

Marcel Duchamp

the biggest fraud in the history of art



by Miles Mathis

First published November 18, 2023

Despite his manufactured fame peaking about a century ago, Duchamp is still sold by the mainstream as one of the towering “geniuses” of 20th century art. This despite never creating any real works of art. How did he manage that? The usual way: he was a gay boy from a rich Jewish family, so he was guaranteed any and all promotion no matter what he did. He knew that from an early age, so he played it for all it was worth.

Duchamp decided before he was 20 that he wished to destroy the history of art and put himself in its place. Who but a rich Jew could conceive of such a project, much less carry it out? I will be told Duchamp was actually a French Catholic and only dabbled with pretending to be Jewish later, when he was also changing sex, etc. But there is no evidence the Duchamps were ever Catholics and lots of evidence they were crypto-Jews/Phoenicians. For a start, although Geneastar scrubs Duchamp's lines pretty thoroughly, in the sidebar they admit he is related to Tim Dowling through the Phillips/Morse line, which means Duchamp is a Stuart and is related to the Queen of England. These links are not ancient, they are recent. As another example, Duchamp's mother was a Nicolle, and she was closely related to peer Arthur Villeneuve Nicolle of Jersey, whose son Frederick married Helia Walker,

daughter of Lady Crichton-Stuart, in 1957.

One of Duchamp's wives was a Sattler, which name is Jewish. His other wife was a Sarazin-Lavassor, of old French/Jewish nobility.



Note the three U-shaped figures in the lower part, which are symbols of the Phoenician goddess Tanit. Also see the Hebrew letter Teth. So the clues actually stack up very quickly if you know what to look for. It is admitted this marriage was one of convenience. Who has marriages of convenience? Gays.

A later beard was Maria de Lourdes Alves, from a Brazilian family of Marranos/crypto-Jews closely linked to the Perons. She had previously been married to a Souza.

Wikipedia tells us that Duchamp and all his brothers and friends were exempted from WWI for a heart murmur.

After World War I started in August 1914, with his brothers and many friends in military service and himself exempted (due to a heart murmur),[\[30\]](#)[\[31\]](#) Duchamp felt uncomfortable in Paris.

You have to laugh. That's interesting, since Duchamp never later had any heart problems. He lived past 80 and didn't die of a heart attack, despite being a lifelong cigar smoker. These people love to start wars but they don't like to have to show up for them personally.

I have told you why Duchamp was promoted in his lifetime, but why would this talentless loser continue to be promoted up the present time? In 2004 his urinal was voted the most important artwork of the 20th century in a poll of 500 art experts.



Are all 500 just taking a piss? Well, yes, but it is more than that. It confirms that art was killed with malice aforethought by Modernism, and that art experts remain satisfied with that murder. All these experts are also talentless losers of the Duchamp sort, ones who could not hope to be included in a living field of real artists. The only way they could ever hope to be consulted as experts is in a field completely decimated: a field defined by a toilet. So Duchamp remains their patron saint.

Art was purposely infiltrated, coopted, and razed by hordes of invaders, this invasion being abetted by the capitalists. The financiers were happy to see art go under, since it allowed them to rebuild the field on their own models. Art requires an eye and a spirit, so it was always beyond the comprehension of the financiers from the beginning. It would always remain for them proof of their own disabilities. So you can see why they would wish to kill it. In its place they would construct a faux-market of pseudo-relevances and pretend politics, promoting it as new-and-improved. This was all so empty it soon self-destructed back down to bare earth, at which point the only use of the thing was as money laundering. Even that is beginning to self-destruct as it goes transparent.

They tell us Modernism was a response to WWI, artists losing all belief in meaning and beauty due to that tragedy, but that is just another lie. Modernism was already in full swing by 1910, four years before WWI even started. They admit Duchamp came up with his idea of anti-art in 1913, before the war, and that he never tied the idea to world politics. It wasn't a political idea for him, it was personal. By that time he had figured out that he had zero artistic talent, and I guess it made him furious. His response was typically childish: if he couldn't do it it must be destroyed.

Science was falling to the same sort of response from the same Families at the same time, with people like Bohr and Heisenberg outlawing all science they couldn't do. Like Duchamp they had a basic inability to visualize, so like him their response was to do away with it. Duchamp wanted to destroy "retinal" art, meaning art that required an eye, and Bohr wished to destroy diagramming and any other drawing in science. Bohr not only couldn't draw, he couldn't even follow someone else's diagram, which of course made him mad. But he found that a lot of his colleagues in physics were in the same boat, and they cheered when he used his authority to remove anyone that could draw or visualize from the field, defining physics as free-floating math. A physics minus the physical. Physics almost immediately crashed and burned and has been existing in that nowhere land ever since. Like the born artist, the born physicist was killed on purpose, simply to make the talentless feel better about

themselves. It was never anything to do with the war, it was simply resentment.

But why hadn't this happened before? Why did it happen in the early 20th century? Because that is when the talented lost their protection from the aristocracy. Art and science had been existing for centuries as adjuncts of the royal and noble houses of Europe, so the fields were completely private. As long as there remained nobles who had an eye and a spirit, they could set up artists and scientists in any way they saw fit. But as that old world crumbled in the 19th century, art and science were thrust into the public world, where they had to fight for funding along with everyone else. Suddenly they had to justify themselves not on their own merits, but in the new cost/benefit ledgers of the financiers. They also had to justify themselves in newly egalitarian ledgers of the public, which turned out to be just as petty, childish, and resentful as any talentless rich boy.

But we know these royal and noble houses still exist: why did they give up on art and science? Why did they stand by and watch both die violent deaths in the 20th century? Because these houses found other games to play. In previous centuries entertainment was very limited. There were no cars to collect, no TV or cinema to watch. Art, literature, and science were the most interesting things going back then, and the nobles proved their elevation to one another by their levels of involvement. But that interest in elevation began to dissipate in the 19th century, as the European nobles watched their richest cousins in America go in another direction. At first they dismissed the American billionaires as what they were: crass boors competing to outspend one another on ugly houses, uglier ranches, and even uglier wives. But the Americans ignored them and continued on apace, judging one another by the billions they were piling up by illegal means, and not by anything useful they did with the money. Unfortunately, the Americans were getting all the interesting worldwide press, so to compete with them the Europeans had to join them. And join them they soon did, in marriage and in every other way. Very soon the noble houses had flushed all interest in art, literature, and science, proving that their previous interest was just a pose. They could just as easily adopt any other pose, as long as it got their names in the paper.

Plus, you have to remember that for the few remaining nobles who still cared for beauty, they could get that from existing art. Their families had been collecting the best art since the Renaissance and their homes were already full to bursting with it. They didn't need any more, so the fact that living artists were being phased out meant nothing to them. These nobles could continue to trade in Old Masters and never find a moment's boredom.

As for science, almost none of them had ever understood it to start with, so when it collapsed they were none the wiser. For these people the new science was a jollier game, since all rules had been abandoned in favor of a say-anything metaphysics of infinite freedom and zero logic.

Nietzsche had seen it all coming 50 years earlier, back to the 1870s, again proving it had nothing to do with WWI. He tried to explain it as something to do with the death of Christianity, but that now looks like another misread. The US was at the same time the worst offender in terms of killing the old world, and the most Christian, so it is difficult to see the connection. God still isn't dead here, 150 years later, but nearly everything else is. So what did Nietzsche miss? Well, he missed what we have all missed until recently: military intelligence.

Even in my gloss of the problem above, it seems this was a kind of natural outcome: a general corruption of society. As they say, things fall apart. Civilizations eventually rot from within. But what if it wasn't that at all? What if this was all planned? What if nothing that has happened over the past 200 years has been an accident or a natural outcome, but the result of a magnificent and longrunning

script? In fact we now know it was. In two decades of deep research I have been able to prove that Nietzsche and everyone else has missed the central cause of Modernism, possibly on purpose. They want you to *think* this was a natural outcome, the result of decay or decadence or entropy or world weariness. But it wasn't. We have caught the Fabians admitting they were doing most of this back to the 1880s, and I have shown you it goes back much further. The roots of Communism in the 1820s and 30s betray the very same project from the very same people. Even then, they weren't responding to the death of God, they were killing him on purpose, to steal his tithe. So Nietzsche had it upside down. The death of religion wasn't causing anything. The death of religion was another *result* of the great plan. Christianity had served its purpose, but the governors had decided its time had come: it was time to replace it with the all-encompassing State. It was time to secularize and simplify everything down to a few basic rules and salutes, to make ruling more efficient. Christianity had taken on a dangerous life of its own, implying to believers that the earthly governors weren't the be-all and end-all of life. Yes, the people had been warned to give Rome what belonged to Rome, ie all your taxes and earthly fealty, but that was no longer enough. The governors wanted it all. To achieve that they needed to not only destroy Christianity, but science, art, the family, traditional medicine, and everything else. The plan was to crush society down to bare ground and rebuild it on "humanist" principles: that is to say, inhuman principles of absolute authority and control. I don't have to tell you the end point of that, since we are now there. All you have to do is look around. The old plan has gone completely transparent in the past two decades and it is now staring us in the face. It is a Mordor plan, so ironically it was Tolkien who was the most prescient of all. Only he understood the true blackness in the hearts of these people.

Nietzsche's various categories of higher and lower man have also turned out to be misdirection, since although they contain a kernel of truth, they are not representative of the movement of recent history. There have been no supermen in that time, just your average clueless citizens and the evil overlords preying on them. Nor have we gotten beyond good and evil. Turning everything evil doesn't take you beyond good and evil. The governors would love for you to believe we have gotten beyond good and evil, since that would leave you with no way to judge them or prosecute them. Without an innate morality, the legal system collapses with everything else, as it now has.

It all sounds hopeless, except for one thing: we can see it unwinding on them. As soon as they pushed this plan into overdrive after 911, the engine immediately began smoking. These "turtles" of infinite patience finally lost patience and rushed the plan, getting way ahead of themselves. 911 was a huge mistake, tearing the curtain, and that mistake has required a long line of tweaks and corrections, each correction precipitating two more. Every doubling down has been a further mistake, and the whole apparatus is now spinning out of control, on the verge of a massive explosion. In fact, I would say the **explosion has already happened**, the Phoenicians hoping to manage the downside by refusing to report on it. They desperately want you to believe something remains of their hegemony, but nothing does, not even the bank accounts. Technically they are all bankrupt, but until you figure that out they can pretend it isn't so. Someday soon they will all be shaken out of the tree and sent to the poorhouse, but until that happens we will continue to live in fairyland.