saladin. And most-

John Dickson:

Saladin was the most famous of Muslim warrior heroes. He defeated crusader strongholds, recaptured Jerusalem, and then successfully defended it against the Third Crusade. When he took Jerusalem in 1187, Saladin planned to avenge the slaughter of Muslims from the first back in Jerusalem in 1099, but the crusaders surrendered and Saladin spared them.

Christopher Tyerman:

And almost all the Western Christians in the Levant been overrun, not all, but the vast majority. The Third Crusade succeeds in reconstituting, a more or less viable Western Christian enclave in Palestine and Southern Syria. It creates a sense of two state solution to the Palestinian geographical political position. The coastal ports are largely retaken, small amounts of the hinterland. Jerusalem is not. So there is a limited success. However, this enclave does actually survive for another century until 1291. The Fourth Crusade, some of the Fourth Crusade goes to the Holy Land and there's a small campaign in Egypt that doesn't achieve much. The bulk of the crusade goes to Constantinople where it's thought that the Greeks would then subsidize the campaign further on the Holy Land. It doesn't work out like that. So one of the-

John Dickson:

It really doesn't work out like that. This Fourth Crusade is a debacle. Along the way to the Holy Land officials decided to attack Constantinople itself. This was a Christian city. This was the city that had asked for help in the first place to get the whole crusader thing going. The crusaders took the city and plundered it. This is just one of the many shocking departures from the principles of just war. Back in the First Crusade, one of the main preachers was monk known as Peter the Hermit. He rallied thousands of Europeans to head to Jerusalem, but along the way to the Holy Land, he and his men engaged in wholesale slaughter of European Jewish communities along the Reinland, partly for their supposed responsibility for the death of Christ centuries earlier, partly for their alleged complicity in Muslim attacks on Christian sites, and perhaps partly just for fighting practice. Anyway, back to the Fourth and Fifth crusades.

Christopher Tyerman:

So one of the consequences of the Fourth Crusade of 1202 to 1204, is that you have French Lords taking possession of states and regions in Greece. And these last for a century or so in various forms.

Constantinople is held by a Latin emperor from 1204 to 1261. The Fifth Crusade, 1217 to '21 is a massive affair involving regular detachments going from Western Europe to the Eastern Mediterranean, where they attack the Nile Delta and take the Port of Damietta, which they hold for a couple of years. Egypt is seen as the key to the Levant, which it is. It has population in terms of the economy, in terms of commerce, et cetera, cetera. Without Egypt, you can't really hold Southern Palestine. That was the theory. So essentially for four years, you have a Western European army in the Nile Delta, but in the end, military defeat means that they have to evacuate and therefore it achieves more or less nothing.

So you have these repeated failures, how the Western authorities deal with this is of course they say, well, it's all the cause of sin. And failure is because we aren't worthy enough. And this in sense allows them to have an explanation, which doesn't actually suggest that the whole enterprise is worthless.

John Dickson:

Whether or not the crusades were worthless, there were critics of the enterprise at the time.

Christopher Tyerman:

Obviously there were some political critics who said, "Why are these people leaving home, leaving their wives [inaudible 00:13:38] estate exposed?" There's a tradition of saying that the king shouldn't go for the same reason. Also, within the Christian Church, there's also a pacifist tradition that continues and it is the wrong way to do it. How can you justify this sort of violence? And certainly in the 13th century, you have a number of intellectuals, particularly amongst the [inaudible 00:14:14], the Dominicans and the Franciscans who say that actually you've got this the wrong way around, that by attacking Islam in this way, or attacking Islam in this particular region, because crusades are not necessarily against all Muslims, they're to recapture the hood of that. They said, "Well, this is the wrong way to do it, look at all you're doing, is you're antagonizing, what you do is convert."

John Dickson:

Here is where I get to introduce you to Francis of Assisi, the founder of the Franciscan Order and the namesake of the current Pope Francis. Francis was one of the most charismatic and influential clerics of the middle ages. He journeyed to Egypt in 1219, warned the crusaders they were destined to fail and insisted that God wanted to convert the Muslims through his simple persuasion. He somehow convinced the Crusader Authorities to let him venture into enemy territory to preach the gospel of Christ's death and resurrection to the Sultan Al-Kamil himself. He was mocked by the Christian crusaders and Francis responded by predicting that the crusaders would fail in their campaign to take the Islamic stronghold of Farasch 20 miles down the Nile river from the Mediterranean sea. Whether a lucky guess or something else, he was proved right in August 1219.

As a result of this successful guess or prophecy or whatever it was, Francis was given permission to cross over into enemy territory and plead with the Islamic forces to become Christians and make peace. The Crusader leadership made clear though, that they were washing their hands of it. Over several days, Francis of Assisi attempted to convert the Muslim army. Sultan Al-Kamil received Francis cordially at first, he was given a large audience and Francis made his case through translators on behalf of the Christian faith. The Sultan religious advisors gave a response and Francis was invited to embrace Islam. When it

became clear that Francis had no intention of becoming a Muslim and indeed that he was trying to convert them, the Sultan advisors recommended that Francis along with the poor monk colleague that he brought with him, be executed for preaching against Islam. After being insulted and beaten and receiving threats of torture and death, Francis was dismissed by the Sultan, lucky to escape with his life. Like the crusades themselves, Francis's attempt at evangelization of the leading Muslim warrior in the world was a failure.

Today's Undeceptions is brought to you by Zondervan's new book, Bullies and Saints. An honest look at the good and evil of Christian history by John Dickson. It's a little awkward doing an ad for my own book, but I'll have a crack at it. Bullies and Saints is certainly the biggest book I've ever written. Others can decide if it's the best. I do think it's one that listeners of this podcast might really enjoy, especially if you're into all that history stuff that we often do here. There are three chapters explicitly on the crusades, but several more explaining how on earth, the followers of the crucified Jesus went from the most persecuted people on earth to proud knights of Christ. And it explores how even when the church was at its worst, Christian reformers invariably sprang up and called people back to the ways of Christ whether in the fifth century, the eighth century, the 11th century, all the way through to today. If you feel that Christian history is mostly a story of charity and wisdom, this book might annoy you.

On the other hand, if you think Christian history is basically a long nightmare of ignorance and hypocrisy, the evidence I immerse here might annoy you too. But if you're looking for my best attempt to give a century by century account of the bullies and saints of the church, I think this might hit the spot. Writing this book has probably crushed any lingering Christian triumphalism I might have once had, but it's also given me fresh inspiration for what the original message of Christ can do in a culture. Whether in second century Rome, sixth century France, 12th century England, or even 21st century America. Bullies and Saints by Dickson. There's a link in the show notes or head to [zondervan.com](http://zondervan.com).

In Zambezia province, Mozambique, Anglican Aid Waterworks campaign is improving the standard of living for over 5,000 rural villages, including 62-year-old Louisa. Louisa had five daughters, but she has lost three of them. One was attacked by a crocodile while at the river collecting water. And two others died of cholera, which could have been prevented had they had access to clean water. The Waterworks campaign has funded boreholes around Louisa's region, making it easy to access clean water for the rest of her family. You can help make this happen in more places, please head to [waterworks.org.au](http://waterworks.org.au), [waterworks.org.au](http://waterworks.org.au), to learn more about how The Waterworks campaign works and you can donate there. And I urge you to do it today. You can find more in our show notes.

Let's press pause. I've got a five minute Jesus for you. Love your enemies. Do good to those who hate you. Bless those who curse you. Pray for those who abuse you. Be merciful just as your father is merciful. Luke chapter six. I regard these words as the most sublime ethical teaching ever given, perhaps this is just confirmation bias on my part, but for several years now, I've periodically posted a challenge on social media, inviting sceptical friends to find a block of teaching from anywhere in the pre-modern world that matches Christ's emphasis on love and mercy towards everyone, including enemies. The challenge hasn't yet been met, but perhaps that's more of my bias. I'm not suggesting Jesus was the only moral teacher from antiquity to put love at the center of ethics. It certainly wasn't emphasized by the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, or the Romans, but love did feature in Jewish ethics. The Jewish scriptures, what Christians call the Old Testament and join things like love your neighbor as yourself, Leviticus 19:18.

In context, this instruction is just one of 613 commandments of the Old Testament, but one influential teacher from just before Jesus brought this love command to the fore. Rabbi Hillel, first century, BC characterized his Judaism as, loving peace and pursuing peace, loving people and drawing them near to the Torah, God's instruction. A humorous story admittedly written several centuries after Hillel's death is told about a certain heathen, a Greek or Roman who wanted to become a Jewish proselyte or convert. He first went to another famous rabbi of the period called Shamai, but he didn't have much luck. So he went to Hillel and got a delightful answer. Here's the text. On another occasion, it happened that a certain heathen came before Shamai and said to him, "Make me a proselyte on condition that you teach me the whole Torah while I stand on one foot." Shamai drove him out with the builders qubit, a big stick, which he had in his hand.

When he went before Hillel, he made him a proselyte. He said to him, "What is hateful to you do not do to your neighbor. That is the whole Torah. The rest is commentary. Go and learn." Hillel's what is hateful to you do not do to your neighbor is similar to Jesus teaching, do unto others, as you would have them do to you. Jesus saying seems like an intensification of Hillel's saying. We don't just avoid doing what is hateful to others, according to Jesus, we do the good to others that we ourselves would like done for us. The revered Jewish scholar, Professor David Fluser of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem memorably wrote about how Jesus intensified Jewish traditions. Those who listened to Jesus preaching of love, Fluser writes, might well have been moved by it. Many in those days would have agreed with him.

Nonetheless, in the clear purity of his love, they must have detected something very special. Jesus did not accept all that was thought and taught in the Judaism of his time. Although not really a Pharisee himself, he was closest to the Pharisees of the school of Hillel who preached love, but he pointed the way further to unconditional love even of one's enemies and of sinners. This Fluser concludes was no sentimental teaching. Fluser goes on to make the crucial point that Jesus not only intensified an already existing Jewish emphasis on love, but that he presented this intensification as an extension of his own life and mission. Fluser writes, it was not simply his total way of life that urged Jesus to express loving devotion to sinners. This inclination was deeply linked with the purpose of his message. From the beginning, until his death on the cross, the preaching of Jesus was in turn linked to his own way of life.

Fluser isn't doing theology, he was Jewish, not Christian. He's just making an historical observation. Love of enemies was central to Christ's teaching, not as an arbitrary moral innovation, but as a reflection of the entire course of his life. The narrative of all four New Testament gospels inches inexorably towards Jesus' self sacrifice, the arrest, trial and crucifixion of Jesus get roughly the same space in the gospels as the Sermon on the Mount, about 2000 words. This is where the love of enemies finds its clearest expression. Jesus willingly gave his life on a cross, not as a matter for accords, but as a saviour taking the place of sinners. You can press play now. One common view is that the crusades eventually come to an end because Europe became more secular and enlightened and therefore more peace loving. Once we sidelined religion a little, Europe became more peaceful and the crusades disappeared. Is that what accounts for the demise of crusading in your view?

Christopher Tyerman:

Well, I think it's quite hard to see 16th, 17th and 18th centuries as time of European peace. I think that's an enlightenment arguably. The French revolutionary wars [inaudible 00:26:56] wars. I think that's a

myth let alone the secular 20th century, which is a century of mass carnage. So I think one has to discount that view. But also of course, there's another great change. The reformation, the reforms of the 16th century. One, Luther's great attack on the Roman Catholic church is due with indulgences, is to do with the Roman Catholic penitential system at the heart of which is the crusade. By the end of the middle ages, you can take the cross, you can redeem it for cash. You can buy a crusade indulgence. Some of the earliest printing are indulgence forms that Guttenberg produced in minds in the 1450s. But this was big business for the church.

The attack on the Roman Catholic penitential system, inevitably attacks indulgences, which are crucial to the religious appeal or the spiritual appeal of the crusades. The crusades are specifically targeted by Protestant [inaudible 00:28:12]. Holy war isn't. They think, okay, you can fight the Turks and God will be on your side, but the ideological underpinning of the Roman Catholic penitential system is critiqued by Protestants, but also by Catholic reformers. Crusades still continue, you can take the cross. Some individuals are taking the cross right in the early 18th century, but as a weapon of geopolitics. It dies out partly because it's poor business and partly because it's no longer business.

John Dickson:

The crusades didn't come to an end because the world got more secular and therefore more peaceful, most certainly not. The appetite for crusading, for waging war as a way of purchasing forgiveness from God, diminished because Christians themselves began to speak out against it. There was a reform within the church from the newly formed Protestants, but also some from within Catholicism. As at other moments in history where the church has committed or has been complicit in atrocities, other Christians rise up, point to the gospels and condemn people for their way of life. Throughout history, there's been this self reform spirit within Christianity. It of course goes back to Jesus's own warnings about religious hypocrisy and calling for self assessment.

Speaker 2:

And this is a new kind of evil. And we understand, and the American people are beginning to understand. Now, this crusade, this war on terrorism is going to take a while. And the American people must be patient.

John Dickson:

That was president George W. Bush giving an answer to a journalist on the south lawn of the White House on September 16th, 2001. That's just five days after the horrible coordinated terrorist attacks on the United States organized by Al-Qaeda. He was heavily criticized for using the term crusade, a term which as the Wall Street journal put it, is shorthand for something else, a cultural and economic Western invasion that Muslims fear could subjugate them and desecrate Islam. What can be said about how the Islamic world told the story of the crusades both back in the time when the crusaders tried and failed and in the modern world?

Christopher Tyerman:

Well, at the time, the contemporary Muslim writers saw once they had had assimilated this with rather different from their relations, say with [inaudible 00:31:11]. Anger, resentment, fear, hostility, ideas about Jihad, which were more dormant were revived in the near East as a way of consolidating political opposition and uniting. Leaders used the Jihad against the crusaders as a way of asserting critical power. [inaudible 00:31:40] himself by using Jihad rhetoric. So we then of course have us a triumphalism, we threw them out. We got back the [inaudible 00:32:00], we got back to Jerusalem. We then a hundred years later finally expelled them from the Islam. And that's a story of success and triumph. The attitude of course then changes where from the 18th century onwards, and particularly in the 19th century Westerners [inaudible 00:32:28] and all that start re-penetrating Eastern Mediterranean.

John Dickson:

600 years after the last crusaders were expelled from Palestine in the late 19th century, the Ottoman Empire based in Constantinople faced a revolt from their Balkans territories. They also faced strong pressure from Britain and France to grant independence to Romania, Serbia, and Bulgaria. The Ottoman Empire was an Islamic run superpower, one of the mightiest and longest lasting dynasties in history, ruling large swaths of the Middle East, Eastern Europe and North Africa for more than 600 years. But in the 19th century, its power was beginning to wane. The response from the Ottoman ruler, Sultan Abdul Hamid the II, was to declare that Europe had begun a new crusade against Muslims. It sounds very similar to what President Erwin has recently done, but at the time it was reported right across the Arab press. A few years later, the first Muslim history of the crusades was written in 1899. The author, Sayid Ali Al-Hariri cited the Sultan in his introduction. Here it is, our most glorious Sultan Abdul Hamid the II, has rightly remarked that Europe is now carrying out a crusade against us in the form of a political campaign.

This was something completely new at the time, but the idea really caught on. Western bullying of the Islamic world, which has been far more effective in modern times than it ever was in crusader times was now called crusading. Here's the irony, the fact that modern Western bullying of Islamic lands has been pretty successful, has created an impression in the modern mind that the actual crusades centuries ago were also some kind of successful campaign to suppress Muslim power. But as we've heard, they were nothing of the sort, whatever the crusades were, whether just wars, attempted just wars or just stupid wars of bigotry, they were not successful and Muslims at the time knew it.

Christopher Tyerman:

And so suddenly, the attitude to the crusades becomes more one of reminding people of the insult, the intrusion but with a tinged sense of victimhood. Instead of triumphants, you had a sense of victimhood. And if you look at these textbooks, school textbooks all slightly different in the Lebanon or Egypt or Syria, or Iraq, you have this discourse of insult victimhood. Despite of course also a lot of triumphalism. And the conundrum is, how come we won the crusades and how come these bastards are back as it were. And it's very solitary to look at the crusades from Egyptian or Syrian academic perspectives and see how peripheral this was. The vast majority of Islam is not included in the crusades.

This is a peripheral activity that ultimately fails the great triumph of the Ottoman Empire, totally overshadows it. But nonetheless, there is a modern view that it can't simply be we won, but is informed in the sense somehow since the 18th entry, they got back at us in a subtler, but more sinister way. And so it's woven into a modern discourse of exploitation, victimhood and resentment. The resentment is in a sense constant throughout, which is not entirely illegitimate it seems to me.

John Dickson:

Most major wars in history leave an indelible mark on the winners and the losers, resources change hands, ideologies are promoted or quashed, and new borders are drawn up. This can't really be said of their Eastern crusades. With the exception of the island of Cypress, which fell to Richard the first in 1191 and has been Western and Christian pretty much ever since, the Western crusading in the holy land has left few traces. There are some wonderful archaeological sites that you can still visit, the Crusader fortress at Caesarea in Israel, for example, and there is a bitter historical memory about the al-Aqsa mosque slaughter of 15th July 1099, but there's not much else, not much else that is of the historical significance of the crusades. How the crusades are invoked in modern propaganda for various causes, both East and West is another matter altogether. What lasting impact then, if any, did these Eastern crusades have on the world, on Europe, on the Middle East?

Christopher Tyerman:

I think more generally, what we're talking about right in the beginning, the crusades have left historical memories, historical myths that still exert power. That the way in which Jihadist groups can talk about the crusaders as current Westerners. The way that they ironically and historically described the state of Israel as a sense akin to crusaders, which is obviously bizarre. So there is a present legacy of the crusades, which is why I feel that it's probably important for discussions of the crusades to be based on historical evidence and interpretation, rather than the crude stereotypes of populist propaganda, because lives matter and people are in sense at risk by misunderstanding what the crusades were. There is almost-

John Dickson:

This propaganda can be seen in many quarters. In Osama bin Laden's declaration of Jihad against the United States, he referred to Americans as crusaders. Then there's the manifesto of the lone gunman who murdered 51 people worshipping at mosques in Christ Church, New Zealand in 2019, which actually quoted Pope Urban the second, the instigator of the first crusade. And the guy carried guns dobed with references to crusader battles and producer Kaley tells me that the mass head of a prominent white supremacist website, she's seen the pictures, that's how committed she is to research for this program, contains a cartoon image of a crusader night with the phrase [inaudible 00:40:47], the very thing that kicked off the first crusade.

Christopher Tyerman:

The stereotypes either, the bad crusaders and the good Muslims or the bad Muslims or the good crusaders, are completely misleading and highly damaging if taken seriously. And of course can be

whipped up by populists on all sides, whether you have Jihadists on one side or [inaudible 00:41:15] Evangelicals of the U.S. on the other.

John Dickson:

The fact is the crusades have left a mark that can't be washed away. The most long lasting impact of the crusades has little to do with borders, Middle Eastern politics, or the relative size of the world's two largest religions. The real legacy of the crusades is the way they stand as a symbol in the modern world of the violent, dark ages of the church and the churches all to human capacity for dogma, hatred, and violence toward enemies. I don't actually think the crusades were all bad. I think at least initially they were in large part about defending other Christians and halting the march of Islam, but no one can deny the crusades often morphed into debased campaigns of hatred, brutality and greed. Militarily, they were unsuccessful. Spiritually, they were an abject failure.

Hey, I hope you don't mind if I raise something I'm a little embarrassed about. This pod is part of a larger Undeceptions project. We research, write and speak to let the truth about Christianity out, and I'd love your help to make this thrive. I'm able to do this full-time currently because of a small group of benefactors who keep Undeceptions afloat, you know who you are, and I'm really thankful. The pod doesn't even pay for itself, let alone all the other writing and speaking projects. So if you are listening and you want to help Undeceptions bust some more myths and promote the truth and beauty of the Christian faith in public, I'd love your support. Head to [undeceptions.com](http://undeceptions.com) and hit the donate button. We've made it particularly large so you can't miss it. No amount is too small. Anything you can do is appreciated. Thanks so much.

While you're there, feel free to send us a question and we'll try and answer it in a later episode. And if you're interested in other good podcasts, check out, *With All Due Respect*, where Michael Jensen and Megan Powell du Toit talk about deep and often divisive issues within Christianity without tearing each other apart. They're doing really well on the Apple Podcast charts. So go and support them. It's part of the Eternity Podcast Network. See you.

Undeceptions is hosted by me, John Dickson, produced by Kaley Payne and directed by Raymond of Aguilers. Editing by Nathaniel Schumack. Special thanks to our series sponsors, Zondervan for making this Undeception possible. Undeceptions is part of the Eternity Podcast Network, an audio collection showcasing the seriously good news of faith today.

Speaker 3:

Brought to you by the Eternity Podcast Network.