

[return to updates](#)

# What *is* the Kavli Prize?



*by Myles Mathis*

*First published July 3, 2015*

As with all my papers, this is an opinion piece, protected as free speech by the US Constitution. It is my best reading of the available evidence, based on my own research.

In 2012, I showed you what [Yuri Milner's Fundamental Physics Prize](#) looks like to me: a prize manufactured (most likely by the major worldwide investment groups) to sell their treasury dips to the public. I will show you here that the Kavli Prize is probably the same thing.

Like the FPP, the Kavli Prize is very recent, first being awarded in 2008. One of its first recipients was Donald Lynden-Bell of Cambridge University, President of the Royal Astronomical Society. That in itself is a clue, given that Lynden-Bell is partly responsible for much of the current confusion in astronomy. Although we are told he was given the Kavli Prize for his work on quasars, he has also been promoting dark matter since the 1980s, and his influence is one of the many reasons dark matter has gained such prominence. Several decades ago it was decided to push dark matter as one of the premier open problems, using it to gain open-ended funding for a variety of projects. Although [I have shown](#) the answer to the dark matter “mystery” is quite simple, those in control of physics and astronomy aren't interested in simple solutions—or *any* solutions. They don't want answers, they want big fake questions that require big fake searches, preferably searches costing in the billions—which they can then milk from the treasuries. That is why the mainstream never seems to make any headway on the dark matter problem (or any other problems), and why *Scientific American* is telling you this very week on its cover that “Dark matter may be much weirder than physicists thought.” Weirdness is very convenient when you are selling open-ended searches for manufactured things: it prevents logical questions and rational critique.

The same can be said of quasars, the theory of which has likewise been muddled to the extent most people can't make heads or tails of it. One of Lynden-Bell's many fortés is misusing General Relativity to muddle up these manufactured controversies, and he has done that both with Black Holes and

quasars. But since other even higher-profile people were assigned to Black Holes (think Hawking and Penrose, for a start), Lynden-Bell was assigned to quasars.

Speaking of Hawking, remind yourself that Hawking is also supposed to be at Cambridge. I have recently [shown Hawking is an impostor](#), and has been since 1985. Do you think Lynden-Bell doesn't know that? This is just more indication that, like the rest of these top guys, Lynden-Bell is a salesman of misdirection, and has been for several decades. Astronomy was basically taken over by particle physicists in the 1960s, and people like Lynden-Bell maintained or polished their positions only by siding with the particle physicists. All the departments of math, physics and astronomy of the major universities were conquered by the particle physicists by 1980, and that is because the particle physicists were most closely tied to what was then called the military-industrial complex—but which is now better understood as Intelligence following the orders of the financiers. All these departments were taken over not for military purposes, but for financial ones. The military was just a further smokescreen.

If you don't know what I mean by that, notice that both military expenditures and science expenditures come from national treasuries. They are both gigantic money holes—holes that feed from the poor and middle classes right into the pockets of the super-wealthy. Despite the fact that there are no wars worth waging right now, and despite the fact that most mainstream science is bollocks, many billions are “spent” on both nonetheless. But the billionaire beneficiaries of those billions don't care a fig for either war or science. They would just as soon push any other boondoggle provided it paid as well. The military, like science, art, music, healthcare, porn, and everything else profitable these days, is simply another racket. It is an *investment*, and little else. Which is why, [if you dig](#), you find the big investment groups behind everything going on right now. It is the investment groups, and the people behind them, that are creating the MATRIX you live in. Physics is now just one hose in that MATRIX.

We see the same thing if we study Fred Kavli, pictured above. Kavli conveniently died soon after his prize was formed, which helps prevent analysis. After 2013, he will never accidentally give us any more clues in an interview, for instance (as he does below in an interview from 2012). My readers saw a similar thing in 2006 with the National Portrait Prize, called [the Outwin Boochever prize](#). We are told this was underwritten by a Mrs. Boochever, who conveniently died before anyone could ask her about it. That is the way they do these things.

If you look for information about Fred Kavli, you won't find much. [His obituary](#) at the *New York Times* is a total whitewash, with almost no useful data. From it, you learn even less than from his very short Wikipedia page, both of which are heavy with his alleged philanthropy and paper-thin on his life before that. If you go to the Kavli Foundation website, you get an even bigger whitewash in [an article from the Vesterheim Museum in Iowa](#), in which you can almost hear violins playing. In the first paragraphs we get a beloved older brother as well as heart-rending anti-Nazi stories, both peppered with constant asides to “his classic American story” of “opportunity, vision, ingenuity, and dreams.” Standard propaganda 101, in other words.

We are told his Norwegian father lived in San Francisco from 1900 to 1914, but aren't told why he came there or why he left. At any rate, the father married a girl with a large farm when he returned to Norway. Her family name was Moen, which was also the name of the town, so we may assume the Moens were prominent. They may also have been wealthy, since a [Soren Moen](#) was in Parliament from that county (Troms) in 1945. As I said, information about his family is scarce, at least in the US. If you are from Norway and know more about the Kavlis or Moens, drop me a note and I will pad this paper out with the info.

Despite most useful information being denied us, we do learn a couple of astonishing things from this interview, such as,

Of course, when I came, we were in the space race, and we got into the Sputnik area, and there were a number of European engineers—especially German engineers, they were very popular, Werner von Braun, for example—and so the government was anxious to get this expertise, and we had very good basic education, and I got security clearance in a relatively short time because they went over to Europe to investigate my background promptly.

Ah, so Kavli had security clearance all the way back to 1956. I would have guessed as much. This is also curious:

I started in a very small company, seven employees. It was really run by a chemical engineer and I was the only physicist actually. One of my first tasks was to design the flight control sensors for the Atlas Missile. Believe that? Just out of school, really, and I become the chief engineer!

Believe that? I don't. Why not? Well, because the same article admits a few sentences earlier that,

He didn't have the opportunity to go to a Norwegian technical university, but he did go to other technical schools . . . . He founded a company making agricultural machinery, which he started later, and he got a lot of patents. He even got a patent for the machine that made those briquettes of wood . . . [ellipses theirs]

So a tractor engineer from Norway arrives in LA in 1956 and immediately becomes the chief engineer for the Atlas missile? I guess those briquettes of wood came in handy for that!

But it is even worse than that, because this article contradicts itself in spectacular fashion, right in front of your face. A couple of sentences after that last quote, it says,

Some of the money Kavli earned with his brother helped to pay for his study of physics at the renowned Norwegian Institute of Technology in Trondheim.

The Norwegian Institute of Technology is a technical university, of course. But didn't they just tell us "he didn't have the opportunity to go to a Norwegian technical university"? Which is it? Probably that he didn't, which is why they had to fake or mis-tag this curious photo:



That is supposed to be Kavli at the Norwegian Institute of Technology. That would be around 1953, when Kavli was in his mid-20s. Does he look mid-20s to you? He looks 40-ish to me, maybe even older.

[**Updated later:** My source in Norway did some research and told me the Kavlis are really Jewish Zieglers from Germany, who came to Norway in the 1600s to open iron mines in Lesja. They were billionaires long before Fred was born. BTW, they soon deleted that photo above, after my paper came out. I guess I now have the only copy on the internet. Google pretends not to know it is here on a search.]

So the entire prize reads as just more misdirection. We see that in another quote from the article where Kavli says,

You see, I look at human beings as we have developed through the ages, and you know, practically everything we touch has been developed through basic science. Its foundation is in basic science. Yet it is sometimes hard to get support for basic science because people want to see things that have results in a shorter period of time. One of the things we are doing is supporting science in the embryonic stage. When it's an idea, it's too early to write a big proposal for the government. . . . You have an idea, you don't know if it works or makes any sense, but you need some money to explore it.

That all sounds great, but if that is so, then why don't the Kavli prizes go to "basic science"? Guth's inflationary model isn't "basic science," is it? It is extremely speculative theoretical physics, with near-zero data and absolutely zero potential application. It also isn't in any "embryonic stage," is it? Guth was given the prize in 2014, but he had the idea in 1980. It was embryonic in 1980, so why is it being given "exploratory" money 34 years later? The Kavli Foundation isn't and wasn't giving money to

young people with new ideas, it is giving money to old people with old failed ideas that need propping up for reasons of propaganda. That applies not only to Guth, who is now 68, but to Lynden-Bell, who is 80, and Maartin Schmidt (the other recipient of the 2008 prize in astronomy) who is 85. We now have mountains of data contradicting the theories of all these guys, but by giving them big prizes, the sponsors hope you won't remember that. Modern physicists have become amazingly adept at ignoring negative data and going where the funding requires them to regardless.

We have more indication of strange goings-on when it is admitted that the Kavli Foundation isn't just funding many million-dollar prizes every couple of years: it is also invading major universities. In the past six years alone, Kavli Institutes have been founded at 16 big universities worldwide, including Columbia (of course), UCLA, CalTech, Stanford, MIT, Cambridge, Harvard, Yale, and University of Chicago. I suppose it is just a coincidence that those are also top Military/Intelligence campuses?

We are supposed to believe Kavli was financing all this with his real estate investments in Oxnard, but Andrew Carnegie—one of the richest men in US history—wasn't able to fund that many university institutes that quickly. Bill Gates—who is supposed to be worth something like \$80 billion—wasn't able to invade the major universities that fast or to that extent. It is also curious that although we are told Kavli was a billionaire, never appeared on the *Forbes'* lists of billionaires. See years 2002 and 2003, for instance, when his wealth should have been peaking before he began giving it away. We are told he sold Kavlico in 2000 for \$345 million, but that and some real estate investments aren't enough to fund all the things the Kavli Foundation are funding. It simply doesn't add up. As usual, Kavli was just the face for some big hidden operation.

I would say it is obvious that the financiers are solidifying their positions at all the universities once again, via another round of pretty transparent invasions. If you think that bodes well for physics or anything else, you aren't thinking. It is the end of any independent research, publication, or theory. From now on, all theory will be controlled by those who control the government—as if it weren't already. You will think what they want you to think and read what they want you to read.

Just consider it for a moment: whereas universities used to be either public or private, they now are neither. A private university or college used to be one that was founded by local individuals, who decided what to teach locally. Public universities were funded by the government, through Congress or other representative bodies. But modern institutions generally don't follow either of those paths, whether we are talking about universities, hospitals, museums, or other major institutions. We are told institutions have lost their old sources of funding, but that isn't strictly true. They didn't lose it, it was *replaced*. Bigger bags of money came in and made various offers that couldn't be refused. Those bags of money may seem to come from the government, but they don't come from representative bodies. Rather, they come from fascist bodies: cloaked investment groups, black military or Intelligence bodies, and so on. This is what we are seeing again with the Kavli Institutes. This is a guy that had security clearance from 1956. Is this who we want funding physics at the university level?

Even if we suppose Kavli actually funded these things himself—which I have shown is doubtful—neither science, art, nor anything else for that matter should be funded by billionaire spooks. Billionaire spooks should not be bankrolling the universities, and that pretty much goes without saying. Those promoting these moves will tell you it is no big deal, since the money has to come from somewhere, but if this invasion is so benign, why has it been so covert? If it is such a good thing, why not just do it in the open? Why not go through Congress and report it honestly in the mainstream press? Why not have a public referendum or a plebiscite?

I will tell you why: because none of this is benign. It is predatory, pure and simple, and it has ended up destroying science. The sciences are no longer promoted for their adherence to truth or their ability to solve problems or even for technical advancement; they are promoted for their ability to make money. As it turns out, fake science generates far more money than real science. Real science is dangerous in this regard, because real science makes sense—it is *not* “weird.” People can figure it out. Which places limits on the dollar signs you can attach to it. But fake science has no such limits. Being weird, sane people cannot figure it out. It remains forever beyond their comprehension, which means it is also beyond their analysis. They don't question it, even when you are billing them huge sums for it.

In this way, Modern science has followed precisely the same path as Modern art, and for the same reasons. Fake science and art are easier to control. Being fake, they have no natural limits. The only limit on either one is how much price inflation can be sold to the public, but since the public has already indicated it will believe [\\$300,000,000 for one bad painting](#), those inflating science figure they are nowhere near the limit.

We see more proof of this reading of the Kavli Prize if we go to [the Wikipedia page](#) for the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, one of the other sponsors of the Prize. There, it says,

The idea of the Humboldt-inspired university, where independent research stood strong, had taken over for the instrumental view of a university as a means to produce civil servants.

You see how they are promoting this idea of independent research, while making sure none gets done. The modern university is neither a Humboldt-inspired university of independent research nor a producer of civil servants. It has become instead a propeller of these various centralized rackets, whereby the very wealthy promote their grand thefts via vast fake projects.

On this same page, it is admitted that the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters has long since been subsumed under the Research Council of Norway, which is itself subordinate to the Ministry of Education and Research (another admitted sponsor of the Kavli Prize). Which means the Norwegian Academy is really just a front, used because its name gives you more confidence than the Ministry of Research. This Ministry sounds like something out of a George Orwell novel or out of Terry Gilliam's movie *Brazil*, and that is because it is. Part of its mission is propaganda, and part of that propaganda is science propaganda as promoted by the Kavli Prize. This is why we see the prize being awarded by the Kings or Princes of Norway. These royals are among the billionaires profiteering from fake science. They give these awards not as seed money for independent “embryonic” research, but as rewards for lifetimes of service to the MATRIX.

In that way, these awards are more like the awards [we saw given to Bob Dylan](#) or Paul McCartney or Mick Jagger: they are given for service to Empire. Kavli himself got one of these lifetime achievement awards from the royal family: he was a Grand Officer, Commander with Star, of the Norwegian Order of Merit. Ask yourself this: if Kavli is who we are told—just a guy who left Norway in his 20's to make sensors for US rockets and planes and invest in California real estate—why is he being given this major award from the King of Norway for “recognition of his work on behalf of Norway and humanity”? What did he ever do for Norway? Whatever the truth of the matter, it is clear we aren't being told the whole story.

We see this yet again when we have to listen to how Kavli was an environmentalist. Unfortunately, very little research is required to find he was an environmentalist in the same way George Bush or Al Gore was an environmentalist: he hoped to profit from panic over Global Warming, creating more

trading schemes and taxation on the lower and middle classes while doing nothing about massive worldwide destruction of the environment by military and corporations. In the article I quoted above, Kavli says,

So I am discouraged somewhat by our lack of ability to tackle the problem [air pollution and other environmental degradation]. We talk about it, but there isn't much being accomplished.

What he doesn't tell you is that the reason nothing is being accomplished is because those he works for—like General Electric—prefer nothing gets accomplished. Cleaning up their messes would cut into their profit margins, you know, so they block any meaningful legislation. As long as government is run by those who own these polluting corporations, nothing will ever get done.

Finally, we have to look at Kavli's Carnegie Medal for philanthropy,

which is given biennially to one or more individuals who, like Andrew Carnegie, have dedicated their private wealth to public good, and who have sustained impressive careers as philanthropists.

We should all know by now what a conjob this so-called philanthropy really is. Patriotism isn't the last refuge of a scoundrel, philanthropy is. It is always the pretty transparent attempt to whitewash the piles of dirty money these rich people sleep upon. Andrew Carnegie is the perfect example. Even Wikipedia admits Carnegie made his first big money from insider trading on the Pennsylvania railroad, helped by Thomas Scott and others. What we aren't told is that, being an insider, his investments continued to be guaranteed long after that, including his investment in the Story Farm, which yielded many more millions. He also profited magnificently during the Civil War, being given no-bid contracts for almost everything due to his relationship with the same Thomas Scott, who was then Assistant Secretary of War. Beyond that, Carnegie was violently anti-union, and he and his head-henchman Frick used force to break up strikes, including the notorious Homestead Strike. Ask yourself this: if Carnegie was such a “philanthropic” guy, why didn't he just pay his workers what they had coming?

Not only was Carnegie one of the richest men in US history, he was one of the biggest hypocrites ever to walk the earth. He wrote, “The amassing of wealth is one of the worse species of idolatry. No idol more debasing than the worship of money.” In the same note, he promised to retire at 35 and give all his money away. He didn't, of course. Instead, he wrote a nauseating book called *The Gospel of Wealth*. Although it appears to be a handbook of philanthropy, it is really a playbook for fake philanthropy, and it taught later billionaires how to whitewash their crimes via fake charities.

For instance, in the book he recommends, “promoting the administration of capital over the course of one's lifetime toward the cause of reducing the stratification between the rich and poor.” With so many billionaires and trillionaires supposedly learning from Carnegie's example, you would think this stratification would have been quickly eliminated. I mean, if superrich people really are so philanthropic and caring, the wealth distribution in this country should be glorious, shouldn't it? With the Carnegies and Rockefellers and Gates and so on giving away all their money, the stratification should be almost flattened out. Is it? I repeat, *is it?*

We are told Carnegie gave away all but 30 million of his wealth by the time of his death. I don't tend to believe that. We are told Bill Gates is doing a similar thing now, giving away an appreciable part of his fortune. Well, if that is so, then how does Gates' fortune continue to rise? For a wider example: if the billionaires are so philanthropic, how is it that they have gotten so much richer in the past 12 years?

According to *Forbes*, worldwide billionaires had a total wealth of around 1 trillion in 2003. Now they have a worldwide total of around 7 trillion. All that “philanthropy” appears to be paying off very well. They have septupled their money in only 12 years! You should also look at the managed funds of the biggest investment groups, which have likewise skyrocketed. Somehow, the profiteering and insider trading continues to outrun the philanthropy by a large margin. Nothing has changed.

And, as with the philanthropy of the Rockefellers, the Morgans, the DuPonts, the Vanderbilts, the MacArthurs, the Gates, and nearly everyone else, it is doubtful most of the money allegedly given away by Carnegie went to “public good.” As we have seen with Kavli, the bulk of it goes to universities or other institutions, which then produce even more money for these same billionaires and their offspring via these various boondoggles and grand thefts from the treasuries. If you follow these “charities,” they most often seem to morph behind closed doors into further investments. **They are guaranteed investments disguised as charitable trusts**, which is how people like the Rockefellers and Gates can seem to give away billions while getting even richer. You never see them giving money to men's shelters or soup kitchens, since they haven't found any way of getting a return on that.

In sum, it looks to me like the Kavli Prize, like the Fundamental Physics Prize, is little more than one more front for the trillionaire investment groups. Its purpose is to whitewash the largest physics programs, which are hugely profitable. The prizes create legitimacy for programs that the public can otherwise not comprehend.

You will say, “Couldn't we say the same about the Nobel Prize? Wasn't it started by the same sort of people, for the same purposes? Isn't the only difference that it is older?” In short, Yes.

But before I sign off, I would like to suggest to you that these prizes (including the Nobel) may be fake not just to the extent that they are for fake research. They may be fake to the extent that most other stories in the news now are. Meaning, they may be manufactured pretty much from whole cloth, being nothing but staged events. Since we have been lied to about everything else, I see no reason to believe any real money changes hands with these awards. Alan Guth may have gotten a check for a million and maybe he didn't. If he didn't, would you know the difference? No. I have no evidence he *didn't* get real money, it is true, but you have no evidence he *did*, other than their golden word for it. My only point is, since their word has proved to be worthless, we don't have to believe these stories. All these prizes and the stories that surround them would work exactly the same if no real money changed hands. And it would save the trillionaires many millions to fake the payments along with everything else.

As usual, I know I will have to field this question: “But if that were true, at least one of these award winners would have squealed over the years.” Well, given the greater mainstream story, that would seem to be true. *If* all these people are who we are told they are, it seems that one of them should have squealed. But there are several logical scenarios in which you *wouldn't* expect anyone to squeal:

Scenario 1: If all these people are already salaried agents, doing a job, there is no reason to squeal. They are paid a salary, and part of that salary is to keep quiet. If they squeal, they don't get paid; they get fired, and maybe worse. This would mean the top end of physics is composed of agents pretending to be physicists, but I no longer find that a bizarre proposal. Actually, it would explain a lot. And we have a mountain of evidence leading in that direction already, which you know if you have read all my papers.

Scenario 2: These people are not agents, they are scientists just like we are told. But they are visited



by Intelligence, which tells them there is a job they need to do for their country. All it involves is accepting a big prize and appearing as a hero in the newspaper and on TV. In addition, it will be claimed the prize includes a million dollars, but it doesn't. They can accept or refuse this job, but whether they accept or refuse they cannot divulge the truth later. If they do there will be unpleasant consequences.

There are other scenarios, equally plausible, but I think I have made my point. The only way you can dismiss these scenarios is to say that the world doesn't work that way. But, unfortunately, it does. And anyone awake for the past decade should *know* that it does, whether that person has read or accepts my papers or not.