

Contra Douglas Murray and Niall Ferguson



by Miles Mathis

First published April 11, 2025

Somewhat surprisingly, this all came from comments Murray made on Joe Rogan. Why is that surprising? Because I don't watch Rogan and never have. I have never sat through even one show. I never last more than a minute before moving on. I just can't take it seriously. So I had to learn about the current fracas from *The Gateway Pundit*, which I do scan every couple of days or so. I don't take the *Pundit* seriously either, but it is a good way to find new topics to comment on, as now.

British peerage writer Murray was complaining that Rogan invites people like Darryl Cooper and Ian Carroll on his show, saying that they aren't historians and don't know what they are talking about. Well, that's mostly true but it isn't really to the point, since Murray is not a historian, either, and only parrots what is in his script. My guess is Cooper and Carroll are covert military ops paid to keep eyes off me. They hit my topics and get about halfway in, stalling out before telling you any of the good stuff. Sort of like Dave McGowan used to do, but these guys do it on Youtube. Which is another red flag, of course. If either man were causing The Man any real problems, they wouldn't be allowed on Youtube. Cooper's lack of a bio tends to confirm that. Like the rest of these bozos, he stays in the shade, but we do know he came out of the Navy.

But I am here today for Murray and Ferguson, who are slightly bigger fish. Murray pretends he is an expert, but his bio is actually very slender and unimpressive: if he weren't highly promoted no one would have ever heard of him, and in a few years they won't. We are told he has a degree in English from Oxford, but that doesn't make you an expert on anything. He is only 45 and is known mainly for being gay and writing several books no one has read. The first one—on Oscar Wilde's boytoy Alfred Douglas (no doubt an ancestor)—came out when he was just 19, so you see the incredible promotion he has always had.



It is hard to understand how Alfred merited an entire book, since other than sleep [with the monstrous Wilde](#) he did nothing memorable. They have to pad out his life at Wikipedia to even make a page of it.

In 2006 at age 27 Murray published the book *Neoconservatism*, but again nobody knows why or on what credentials. Had he since become a distinguished professor of anything at Oxford or Cambridge or anywhere else? Not that we know of. I guess all peerage Murrays are guaranteed a major publisher and promotion from all the mainstream outlets, no matter what they choose to do, as long as they toe the party line. Which of course Murray did. The book was promoted by the newly conservative [Christopher Hitchens, which should have been enough to damn it](#) for anyone who had learned to see through a glass wall.

In 2011 he wrote a book on the Savile inquiry—which we may assume was some sort of smokescreen—everything Murray touches is; and in 2017 he wrote *The Strange Death of Europe*, about unchecked immigration. This last is roughly correct, since he argues against it (brave argument that), but the book is misdirection nonetheless, since he avoids the central problem like the plague: this isn't caused by birthrates, crusading Muslims or weak officials, it is part of the long Phoenician plan to obliterate the Gentiles, a plan Murray—as a Phoenician—is in on. When Murray addresses this, he always deflects into “the left”. Like all his pals in the alternative press, Murray assures us that Western Civilization is being undermined by The Left. Which again is true in a way, but which hides the real puppetmasters. The left in the US and Europe isn't self-propelled, and it isn't propelled by leftist politicians like Obama or Biden, either. Those people are just actor/fronts like Murray and Rogan. This is all coming down from the trillionaire bankers and aristocrats, and I beg you to notice how unskillfully they always push you away from that.

And, I remind you it is also coming from the right, since the trend has never reversed under Republican Presidents or Conservative Prime Ministers. This trend has steadily advanced over the past century no matter which party was in charge. For some reason, the conservatives are pretending to just become aware of it, promising to make a run at it, but whether or not they will is yet to be seen. Did the US magically become whiter or more European during Trump's first term? No, all major trends continued. Only the banter changed a bit.

But given the thesis of this paper, perhaps the funniest thing is the response to this book by *The*

Economist—not exactly a liberal rag—which noted that it needed a lot more reporting and analysis, rather than just hundreds of pages of opinion. Remember that anytime Murray or Ferguson starts talking about “doing history” or “doing research”. I will get to Ferguson, but Murray has never written or said anything that hadn't already been written or said a hundred or a thousand times before. His books are just a compilation of one side of broad political opinion, and you learn nothing from him you wouldn't learn more efficiently from scanning the internet for a few minutes. It is just a bunch of self-important blather, like all other mainstream books now.

He has published two more books since then, both of them said to be bestsellers, but we know what to think of that. Those bestseller lists are manufactured by CIA/MI6 like everything else. They have been doing it back to the time of F. Scott Fitzgerald and before, [as I have proved](#). The army or CIA buys thousands of copies and uses them as toilet paper or something.

So nine books in 25 years, two of them co-authored and none containing any original research. Not academic books, just bestseller pulp. I remind you that in the same period I have published 145 volumes of material online, containing more original research than anyone has done in our lifetimes, maybe ever. Which is EXACTLY why both sides of this—Cooper and Carroll and Murray and Ferguson and everyone else—have to be so heavily promoted. It is all the attempt to blow smoke around my research and drown me out by sheer volume.

Which leads inexorably to this begged question: why has Rogan had Murray on his show *ever*? Like Alex Jones, Rogan pretends to be in some sort of infowar with the mainstream, especially the New Left, but most of the time he is just promoting one side of the mainstream misdirection, as with Murray. I have pointed out the same thing about Jones, who republishes mainstream science propaganda with no analysis or reply. Just straight-up reportage. Rogan does the same thing, promoting the towering frauds Neil Degrasse Tyson and Michio Kaku, among others. I wouldn't trust either of those bozos to tell me the correct time. They are just mouthpieces for the government, as we saw with Tyson promoting the vaccine. So he's just a Pfizer rep. Rogan might as well have Albert Bourla on, calling him a great great man, like Trump did.

So the primary question isn't, why would Rogan have on someone like Cooper, the question is why would he have on someone like Murray? If Rogan's audience was as keen as it thought it was, it would be able to peg Murray just from his name. It couldn't be a bigger red flag if his name was Goldie Sachs. Murray's parents are scrubbed in his bio, including at Wiki, so he is hiding something, but we are told his father is from Isle of Lewis. Interesting, since Trump's mother Mary Anne MacLeod is from that same tiny island off the coast of Scotland. At Wiki we are told Murray's mother was a schoolteacher and his father was a civil servant, but [other mainstream sources say the opposite](#).

Some have said it is strange that Murray is gay while being a conservative. That's actually not so strange, since other things in his bio and *oeuvre* scream double-agent far louder than that. What is strange is him getting caught saying things like this:

I respect some opponents of gay marriage. But, it has always seemed to me that once you accept that homosexuality exists, there is no decent non-religious reason not to permit equal civil rights, including civil marriage.

Really? He doesn't know of any non-religious reason? Can't think of one no matter how hard he tries? How about this: [married couples get tax deductions and write-offs, don't they?](#) Those were originally created to help build traditional families and encourage children, but would those who created those

write-offs have wanted to give them to gay couples? Absolutely not. Have we changed our minds about that? Maybe, maybe not, but seeing that this is allegedly a democracy, it should probably be put up for a vote, right? Well, that didn't work even in California, where it was voted down in 2008. That despite the best effort of people like Murray to NOT frame it as a tax issue, but rather as a rights issue. What followed was one of the greatest legal trainwrecks in history (which is saying a hell of a lot), when a district judge ruled that **vote was illegal**, because gays had a Constitutional right to marry simply by existing. So nice to see judges ruling that voting is illegal. That was mysteriously upheld by the circuit court, and the US Supreme Court dodged on standing—the biggest and most obvious cop-out possible. According to the Supremes, the sponsors of Proposition 8 didn't have standing to appeal when California neglected to do so. In other words, voters are effed when up against the State and the Courts. Any vote the governors don't like can be nullified, as we are finding out even more pointedly in Europe right now, see Romania, Germany, and France.

My point there was not to dredge up that again, though I don't mind wading into whatever is at hand. My point was to show you what a slippery eel Murray really is. He can't ever just come at you straight-on like I do, he has try to hypnotize you with some Sith mindtrick like this, trying to fool you into forgetting what you already know full well.

Murray's bio is so heavily pawed it is impossible to say who he is, but his promotion tells us he must be of the peerage Murrays. Which tells me his middle name is probably fudged to help hide that. Kear is not a peerage name, so best guess it is a fudge of Kearley, Kearney, or Kearsy. For now I will just remind you that the Murrays are top peers very closely related to the Stanleys, having taken over some of their titles via marriage. Same for the Douglasses, who are basically Stuarts by another name.

While researching Murray I tripped across Niall Ferguson, who also enraged me. Like Murray, he claims that only professional historians have a right to speak or publish since only they do actual research. Right. Upside down to the truth, as usual, and just as much so in the case of Ferguson as in the case of Murray, as we are about to see *from my research*.

Ferguson is a much bigger spook than Murray, but they are probably related. Ferguson's mother is a Hamilton, his ex-wife is a Douglas, and his middle name is Campbell, so this guy couldn't be more privileged and promoted if he were the King. Don't believe me? His bio is an avalanche of red flags, the like of which I have never seen outside a Dukedom. Like Murray, he comes out of Oxford, but Ferguson has a masters and PhD as well, which he allegedly achieved by 25 despite being in Hamburg for two years. So, let's do the math: unless he got his bachelors *very* early, that's a masters and a PhD in **one year**. Supposing he got any credits while in Hamburg, he could not transfer them to a PhD program at Oxford. Not really adding up, is it? But it never does with these people. Somehow, right out of that PhD, he became a fellow and lecturer at Peterhouse College, Cambridge. Almost immediately he also became a fellow and tutor at Jesus College, Oxford, later becoming a professor there. Two years after becoming a professor at Oxford, he became a professor at New York University, and two years later at Harvard, where he was the **Laurence Tisch** professor of history. Just what we need, Tisch professors of history. In case you forgot, Tisch was the billionaire Jewish CEO of CBS. Tisch was an expert on history due to his hotel empire and his ownership of Loews theaters, you know.

While at Harvard, Ferguson also taught at the London School of Economics, where he sat hugely in the Philippe Roman chair of history and international affairs. He wanted to hit them all, you know.

Finally, after 12 years at Harvard he became a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution on the Stanford Campus. Finding that still not spooky enough, he announced in 2021 that “higher ed is broken” and joined Palantir creep Joe Lonsdale in starting the University of Austin. That just opened last year, to much fanfare in Langley.

Higher education IS broken, but Ferguson should step up and take due credit for that, since he was part of the long infiltration of academia by CIA/MI6 and other nefarious entities. The University of Austin won't reverse that breaking, it will just break it further in the same direction, since it will be like CNN or *USA Today*, built from the ground up by Intelligence. As with those places, it will save the CIA the trouble of having to infiltrate it.

Speaking of infiltration, on the ground in Stanford, Ferguson is most famous for being the Hoover fascist who ran a down-and-dirty J. Edgar Hoover-type campaign against an undergraduate student who didn't like the spooks Ferguson was bringing to campus to speak, like Charles Murray (yes, THAT name again, though Charles claimed to be a small-town nobody). Rather than let this kid have his say, Ferguson decided to run a full-spectrum blackwash on him, including a background check and a targeted campaign by the campus Republicans. When Ferguson's emails were leaked, he resigned in disgrace from the lecture group, but of course kept his fellowship. So if you thought these Hoover beasts were too massive to get involved in baking and terrorizing the local Stanford fauna, well, you would be wrong.

Then we find this:

In 2000, Ferguson was a founding director of Boxmind,^[45] an Oxford-based educational technology company. In 2006, he set up Chimerica Media Ltd.,^[46] a London-based television production company. In 2007, Ferguson was appointed as an investment management consultant by GLG Partners, to advise on geopolitical risk as well as current structural issues in economic behaviour relating to investment decisions.^[47] GLG is a UK-based hedge fund management firm headed by Noam Gottesman.^[48]

I'm sorry, what does any of that have to do with being a history professor or fellow? Am I missing something? This was back to 2000, when he was just 35, still tutoring at Jesus College. How does a person about to become a full professor at Oxford have time to found companies? And I suppose you noticed the hedge fund thing. You can see why this guy makes my stomach turn.

But it gets better, I mean worse:

Ferguson has written regularly for British newspapers and magazines since the mid 1980s. At that time, he was lead writer for *The Daily Telegraph* and a regular book reviewer for *The Daily Mail*. In the summer of 1989, while travelling in Berlin, he wrote an article for a British newspaper with the provisional headline "The Berlin Wall is Crumbling", but it was not published.^[51] In the early 2000s he wrote a weekly column for *The Sunday Telegraph* and *Los Angeles Times*,^[52] leaving in 2007 to become a contributing editor to the *Financial Times*.^{[53][54]} Between 2008 and 2012, he wrote regularly for *Newsweek*.^[39]

In the mid-80s Ferguson was just 20, still an undergrad. So how could he be writing for the *Telegraph* and the *Mail*? What sort of credentials did he have for that? Oh, I forgot, Hamiltons and Campbells don't need credentials, all doors are open to them from the crib. And writing for *Newsweek*? If I were him I think I would deny that. It isn't even a credit anymore. He might as well admit he wrote for the *Langley Courant*.

According to his Wiki page, Ferguson has written or at least published 15 books in 30 years, but again these mostly aren't scholarly books. The latest is his 2021 pulp-dog *Doom*:

Setting the annus horribilis of 2020 in historical perspective, Niall Ferguson explains why we are getting worse, not better, at handling disasters.

Disasters are inherently hard to predict. Pandemics, like earthquakes, wildfires, financial crises, and wars, are not normally distributed; there is no cycle of history to help us anticipate the next catastrophe. But when disaster strikes, we ought to be better prepared than the Romans were when Vesuvius erupted, or medieval Italians when the Black Death struck. We have science on our side, after all.

Yet in 2020 the responses of many developed countries, including the United States, to a new virus from China were badly bungled. Why? Why did only a few Asian countries learn the right lessons from SARS and MERS? While populist leaders certainly performed poorly in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, Niall Ferguson argues that more profound pathologies were at work--pathologies already visible in our responses to earlier disasters.

Do we really need “top historians” to be writing Pfizer propaganda like this? Are we supposed to believe he really wrote this? I don't. Regardless, you can see what it is about just from the blurb: **Pandemics are hard to predict.** Are they? No, since this one had been planned for decades. The big dogs were caught red-handed as usual in 2019 and earlier with their Agenda 2020s and Agenda 21s and other evil white papers plotting their usual destruction and mayhem. But even if they hadn't, this gain-of-function and other Frankenstein research has been a ticking bomb for decades, and everyone awake knew that. There was never any reason to be working on this at all, except as some sort of evil military experiment, purposely pursued for maximum destruction.

Same for the “new virus from China” BS. This wasn't new and it wasn't from China. Those were our labs which just happened to be outsourced to China: that has now been admitted in Congressional testimony, so I wonder when Ferguson plans to retract this book?

Even worse than the manipulated viruses were the fake vaccines, the dangers of which were also not hard to predict at all. They were absolutely known beforehand, so the disaster was created on purpose, with full prior knowledge and intent.

Was Ferguson ever a real historian? No, since his second book is also famous for being stinking propaganda. This is 1999's *The House of Rothschild*, written when he was 33. But before we get to that, you should know that his bibliography only lists one other book before that, 1995's *Paper and Iron*, which may be based on his thesis since it concerns Hamburg. He was 31 in 1995, so it is really not clear to me what his early career was based on. He was publishing so little in his first decade out of school he should have perished as an academic historian, but we have seen that instead of writing scholarly history, he was writing propaganda for the newspapers and starting hedgefund companies.

Also amusing is that Wikipedia lists Ferguson as a history professor at six major universities, but under doctoral students, it lists only one guy. Ferguson was too busy starting hedgefund companies and writing agitprop for *Newsweek* to have doctoral students, I guess.

Anyway, *The House of Rothschild: the World's Banker* is not an exposé, and you can tell that straight from the title, which is salesmanship itself. You can also tell that from the back cover, where the book is praised by Jewish reviewers at *TIME*, *the Wall Street Journal*, and *The New Republic*. Low praise indeed. According to the front flap, the Rothschilds gave him full access to their private and hidden archives, so this is just official hagiography. Showing us precisely how Ferguson advanced, but not showing us why any real people ever bought his promotion.

You may know that Ferguson has sold himself as a “classical liberal” and a “Scottish enlightenment” liberal. You have to laugh. A classical liberal writing official hagiographies of the Rothschilds and Kissinger. A classical liberal who is a member of all the seats of centralized power and tyranny, including the Bilderbergers, CFR, London School of Economics, Harvard, and the Hoover Institution. I guess the Rockefellers are also classical liberals.

In 2016 Ferguson published the book *Kissinger: the Idealist*. No, seriously, he did that. He may need to look up the definition of idealist, but whatever. The idealist who “shot to celebrity by arguing for limited nuclear war”, as it says in the blurb for the book at Amazon. Oivay. Like his Rothschild book, this is just another sickening hagiography of a Jewish fraud and propagandist—another ugly, creepy, disgusting little person in the long vaudeville that was the 20th century. In volume one of this joke, Ferguson tries to sell us the idea Kissinger was influenced by Immanuel Kant. You have to laugh. Sort of like Dan Quayle was influenced by his deep reading of Plato's *Republic*, I guess. No, wait, on rereading my Kant, I find I was wrong: in the *Prolegomena* he does indeed recommend limited nuclear war. I forgot about that.

Did Ferguson ever write a real book? Not that I could discover. His book of 2008, *The Ascent of Money*, is even worse than the title promises, being a sort of continuation of his Rothschild apologia, whereby you are supposed to believe being robbed by trillionaire bankers is a good thing.

***The Ascent of Money* reveals finance as the backbone of history, casting a new light on familiar events: the Renaissance enabled by Italian foreign exchange dealers, the French Revolution traced back to a stock market bubble, the 2008 crisis traced from America's bankruptcy capital, Memphis, to China's boomtown, Chongqing. We may resent the plutocrats of Wall Street but, as Ferguson argues, the evolution of finance has rivaled the importance of any technological innovation in the rise of civilization. Indeed, to study the ascent and descent of money is to study the rise and fall of Western power itself.**

Ah, so the Renaissance wasn't about art and architecture and a flowering of culture, it was about bankers! Good to know. The French Revolution wasn't about overthrowing the King, or—[as I have shown](#)—about looting the Catholic Church, it was about a stock market bubble. OK. But that wouldn't be a case of wild-ass revisionism, would it, to keep your eyes off the truth? Yeah, nah. And the 2008 “crisis”, that wasn't the bankers raping the treasury like never before, that was something to do with Memphis, Tennessee, and Chongqing, China.

Even the *Guardian*, which can usually be relied upon to give Ferguson the Rex Reed four stars—since we may assume that is what they are paid to do—[trashed this one](#) as a TV tie-in, an “anodyne, reverential panorama of neoliberal capitalism” and Ferguson as a “hagiographer of hedge funds”. It is also called a “solipsistic” rush through history and soundbite analysis of centuries to get to a gibbering plug for George Soros and Jim O'Neill. Imagine how bad this book must be to be too awful for the *Guardian* to recommend. You don't have to imagine: read a few pages and you will see it is far worse than they let on.

One question: did any real person with an IQ over 80 ever get through the first chapter of this without wrenching his or her guts out? Would you believe two questions: who paid the 1500 reviewers at Amazon to give this five stars? Here's one of them:

Nothing is more imperfect and unstable than the currency; the human one, too. Niall Ferguson, always extremely enlightening, illustrates a picture that the currency is here to stay, and nothing more natural than financial shocks.

What? OK, now I get it, no one had to be paid because this is AI. Don't believe me? Here's some other five-star reviews:

Very good **dopy**.

The book deals with financial history in a rather interesting yet understandable manner. It is slightly basic if you're well versed with financial instruments and understand financial news well. However, there's lots even the initiated will learn from this book.

There were no missing pages.

I bought this for my son in love. I didn't give it to him yet but I'm sure he will like it because the subject is very interesting.

This book can not be read fast enough .Understand the past is key to knowing what will happen in the days ahead. Niall has written many books and each one is clearly a path to enlightenment but this book is his best on the subject and is written in a way that is clear and informative but not over my head. [This one is from Asa Ferguson, so maybe his granddaughter wrote this?]

The book came in as expected, good copy, with very limited scratches from normal wear-and-tear.

Excellent book about the evolution of money from metals, to receipts for metal, to promises of metal to just plain promises. Should be required reading for anyone interested in finance and/or the economy.

Here is one of the one-star reviews Amazon let stand:

There are many, many excellent books addressing the current economic crisis, the utter failure of deregulation, the outrageous excesses, looting and crimes of Wall Street, the destruction of the middle class, the horrid debt burden left for our children, the fantastic increase in disparity between the haves and have-nots--in short, the destruction of the American way of life as we have known it. Don't get your history and analysis from a right-wing apologist for Wall Street and the ultra-wealthy, who likes to blame the poor and middle class victims for the horrid, downhill course of the last 30 years.

And there it is. The truth will set you free.

But let's not stop here, this is too much fun. Ferguson has also pushed a thing he calls **Counterfactual History**. No, again, seriously, he really did that. That's right up there with Counter-Empirical Science, which is now also a thing. Also known as a MindScrew.

Ferguson sometimes uses counterfactual history, also known as "speculative" or "hypothetical" history, and edited a collection of essays, titled *Virtual History: Alternatives and Counterfactuals* (1997), exploring the subject. Ferguson likes to imagine alternative outcomes as a way of stressing the contingent aspects of history.

A colleague at Oxford, Noel Malcolm, replied, "Students may find this an intriguing introduction to a wide range of human history; but they will get an odd idea of how historical argument is to be conducted, if they learn it from this book."

So that's another "scholarly" book he has written, completely undermining scholarship on purpose. Are all of Ferguson's books secretly this "counterfactual history"? It's a question to ask, because the answer is Yes, whether he admits it or not, intends it or not. They are counterfactual, ie purposely wrong, piecing together a grand fiction Ferguson has sewn together at the request of his masters and cousins in order to control you and herd you. Technically that isn't counterfactual history, since

counterfactual history is of course an oxymoron. It is just the same tissue of awful lies we get from all these bought-off mainstream “historians”.

Also notice that “counterfactual history” is a sort of double-eff, since it purports to purposely falsify history as a sort of parlor game. But that subtly confirms that mainstream history was factual to begin with . . . which it wasn't. Ferguson is simply fictionalizing a history that was already fiction, taking you from one-step removed to two-steps removed from reality.

If none of those books panders to the powers-that-be enough for your taste, you can try his 2018 *The Square and the Tower*. No, he is not selling himself as the square, though if you thought that it is an honest mistake. This is basically a collection of resells of every mainstream lie of the past three centuries, from 911 to the Cambridge Five to the Illuminati: the attempt to re-hammer in every nail I have pried out in the past two decades. As such, it is a wildly weak attempt to debunk my work without ever meeting it head-on. As usual with these people, Ferguson simply assumes mainstream history is true, then performs some dipsy-doodle cartwheels on its periphery to make you think he is creative, and sells that as performance art. But since he fails to address even one of my million substantive points, the whole enterprise can only look like a sad dance, akin to Raygun's efforts at breaking.



Ferguson was so far gone by 2018 he couldn't remember how to hypnotize his audience. Even before Covid he had fallen into some sort of permanent brain fog, forgetting the trick he had learned as a callow youth in some MI5 program about properly ingratiating yourself to your audience of semi-literate gulls in the first pages, by pretending you had something in common with them. Instead he starts this book by preening as a CFR and Bilderberg member and dropping a bunch of names. How could he not see he was outing himself before he could even present his pretend thesis? Did he imagine any real person in 2018 wanted to read a book from a Bilderberger about how important the grassroots really was and how overrated the ivory tower was? Like his cousins in Hollywood, he had forgotten about the target audience. What set of ten people on ventilators was this supposed to appeal to?

Why do I call his readers semi-literate gulls? Because no one who had ever read a real book would be fooled into thinking this was one for a moment. Almost without exception, contemporary literature—

including alleged non-fiction like this—is for Oprah book-clubbers, marketing grads, and those who think Barnes&Noble is a rich cornucopia of scholarship and wisdom. It is why even the negative reviews at Amazon for these books aren't really to the point: they were written by people who thought for a moment this thing made of paper in between cloth covers might be a book, based on a recommendation by the *New York Times* or the *Wall Street Journal*, I suppose. In other words by people who still, in the year 2025, aren't really paying attention. They haven't figured out that all bestsellers, without exception, are wet propaganda, and that recommendations from the mainstream media aren't worth jack.

And this is because fewer and fewer people are getting anything resembling an education in the schools or universities. For the reason I just gave you, all real books are being hidden, discontinued, shredded or rewritten, and even our brightest youth don't come across them. It is only older folks like me that remember what a real book tastes like and can tell the difference between one that has been written by an honest human in love with his subject, and one that has been written by a committee of soulless cyborgs working for Sauron.

All intelligent people should be shunning the bestseller lists, the mainstream bookstore chains, and these agents posing as writers, instead mobbing the remaining mom-and-pop used bookstores, the public libraries, Ebay, and Abebooks, which is where the real books are hiding. Many of these you can preview at Gutenberg.org, to be sure they are what you were looking for. This won't solve all your problems, because old books are also heavy with propaganda and lies, especially the history books, but in general they aren't nearly as bad as the newer books, which have no redeeming qualities. The Intel agencies have always been around, that is to say, but they didn't take over the entire culture until the past 60 years or so, so even going back that far will increase your odds dramatically.

The good news is that I now believe that, going by real numbers, I have more readers than these people like Ferguson, and my reach will continue to grow as his fades away quickly. He is nothing without heavy promotion, while I have expanded even while being anti-promoted by the biggest censors on the planet like Google and Microsoft. And the reason for that is clear: I am the one doing real history, while he is just a pretender.

But hey, if you want to get your history from the Rothschilds, don't let me stop you. Enjoy your counterfactuality!