

## Muhammad Zafrullah

---

**From:** "Dobbs, David E" <ddobbs1@tennessee.edu>  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 09, 2020 10:03 AM  
**To:** "Muhammad Zafrullah" <mzafrullah@usa.net>  
**Cc:** "noomenjarboui" <noomenjarboui@yahoo.fr>  
**Subject:** Goodbye

Muhammad,

You are a self-deluded liar. Now that I have tested positive for COVID, I am fighting for my life, and so this will be my last message to you. Ever.

My comments about the Mary Martin paper are almost exact quotes from you! Your convenient forgetfulness does not change that fact.

You can choke on your views of a master race. Although you regard me as a mad dog, I do see you as a human, albeit a sorry excuse for one. The world regards people like you, with your poisonous, dehumanizing, murderous views of "Untermenschen", as "Our blight".

Dan will tell you, as he has told me twice without provocation, that he regrets having been so inexperienced as a referee as to have accepted the Brewer and Rutter paper, even though it is now recognized to be a shameless theft and plagiarism of my earlier paper with Papick. Brewer was forced to add "we profited from access to a preprint by Dobbs and Papick" ["access," as in copying practically two pages word for word!] to the galley proofs of his paper with Rutter only after learning that Fossum, as editor at PAMS, had overruled Brewer's rejection of the Dobbs-Papick paper. Fossum apparently read Brewer's report and the Dobbs-Papick paper and made his decision before involving me. You Nazis never remember to account for the unforeseen and uncontrollable actions of decent people!

Brewer -- just another exponent of the master race! They come in all stripes. I suppose that unlike Brewer, you were not an acclaimed golf champion at a segregated golf club as a youth -- no, you learned your racism elsewhere!

I am not (as you put it) a joker from UT, just a fellow who privately bemoaned the lack of generality of your pullback papers because of your noncategorical overfascination with domains.

So, you think that my contributions were only to going-down. I no longer care what you think about anything. I did more in the way of lasting contributions to cohomology and dimension theories for commutative rings -- before you even heard of me -- than all your prattling about factorization will ever accomplish. My work in building a periodic table for minimal ring extensions of finite commutative rings will be of great use in this century long after your work has been forgotten.

I do not understand your latest comments. Perhaps, you have claimed to be warning me that Noomen is untrustworthy and that he has betrayed a fellow Muslim. In any case, you have not made the point clearly and I do not have the time to continue to suffer such foolishness gladly.

Your mendacity has become predictable. Your comment that "and now ... I am of the opinion that perhaps Jews brought the Holocaust upon themselves" is exactly, word for word (except for "perhaps"), what I was told you had said to others some 40 years ago. It's not "now" -- with you, it's always! You -- who cannot see the individual but only a caricature. You -- who believes in a master race than must eradicate the supposed untermenschen. You -- clinging to your paranoic racism!

I do hope that you will cease your paranoid ramblings and stop acting like a mathematical Unabomber. Reach out and try to help someone, instead of being just a self-centered user and a taker.

My whole family is now infected (7/7). But at least, I can now wash my hands of you.

Adonai Elohaichem Emet! God is just.

D.

---

**From:** Muhammad Zafrullah <mzafrullah@usa.net>

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 8, 2020 9:11 PM

**To:** Dobbs, David E <ddobbs1@tennessee.edu>

**Cc:** Dobbs, David E <ddobbs1@tennessee.edu>; noomenjarboui <noomenjarboui@yahoo.fr>

**Subject:** Re: Question

There is a phrase in Arabic “Laanatullahe Alalkadhebin” Translated simply, it means cursed be the liars” Now tell me if you even know what was in that paper of mine with Mary Martin.

Saying things like: “Do you really not remember asking me to relinquish coauthorship on our completed project on weakly primary or some such babble, just so you could ingratiate yourself with Ronnie who was fond of Mary Martin and, as you explained, Mary needed a paper and had not worked on this paper but her/your boss Ronnie would be glad to give you a better job if the paper had only two authors, you and her (never mind that Mary had done nothing except give you this opportunity for abuse!).” You can put doubts on my work, but can’t accomplish a thing. People will laugh at your claims, asking “but where is going-down?” You see, you often try to bring in “going down”, for you do not have much else to say. As far as I am concerned I have acknowledged any and all help from people, often saying so and so was exposed to the script in the absence of any comment. (Whenever you helped, I acknowledged, even when my coauthors, or I, had something better to offer.)

I did peddle those A\_Z questions because I expected some useful outcome. I won’t say I had much to contribute and I did not write the final script. So, you can’t blame me for not including your names. To tell the truth, bulk of the work was done by Costa and perhaps written by Dan. But being the weaker link, I got the rap!

I was on the wrong side of WWII? Alain Bouvier told you that? “Cursed be the liars”. Frankly, I never regarded Jews anything different from other humans and now after your brazen faced lies I am of the opinion that perhaps Jews brought the Holocaust upon themselves. On the other hand, I am firmly of the opinion that the J. Algebra paper, “The  $D + XD_S[X]$  construction”, with Costa and Mott, would have been hailed as the best paper of the century if my name had not included “Muhammad”. I remember some jokers from Tennessee writing papers skirting that paper, while mentioning the Brewer and Rutter paper that cited a pre-print of my paper with Costa and Mott.

My belief is a matter between myself and my God. I do not care if my community is liked or hated I trust that I would get what I work for. I have done my bit of good and bad and I am fully prepared to face the consequences. I have helped people without looking back to see what they thought of me. I got angry because I saw a fellow seeking my help to attack someone who I thought was unaware. Now I am of the opinion that you fellows have been had.

Thank you for writing this: “

I am profoundly saddened that you seem happy that Noomen and I were taken in by what seemed like a reprint. Only a heartless beast would rejoice when a selfless academic is ambushed in spite of his good intentions. There is only one heartless beast here -- look in a mirror!

Noomen has written to you that Allah will reward you. I can add nothing more to that comment, other than to say that in my personal conduct, I aim for the biblical example of being slow to anger (it has taken me almost 50 years to be really angry at you!) and quick to reconcile. I will not follow your advice to pray that you will die soon. I do pray that you will come to see two things: that your mathematical efforts are valued and acknowledged, and that there can be much joy in acknowledging the contributions of others.”

Let my God reward me for whatever good or bad I have done.

As far as you are concerned David Dobbs. I wrote that e-mail to warn you that the fellow who cannot be the friend of his own people cannot be your friend either. You got it all wrong. Now here's a challenge: Dear David Dobbs, spread all the truths and lies about me. See if I Muhammad Zafrullah care. For I firmly believe that God is Just.

Muhammad Zafrullah

**From:** Dobbs, David E

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 08, 2020 5:14 PM

**To:** Muhammad Zafrullah

**Cc:** Dobbs, David E ; noomenjarboui

**Subject:** Re: Question

December 8, 2020

Dear Muhammad,

You old reprobate. And ingrate. I suppose that you will never change. Being called a mad dog by you puts me into a fine class of many fine folks whom you have similarly abused.

You went too far in calling Noomen a Tunisian bicycle thief. You, who have always bemoaned that other Muslims distrust you because they accuse you of sharing some mischief that they attribute to other Amadeans (I am sorry if I misspell this word - surely, you know what I mean) -- you cannot see me as an individual but only as a caricature. I should have paid closer attention to Dan who warned me as early as 1976 that you were on the wrong side of WWII (a comment repeated a few years later by Alain Bouvier).

You are a user. You peddled the A-Z problem, visiting and soliciting help from folks at at least four universities (around this time of year, wasn't it?), but not telling those faithful collaborators later when the work had been completed. Perhaps my talents do not lend themselves to crescentish concepts, but when I have agreed to work with someone on something, they become a coauthor whether they eventually contribute or not. Your criteria are different and DFA and I had to shame you into offering coauthorship to us, as we had continued to work for weeks on that problem after you had asked for our help and long after you had apparently solved it on a later trip to another university. Was that the act of a friend or a colleague or a collaborator or a faithless user?

Do you really not remember asking me to relinquish coauthorship on our completed project on weakly primary or some such babble, just so you could ingratiate yourself with Ronnie who was fond of Mary Martin and, as you explained, Mary needed a paper and had not worked on this paper but her/your boss Ronnie would be glad to give you a better job if the paper had only two authors, you and her (never mind that Mary had done nothing except give you this opportunity for abuse!)

I am stunned that you reacted to the manifold favors and gifts that I have showered upon you for more than 40 years by rejoicing that Noomen and I were misled (as you seem to think, intentionally) into critiquing an early erroneous draft of an AV domain pair paper.

Where is your humanity? I am obligated to treat all strangers at least as well as I treat my family. If you are a true Muslim, you are required to treat me, as a person of the Book, honestly in at least 50%

of our business dealings. Apparently, you have not done so. You view me, your benefactor, as just one more mad dog. To use an expression from the Politburo, you see me as just another useful idiot.

Most people in my position would probably conclude that there is nothing to be gained of human or mathematical value in associating further with human waste such as you.

So, you ``plan to spill the beans," do you? I suppose you don't mean the ``weakly" beans when I gave up my half of a paper so that your career could be advanced by MM's patron? Do you mean the beans that Noomen and I rushed to submit a paper that would inform the community that a published paper was qualitatively wrong? If we had known that the paper that we were looking at, with JAA imprimatur and pagination and looking like a reprint, was only a draft, we would not have had as great a moral obligation to submit quickly and we could have contacted the authors directly. That is what you call ``the standard procedure," but only for preprints, not for published papers!

Any objective review would conclude that my record is spotless. You have a long history of being a manipulative user, and I do not!

I do not recall your contacting me to warn me that I was using a preprint (not a reprint) and that you had extended advice to Noomen, apparently expecting that advice to reach me with credit attributed to you. TO THE BEST OF MY RECOLLECTION, NOTHING LIKE THAT HAPPENED!

I am profoundly saddened that you seem happy that Noomen and I were taken in by what seemed like a reprint. Only a heartless beast would rejoice when a selfless academic is ambushed in spite of his good intentions. There is only one heartless beast here -- look in a mirror!

Noomen has written to you that Allah will reward you. I can add nothing more to that comment, other than to say that in my personal conduct, I aim for the biblical example of being slow to anger (it has taken me almost 50 years to be really angry at you!) and quick to reconcile. I will not follow your advice to pray that you will die soon. I do pray that you will come to see two things: that your mathematical efforts are valued and acknowledged, and that there can be much joy in acknowledging the contributions of others.

I am truly saddened that you seem to have so little esteem or care for me. But I have no more time for this. Perhaps we can continue when we are both on the other side of the grass.

David

---

**From:** Muhammad Zafrullah <mzafrullah@usa.net>

**Sent:** Monday, December 7, 2020 2:43 PM

**To:** Dobbs, David E <ddobbs1@tennessee.edu>

**Subject:** Re: Question

Dear David,

I hope you and all your family stay well. As far as I am concerned I am just dying and it's my dying wish that someone should acknowledge the fact that some help was requested and offered before the paper even started. Or I would die thinking that all my effort at trying to restrain two mad dogs barking at a wrong tree went to waste. (Fields Medal? I started doing math after I was past that age.)

I have poked a lot of people and found out that the guiltiest is the one that is ready with counter-accusations. Now would you care to tell me what you know about me using my coauthors? Especially Mary Martin? Perhaps the result of such propaganda was that a number of results from that paper with Mary Martin were redone with substandard proofs.

What about the A to Z paper, the one that everyone wanted to hop onto? If people wanted to work with me, it was mainly because I had ideas.

Now, I am too weak to sit and write a rebuttal but let me put it this way: Pray that I die soon, or if I live

I plan to spill the beans. I might write the story of two mad dogs barking at a wrong tree. (Don't you get it? The fellow (Jarboui) had been snooping around and had been set up with that false result. He (Jarboui) fed it to you and you hungry for a pound of meat fell upon it without thinking of the standard procedure of letting the authors of the "mistake" know of their mistake.)  
Muhammad

**From:** Dobbs, David E

**Sent:** Monday, December 07, 2020 10:55 AM

**To:** Muhammad Zafrullah ; noojarboui@hotmail.com ; Dobbs, David E

**Subject:** Re: Question

December 7, 2020

Dear Muhammad,

You have reached me at a difficult time. Except for my wife and me, every other adult in my immediate family has tested positive for COVID during the past week. Our Thanksgiving dinner seems to have been a super-spreader event. My wife and I were tested yesterday, with results to be expected back within a few days. My symptoms have been raging for 12 days and I am quite groggy from the aftereffects of various medications. So, please forgive me if I have failed to discern the level of seriousness or whimsy in your message.

It is interesting that you and Jarboui have corresponded for a long time. He and I corresponded for about 20 years before we wrote a paper together. My goal in that early correspondence, which was always at his instigation, was to help a talented younger colleague in a less fortunate country. You may recall that Joe Mott and I led the way in doing sort of thing for you some 40-odd years ago when you were in Libya, etc.

About the Dan et al paper: the referee and editor of our paper confirmed that any possible overlap with the Dan paper is trivial (after all, many people are interested in valuation domains and  $D+M$  constructions) and that the JAA received our paper before the Dan et al paper hit the Arxiv. As you may know, I never look at the Arxiv, but the JAA confirmed that the published part of our paper that had any conceivable overlap with the Dan paper was unchanged from our original submission. If memory serves, the best results in the Dan paper concern DVRs, whereas Noetherian things are just an aside in most of my work.

You know that my most serious drawback is that I tend to give too much credit to too many people. I may have done so in even mentioning the Dan paper in my paper with Jarboui. I hope that you did not intend your message to suggest that I am being instructed to advise Jarboui to publicly thank you for something. If that was your intent, I find it offensive and preposterously overbearing, but I will chalk it up to being just one more bitter comment from an old friend.

I am not Jarboui's keeper. Nor are you. Your career in terms of (ab/mis)using collaborators is not pristine. (Do I need to mention Mary Martin and weakly things? How about the A-Z paper? Enough said!)

Several years ago at the holiday season, I had to convince you to stop pillorying Sylvia Wiegand just because she was an editor of a journal which omitted some pages in publishing one of your papers. As I predicted, she used her good offices to do the right thing as soon as she became aware of the mistake. At the time, I wondered about the timing of your unwarranted, over-the-top attack on her. Is it something about this time of year that sets you off? Do you think that you are more aggrieved or more entitled than the average working mathematician?

I cannot be expected to help with your missing bicycle. Perhaps, in the same spirit of reasonableness, I will ask you to find my leather jacket which was stolen from a coat rack at a Greyhound bus station in

San Francisco in August 1961.

I am trying to write what would be my final paper, but as I mentioned, the medicines (and frankly some of the messages) are getting in the way. As you and I both age and circle the drain, I suggest that we agree to stop fighting old, one-sided battles and make one final effort to make the world a better place. My fight is almost over and I am content that I have done my best. I wish you well.

Sincerely,

David

PS: After writing this reply, I have just scrolled down and I have seen some of your correspondence with Jarboui. I can assure that you that when he asked me for an example AV domain pair with different quotient fields, I answered with full details (exactly as it was later published) by return mail, in less than one hour. I have no interest or time to devote in further litigating or rehearsing your annoyances, picayune or otherwise. Those will be in the hands of the Heavenly Tribunal soon enough. D.

**From:** Muhammad Zafrullah <mzafrullah@usa.net>

**Sent:** Monday, December 7, 2020 12:37 AM

**To:** dobbs@math.utk.edu <dobbs@math.utk.edu>; noojarboui@hotmail.com <noojarboui@hotmail.com>

**Subject:** Fw: Question

[External Email]

Dear David,

Re: Your paper on almost valuation ring pairs

I know it's hard but would you get your coauthor Noomen Jarboui to comment on the attached files? Should someone make a nice comment some place pointing out that Professor Jarboui had forgotten to mention that he had been consulting this lowly person named Muhammad Zafrullah? (Long ago, when I was in Libya, a Tunisian stole my bike. I thought it was by a chance.)

Sincerely,

Muhammad

**From:** Muhammad Zafrullah

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 03, 2019 3:55 PM

**To:** noomenjarboui@yahoo.fr

**Subject:** Fw: Question

ADVR(AXZ13).pdf is the final version. If you have used any of the contents in your research, please adjust the title. (The paper was submitted, around a month ago.)

Sincerely,

Muhammad Zafrullah

**From:** Muhammad Zafrullah

**Sent:** Monday, October 07, 2019 2:35 PM

**To:** noomenjarboui@yahoo.fr

**Subject:** Re: Question

Dear Prof Jarboui,

Think, it is  $R \setminus \text{subteq } R'$  and I don't know if that would work in your case. The paper we are working

on is attached. Please do not write to any of the authors about the content. You can cite the script if you **use something from it**.

**Wassalam,**

**From:** Noômen Jarboui

**Sent:** Monday, October 07, 2019 2:19 PM

**To:** Muhammad Zafrullah

**Subject:** Question

Dear Professor Muhammad,

Please precise me the ring extension  $R \setminus S$  which produces an AV pair with  $qf(R) \neq qf(R)$ .

Best wishes

Noomen Jarboui

[Envoyé depuis Yahoo Mail pour Android](#)