

[return to updates](#)

# Tim's Vermeer:

## CIA\* Propaganda in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published July 3, 2014*

A documentary called *Tim's Vermeer* was released early this year and nominated for an Oscar. Although it didn't win, it has been promoted heavily by the Intelligence-owned mainstream media. We must assume it was nominated due to influence by the CIA or some other agency. Despite the fact that it received [many bad reviews](#)—including [one at the New York Times](#)—no one has yet seen what it is really about.

[*Correction, August 6, 2014.* One of my readers pointed out to me that the film was not in fact nominated for anything. Confused, I returned to my original sources for this piece, only to find no mention of a nomination in any of them. Since I don't usually make mistakes like that, I suspect I originally tripped over some planted information, not realizing it was planted. Or, maybe I just made a mistake. It happens. At any rate, this correction forced me to return to Wikipedia, to see if maybe I got the bad information from a temporary edit there. I found no evidence of that, but did find something interesting. After this paper was published, someone added a paragraph to Wikipedia pointing to Jonathan Jones' bad review of the film at the *London Guardian*:

Writing for *The Guardian*, journalist and art critic Jonathan Jones dismissed the film's characterization of Jenison's painting as a success, and described it as "a pedantic and laborious imitation" that was "not a Vermeer, any more than an Airfix model is a flying Spitfire". Jones criticized the project portrayed in the film for relying on reproductions of the Vermeer's *The Music Lesson* rather than the original itself and summarized his criticism by stating that "*Tim's Vermeer* is the equivalent of someone hanging a painting-by-numbers version of a masterpiece over the mantelpiece and claiming it's as good as the real thing. At last, an art film for philistines.

Although I don't normally agree with anything major critics write, of course I agree with that

wholeheartedly. Unfortunately, that addition to Wikipedia lasted about a day before it was undone by the Wiki police, who claimed Jones' opinion “was excessively long and negative which isn't consistent with the majority opinion.” Allowed to stay in the Wiki article was the 89% favorable rating at Rotten Tomatoes based on 107 reviews, and the 76 rating at Metacritic, based on 32 reviews. But the Wiki police don't tell us how many of those 107 and 76 reviews were written from Langley.]

It is the people involved you should study first, before you ever watch the film. Tim is Tim Jenison, a computer gaming guy with loads of money and all the depth of formica. The magicians Penn and Teller narrate and produce, and the film also includes appearances from David Hockney and Philip Steadman. These latter two guys came up with the pathetic theory that propels this transparent piece of propaganda. Or, Hockney proposed it years ago and Steadman was later hired as support. Together, they know as much about art as Paris Hilton and Justin Bieber.

In short, the theory is that all the Old Master artists cheated, using some form of lenses, pre-photography, or other crutches. This makes Hockney, Jenison, and all the other Modern faux-artists feel better since it seems to them to bring the famous guys like Vermeer, Van Eyck, and Ingres down to their level.

Of course Intelligence has manufactured both sides of this made-up pseudo-theory, as usual, expressly to divert anyone who wanders into the discussion. As I have shown [in previous papers](#), several academics—including David Stork, a professor of computer science at Stanford—have been hired to provide the controlled opposition, compiling thousands of pages of arcane evidence *against* the theory. This evidence is so extensive, convoluted, and confusing it only acts to extend the manufactured “debate,” making it look scientific. Unfortunately for all those involved, the theory can be disproved with two quick observations. One, even with all the modern photographic tricks, including using a projector and tracing straight from it, neither Hockney nor any of the other Moderns have managed to produce a single great realistic painting of their own. With the help of computers, they can sometimes produce *copies* of old master works that look like de-souled CGI knock-offs, but they haven't been able to compose anything of their own. If you study Hockney's 2001 book *Secret Knowledge*—where he publishes his own attempts at realism—you will find he never even gets in the ballpark. Using the tricks of the Old Masters doesn't make him as good as them, or even 90% as good. Cheating with all his might, he strains to hit 5%.

Second, I have challenged these people to work side-by-side with me, filming themselves drawing and painting with all their lenses and projectors and calipers while I draw freehand, but they haven't been up to it. All they have to do is watch someone with real talent draw (doesn't have to be me), and they will know how it is done, but that never occurs to any of these phonies. Or, it may occur to them, but it isn't part of the current psy-op.

Yes, this movie is part of a long-running psy-op. At the time of my last paper on this subject (2009), I didn't know that, but I have since dug further down the rabbit hole and have more to report. As I have shown in even [more recent papers](#), the CIA outed themselves as controllers of Modern art since about 1945, admitting they have been heavily involved in the promotion of Modernism and anti-promotion of Classicism since that time. Mainstream articles in major newspapers have blown the whistle on the CIA, as you can see by [going here](#). They have tried to spin this control as something to do with the Cold War, but I have shown they were controlling the markets way before 1945, which means the control had nothing to do with the Cold War. Intelligence promoted Modernism and anti-promoted Classicism or Realism at least back to 1910 because Modernism was far easier to control, inflate, fake, and launder. Although art by the old definition would always assert its independence, Modernism was

tailor-made for top-down control. Modernism was almost indistinguishable from propaganda from the start, so the Intelligence agencies and the rich people they worked for had very little to do to make it their own.

To comprehend my line of argument, you have to have read my previous papers of the last nine months, or at least the mainstream sources I link to. If you don't realize that US and British Intelligence have *admitted* they have done these things, my argument will look like wild opinion, or unsubstantiated conspiracy theory. But it is neither. Documents have been declassified, books have been written, and the mainstream has been forced to admit these things have indeed happened. There is no possibility of denying the facts; the only question is what you wish to make of them. Top CIA agents like Tom Braden have admitted in mainstream publications like *The Saturday Evening Post* that the most famous artists have been underwritten by Intelligence, including Jackson Pollock, Mark Rothko, and all the other big names. They have also underwritten all the top art critics and the top art journals, as well as the top poetry and literary journals. Much of this information can be confirmed at [cia.gov](http://cia.gov), and the window for denial was closed decades ago.

What does this have to do with Vermeer or the film *Tim's Vermeer*? Everything. Anyone with a jot of residual sense can see this film is just a continuation of the old game. The CIA always claims their games are over and that they have gone straight, but no one over the age of five believes it. The stench arising from *Tim's Vermeer* is precisely the same stench that arose from the [American Committee for Cultural Freedom](#) [ACCF] 60 years ago. The ACCF is now known to have been a front organization for the CIA, promoting Modernism at the behest of the Rockefellers and other rich families. It was run out of the Museum of Modern Art. It is said to have closed up shop after being outed in the late 1960's, but it is clear it simply changed names and went further underground. We know that control of art didn't end at that time, since mainstream art has continued to deconstruct and implode in the same prescribed ways. Therefore, all one has to do is look for new programs that look like the old programs. The newer embedded agents are no longer hiding behind anti-Communism (usually), but otherwise the tune is the same. They are promoting Modernism and Modernists while demoting Classicism, Realism, or quality by any other name. Since that is exactly what this film *Tim's Vermeer* is doing, our first assumption should be it is a newer incarnation of the old program.

Why would they wish to promote Modernism and slander Classicism? Simple: They are either Modernists themselves (like Hockney), or they are invested in Modernism, or they are working for billionaire families that are invested in Modernism. The last thing they wish to see is any real revival or renaissance in any of the arts, since that would jeopardize their hegemony. As it is, they own and control all the arts. The last thing they want is for the public to become interested in art again, or for real artists to regain any control of the field.



CIA markers are all over everyone involved in this film, but we will concentrate on Penn Jillette—since he is the most transparent. Jillette, along with his partner Teller, has long been involved in propaganda. It is hard to say when or where they were recruited, but it first became obvious (to me) with their show *Bullshit*, which aired on the CIA's own movie channel, *Showtime*, from 2003. The segment on 9/11 was especially telling, since in it Jillette claimed to debunk the idea that the US Government was involved. Although Jillette was able to work the slur “bullshit” into the show many times, he was not able to work any evidence or argument into it, and it was clear to anyone awake that he was being paid to blow smoke. I encourage you to dig it out of [the archives](#) and watch it, since with hindsight it is as transparent as thinnest glass. Since then he has run interference for many other government programs (Kennedy assassination, mobile phones, anti-environmentalism, and so on), debunking the truth and spreading disinformation.

For more indication of that, we see that when *Bullshit* was canceled at *Showtime*, Penn and Teller moved immediately to the Discovery Channel, another CIA front. The name of their new show? *Penn and Teller Tell a Lie*. No, really.

Jillette was also involved with the film *Michael Moore Hates America*, which anyone can see is government propaganda. I am not a big fan of Michael Moore, but the title alone here is enough to tell you what this is about. It isn't about Michael Moore or any specific topic, it is about making you feel anti-American if you question anything the government is trying to sell you. It is a psy-op, and I don't like to be psy-opped by either side. You probably don't, either. No matter how you feel about Michael Moore, you would probably like to be able to look closely at any topic without being shouted down by loudmouths on one side or another yelling “Bullshit” or calling you unpatriotic.

According to his Wikipedia page, Jillette is a Fellow at the Cato Institute, which is as big a red flag as you could hoist. The Cato Institute was founded by Charles Koch, Murray Rothbard, and Ed Crane: all claim to be libertarians but are really blue fascists. Their job from day one was to hijack the libertarian movement from the direction of the Democratic National Party and corrupt and confound it into oblivion. They care nothing about liberty and everything about agitprop. The foundation was originally called the Koch Foundation, but they had to change the name to Cato in order to divert attention away from the unpopular founder. Although Jillette and other fake libertarians claim to be progressive in various ways, when it comes down to it they are anti-progressive. As one example, we find that Koch industries is against regulation of financial derivatives. They try to sell this as part of their support of the “free market.” Talk about bullshit. Unregulated derivatives were at the heart of the

recent financial meltdown—even Alan Greenspan admits that—and that meltdown shifted billions to the billionaires and away from the poor and middle class, via various forms of theft, graft, and manipulation. When they say “free market,” they mean a market free of laws against theft.

As another example, Koch is against automobile fuel standards, since that would cut into his profits as a billionaire oilman. His lobbying is one of the primary reasons the US has the worst fuel efficiency standards in the civilized world.

For a fuller list of the crimes of Koch Industries, you can watch the documentary [Koch Brothers Exposed](#).

You will say, “What does that have to do with Penn Jillette?” It has everything to do with Jillette, since Jillette is a Fellow at the Cato Institute, and the Cato Institute is just a front for Koch Industries. This is who Jillette runs with and probably works for. Real independent thinkers aren't this closely linked to mega-billionaires, you know. If you don't see red flags (or see red) whenever these billionaires pop up, you really aren't paying attention. You need to lower your daily dosage of fluoride and aspartame. The more you know, the more all these media and performance people like Jillette look like pawns of industry. Although the CIA hasn't yet declassified the contracts of the past twenty years, all the evidence points to a continuation and expansion of the gambits they have previously admitted. That is to say, the CIA—working for the billionaires—is continuing its control of artists, performers, writers, critics, debunkers, editors, poets, actors, producers, directors, and so on, and it is controlling them in the old ways and for the old reasons. Those reasons are many, but they included and still include promotion of Modernism and suppression of Classicism. This film *Tim's Vermeer* is nothing more and nothing less than the latest production of the ACCF, 60 years on.

The film can also be read as a continuation of [Operation Chaos](#). Jillette's entire career has been a sort of purposeful confusion, a spreading of chaos, what with his everchanging and contradictory theories and opinions, his claim to be a truth crusader while naming his shows things like *Penn and Teller Tell a Lie*, his stance as an intellectual while having a degree from Clown College (not making that up), his position as both magician and anti-magician. Whenever your mind needs to be stirred, you will find Penn Jillette riding in to do the deed. His persona alone does the deed, since he is sold to the world as charming (why else would he be hired to appear everywhere) while having an anti-charm it would be hard to surpass.



Anyone who sees him anywhere must think subconsciously “*Why* am I looking at this guy? Do other



people find him intriguing for some reason? Has his opinion been shown to be worthy for some reason I don't know about?" Those initial questions create enough chaos on their own that it almost doesn't matter what Jillette says or doesn't say. His every appearance in the media is by itself an unsolvable mystery, and that alone is enough to turn most people's minds to mush.

This is why Penn Jillette is involved in *Tim's Vermeer*, you see. Jillette's act has always been about demystifying the magic. Jillette's hero is the Amazing Randi, and it should be no surprise to you that Randi also worked with the Intelligence agencies, debunking things the government wished to remain hidden. In one of [my recent papers](#) on my science site, we saw Randi debunking polywater. And like Jillette on 911, Randi was debunking something that was *true*. This is what the new debunkers do. They work for the government debunking the truth. Randi helped to move the public's attention away from polywater, and he did this because the government wished to classify its existence.

Just as Randi debunked the truth of polywater and Jillette debunked the truth of 911, Jillette and Tim Jenison and the rest are being paid by someone to debunk the Old Masters. They are trying to puncture the mystery. If they can show you that the Old Masters used tricks—tricks that anyone can master with a few tools—the old paintings in the museums no longer seem so elevated. And the artists who created them no longer seem so elevated. “Those old guys weren't more talented than you or me, they just knew how to use a lens.” Not only does that make you feel better about your little old self, it protects the Modern Art investments of the billionaires. Modern Art isn't about talent anymore, you know, so they don't want you believing in talent. If you start believing art is about talent again, or about beauty or elevation or subtlety or achievement, instead of about politics, vulgarity, and raw promotion, they are cooked. If the public wakes up and shakes off the brainwashing, they are finished. If the public climbs from the vat of cytoplasmic fluid and pulls the wires from chest and neck, it may remember that the old art really *was* created by talented artists: artists so talented they make the current batch of pretenders look like something scurrying under the kitchen sink. Even worse, they might remember that such talented artists may still exist, and in fact *do* still exist. They will then ask where these artists are, and why we don't hear anything about them. They may ask why these artists aren't in the museums, magazines, newspapers and books, instead of the scurrying ones.

Some people have awoken, and they *have* asked just that question. Problem is, they ask *me* the question. For instance, they email me and ask why [my Triptych](#) isn't in a museum instead of the Modern scurrying stuff. Why are they asking me? Do I own the museums? Do I make these decisions? My answer is that we both know why, but talking back and forth won't change anything. The only thing that will change anything is if a large number of people go to the museums and galleries and ask *them* why. Even better is if a large number of people go to the galleries and museums and *demand* they start showing real art again. You don't have to go to New York or DC to make that demand. Go to your local museum. Tell them you pay taxes to keep them open and you are tired of having nothing to look at except the scurrying stuff. Demand they show some real art or close and quit taxing you. If thousands of people began showing up at museums and city councils making this demand, things would change. But I can't do it myself. I can exhort you. I can push you. But I cannot speak for you. I cannot build museums or move city councils by myself. No lawsuit of mine will get anywhere, since it is too easy to dismiss me as an economic casualty. Only a class-action lawsuit by real art-lovers could hope to make any progress. Are there any left, or is it all empty talk now by paid agents? Every high-profile art-lover I have met or heard of has turned out to be an agent. Does a world outside of Intelligence still exist, or is reality now just a construct beamed from Langley?

\* I say CIA, but it could be any arm of Intelligence. They don't tell us how they are dividing the workload these days, so it is easiest to use the most famous 3-letter as a catch-all. If it isn't in fact the CIA behind this, I apologize to them and suggest they help me expose the game. We have signs they may be doing this in other sub-fields (see Snowden), and I encourage them to join me here. If it is in fact DHS that is now running these stinkiest campaigns, I would be happy to change my title.