

[return to updates](#)

I Don't Believe in Elon Musk



by Miles Mathis

First published October 5, 2015

As usual, this is an opinion piece, protected by the US Constitution. It is my personal reading of the published factoids. If you prefer the mainstream reading, you can have it.

[Elon Musk](#) is supposed to be worth 13.6 billion. He is supposed to be the CEO of Tesla Motors. He is supposed to be the founder of SpaceX. He is supposed to be the founder of Solar City. He is supposed to be the inventor of Hyperloop. I for one don't believe any of it. Elon Musk looks to me like a person totally manufactured by Intelligence as the fake human front for all these fake projects. In this way he is exactly like Mark Zuckerberg, another person [I have outed as a probable manufactured entity](#). When I wrote that paper on Zuckerberg, he was also alleged to be worth 13.6 billion. Coincidence? Nope.

Why do I think that? I think it because Musk's entire Wikipedia page and bio reads like a red flag. It is nothing but transparent BS from top to bottom. We'll start with his family. His mother's maiden name is Haldeman. That is a prominent Jewish name. Elon is also a Jewish name, meaning "oak" in Hebrew. Kimbal, Elon's brother, also has a Jewish name. So why not just admit they are Jewish? I don't know. Maybe they plan on running him for Governor of California or something.

Although we will cover the other red flags, I want to skip ahead to the end, to lead with later red flags that demand our early attention. I want to lead with them although they come later on the Wikipedia page. Musk has claimed he is a big fan of Margaret Thatcher. What? Only fascists and plants are fans of Margaret Thatcher. No real person of any intelligence and scruple is a fan of Margaret Thatcher. Musk is sold as a progressive, but no progressive would claim to be a fan of Thatcher. It doesn't fit his profile at all, and we can only imagine it was worked into his bio as either a clue for people like me or as part of some late promotion of Thatcher and fascism in general. Actually, I assume it is mainly another plug for privatization. Musk's entire bio is a long plug for privatization. Along with deregulation, privatization is one of the two main planks of neo-fascism.

Musk has said he is “socially liberal and fiscally conservative”. Was Thatcher socially liberal? Not according to Section 28, which made “promotion” of homosexuality illegal, and which stopped just short of making homosexuality itself illegal again, as in the time of Oscar Wilde. I should think this would be of some concern to Musk, since I don't really buy either one of his marriages. But he doesn't have to be concerned with that, does he, since he lives in the US in 2015, not the UK in 1980. In the US in 2015, homosexuality is being promoted like never before.

So why don't I buy his marriages? Well, in answer to that, I send you to pictures of Musk with his wives and girlfriends. Just Google something like “Musk with Riley”. While any normal heterosexual guy would be getting all the sugar he could from these sweeties, glowing in the perfume, Musk always looks highly uncomfortable.



The girls are often leaning away from him, as there. And look at his hand in his pocket. Discomfort signs all over the place.

Or you can read [this 2010 article](#) at *Marie Claire* written by his alleged first wife Justine. You may find it convincing, but I don't. Just look at the lead photo for the article:



I draw your attention to the three tricycles and two bikes. This is to remind us that Musk is supposed to have five sons by this woman. Not only do we get no photos of the children—which is perhaps understandable—she doesn't mention them once in the article, either by name or in any other way. Mostly she just repeats the story of Musk's rise to fame and fortune, with the occasional plug of her own. Very strange. I would have to say it is the most impersonal article of its kind I have ever read. No, beyond impersonal; it is chilly, almost chilling. It reads like it was put together by a committee, and it may have been. I say that because if we do a people search on Elon Musk, we find no evidence

of these children in the computers. In fact, Intelius doesn't even have an Elon Musk listed in California. Only his father, Errol Musk. InstantCheckMate lists an Elon Musk related to Justine, but the only other relation is a Jennifer. Since Justine's middle initial is J., I assume Jennifer is also her. If these five boys have birth certificates, they should be in the computers. They aren't.

Then we have to read this:

Musk is a self-described [American exceptionalist](#) and [nationalist](#), describing himself as "nauseatingly pro-American". According to Musk, the United States is "inarguably the greatest country that has ever existed on Earth", describing it as "the greatest force for good of any country that's ever been". Musk believes outright that there "would not be democracy in the world if not for the United States."

Nauseating, yes. Believable, no. Again, no real person of any intelligence would be caught saying that in the second decade of the 21st century. Even the American Nazi Party is more circumspect than that. Musk has obviously been hired to read these lines provided him by the Pentagon or someplace (except that even the Pentagon isn't that jingoistic these days). Now that I think of it, this reads like copy provided Musk by Henry Kissinger or the CFR. But even in that context, it is over the top. When I read quotes like this, I have to imagine that clues have been inserted into Musk's bio on purpose by someone. I begin to think this is all part of some game: a nationwide contest to see if anyone can see through this. If so, send me the prize.

Although I may be the first to propose Musk is an Intel creation, I am not the only one who has noticed that he appears to be reading from neo-con or fascist cue-cards. PolicyMic and many other sites have criticized Musk harshly for contributing to anti-science Republican candidates and groups like the Longhorn PAC and the NRCC, confirming my analysis above by saying that

these political calculations betray Musk's persona of a socially-conscious entrepreneur.

His many interviews also betray (or disprove) his created persona of a person with very high intelligence and skills. Although he is sold as some sort of Tony Stark, he comes off as Ron Howard with a bit more hair** and a foreign accent. I don't see any spark there, and in my opinion he looks like just another hired actor. Unfortunately, he's not even a good actor, and if he hadn't been born into a rich family he would have had to work as a crisis actor, like Robbie Parker.



**Actually, it's a toupee, as we can tell by the picture under my title. Musk is 24 there and his hair is very thin in front, so we may assume his new look is augmented in some way. In that more recent photo, he obviously has on a rug. It doesn't really matter, of course, and I wouldn't mention it except for the fact that I am showing Musk is a fake in all ways.

Although Musk's companies have received 5 billion in government subsidies, Musk says he isn't in favor of government subsidies for companies like his. Instead he has come out in favor of a carbon tax. Obviously, he is just reading from the Teleprompter again there, and isn't concerned with appearing to be consistent. Fake people fronting fake companies don't have to worry about appearing consistent. It is all about stirring your mind into Musk, I mean Mush. The people behind Musk want all the subsidies they can drink, but then they want to pretend they don't lust for them like they do. They also don't want *you* to apply for any subsidies, because they don't need the competition. They don't want you to be subsidized; they want you to be *taxed*.

So why do I think these companies are fake? We'll start with Musk's links to Mike Griffin. Griffin was head of NASA from 2005 to 2009, but on Musk's page we learn that Griffin also worked for In-Q-Tel, the venture capital arm of the CIA! **That is probably the biggest red flag on the entire page.** Curiously, that information has been scrubbed off Griffin's own page. What exactly is In-Q-Tel?

In-Q-Tel invests in high-tech companies for the sole purpose of keeping the [Central Intelligence Agency](#), and other intelligence agencies, equipped with the latest in [information technology](#) in support of [United States intelligence](#) capability.

That is the key to unlocking this whole mystery, so I suggest you read it several times, to let it sink in. I suggest that not only did In-Q-Tel “invest” in all of Musk's companies, it actually *created* them, and him. We know the CIA creates many front companies, since the mainstream admits it. But it is usually assumed they do this to facilitate domestic covert operations of various sorts. But we have tripped over much evidence companies are created for reasons even more fundamental to the American way. That is to say, a significant part of the US infrastructure is an illusion—an illusion created to facilitate a variety of treasury dips by the very wealthy. Actually, the mainstream press has already reported on a small part of these thefts and grafts. See, for example, Matt Taibbi's *Rolling Stone* reports on the big banks, especially [this 2013 report entitled “Everything is Rigged”](#). However, even Taibbi has not yet seen that it is not only via rigging that the rich are becoming richer. It is also via manufacturing fake companies, fake portfolios, and fake projects, by which the treasury can be milked and bilked of billions of dollars of subsidies, grants, and other monies.

So if you thought my mention of Intelligence in paragraph one was just conspiracy theory, think again. Musk has admitted ties to the CIA through Griffin, if nowhere else. You see, before he was hired to head NASA, Griffin was working with Musk on SpaceX, trying to buy old ICBMs from Russia. Again, could you ask for a bigger red flag? Griffin and Musk were in Russia in 2002 trying to buy ICBMs! We are told one of the Russian engineers spat on Musk, which is about the only thing that makes sense on the entire page. They could probably see he was a spook-baby.

Musk also has some parallels to Yuri Milner, the Russian billionaire who—we are told—is the money for the Fundamental Physics Prize.* Like Milner, Musk went to the Wharton School of Business. He also went to the University of Pennsylvania, which has come up in my previous papers. Both Ezra Pound and Noam Chomsky were probably recruited from there.

But back to SpaceX. The whole project stinks of a con. We are told,

In 2001, Musk conceptualised "Mars Oasis"; a project to land a miniature experimental greenhouse on Mars, containing food crops growing on Martian [regolith](#), in an attempt to regain public interest in space exploration.

That idea is ridiculous for so many reasons it is hard to know where to start. Food crops on Mars? Wouldn't the transport costs back to Earth be a little high? Talk about a carbon footprint! Before we start growing food on Mars, shouldn't we hit a few others things first, like, say, *getting people there*? Who is going to eat that food? I guess they can feed it to the ground squirrels we have seen in NASA's fake pictures from Mars. Except that those ground squirrels are already eating pretty well it seems, since we have also [seen their candy wrappers on the ground](#).

Also, who is going to water those plants on Mars? Maybe this lady:



Actually, it wasn't any of the Mars anomaly photos that convinced me the Mars missions were faked. It was watching [this NASA press conference](#) for the Curiosity lander. I recommend you watch it without any later commentary added, so that you can be completely objective. Just ask yourself if these guys seem like real scientists. Notice that they are unable to answer any substantive questions from the audience. Only after you have watched these NASA guys should you return to the anomaly photos. Once you do, your mind will be in a more receptive state and you will start to see what is there.

[Addendum, October 14, 2015. Another strange coincidence, if coincidence it was: I ran into some friends at a local pub this evening and they asked me if I wanted to go with them to a movie. I asked what they were going to see, and they said *The Martian*. I immediately got a creeping feeling (as I usually do now when I think of any Hollywood movie) and begged off. When I got home, I looked up the film. Guess what it is about? Top spook-baby actor Matt Damon is stranded on Mars. Being a biologist, he is forced to grow his own food in a greenhouse attached to the stranded lander. Curious how this ties into Musk's plan for Mars Oasis, eh? Hollywood is still selling NASA's fictions, almost

50 years later.]

We are told Musk gave up on the ICBMs, which Russia wanted 8 million apiece for, deciding he could get the materials for only \$240,000. OK, let me see if I understand this. We are being told the materials to build a rocket large enough to carry an entire greenhouse to Mars will cost only \$240,000. In that case, I think we may have been overcharged for the Apollo missions, for which we were billed about 110 billion. I think we may be overcharged now for fighter/bomber jets, [which cost up to 2.4 billion apiece \(the B2\)](#).

Nevertheless, we are told Musk invested 100 million of his fortune into SpaceX. Which brings us to his fortune. At age 24, right out of college, Musk invested \$28,000 of his dad's money in a company called Zip2. We are told this company developed an internet city guide for newspapers then going online in 1995. That story is so full of holes it looks like prairie dog town. You can't start a company with \$28,000, at least not one that you then sell four years later for 341 million to Compaq. [We are told](#) Zip2 “provided online publishing for media companies” and had a contract with the *New York Times*, but the *NYT* had been computerized since 1976 and online since 1981. By 1995 it would have already had all the “customized portals” it needed. Compaq also had no use for internet city guides and online publishing portals in 1999, so this sale looks manufactured. I am not the only one noticing that. Take the last link to quora.com and you will see that a lot of people are asking questions about Elon Musk.

It looks to me like this Zip2 story is being told to explain the genesis of Musk's fortune. The same can be said for Musk's alleged involvement with Paypal. At age 28 Musk founded another company, using 10 million from his 22 million profit from selling Zip2. This company, X.com, immediately merged with Confinity, which contained Paypal. So Musk had absolutely nothing to do with founding Paypal, and even according to the mainstream story was only used for his money. He came in on the merger and was only 28, so why would he have been made CEO? No answer. Also no answer to how he was able to leave the merger just three years later with \$165 million. That's a three-year return on investment of 1500 percent. If Paypal was already so profitable in those early years, enough to buy out Musk to the tune of \$165 million, why bring him in in the first place? With big early investors like Deutsche Bank and Nokia, why would Confinity allow Musk to waltz in and soak up a large part of those profits? In other words, with money from a source like Deutsche Bank, why did they need Musk's paltry 10 million? My guess is all these companies are Intelligence fronts, and Intelligence just inserted Musk into the story later.

Which brings us back to SpaceX. Curious that there is no mention on Musk's Wikipedia page of the explosion of the Falcon9 in June of this year. Also no mention of it on the SpaceX page. Also curious that [the footage from Space.com](#) of the SpaceX capsule Dragon docking with the ISS looks so fake. I encourage you to watch it and come to your own conclusions, but to me it looks like nothing but a series of anomalies. The ISS looks like a plastic model. I am just surprised they couldn't do a better job faking this. NASA's real budget must have dropped below six figures if they can't hire Hollywood people to create something better than this. I honestly don't understand why they spend \$108 million on a movie like *The Martian*, but spend about \$10,000 faking this docking sequence with the ISS. I guess they know that millions will pay \$10 to be propagandized by Hollywood, but only a handful will watch this free release from NASA.

The valuation of SpaceX is also a red flag. According to the mainstream story, Musk invested 100 million. Founders Fund invested another 20 million. The first launch was estimated by Musk to happen in 2003, just 15 months after the company started, but there was still no launch in early 2012, *nine years later*. Despite that, the value of the company in early 2012 was said to have ballooned to 1.3

billion. *Based on what?* After the alleged launch in May of 2012, the company's value ballooned again, to 2.4 billion. But SpaceX is a private company, the only profit for which is made in supplying the International Space Station. Why would NASA hire a private company to do that? Surely NASA wouldn't have put the ISS into semi-permanent orbit without a way to supply the astronauts with food, right? Weren't they getting food before 2012? Yes. So why should the federal government give huge subsidies to a private company to form, so that this company could do what NASA was already doing?

To see what I mean in more detail, remember that a large part of Musk's alleged fortune comes from SpaceX. According to published numbers, about 2 billion of his wealth comes from SpaceX stock. So basically NASA has paid Musk that amount to do what it was already doing. This is one great argument *against* privatizing things and *for* keeping them as government projects: in public projects, you don't have CEO's and other rich assholes siphoning off a large percentage of the money. In NASA projects, they don't have directors they have to pay hundred million dollar salaries to. So even if SpaceX is a real project, it isn't clear why space funding has moved from public to private. My assumption is the project is mostly fake, and that answers the question. Space funding has moved to the private sector so that even more money can be sucked from the treasury with even less real outcome and far less oversight. The conjob become so much easier once this is privatized.

Now let's move on to Tesla Motors. As with Paypal, Musk was not involved in the founding. He also wasn't an engineer or designer. He just came in as a suit with a bag of money.



For The Chronicle / Erin Lubin

Notice two things about that 2003 photo. One, Musk is not in the picture. That is Eberhard and Tarpenning. Two, the Tesla Roadster is complete. They are not posing with drawings or schematics, are they? They are posing with a car. If you don't believe me, ask Martin Eberhard, [who sued Musk in 2009](#). Among other things, Tesla founder Eberhard claims in the suit that,

In his zeal to appropriate Eberhard's legacy, Musk has instead sullied Tesla Motors' integrity and blemished Tesla Motors' reputation and prosperity.

He also accused Musk of libel, slander, and breach of contract. Although it is claimed Musk countersued, the suit was eventually settled out of court, which of course means Eberhard won. Musk

claimed that he would show Eberhard's history of Tesla Motors was false, but he never did that. He only paid to sweep everything under the rug. *Wired*, which published these lawsuit stories, [claimed in their final title](#) that Eberhard said “uncle” in the battle of lawsuits, but that is more misdirection. Their author Chuck Squatriglia admits in the article that “it is unlikely Eberhard withdrew the suit out of kindness”, and that “a settlement has been reached.” He also admits that the judge refused to dismiss the suit as requested by Musk's attorneys. That indicates that Musk did *not* actually countersue, and that it was Musk who cried uncle. Since Eberhard then took down his website, we may assume Musk paid him very handsomely to do so.

Although Eberhard is now saying there were five founders of Tesla, before the settlement he was saying there were only two—himself and Tarpenning. The logical conclusion is that those behind Musk bought him off. For enough money, he will say whatever they want him to. For me, the picture above say it all.

And then there is the problem of the valuation of Tesla Motors. According to mainstream sources, it posted profits for [the first time in the first quarter of 2013](#). So how did Musk pull in a 2012 salary of 78.2 million? He is said to be the highest paid CEO in the world for that year, a year in which his company was not profitable? How does that work? As usual, none of this makes any sense.

It also makes no sense for Tesla Motors in 2014 to open up all its technology patents, basically giving away everything it knows to its competition for free. We are told this is to speed up worldwide development of electric cars, but once again it isn't believable. The board of directors of a real company would have fired Musk in a split second for something like that. It now looks to me like Musk was probably inserted into Tesla Motors expressly to destroy it. Big oil may have inserted Musk into Tesla in order to eviscerate the competition from the inside out. I wonder if Eberhard ever considered that possibility?

He appears to have considered that possibility, since remember he said that Musk had “sullied Tesla Motors' integrity and blemished Tesla Motors' reputation and prosperity”. But what if Musk didn't just *accidentally* sully Tesla's prosperity? Again, none of it looks like an accident to me.

That possibility is greatly increased by further research. *Top Gear* in the UK and the *New York Times* both published or aired very damaging accounts of the Tesla cars, showing they had a range of only 55 miles, a range diminished even further by cold weather. Given that both *Top Gear* and the *NYT* also have Intelligence ties (Intelligence runs the media in both the US and UK), you should ask yourself why one Intelligence front would be attacking another. If Intelligence genuinely wished to push electric cars via their man Musk, why would they allow these programs to air or publish? The answer is, these programs were *intended* to damage Tesla Motors. It looks to me like Tesla was infiltrated. I give it two more years, tops.

Finally, we find that Musk gave 10 million this year to the Future of Life Institute. This is curious, since although Musk has said he considers artificial intelligence to be the greatest danger to the future, and although Future of Life also claims this is one of the greatest dangers, the Institute was actually founded and is advised by a group of technofascists, including Stephen Hawking, Max Tegmark, Jaan Tallinn, Anthony Aquirre, George Church, Frank Wilczek, and Stuart Russell. I will comment on most of them below. Like Musk, all are promoting a MATRIX future while pretending to be concerned about it. [I have covered Hawking in previous papers](#). Max Tegmark has promoted the idea that everything that exists mathematically also exists physically, which is among the stupidest ideas ever put on paper. I have uncovered giant piles of fudged mainstream equations in my papers on my science

site, and if Tegmark's thesis were true, it would mean all the bad equations existed equally with the good equations. Of course new physicists and mathematicians *want* you to believe this, since if it were true it would give you no way to disprove their bad equations and bad ideas. The natural spin-off of Tegmark's thesis is that every bad physical idea a lousy physicist can propose also exists physically. And the next step is to propose that every such physicist who comes up with an equation, good or bad, deserves the title of god (since he just created a real physical thing) and a Nobel Prize.

Jaan Tallinn has a BSc in physics, his thesis having been on interstellar travel using warps in spacetime. Which means they are now giving degrees in physics for science fiction. We have no evidence of warps in spacetime, and the Einstein equations used to predict them are flawed, [as I have proved](#). Tallinn is also involved in the Machine Intelligence Research Institute, which takes us a step closer to figuring out what is going on here. It is very like the Future of Life Institute, composed of the same people, but a bit easier to unravel. Ray Kurzweil was a director of MIRI from 2007 to 2010, and he is a notorious transhumanist and futurist. Although he created some useful devices when he was younger, he later either went off the deep end or was hired by Intelligence to seem to do so. He began writing books about AI like *The Singularity is Near*, which promotes ideas like this:

Kurzweil predicts the technological advances will irreversibly transform people as they augment their minds and bodies with genetic alterations, nanotechnology, and artificial intelligence. Once the Singularity has been reached, Kurzweil says that machine intelligence will be infinitely more powerful than all human intelligence combined. Afterwards he predicts intelligence will radiate outward from the planet until it saturates the universe.

Doesn't sound like someone who is too concerned about the dangers of artificial intelligence, does it? Which confirms what I said about Musk. Musk and all these other guys aren't concerned about AI, they are only concerned with hooking you up to the machines as fast as possible, so you will no longer be a worry to them. If I were hooked up to the proper machines, I wouldn't be writing this, would I?

Frank Wilczek is one of the top fake physicists in the world, along with Hawking, Susskind, and a few dozen others. I have mentioned him before in my papers, notably in my paper destroying [asymptotic freedom](#). Wilczek got his Nobel Prize for asymptotic freedom, but since [my nuclear diagrams](#) utterly destroy the strong force, and since asymptotic freedom concerns the strong force, he doesn't impress me too much. I can see right through him. To help you see through him, notice he appeared on Penn&Teller's *Bullshit*. [I have outed Penn Gillette](#) as a probable agent, so Wilczek is just hanging with fellow agents. For someone with such a long career, Wilczek has done precious little real physics (or none, actually). He is also known for his ideas on axions, but [I have already destroyed those as well](#). There are no axions, and the theory was never even interesting. Given my work on charge photons, the theory of axions now just looks pathetic. Wilczek's being involved with these creeps in transhumanism and AI only confirms my opinion of him as a total towering phony, one probably created—like Musk—from whole cloth by Intelligence.

George Church is another spook-scientist, involved in synthetic biology. Beyond the expected red flags, we find a curious cross-pollinating red flag, by which Church is said to have invented a use for DNA to detect dark matter (WIMPS). Since [I have proved dark matter is just charge](#), there are no WIMPS. And since you cannot use DNA to detect something that doesn't exist, this claim about Church does not impress me. Just the reverse. He has worked on cloning a Mammoth, going so far as to insert genes into living elephants. He has said the same could be done with a Neanderthal, although he claims he isn't working on it. Given what we know of past government programs, that assurance doesn't reassure me much. Church is a big pusher of “open consent”, which is the opposite of genetic

privacy. Basically it means he thinks the government should be able to do anything they want with genes, including your genes, without your consent. Lovely, right? To see just the least awful use of open consent, [you may go here](#). Church, like the rest of these Frankensteins, has been on TED several times, which is another red flag. Bill Gates is another of these manufactured billionaire spooks, and he pretty much completes the circle here.

*See [my paper deconstructing that prize and Milner](#).