

[return to updates](#)

Yes, the Leonardo Painting is a Fake

but there is so much more to the story



by Miles Mathis

First published November 23, 2017

On November 15, 2017, the alleged Leonardo painting above allegedly sold for around \$450,000,000, a record price paid for a painting. If you are thinking that sounds a tad unbelievable, you are right. It *is* unbelievable. In fact, it isn't believable in the least, and I suggest you don't think of believing it. Like all the other things being reported in the news now, it is false. It is fake. It is manufactured to keep your mind off other things and to stir your poor brain.

If you search on this online, you find that I am not the only one saying this painting is a fake. However, I am probably the only one to tell you the sale is also fake. Not only that, but all the “experts” who supposedly authenticated the painting are fake. The news outlets reporting the story are fake. The people hired to talk and write about the painting, pro and con, are fake. This story is a fake within a fake within a fake.

Bloomberg.com admits many critics and art mavens are crying foul on this one, but it dismisses them as “not experts”. So who are the experts? We aren't told. But can we imagine that they are great painters? No. Are they respected historians? No. I have shown you there are no historians worthy of respect, and never have been. The historians—to the last man and woman—have missed all the things I have uncovered in pretty easy research, so we know what to think of them. The same applies to art historians and other art experts: art now is what it is due to their corruption and malfeasance, so we can ignore them completely.

The unnamed “experts” are curators and art historians hired by various museums, and these people have a terrible track record. They and their predecessors have been caught in many fakes over the years. They have proven they couldn't spot a fake if it bit them in the ass. Some of the most famous

paintings in the major museums are fakes right now, but none of these experts seems to care. All they care is that they get paid and that their careers continue on.

As for this sale at Christie's: the auction houses have the same amount of scruples the historians have—which is to say, NONE. Their only concern is profit. They don't care about art and aren't concerned with authenticating art. As a broker, they don't guarantee authenticity. And besides, they are run by the wealthiest families we have seen from the peerage, so they are basically above the law. The laws don't apply to these people, since their relatives own the congresses, courts, police, and military. You should trust nothing you read about auction house prices or records. The art market is one of the most corrupt markets in existence, and honesty and reality have no role there.

I know. I have been a part of the art market for 30 years now, so in this case I do have some inside knowledge. I will be answered that I am just a small player in a minor market: contemporary realism. Which is true. However, the difference is, everything I do is real. Everything these “big players” do is fake. I create real paintings that sell for real prices to real people. They don't.

Most of the art market is an illusion. I would say this applies to *all* of Modernism, but it also applies to large parts of the rest of the market. See my [paper on money laundering in art](#) if you don't know what I mean. As for these absurd prices, they simply make them up. At Bloomberg, the page on the Leonardo sale has some loudmouth quacking woman asking why the prices paid for paintings continues to rise, despite the collapsing financial state of the world, but of course she leads you directly away from the right answer. That being that those involved in major money laundering—including all the world's governments—need to launder larger sums of money. They are involved in ever larger thefts and cons, so they need fronts for those cons. It is more convenient to have one big-ticket item for such a front rather than several. This Leonardo can now front nearly a half-billion in money laundering at one go, you see.

Now for some other things you should know. This painting previously sold in 1958 through Sotheby's for about 100 dollars. So why were the experts at Sotheby's (and worldwide) so stupid 60 years ago? They couldn't see the unmistakable marks of Leonardo here? Well, the painting didn't look like it does now back then. Here is what it looked like in 1904:



Yes, that is a black and white photo, but still. It doesn't even look like the same guy.



How could you possibly “restore” the first painting into the second? The shape of the head is completely different. The shape of the forehead is completely different. The length of the chin is completely different. The eyes are completely different. The hair to your left is completely different. The first guy has a mustache and the second guy doesn't. This wasn't a restoration, it was a complete repainting.

I will tell you another inside secret here: if this had been a real Leonardo, it would not have been repainted by anyone, I don't care what kind of shape it was in. Have they hired some bozo to go in and repaint *The Last Supper*? No. Despite the horrible shape it is in, you don't paint over a Leonardo. Such a thing would be considered a sacrilege in the art world. Even *cleaning* the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel was considered a sacrilege by many. Inpainting (tiny touch-ups) are even frowned upon with works of this stature. But total repainting is forbidden. It would not be considered restoration, but wanton destruction. If this Leonardo had been real, all the historians, critics, conservators, and other experts should have been calling for the arrest, prosecution, and flogging of these dealers who had it repainted. In fact, *there are laws on the books* preventing the alteration of artworks. These laws apply to unimportant current works by living artists, works worth very little. These artists can sue if their works are altered without permission. But the laws are much more important regarding major works like those of Leonardo. These works are considered national or international treasures, and anyone who altered them would open himself to major prosecution. The fact that we see no talk of that here indicates to me that all the important insiders know what is going on. They know this is not a Leonardo, so they don't care. That, my friends, is what the experts are really thinking.

So what is going on? Why is this happening now? I would say the difference is, in 1958 Sotheby's didn't have an in-house painter who could repaint the work in the style of Leonardo, but in 2017 the dealers Robert **Simon** and Alex **Parish** felt that they did. They obviously had someone with some talent (Dianne Modestini?). Someone who could paint fine hair in the style of Leonardo. Someone who could blend a face in the style of Leonardo, even creating that famous *sfumato* effect to some degree.

However, that leads us to notice something else important. Look closely at the hand. She didn't have to repaint that much at all, did she? But ask yourself why the hand would have remained in great condition while the rest of the painting needed to be totally repainted. The story we are told is that this painting dates back to the early 16th century, and that it has changed hands many times. Each time it changed hands it was restored, and eventually the details were “scrubbed” away. Before it was restored

this last time it was just a “ghost”, we are told. But the hand puts the lie to that tale. Why would the face age so much more poorly than that hand? Being painted skin, they would have been painted with the same pigments, and should have aged in the same way. If one cracked, the other should have cracked as well. If one faded, the other should have faded equally. And yet, we see little or no change to the hand. This indicates that even before Modestini got to work on it, it was a later production. My guess is its provenance has been faked like everything else.

You should also know that there was a big story on this painting less than a year ago. [You can read about it at Bloomberg as well.](#) There we are told that in 2013 this painting was delivered to the Manhattan penthouse of Russian billionaire Dmitry Rybolovlev. He wanted the painting and was apparently known to be willing to spend \$100 million to get it. And get this: his penthouse just happened to be located *right above* Sotheby's on Central Park West. It is a clue they dangle in front of your face, knowing you won't read it correctly. Although the painting was physically delivered to Rybolovlev's residence, for some reason Sotheby's brokered the sale to Yves Bouvier, Rybolovlev's own art dealer. Bouvier immediately turned around and sold it to Rybolovlev, at a \$45 million mark-up. [Rybolovlev is the seller in the current sale.] The original owners (Simon and Parish), then threatened to sue, claiming they had been cheated out of the mark-up. But—and now get this—Sotheby's beat them to the punch, suing *them*. We are told Sotheby's wanted a judge to confirm they had done nothing wrong.

Does any of that make any sense? If you say no, then you will not be surprised to hear that none of these lawsuits has any update. Like everything else, they also look fake. I doubt they will have any real outcome, ever. If you don't know what I mean, ask yourself why Sotheby's was involved AT ALL. If the owners delivered the painting to Rybolovlev's penthouse, why couldn't they sell directly to him, without the involvement of either Bouvier or Sotheby's? Rybolovlev and Simon both had lips and were apparently able to speak English. So why did they need to hire any middlemen? Middlemen just drive costs up: everyone knows that, especially billionaires. So the last thing these two parties would wish to do is involve brokers. There was nothing to broker, was there?

Obviously, this story was manufactured to drive the price of the painting way up. This Rybolovlev story was a planned precursor to the story this year, when the price would be bumped way up again. For myself, I don't believe any of this ever happened.

Why not? Well, consider the people involved. I suppose you recognize the name **Bouvier**? As in Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, who we now know was a **Levy** through her mother. Gore Vidal himself told us that. The dealers **Simon** and **Parish** have the same red flags on them, being from the same Jewish families. Parish we have seen many times now, going back to [the Salem Witch hoax](#) of 1692. There, the lead was played by Samuel **Parris**, remember? Same name, different spelling.

And what about Rybolovlev? As a Russian billionaire oligarch, he is immediately suspect. He previously allegedly bought a Mark Rothko painting for \$186 million –about 186 million times what it was worth.



So this wasn't his first suspicious purchase. If we search him at Wikipedia, we find no parents given. This indicates to me he may be Jewish. More on that in a moment.

More research takes us a [massive art fraud case](#) in Europe involving Rybolovlev. Of course it isn't being mentioned in the current stories on the Leonardo sale. Rybolovlev owns the football club AS Monaco, and in what is now being called Monaco-gate, the Minister of Justice of Monaco, Philippe Narmino, resigned in September. This was after *Le Monde* reported Narmino had been working for Rybolovlev to “influence a billion-dollar art fraud case”. In these stories, Rybolovlev is supposed to be the victim of fraud, not the defrauder, but I wouldn't accept that at face value if I were you. The defrauder is alleged to be Bouvier, who has now been arrested by both Switzerland and Monaco at the behest of Rybolovlev. In Switzerland, Bouvier is being sued by the government for \$145 million in back taxes on paintings said to be undervalued by him in documents.

Bouvier was allegedly “lured” to Monaco by Rybolovlev, where he was arrested. But how stupid are we supposed to believe he is? He knew he was involved in a worldwide scandal and that arrest warrants had been drawn up for him. He also knew Rybolovlev lived in Monaco and was extremely prominent there. So how could you possibly lure him there? Lure him with what, candy? This just indicates Bouvier is in on this entire hoax, playing a part. There is no chance he was ever arrested for real.

Yes, my reading of this is that it is all misdirection. They are telling a new story to make Bouvier the fall guy, but that is just to keep your eyes off the bigger anomalies in these stories. It looks to me like the fraud goes far deeper than just Bouvier gouging his clients or cheating on taxes. It looks like all the parties involved, including Simon, Parish, Rybolovlev, Sotheby's, Christie's, and others—including major media—are all conspirators in another vast fraud. That fraud is faking both paintings and sales to create an entirely fake market. That fake market is then used as a front for even more massive frauds, including laundering money from huge international thefts from national treasuries worldwide. We now know the billionaires are stealing from treasuries directly in the form of various banking scandals, including LIBOR, TARP, PPIP and so on and so on. Many bank and savings and loan collapses have been faked over the decades to facilitate treasury dips in the form of needless “bailouts”, paid for by taxpayers. These aren't bailouts, they are just grand thefts in broad daylight. Well, these fake art sales are simply used to launder some of the billions of dollars stolen in these various cons. In that previous paper, I even told you how it is done.



Now, what about Dianne Modestini, the one who “conserved” this painting? Look at her there, “conserving” a Leonardo with some paint splotches on a piece of notebook paper. I have done some restoration myself, and I can tell you it isn't done that way. She needs a full palette of top quality pigments, in order to mix exactly the right value. You will tell me this pic was shot just for show, but it still makes no sense. That isn't the work space of any professional artist or restorer. She appears to have a small open bottle of turp or something on the far side, resting on the easel ledge. Again, not a great place to have an open bottle of turp: just inches from a Leonardo panel. Even the photographer doesn't know what he is doing, since she is backlit by that window. The whole thing screams “fake”.

The Modestini are a family of nobility in Italy related to the [Mattoli/Mattioli/Matteoli](#). Her middle name is **Dwyer**, although we aren't told if it is her maiden name or not. Either way, it is a clue, since it is another name from the British peerage. They are related to the **Barclay** de Tollys, as in Barclays Bank. They descend from General Thomas Peard Dwyer, whose son married a **Cunynghame**, of the Baronets of Milncraig, in 1871. The 11th Baronet Cunynghame married Margaret **Stanley** in 1941. She is the daughter of Arthur Stanley, Baron Sheffield, and Margaret **Gordon**. We have seen the Stanleys in almost every paper I have written in the past five years. Through the Stanleys and Gordons we link to everyone at the top of the peerage. Also, Margaret Gordon's mother was Mary Theodosia **Sartoris**. Why is that important? Well, first of all, her brother married Ellen **Grant**, daughter of President of the US Ulysses Grant. Second, Dmitry Rybolovlev's socialite daughter Ekaterina is currently married to Uruguayan billionaire Juan **Sartori**, owner of Union Group. That is one of the biggest companies in South America, involved in mining, oil and gas, forestry, and real estate. Sartori/Sartoris. Coincidence? Not a chance.

You may also remember there was a Dwyer involved in the [faked Buddy Holly plane crash](#). Hubert J. Dwyer owned the flying service that provided the plane and pilot.

The Dwyers are also related to the **Hoares**, which links us back to Salem and forward to Jennifer Aniston. Also to **Hoare Bank**, England's oldest privately owned bank. The Dwyers are also related to the **Joyces**, and through them to author and spook James Joyce. See the **Dwyer-Joyces** in the peerage from Dublin. [They later married the Crichton-Stuarts](#), linking to that nest. They are Marquesses, closely related to the **FitzAlan-Howards** (Dukes of Norfolk) and **Leveson-Gowers** (Dukes of Sutherland). The Dwyers are also related to the **Palmers**, the Baronets **Shaw**, the **Hills**, the Barons **Berkeley**, and the Baronets **Bourke**. So Dianne Modestini throws up a large number of red flags herself and appears to be related to the seller of the painting through the name Sartori(s). My guess is she isn't the artist who repainted *Salvator Mundi*, though she is listed as the conservator. I see a younger hand in the work. I would guess his age to be about, oh, let's see. . . 47.

[Further research](#) on the name Modestini finds they are also related to the Sciortinos. This is interesting, because the Sciortinos are known for their connections to the mafia. See Wikipedia, which lists two of five with admitted mafia connections. That's curious in itself. I didn't realize mafia connections were listed in mainstream bios. We can take that info back to the Matteolis/Mattiolis, finding the same thing with them. This reminds us of Altero Matteoli, current President of the VIII Commission of the Italian Senate and former Minister of Infrastructure. He was also a member of the Commission of Inquiry on the Mafia. But most importantly, he was sentenced this year to four years for corruption, and fined almost 10 million euros. This was for his part in graft related to the MOSE project in Venice. Also part of this scandal is Amalia **Sartori** of the EU parliament, which surname we just saw above. We will see it again below.

The Mattolis are equally interesting. See Agostino Mattoli II, who married the daughter of George [Washington Balch](#) in 1905. Balch was the nephew of Admiral George Beall Balch of the Civil War, and was one of the wealthiest men in Detroit at the turn of the century, being involved in Western Union as well as the Michigan Bell Telephone Company and Detroit Electrical Works. The Balchs hailed from Essex Co, MA, which is Salem. They are related to the Nobles, Bradburys, Fosters, Newtons, Ayers, Genthners, Woods, Swains, Butlers, Morses, and Harrimans. The grandson of Mattoli is Agostino Marron Mattoli, who is a knight of the order of Savoy. That links us to previous papers, including my [paper on Mussolini](#).

Also interesting that Roger Moore [James Bond] was married to Luisa Mattioli.

Now let us look at Christie's, founded by James Christie in 1766. His Wiki page doesn't mention these Christies were in the peerage, but of course they were. [James Christie of Durie](#) married Mary **Turner Barclay**-Maitland in 1783 in Stirling, Scotland. Note the name Barclay, which we just saw linked to the Dwyers. Equally interesting is that [another James Christie](#) of the peerage lived in Montevideo, Uruguay, in the middle of the 20th century. Why is that interesting? Because it links us to Juan Sartori of Uruguay above. As I have told you many times, all these people are related, and we are seeing it again here. Yet another James Christie of the 19th century had a daughter named Augusta **Meyer** Christie. Note the middle name, which is Jewish. It must have come from her mother, not listed of course. She married Major William **Baines Morris**, son of John **Grant** Morris. This links us both to Lyndon Baines Johnson and Ulysses Grant. Through the Grant, it also links us to the Sartoris again, doesn't it? Wow. All this just from clicking on the James Christies in the peerage.

The Christies were also related to and descended from the **Lindsays**, Earls of Balcarres. These Lindsays were directors of the East India Company. The Lindsays also married the Grants, as well as the **Trotters**. Brad Pitt is a Trotter, remember. In 1864, [the Baronet Lindsay married a Rothschild](#). Her grandfather was Nathan **Meyer** Rothschild. Since we just saw an Augusta **Meyer** Christie, we should assume the Christies were closely related to the Rothschilds—even closer than the close link through the Lindsays.

I trust you are starting to get a lay of the land here. But it gets even better. We can pull in Yves Bouvier, too. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy is also in the peerage, although they never tell you that. So is her mother, Janet Norton Lee. Well, Janet Lee's first husband was the Bouvier, and her second was an Auchinloss, but her third husband was Bingham **Morris**. These Morrises were related to the Bouchers and Carters, as well as to the Grants and Christies. See two paragraphs up, where we just found these Morrises. This links the Bouviers to the Christies. You will tell me Yves Bouvier was working in the current story with Sotheby's, not Christie's, but it is all the same. The second sale was at

Christie's, and Bouvier is still alive and still tied to Rybolovlev, so he is therefore tied to Christie's. As I showed you, the feud between Bouvier and Rybolovlev is manufactured as misdirection. Besides, Sotheby's and Christie's are closely tied and often work together. That is why Bouvier bought from Sotheby's but Rybolovlev sold through Christie's. It just proves again how stupid the stories are, since it shows you why—if Sotheby's and Christie's were really separate—Sotheby's would have never screwed over Rybolovlev by selling to Bouvier. You may have thought at a first reading that they had nothing to lose and everything to gain by simply selling to Bouvier behind Rybolovlev's back, but they actually had a huge amount to lose, didn't they? By (apparently) pissing off Rybolovlev, they (apparently) missed out on the biggest sale of all time, didn't they? But, as I said, you can be sure none of that happened, since both sales were fake. The whole thing has been a con from the first.

But we still aren't finished. Remember Hoare Bank above, related to our players here? Well, they are also linked to Christie's. On a hunch, I searched on “Hoare Bank Christie's” and [it paid off](#). In 2017, Hoare Bank hosted a talk by Lord Hindlip, who was promoting his new book. Hindlip is Charles Henry Allsopp, 6th Baron Hindlip, formerly General Manager of Christie's New York, later Chairman of Christie, **Manson and Woods**, and finally Chairman of Christie's International. So why is Hoare Bank promoting this man?

Before we answer that, let us look at that name Manson, which sort of leaps off the page at us, especially this week. [For those reading this later, Charles Manson died this week.] The encyclopedias won't tell us who this Manson linked to Christie was, so again we head to the peerage. There, we find the Mansons were also related closely to the Grants. See William Alastair [Leslie Grant](#), who married Frances Waddington in 1961. Her mother was Elspeth Grant, daughter of Col. Grant, 10th Baronet of Monymusk, and Evelyn **Lindsay Wood**. Note the name Lindsay, which we just saw above. We also get this quick link to Wood, as in Christie, Manson and **Woods**. Coincidence? I doubt it. The Mansons in the peerage are well scrubbed, for obvious reasons, but we do find a [Solomon Manson](#), b. 1901, whose mother was a **Steinberg**. He married a **Taylor** and his daughter married a **Gould**. All Jewish names. The daughter became the Baroness Gould, though her husband is scrubbed. He must have been a Baron, though. Solomon's father Nathan was born in Russia. In 1856, we find an Elizabeth Manson marrying a Lt. Gen. **Gordon**, also related to the **Forbes** and **Pratts**. This links us again to the people above. In 1946, we find a Royston Manson marrying Joan Lewin, daughter of Brian **Spencer Lewin** and Violet Hughes-**Morgan**. Lewin is Jewish, related to Lewinsky, and Morgan links us to Morgan Bank. The Mansons were also related to the **Douglasses**. Also the **Reid** Baronets. Also the **Bacons** and **Caulfields**. Also the Barons **Mackay**.

But back to Charles Allsopp, Baron Hindlip of Christie's. His grandmother is a **Middleton, as in the current Duchess Kate Middleton**. He is also related to **Johnstones**, which links him to the Mansons, who were as well. The Johnstones were closely related to the Gordons, so everywhere you see the Gordons above, you can insert the Johnstones also. Anyway, Allsopp's sister Sarah married a cousin, Hugh Myddleton, whose grandmother was a **Nevill** (Marquesses of Abergavenny). They are related to the **Howards** (Earls of Arundel) and **Stanleys** (Earls of Derby). The Myddletons also link us to the Morrisises again. We also link to the **Petty-FitzMaurices**, and through them to the **Hamiltons**, **Murrays**, and **Greys**. So, to make a long story short, Allsopp wasn't working at Christie's by accident. He was closely related to the founders and owners. And Hoare Bank isn't promoting him just to educate their clients on art. They are promoting him because they are related to him.

What about dealer Robert **Simon**? I found no bio for him online, but best guess is he is related to all these people as well. So we just return to the peerage for clues. There we find a Roger Simon, 2nd Baron Simon, who died in 2001. Although a peer, he allegedly became a Communist, joining the

Communist party. Oivay! His father was Chairman of the BBC Board of Governors. Roger's cousin was Christopher Gordon Horsfall Simon, British General Commissioner of Income Tax. His aunt married the 1st Baronet Hamilton, linking them to the Clements and the Kings. Also note the names Gordon and Hamilton, which link us to the people above. There is also a Baron Simon of Highbury, b. 1939, managing director of British Petroleum until 1995. While researching this, I discovered [singer Paul Simon](#) is in the British peerage, although it is not clear why. We also find the 1st Viscount Simon, b. 1873, who married the daughter of a **Pollock**. His sister married a Morgan. The earliest Simon I could find in the peerage is Isaac Simon, who married Jean Black in 1741. Her mother was Margaret **Gordon**, linking once again to the same people. Her father was the 1st of Esselmont. He married Isabella Byres, whose mother was a **Middleton**. Again providing the link. We also find a Hedwig Simon, no ancestors listed, but her daughter Heide Hansen just happened to marry the Prince of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen in 1971. His mother was the Princess of Belgium. His grandmother was Antonia of Braganza and Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, linking us to the Windsors, rulers of England. They changed their name from Saxe-Coburg-Gotha. We also find an [Eva Maria Simon](#) of the peerage coming out of nowhere to marry Austrian royalty in 1990.

But let's return to Rybolovlev for a moment. A search on that name pulls up no one but our Dmitri, and he has no genealogy and no parents listed. So where does the name come from? My guess is it is some sort of Russian fudge for Rubinstein/Rubenstein, linking him to my previous papers on Jack Ruby. More digging pulls up a 2016 Google book by Zsolt Szemerszky called *Living in Monaco*. Szemerszky lives in Monaco himself and would appear to be another wealthy Jew, [but on page 260](#) he gives up some dirt on Rybolovlev. There we learn that it was not only Bouvier who was arrested in Monaco, it was Rybolovlev himself—along with his attorney Tetiana Bersheda. **The charge was multi-million dollar art fraud.** So apparently Rybolovlev *wasn't* thought to be just the victim of Bouvier, not by the officials of Monaco. Tellingly, Szemerszky also ties this case to the HSBC Bank case, admitting Rybolovlev is its largest customer. And, as we saw in New York, curiously Rybolovlev lives in Monaco right above the bank. Edmund Safra's HSBC Private Bank of Monaco occupies the first four floors of the Belle Epoque building, and Rybolovlev's quarters are just above. These “coincidences” remind me of an early Sherlock Holmes segment called *The Red-Headed League*. In it, some bank robbers inhabit a pawnshop next door to the bank and tunnel in from there. So finding Rybolovlev living just above both Sotheby's and HSBC in different cities is a huge clue. It indicates we may actually be dealing with trapdoors and such here.

It is also worth remembering the reversal I showed you in my paper on money laundering, where the buyer is really the seller and the seller is really the buyer: not of the painting but of some hidden commodity. Which would mean Rybolovlev probably just bought something for about half a billion from someone. What was it? Arms? Drugs? A lifetime supply of Viagra?

But what was the HSBC Bank case I just mentioned? A search on that finds that HSBC is exiting Monaco, and it is doing so due to this scandal. [According to an October 2016 article in *The Guardian*](#), HSBC—Britain's largest bank—has pulled out of not only Monaco, but 100 other countries worldwide, in response to recent litigation. That's right, HSBC was recently located in 150 countries, but is now located in only 50. Do you think that is a small story? And guess what, the article at *The Guardian* specifically mentions money laundering as part of the scandal. It also says this:

A hack of its [Swiss operation's 30,000 accounts in 2007](#) showed how the bank helped wealthy customers dodge taxes and conceal millions of dollars of assets, including doling out bundles of untraceable cash and advising clients on how to circumvent domestic tax authorities.

The author also links us [to another Guardian article](#) about Panamanian law firm Mossack Fonseca and its “Zurich boss” Sandro Hangartner, other players in the HSBC scandals. Of course this ties us to the recent and famous **Panama Papers** leaks. In those we see major media like *The Guardian* at least partially outing the tax fraud, money laundering, and other schemes of the superwealthy. Why they are doing this is a question for another paper, but they *admit* they are doing it at the behest of the government, who needs these taxes for itself. Since the “government” is just other wealthy people, we basically see the billionaires feuding and trying to steal from one another. We have nothing left to steal, so they now have to steal from one another.



You may be interested to know that Jurgen Mossack of Mossack Fonseca is the son of a Nazi. His father was in the Waffen SS. After the war the father Mossack went to work for the CIA. All that is from his page at Wiki, so I am not divulging secrets. What this tells me is that you should continue to be wary of these stories about Mossack Fonseca, including the entire Panama Papers leak. These leaks are normally controlled leaks, leaked by Intelligence itself. Although they may contain some good information and seem damaging to top people, more likely is that they are a further form of misdirection.

Further indication of that is Ramon Fonseca Mora, the other partner. He comes out of the London School of Economics, a top Intel conduit. Mick Jagger also came out of the LSE, as we saw recently. Fonseca is a protégé and minister of Juan Carlos Varela, President of Panama. We are told at Wiki that Mossack Fonseca has acted for about 300,000 companies worldwide, with only 500 employees. Impossible, isn't it? They would have to have 100 times that many employees. The only entity with that number of employees—besides the large countries' militaries—is Intelligence. So best guess is Mossack Fonseca is *also* an Intel front. That should help you read some of the leaks. Also, given the content of the leaks in 2015, you would have expected the company to be immediately shut down. It is not like they exist on another planet and can't be reached physically by the governments of the world. So why are they still in business? Although we are told Peruvian, Panamanian, and Salvadorian police raided their local offices in 2016, none of these offices have been closed. Their offices in the US and Europe are still open for normal business. It is now two years after the leak, and we hear nothing about Mossack Fonseca's 300,000 clients being tried and convicted of tax evasion by all the governments of the world. Just a few pointless lawsuits and sanctions that of course go nowhere. See the Wikipedia section on “sanctions”, where you will find only a few parties with Eastern names like Barqawi and

Makhlouf. No word on why the major banks involved haven't been put in receivership, liquidated, and their owners and controllers jailed.

A major clue to what is going on with the “leak” is found in the section at Wikipedia on “people named” in the leak. Included is the Prime Minister of Iceland, which should throw up a red flag. This Gunnlaugsson had been the lead voice when Iceland refused to pay £2.3 billion in compensation when it threw the bankers out and nationalized the banks beginning in 2008. Some bankers were even arrested. So it is curious to find this guy named in this new banking scandal. The fact that he is near the top of the list and is one of the few people mentioned by name on the main page at Wikipedia tells me the Panama Papers leak is actually controlled by the big bankers themselves. They are using it to get back at Gunnlaugsson and others. It is so obvious.

Also notice that almost no one from the UK, US, France, or Germany is named. In fact, not one person is listed under Germany. One minor person is listed from the US. In France, only people like Le Pen and Strauss-Kahn are listed. Except for Strauss-Kahn, almost no Jews are on the list from any countries. This is the opposite of what you should expect, given the Jewish preoccupation with banking and finance. The list should be heavy with obvious Jewish (and obvious-to-us crypto-Jewish) names. It should be a list of 300,000 Levys, Kohens, Steinbergs, Isaacs, Jonases, Rothschilds, Rockefellers, Meyers, Liebermans, Fishls, Pollacks, Stuarts, Marxes, Stanleys, Morgans, Taylors, and so on. This is all the indication you should need that the list is fake, upside down, and drawn up by the very people who should be prosecuted in these scandals.


Despite that, the Panama Papers are central to the thesis of my paper here, since in them we find art involved. [Mossack Fonseca was involved](#) in the contested case of Modigliani's painting *Seated Man with a Cane* and other “Nazi-looted artwork”. It [was also involved in the sale](#) of Picasso's *Women of Algiers*, which allegedly sold at Christie's for \$31.9 million in 1997—a record at the time. The previous owners were thought to be the Ganzes. [This painting just happened to be lot #33, by the way.] But what we found out in 2016 is that this painting had already been sold previously by the Ganzes to Joe Lewis, billionaire currency trader. So the owners were misrepresented at the time. Lewis allegedly spent \$168 million for the entire Ganz collection and then auctioned it one piece at a time, making a huge profit. But again, that is just a cover story, one we are unwinding here. As with Rybolovlev, so with Lewis. You can see that even more easily here with Lewis, since it is now known and admitted that Lewis was the largest shareholder in Christie's at the time. Can you say “conflict of interest”? Can you say “inside job”?

The way Mossack Fonseca was involved was as an agent for Simsbury International Corp., which was a front for Lewis. So Lewis was hidden twice in this deal. What is still hidden is the buyers of the various works. But we should suspect the second part of the con, by which Lewis simply bought them himself through other fronts. This would drive not only his own value way up, it would drive the rest of the fake market up. Which it did. That 1997 Christie's sale was the start of the huge acceleration of price inflation, and that is now admitted. You will say that if he bought them himself, he didn't really profit, but that is true only in a limited sense. He didn't profit from that particular auction, which was a total fake. But he profited by increasing the value of his “chits”. As I showed in my previous paper on money laundering, these paintings are used as markers in other deals, and if your markers increase in value, it is like money in the bank, you see.

More clues that Lewis did indeed buy back his own works is the fact that Wiki now states that he currently has a collection that includes Picasso, Matisse, Freud, and Moore. Gee, that sounds a lot like the Ganz Collection, doesn't it?

We also find Barclays Bank involved in the Panama Papers, and we saw them come up several times above. While Mossack Fonseca and HSBC created 2,000 offshore accounts to dodge taxes, [Barclays created at least 300](#). And this also links us to the **Paradise Papers**. Not the Panama Papers, but the Paradise Papers. These were leaked just this month, but involve many of the same subjects and people. One thing I point you to [in the Paradise Papers](#) is the involvement of the Isle of Man as a tax shelter. Of course this links us to my previous research on Anglesey and Isle of Man, both ancient strongholds of the Stanleys and others.

Yesterday, November 22, the ICIJ [published a report on Blackstone](#) and their tax avoidance as part of its Paradise Papers release. I suggest you read it. Of course this ties us back to my previous papers, since I have outed Blackstone many times as a player in various hoaxes, including Michael Jackson's faked death, the faked Aurora shooting, and so on. The ICIJ also has red flags on it, since its deputy director is Marina **Walker Guevara**. Think George Herbert **Walker** Bush and Che **Guevara**. Che Guevara was another spook actor from the families. On his mother's side he is a **Duran**, and that surname is a variant of the crypto-Jewish Durant/Durrant. [He is also a Castro](#), which explains his hoaxed [escapades with Fidel](#). His paternal grandfather was a Castro, from Hayward California. Che was a Castro on his mother's side as well. On his father's side he is descended from Patrick Lynch Blake of Galway, who moved to Bolivia and married a granddaughter of General Nunez de Abalos. [The Lynches of Galway](#) were the most prominent family there for centuries, being merchant/traders with Spain and becoming extremely wealthy. Before that they were from Austria, originally being **Linzes**. This links them to the Lindsays in the peerage. For instance, study this picture of Che as a child with his family:



Not what you expected, I'll bet. Dad doesn't look hispanic at all, and neither does Che. Neither do the first and fourth children. The third looks like Anne Frank. Mom looks slightly hispanic, but that is because she is a Marrano. Che is also related to the **Perons** of Argentina, going all the way back to Ponce de Leon of Spain. I have told you what that means [in a previous](#) paper: they are all Jewish. The Lynches of Galway are also Jewish. Che is also related to Enrique Lynch de Solar, organizer of the Modernist art movement in Chile. Of course that ties into the thesis of this paper.

The Paradise Papers are more interesting since they *do* name many major Jewish persons in the first world, including Sheldon Adelson, George Soros, Carl Icahn, Gary Cohn, and the Windsors. However, once again the subjects leaked are all softballs or airy snowballs. For instance, we are told Prince Charles invested \$113,000 in Sustainable Forestry Management, then called for carbon credits for such companies. Really? That's the worst thing the Duchy of Cornwall is involved in? At a quick glance, it appears the Paradise Papers were released to answer criticisms like mine above of the Panama Papers. The bankers realized they needed to follow up by leaking some documents with Jewish and first-world

names on them. But of course they still weren't going to leak anything important. You will never see anything leaked that opens up the big banks to meaningful prosecution. These banks will agree to pay some very minor fines—.0000001% of their thefts—but they will never allow any real information to reach the mainstream media.



But back to Joe Lewis. Is he related to the rest of these folks? I would assume so. There are about 830 Lewises in the peerage, including two Joseph Lewises. We saw some of these Lewises in [my paper on C. S. Lewis](#), and he is also listed in the peerage. Joe Lewis is admitted to be Jewish, though no parents are listed at Wiki. Curiously, he named his personal conglomerate the **Tavistock** Group, comprising over 200 companies. For a laugh, you can visit [this page](#) on Lewis at Celebfamily.com, where a bio of Joe Lewis is illustrated with photographs of famous black boxer Joe Louis. No information on Lewis' ancestry is forthcoming there, so we have to rely on clues from the peerage. No Joseph Charles Lewis is listed, but my guess is he has either been scrubbed or hidden. The Lewises were from Wales, and were Baronets and Barons Merthyr. Also Barons Essendon and the Baron Brecon. The Baron Brecon, b. 1905, was the son of a Morgan. Neither he nor the 2nd Baron Essendon, b. 1903, are listed as having children. So it is possible Joe Lewis could be the unlisted son of either one. Neither page states “he died without issue”, as is the norm with titled peers. We also find the Baron Lewis of Newnham, b. 1928. This Baron Lewis is strange because he was created a Baron, while his father wasn't one. You will say that isn't so strange, but it is because Lewis was a Chemistry professor, not a rich guy. So why was he elevated into the House of Lords? His bio at thepeerage is very strange, since he is said to have graduated from London University in 1949, getting a PhD in 1952. He got a DSc in 1961 from London and an MSc from Manchester in 1962. He then got an MA from Cambridge in 1970, when he was 42. I can't make sense of that, and it isn't the bio of someone later given a Baronage and a place in the House of Lords.

Another candidate for the father of Joe Lewis is Arthur **Spencer** Lewis of London, otherwise scrubbed. His son Ronald Graham Lewis married Hilary Zara **Morris**, daughter of the 1st Baron Morris and Forence **Isaacs**. Isaacs is Jewish and Morris ties us to the people above. The Baron's father is given as Jacob Samuel Morris, otherwise scrubbed. In fact, I think this Lewis is our best candidate, given the four clues: 1) London, where Joe Lewis was born, 2) the name Morris, linking us to the families above, 3) the name Spencer, linking us to the families above, 4) the name Isaacs, telling us we are among Jews here. Remember, Joe Lewis is admitted to be Jewish.

Anyway, I have just shown you that everyone involved in the current Leonardo hoax is related, including Yves Bouvier, Dmitry Rybolovlev, Dianne Modestini, and Christie's itself. This indicates another big inside job, a hoax, and a con. And the point of it is? Well, we saw in the HSBC case that major firstworld governments appear to be cracking down on the banks in some ways, making it harder for them to avoid taxes and launder money. So the banks are looking for new methods, or new ways to

tweak or expand old methods. That is what this art market business is about, including the fake sale of this fake Leonardo. They need to get the prices for these fake works even higher, so that they can launder money more efficiently with fewer artworks.

In conclusion, we can now answer [the New York Times' question](#) as to why this Leonardo was listed by Christie's in its auction of Modern art, instead of with the Old Masters: it was forged recently, probably in the last 150 years.

Addendum November 29, 2017: This most recent fake comes hot on the heels of [another fake Leonardo](#), *La Bella Principessa*, which arose in 2010.




That's supposed to be a portrait of Bianca Sforza. There is a lot of “evidence” listed for why this is a Leonardo, but the evidence it *isn't* is final. To start with, Leonardo never worked in this style in any other work. Not even close. His drawing was always far more stylized. The drawing here is tight, reserved, and decidedly German (or Modern). The line quality is extremely boring, and Leonardo wouldn't have stooped to drawing the breasts or bodice like that, with standardized curves. He also never used such low contrast in either drawings or paintings. He liked shadows. There are almost none here. The drawing is all middle tones, with no darks and no highlights. In addition, the drawing has far too little aging and damage to be so old. It may be on old paper, but that is a standard trick of forgers. They scour Europe for old paper or wood before they even start.

This painting has no provenance of course, being documented only from **1998**. Before that, it's history is oral only, relying on the word of Jeanne Marchig, who tells us it was owned by her husband back to 1955. He was the art restorer Giannino Marchig. That's curious, eh? That it comes from the collection of an *art restorer*—someone capable of forging it. More recently, the convicted art forger Shaun Greenhalgh has *admitted* forging it, even going so far as to tell how it was done.

It has been sold in the media most heavily by spook Martin Kemp, whose Wikipedia page and bio is

one long red flag. No parents are listed and his early CV is almost non-existent. Most of his listed work is recent, from when he allegedly became an emeritus professor at Oxford. He writes for *Nature*, a known spook front that has been caught publishing faked science (see the Climategate scandal, as just one example). He is listed as a top Leonardo expert, but if he thinks this painting is a Leonardo we know what to think of that claim without further reading of his credentials. His name pegs him as someone scrubbed from the peerage, probably being related to the Viscounts Kemp. I would guess he is a cousin of St. John Durival Kemp, Viscount Rochdale. I would also assume he is related to the Martin Kemp of the 80s UK band Spandau Ballet.

One of the selling points of this Leonardo is supposed to be its similarities to *Lady with an Ermine*, long attributed to Leonardo, including “the handling of the eyes, the modelling of flesh tones using the palm of the hand, the intricacy of the patterns of the knotwork ornament and the treatment of the contours”.



Do you see any such similarities? I don't. The handling of the eyes is not similar, it is completely *dissimilar*, with the eyes in *Ermine* having both far more expression and far more shading and roundness. The fake is completely flat compared to the older work. The treatment of the contours is also completely dissimilar, with *Ermine* having a delicacy altogether lacking in *Principessa*. All the other arguments for *Principessa* fail just as spectacularly, and are only listed at places like Wikipedia to fool the gullible. No one with an eye would be fooled for a moment, which leads us to immediately write off all the experts listed as either highly incompetent or paid liars. Just so you know, that includes Nicholas **Turner**, Alessandro Vezzosi, Carlo Pedretti, and Cristina Geddo. To their credit, these scholars do not accept this drawing as a Leonardo: Pietro Marani, Nicholas Penny, Klaus Schroder, Carmen Bambeck, and Everett Fahy.

For the record, I believe *Lady with an Ermine* is also a fake, but it is a far older and a far better work of art. Its provenance starts in 1798, almost three hundred years too late. It isn't a Leonardo, but it is a great work of art nonetheless. This also applies to its “sister” painting, *La Belle Ferronniere*, said to be the same model.



It *isn't* the same model, as anyone with eyes can see. This painting also has no good provenance, and looks nothing like a Leonardo. It isn't nearly as good as *Lady with an Ermine*, and I would say it is from the 19th century or later. It is closer to the style of Ingres than Leonardo, and looks decidedly French in the eyes and mouth. And what about that ledge in front? Could that be clunkier? Do you think Leonardo would have done something like that? The background is a dead giveaway as well, since it looks nothing like any Renaissance background I have ever seen. The experts at the Louvre should be flogged for trying to pass this off as Leonardo “or his Milanese circle”. I personally could fake a better Leonardo than that.

But let's return to *Principessa*. For non-artists, the easiest clue may be the look of the model. Does she look like a Sforza to you? Did they have red hair, tiny perfect noses, and pale blue eyes?



That's Bianca's father, Ludivico Sforza, with his Jewish nose.



That's his wife Beatrice, with jet black hair. So where did this Bianca Sforza get her red hair and blue eyes? I will be told this Bianca was illegitimate, and her mother is not listed, but I doubt she was ginger Irish. There is another Bianca Sforza, daughter of Ludovico's older brother Galeazzo:



Also obviously Jewish. Besides, we know what this Bianca Sforza looked like at that age:



No match. This Bianca had brown hair and dark eyes, a longer nose, and a weaker chin. Maybe they

mean this Bianca Sforza, wife of Francesco Sforza:



Do you see a profile match there?

Some may chafe at my claiming the Sforzas were Jewish, but I have already hit it in previous papers. To start with, they were closely related to the Medicis, [who were also crypto-Jews](#). They were bankers and traders with the East, remember? We also saw the Sforzas [linked to the Jagiellons and Vasas](#) of Poland at the time of Leonardo. See [Bona Sforza](#), wife of King Sigismund I. She has a listing at the Jewish Encyclopedia. Her daughter was Anna Jagiellon, [who was an ancestor](#) of many current nobles, including the Windsors.