

The HISTORY you've learned is FAKE – The LIE You've Been Force-Fed | Raymond Ibrahim

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=761Jcg3N_2s&t=25s

10:33 mín.

Marshall: You've mentioned a few times as you're discussing this that historians like to ignore this. **Historians** like to ignore that or they paint this one-sided picture and the way you actually describe it is that the one-sided picture **they paint is the opposite of what is true**. I'm curious by what you think the motivation is by those historians.

Ibrahim: I think there's several. I think today it's just it's kind of, you know, it's snowballed and it's just that's the narrative. So if you're just a moderately ed, if you go to college today and you're a history major and you're studying this field, **you're not going to read primary sources, which you should**. That used to be the original thing. You're supposed to, but go read this, you know, three, four books by the secondary secondary his uh source would be, you know, like me. Okay, a modern person who supposedly consults the primary sources and then, you know, puts it into a book form and you read it.

So most people will read that and those books now you know they and they've been going and and the question is why but have painted a completely different picture you know **a guy like Sir Steven Runciman** [1903-2000] for example who's the he wrote like four or five volumes of the crusades and it was considered you know, the best seller etc etc.

[...*History of the Crusades* ...Jonathan Riley-Smith, one of the leading historians of the *Crusades* of the subsequent generation,[6] was told by Runciman during an on-camera interview that he [Runciman] considered himself "**not a historian, but a writer of literature**."...According to Christopher Tyerman, Professor of the *History of the Crusades* at Hertford College, Oxford, **Runciman created a work that "across the Anglophone world continues as a base reference for popular attitudes, evident in print, film, television and on the internet."**..., source Wikipedia, T.Í.]

I think came out maybe in the 50s or 60s and now historians will tell you - yeah **this guy really had an axe to grind you know**. And he was just **dedicated to making the Christians look bad and making the Muslims look good**. All right. And how do we know this? Because the ones who have taken the time to consult the primary sources are realizing **what he's saying is not there**. And **often times the opposite is there**.

So why okay the reason why um I would argue today it's because of what we would call **political correctness**. It's this desire honestly okay really to bring it down where you know the narrative has to always be this: **Christians whites are bad non-Christians brown people are good**.

Okay this is it. That's **the mantra** and everything has to conform to this. Why? Okay, we can get into that. But that has been **the case for I would say a long time since the 60s**. Okay. Um and this sort of **self-hatred thing has arose**.

But you know there's also other reasons you know **academic reasons**. For example, you want to be a historian. Okay. The the thing that would **make you popular** is you come up with a new interpretation. So for the longest time the interpretation was what I'm telling you. But if I can come up with **something clever like, oh wait, actually Andalucio is a great beacon of light and learning**. Okay, wow. Then I've made a new contribution. Especially if it's what people want to hear. People want to hear that narrative for the reasons I just explained.

They don't want to hear about, okay, Christians and Muslims fighting because Muslims are aggressors, etc. So all of these um but you know again today in the current climate it's just you know what I'm saying right now I don't care how my books *Sword and Scimitar* has like over a thousand citations endnotes to show you where I got my stuff cuz

I already knew I'm going to be attacked where'd you get that where'd you get that so the facts are there but you know people just they still till this very day want to believe that narrative okay which and you see it everywhere manifestations of what I just said this narrative even if you're watching the news and there's some kind of incident **or criminal activity between a black man and a white man** or something, **it has to be spun a certain way**.

So, of course, it's been going on with history because, you know, history people talk about fake news and it's very important obviously, but to me, fake history is more important because fake news is ephemeral and it, you know, creates its mischief, but then it, you know, vanishes and we move on something else.

Fake history, you create overarching narratives and and um, you know, basically paradigms where you sift reality through. So if I've created a fake history where you know Muslim Christian relations are such **that Christians were the evil aggressors and Muslims were the poor guys**.

Well of course now when you talk about anything in the modern era and you see it through that lens it all makes perfect sense and gives you more reason to despise the Christians and the westerners etc. And that's what's been going on for a long time.

Which is why I think when I discuss these things, you know, the number one response I get from people is like, I'm embarrassed. I didn't know this. You know, why didn't I learn this in school? And well, I'm this is why you not you didn't because there's a narrative.

Marshall: Fake news has a political agenda than fake history. It's the agenda.

Ibrahim: It's more profound,

Marshall: but it's still somewhat political, right?

Ibrahim: Yeah. Of course, **it is political** and it manifests itself ultimately in a political way, but it's very subtle and it's harder to prove. And you know, so fake news, we can argue, oh, here's evidence that this guy didn't say, whatever. **But fake history**, you know, who's going to take the time to delve into the primary sources like, let's say I did, and I did it cuz I love it and I was at the Library of Congress and I had access to all those books and I know a couple of languages, you know, so it's not that easy to do that.

And you're just going to go by if I go to the bookstores, Barnes & Nobles for example, um, and I go to the Middle East or a history section, all the books, and I'm familiar with them. They're all the politically correct books that say the exact opposite of what I'm telling you.

Marshall: Yeah.

Ibrahim: So, if you mean well and you want to read a book and **you educate yourself and you go to Barnes & Nobles**, you're just going to you're going to you're going to you're going to learn the exact opposite. And that's why **I always find it funny that you're better off being ignorant**. Because if you're ignorant, if you're an unlearned, learned person, maybe just dropped, you know, high school and you didn't go to college, you're probably going to have a **better understanding** of what we're talking about **from an instinctual level at least**.

Marshall: Yeah.

Ibrahim: But if you go the further **you go into higher education and formally study these things, what happens is ...you learn the exact opposite, but then you're proud of it** and you're so visous about you know because **I got a degree**. I know what I know this. You don't know what you're talking about. But what happened is **you've been indoctrinated in lies**.

Marshall: Yeah! So look, you've mentioned a couple of books that have changed the popular understanding of let's say the Crusades and these very various other moments. But would you could **you pinpoint to a specific moment in time when the narrative changed from as you described earlier there was a common understanding in Europe about Islam aggression in Europe to now where most people have no idea. Is there a moment in time where that the transitional phase?**

Ibrahim: Yeah. Which is a good good question. So, okay. Honestly, it all really starts with and and a lot of people don't like to hear this, but the with the Protestant Reformation, okay, because with the break with the Catholic Church was a need to, you know, I don't want to use the word demonized, but whatever, you know, justify the break. And so, anything the Catholic Church did became jaundest and kind of bad, including the crusades. And, you know, the Protestants made good points, you know, indulgences, etc., etc. I get that. That makes sense.

But you you got this move now where like whatever we can, you know, however we can make Catholics look bad, we should. And that was the beginning. So Martin Luther, he condemned the crusades. And then he condemned when the Turks were actually invading Vienna or coming towards Austria, he actually said, "Don't fight back." And and he said, "This is God's way of punishing the Catholics and church." until they got close to where he was and he actually changed his tomb literally and wrote a new saying no, „...you can fight back, it is just war this is...“.

I'm not lying to you this is true I can give you the evidence I was up for motivated reasoning yeah so so it really starts with a prot and look I'm not people I'm not I don't want to get into the I'm not a theologian I'm not arguing who's right theologically I'm just saying as a historical development the rift between in christendom between protestants and Catholics created a sort of hatred towards the crusades okay because it was another thing to point at and say, "Oh, look."

And then and they also this is was also the the beginning of the rehabilitation of Muslims in the eyes of Europeans because if Muslims are the enemies of the bad guys, the Catholics, they must be good. Okay? And this is why till today it's actually Protestant nations that are suffering from Islam because they're the ones who have completely opened their doors and who - who follow this logic which is Muslims are great. It's the Catholics you got to worry about. Okay? Or or at least elements of it still subconsciously maybe exist.

Um that's why you have Muslims running a muck in Scandinavia and Sweden and in the UK and in Germany. Um then but then you look at countries like uh you know Hungary and Poland which is you know Hungary I know is Catholic and and so is Poland and you don't see that sort of thing as much of course and I think that's a u so anyway that's the beginning of it.

I would say the Protestant Reformation and again this isn't me I'm not talking about theology. I'm talking about historical development which is normal of course. Um, and then you get the Enlightenment, right? And with the Enlightenment, all of a sudden now, now there's a kind of it's not that the Muslims are good, but yeah, these Christians are fanatics.

This is now Edward Gibbon, for example, um, is in Voltaire and these guys it. So now once again, the the crusaders and their cause looks ridiculous and they're stupid and what what are they fighting over? This is dumb, etc. Okay. And then you move on until you come to sort of the modern, you know, 19th century, 1800s. Now you have serious scholars, orientalist, and um you know, they just approach it in a very cold fashion that are I I actually like their writings.

They're objective, okay? And they're looking at the sources and um they're actually better than the other guys, but you still have the influence of the sort of, you know, the Protestant disdain for crusades and you have the, you know, the enlightenment disdain as well.

Um and then you come into the modern era where again I think it's this need, you know, we comes from, you know, I want to I think sometime in the 60s you get this move this very anti-Christian thing where you know Christians and Europeans and Westerners are the root of all problems. Okay. And of course this is how the crusades been.

So now it's being taught that way and you know we're gravitating back. So now it's worse than ever because what they're doing is they're lit literally playing with history. I already gave you an example of all the horrors that happened before the first crusade.

In one year 30,000 churches were destroyed. This is say nothing of the killings of Christians under Hakimah the Fatimid Khif or all the other ones and they ignore all that intentionally and just tell you crusades just happened out of the blue five centuries of peace down the toilet and now - and now Muslims can you imagine that when 9/11 and all that happened.

And until now when there's an Islamic terror attack in Europe they try to actually associate it to the crusades and say well Muslims are still upset about that they have grievances - Okay. And they don't! I mean because Muslims are not idiots. They actually respect the crusades in the sense that oh okay there was a time when Christians fought back. Okay. Good for them.

But but I mean everything is being done, you know, to just rewire everything so it fits that narrative.

Marshall: Thanks for watching this clip from the Winston Marshall Show. You can click here to watch the full episode. And for more clips like this one, don't forget to subscribe. And as always, be well.