

[return to updates](#)

## ANOTHER FAKE PAINTING OF CHRIST PRETEND-SELLS FOR \$45 MILLION



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published January 30, 2022*

This is getting old. Do they really think we are believing this stuff? I guess they just don't care. We are in a "say anything" world.

That painting is supposed to be by Botticelli and it is supposed to have sold for over \$45 million at Sotheby's on Thursday. No one is stupid enough to believe that is really by Botticelli or to pay that much for it, so we must assume they didn't. This must be one more fabulous example of [money laundering](#), using fake art to hide other illegal transactions. It is admitted that using art to launder large sums of money has become an ever-growing problem, with many high-profile arrests, but clearly they have only touched the tip of the iceberg.

Just let me be clear: I personally could fake a better Botticelli than that. It is fake at a first glance, to any real artist. We don't need to check the back of the panel or test the paints. This is such a gloriously obvious fraud to anyone awake, it is hard to understand how they thought they could pass it. It is an affront to the ghost of Botticelli, who has asked me to speak for him.

They even admit there is another work underneath it, upside down, proving the forger used an old panel. But instead of recognizing that as an obvious sign of the fraud, they are trying to sell it as proof

of authenticity, claiming Botticelli painted over one of his juvenile efforts. Again, clown-world levels of absurdity and bold lying.

As usual, the work has no good provenance, being trackable only back to the mid-1800s (if that). Botticelli painted in the late 1400s. Tellingly, the Stanleys are involved here, which doubles all the red flags and adds two or three more exclamation points to the fraud. It comes out of the collection of British actress Pamela Stanley, who sold it for £10,000 in 1963. So how could it be worth \$45 million now? Because it wasn't a Botticelli back then. It was "re-attributed" to Botticelli in 2009 by Keith Christiansen, then chairman of European painting at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Laurence Kanter, the head of European art at the Yale University Art Gallery. Two blind men, I guess.

If you think this actress Pamela Stanley was just any Stanley, well, you would be wrong. She was the daughter of the Baron Alderley and Margaret Gordon, linking us to the Gordons, Dukes of Gordon, as well as the Stanleys, Earl of Derby—the Kingmakers. As Kings of Mann and Lords of the Isles, the Stanleys actually outranked all Kings of England. Pamela's brother was the 6<sup>th</sup> Baron, Edward Stanley, and the mansion at Alderley Park where this painting hung burned down to the ground in 1931. The entire estate was sold in 1938. I guess we are supposed to believe this painting survived, but I would say a better guess is that this piece of crap was painted sometime after 1931, maybe in an attempt to recreate a real painting that was lost in that fire.

These Stanleys of Alderley are from Isle of Man, where they were also Cholmondeleys. In the 1600s they joined the Pitts, Warburtons, and Leighs. In the 1700s they also became Owens. They were closely related to Bertrand Russell through the 2<sup>nd</sup> Baron Alderley. Edward Stanley married Victoria Chetwynd-Talbot, daughter of the Viscount, and her mother was a Paget of the Marquesses of Anglesey. Anglesey is also a primary demesne of the Stanleys. Pamela married the Baronet Cunynghame. Pamela's son Sir Andrew married a Dupont and a Watts. Her aunt Venetia Stanley was a close friend of Prime Minister Asquith.



Most important to us here is Pamela's grandmother, Mary Theodosia Sartoris. She was a famous beauty painted several times by Lord Leighton, as above. Her brother married Ulysses Grant's daughter. [As we saw in previous papers](#) (p. 7), the Christies of the auction house are closely related to this Sartoris family. In fact, in that paper we saw these very same people related to Diane Modestini, the alleged conservator of the fake Leonardo painting *Salvator Mundi*. Through the Dwyers, she is

related to the Cunynghames and Stanleys. Through the Grants and Morris, the Sartoris also link us to the Christies. What this tells us is that Pamela Stanley had family connections to Christie's auction house, which could have made it much easier to run schemes like this. You will say we are dealing with Sotheby's here, not Christie's, but they are closely linked and controlled by the same families. Everything is.

This is also very strange: only two bidders were interested in the work, and bidding started at \$32 million. The bidders were both employees of Sotheby's, [according to this report](#) by Eileen Kinsella at Artnet (since removed there but still up at MarketScreener today).

**Auctioneer David Pollack opened the action at \$32 million and called out bids in increments of \$1 million. When the work reached just around \$38 million, Sotheby's Old Masters specialist Elisabeth Lobkowitz called out a bid of \$38.2 million, a considerably milder price increase.**

**Lobkowitz competed with Old Masters department head Christopher Apostle up to around \$39.2 million, when she dropped out of contention. But her client jumped back in with a final bid of \$39.3 million that made Apostle's collector balk, ostensibly leaving Lobkowitz with the lot.**

I can't make sense of that. I suppose the clients are kept anonymous, with Sotheby's employees bidding for them. But that is suspicious in the extreme, of course, since we have no proof there ARE any real clients. There can't be, since no one would be blind enough to bid \$40 million for that atrocity.

---

---

It seems to be a hot time for fake Botticellis, since this one isn't the first. What about the Botticelli portrait that sold for \$92 million in January 2021 at Sotheby's?



It too is a horrible fake with no provenance. Again, I could produce a better fake Botticelli than that. Hundreds of people could. That isn't even remotely as good as a real Botticelli. It is so extravagantly bad everyone who had anything to do with the sale should be immediately arrested, and I formally call for their arrests. Or please sue me for libel, so that I can go to court and point out to a judge and jury all the ways this sucks.

I have never painted anything even close to a real Botticelli, but I have painted many things better than that fake Botticelli—since there is a huge gap between the two. That thing is flat and wooden, scrabbly, clumsy, and google-eyed. It looks like his head is on backward. Either that or his shirt is on backward. It reminds me of that scene in *The Empire Strikes Back* where Chewbacca puts C3PO's head on backward.

Look at the way the painting cuts off at the bottom. Is that supposed to be a ledge, with the finger overlapping it? It looks to me like the forger just taped that off with masking tape, with that being the color of the ground. He then painted the finger over it, and poorly faked a shadow. Botticelli never did anything like that, nor would he. The background is idiotic in the same way, and looks like it was painted by a third-grader with a straight edge. The shadows aren't even right. Botticelli never painted hair like that. He never painted fingernails like that. He never painted cloth like that. He never painted backgrounds like that. Look at the left edge of the neck and the lower edge of the hair on both sides! That is clumsy and modern in the extreme. I would love to see experts from the Uffizi comment on that!

The boy is holding a roundel, but again the shadows on the frame aren't even correct. It is so amateurish it defies belief. And why does this painting look like it was painted yesterday, with no damage, no craquelure, and no fading? You will say “There is nothing to fade, since there is no color in it.” Right. So what other Botticelli can you say that about? But honestly, does that painting look 500 years old?

Botticelli was famous for his soft and melting eyes. So look closely at the eye to your left here. Look at how the dark edge of the iris hits the white of the eye. It's all wrong, isn't it? It is too abrupt, making that edge come forward, ruining the roundness of the eye. Another amateur error by a very clumsy forger. This is one of the worst fakes I have *ever* seen.

They admit the first record of the painting was in 1938. Which gives us a 458-year gap in the provenance! You really have to laugh. The art dealer Frank Sabin allegedly bought it from Robert Vaughan Wynn, Baron Newborough, for a few pounds in a job lot. It had been hanging in servant's quarters. He sold it for around £10,000 in 1941 to Sir Thomas Merton, at which time it became known as a Botticelli. This Thomas Merton just happened to be the real Q at MI6. No, really, you can't make this shit up. Merton was a materials scientist who specialized in inks, papers, diffraction gratings, rulings, and grounds. But that isn't suspicious. Wikipedia tells us

**The attribution to Botticelli was put in doubt in later years, as prominent monographs on Botticelli did not include the portrait as a painting of Botticelli<sup>[1]</sup> but currently the attribution to Botticelli is accepted by a majority of the art historians.<sup>[2]</sup>**

Really? What art historians? Those paid off by the peerage or threatened by MI6? The footnote goes to a German book by Gina Thomas that I personally will not waste time reading. Any art historians or other experts who think this is a Botticelli should be bounced from the field.

For the record, I don't even believe this painting goes back to 1938. It looks like it was painted in the past few years. Paintings from 1938 look far older than this. And in 1938 someone might have done a better job faking it. Even the forgers are pathetically bad now. They may have gotten it from one of the Chinese factories that are cranking out copies of all kinds now. You can get your own Botticelli on Ebay for just a few thousand, you know, and my guess is it would be as good as this one.

So who bought it? New York real estate mogul Sheldon Solow, originally Solovieff. His wife just happens to be a sculptor, Mia Fonssagrives-Solow. Her father is the famous photographer Fernand Fonssagrives, originally Vigoureux. The Solovieffs are direct descendants of Rasputin, see Boris Solovieff who married Maria Rasputin in 1917. Which gives us more links to worldwide Intelligence, since [Rasputin was just an agent/actor who faked his death](#).

---

But we still aren't finished with Botticelli. In 2019 the National Gallery and Victoria and Albert “experts” claimed that a bad copy of *Madonna of the Pomegranate* was from Botticelli's studio, and therefore genuine.



Based on what? It is on poplar and has the right pigments. So, that means it may be old, it doesn't mean it is 500 years old or that it is from the studio of Botticelli. No one noticed the skin tones are all wrong for a Botticelli?



It also has a correction, which they say proves it is not a copy. What, copyists don't make corrections? In a big copy like this, you may get a figure in the wrong place, not realizing it until after you have painted the central figure. I know, I have done copywork. I guess they haven't.

They didn't notice how clunky the eyes are compared to a real Botticelli? [Botticelli eyes are famous for being soft and luminous](#), but the Madonna here just looks tired. She looks like she isn't getting enough sleep. [Take that link to the Uffizi to see the difference from the original.] They didn't notice the Madonna's cloak is a disaster, both in color and brushwork? The cleaning should have given us a beautiful blue cloak like the Uffizi painting, but it didn't. Even more obvious is the fact that the reds *haven't* faded. In the original in the Uffizi, the reds have faded to pink in most places—see for instance the cloak to your right. Very rich red, while in the original that has faded away. Indicating the copyists *didn't* use the reds of Botticelli's studio. Also notice the crossed bands in the angel to the left. There should be text in those bands, reading “ave grazia plena. . .” Very hard to copy that, so the copyist didn't even attempt it. While the real studio of Botticelli would have had a specialist for that. The old masters commonly had specialists for things like animals, flowers, scripts, and so on. The Master himself would only paint the heads and maybe the hands. Which is why we look at the eyes first with a Botticelli.

And if this is from the studio of Botticelli, why did he allow his assistants to paint this second one with so little gold above, and without the rays coming down? Why did he take out the two angels immediately left and right, although the one to your left is one of the best? That loss destroys the whole composition, doesn't it, breaking the circle of heads. It looks to me like those heads were painted out after an attempt to paint them, probably because the copyist found he had made his initial drawing too big for the panel, not leaving enough room. So like a dentist pulling teeth to make room for molars, he painted those two out so he could fit in the ones to the side. Botticelli himself would never have solved the problem that way, if he had wanted to make a somewhat smaller and simpler composition. In that case he would have removed the figure in profile to your left, not the one in full

face closer to the Madonna that the copyist removed. Why? Because the one in profile is neither as good nor as important. Even in the original, that is the worst of the eight heads. I could go on all day pointing out big flaws here. There isn't even the slightest chance this is from the studio of Botticelli, so you should see this as just one more proof that contemporary art “experts” are either wildly incompetent or wildly dishonest. I don't see a third choice.

---

---

And in a tack-on, I want to comment on the Joe Rogan controversy raging right now. I am generally on his side, since I am against censorship. All those like Neil Young and Joni Mitchell are just embarrassing themselves right now, and look like Pfizer reps. Do they really think doctors and scientists like Robert Malone shouldn't be heard? We should only hear from Pfizer on this, and from government agencies bought by Pfizer?

But more broadly, I find the whole argument scripted from both sides. What do I mean? I mean, I don't believe Spotify paid Joe Rogan \$100 million to host his podcast. Why would they? Although popular, he had nothing like a revenue stream to justify that. So Spotify must just be another CIA front, like Google and all the rest. It is creating the opposition. As usual, these big numbers are just being manufactured to make us think these people are more important and more influential than they are. That is where they want our eyes, and our eyes go where the money is. For whatever reason, they want the eyes of the right on Joe Rogan and Tucker Carlson and Alex Jones right now, so they are feeding them the best scripts, the best guests, and the best writers. Conversely, they *want* to tank the Democrats, so they are feeding them the worst scripts, the worst writers, and the least charismatic talking heads. They are moving us all right on purpose, as I have said many times before. But you should be resisting that as well. Tucker is from old money and Joe comes from mainstream media. He somehow morphed out of *Fear Factor* and UFC, so seeing him as a leading revolutionary should look mighty strange.

So don't let them funnel you back to the Republican Party. They were never your friends and aren't now. Both parties are completely corrupt, and there is no cleansing them. If you want to solve this through voting, you have to return to the write-in, [as I told you years ago](#). In voting, as in everything else, your only hope is to go completely off the grid. You can't let the Phoenicians pick any of your candidates for you, not even in a third party. Candidates have to come from among you, like the truck driver Edward Durr who won in November in New Jersey. He came through the GOP, but it would have been even better if he had won through write-ins.

---

---

In a second tack-on, I will very briefly hit the 1966 murder of Valerie Percy, which a reader has asked me to take a look at. Valerie was the daughter of Senator **Charles Percy**, who was later Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. She was allegedly killed at age 21 after just returning from Paris, where she had spent her junior year in college. The murder happened on September **18**, and we aren't told why she wasn't already back at Cornell for her senior year.

I can tell you: it was faked, as usual. What most people don't know is that Valerie had a twin Sharon, who would marry John Rockfeller IV just a few months later. The Percys were a very prominent family, being related to the Percys of Northumberland across the pond, who were Dukes and close cousins of the Stuarts. So they had been faking events for centuries. This faked death was just a small

part of the old Men-are-Pigs project, which was already in full swing in 1966. It would peak just a few years later with the Manson murders and never let up since then. My guess is Valerie never came back from Paris, the family simply paying off the coroner to fake this death, sending the story to the papers to scare women again. When Valerie did come back, she probably went into the CIA. She had the perfect cover: whenever she was spotted on the street, all she had to do is say she was Sharon. The CIA loves twins, as we have already established.

Want more? [Go here](#), where you can follow the fake yourself. Valerie's brothers were both out of the house, one at college and one at a sleepover. That's convenient. Plus, it confirms my question above: why wasn't Valerie back at Cornell for her senior year? If you tell me it is because school hadn't started, I can now point to the fact that her brother was already back at college, so school must have started.

Her stepmother Loraine claimed to hear glass breaking and footsteps at 5am but went back to sleep. Right, because that makes sense. Also makes sense that a murderer would attack a house with five people in it. That doesn't happen. You don't attack a girl when her parents and sisters are asleep in the next room, for obvious reasons. Loraine later heard moaning, so she got up.

**She made her way into the hallway and approached Valerie's bedroom door. Upon opening the door she got a brief glimpse of a man standing over the bed. He swiftly turned around, dazzling Loraine with the bright beam of his torch. Loraine ran out of the room and set off the burglar alarm. Whilst doing this the intruder seized his opportunity to hastily escape the premises.**

Yeah, I'm sure that happened. If they had a burglar alarm, how had the intruder bypassed it? We are told he used glass cutters, but as you already see that conflicts with the stepmother's story of hearing breaking glass. It can't be both ways. And in neither case would the alarm have been bypassed. You can't bypass an alarm by cutting glass.

Their next-door neighbor just happened to be a doctor and close friend, and he made the first pronouncement of death. That's also convenient. But this doctor's wife later admitted that he had said the bedroom already looked like it had been cleaned up before he got there. So that whole story is also compromised. We are told the head was bashed in, so this doctor would have to just assume the body was Valerie. If the doctor isn't lying completely, they may have brought in a corpse from the morgue.

Police claimed to find fingerprints, palmprints, AND bare footprints in the sand. Wow. Everything but a locket and classring. Loraine gave a description of the man but it was of course worthless. All we know is he wasn't tall.

Nothing was taken and Valerie wasn't molested. She had no enemies and hadn't even been in the country until a few days earlier. So Sherlock would say it was either no one or one of her family members, focusing on the twin. But as I have already said, it was almost certainly no one. If she was really murdered the story wouldn't be so full of holes.

Another hole can be found [here](#), where we find that on the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the murder in 2016 the authorities had still sealed all evidence. All FOIA requests were ignored.

This is also a big clue: Percy was running for Senate for the first time that year, and this was just before the election in November. In September, just six weeks before the election, he was doing poorly in the polls and it looked like he would lose. He had already lost the Governor's race two years earlier and



most people didn't like him because he was seen as a Rockefeller stooge. He came out of the Rockefeller Foundation and was a personal advisor to Nelson Rockefeller. But after the fake murder of his daughter, he won due to a huge sympathy vote. So that was the start of his career in the Senate. Just a coincidence, I'm sure.