

EXPLANATION TO HARVARD OF POLITICAL STRATEGY

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED

1. ADDRESS TO HARVARD ADMINISTRATORS

I want to be very clear about my political decisions. I am certainly taking a hard position regarding Bill Gates, the individual. I am taking him on hook, line, and sinker, to use the fishing metaphor. He attacked me and my interests and it is my right to retaliate to destroy him.

I am not now nor in the future interested in taking the same position with Harvard University. This is rational. I accept Harvard's right to do whatever Harvard chooses, to give me two doctorates and tenure as I have explicitly asked, or to deny these for whatever reason pleases Harvard. I accept these rights of Harvard. I do not pretend to coerce Harvard and have no interest in doing so.

However, I do not determine Harvard's reputation. Billions of people around the world consider Harvard with admiration and respect today, as a pre-eminent intellectual mecca. I have no interest in negative propaganda regarding Harvard at all. I do have that interest with Bill Gates, to be clear.

But history has shown that Harvard cannot escape judgment of billions of people around the world and be hurt in their reputation regardless of whether I attacked Harvard *if Harvard makes the wrong choices regarding Bill Gates versus Zulfikar Moinuddin Ahmed*. That is not based on my will; that is simply the nature of human judgment. If people feel that I was a great genius who was stuck with abuse from my aunt in Allen Texas while Harvard could have given me natural tenure and doctorates since I have certainly proven my intellectual gifts, they will lower Harvard naturally and they will in my view have made a good decision. Harvard is judged based on Harvard's values and actions, and not based on what I want.

If Harvard wants to serve rich white supremacists like Bill Gates then Harvard does not deserve to be considered a world class academic institution, and the world will adjust without my pushing it. That's just the law of human judgments. Human beings are extremely good at judging moral issues quite naturally. They will judge Harvard or me or Bill based on moral imperatives that are deeply ingrained in their genetic heritage. These are not in my control, not in Harvard's control, and certainly not in Bill Gates' control. I am surprised that Harvard Administrators do not know this.

2. HARVARD'S REPUTATION IS NOT IMPORTANT TO ME


Well first of all I am Princetonian. I have actual loyalty to Princeton. Princeton was kind to me and gave me a world class education. Princeton's reputation I have some responsibility for, and I do this by being a good, courageous virtuous man. I believe that I do an exemplary job in carrying forward Princeton's reputation. I

Date: June 17, 2021.

like Harvard, but I am not a Harvard Professor at the moment. I do not have any responsibility for Harvard's reputation at all. Now since Bill Gates is threatening my Life, Liberty, and livelihood, I have bigger issues than Harvard's reputation. I am in a war for survival, and if Harvard then makes a wrong decision here or there and crashes and burns, I won't even twitch. I do not have malevolent intentions toward Harvard, but I am not Harvard's baby sitter. If you screw up and burn to ashes, that's your headache.

3. RECAP: MORAL VALUES ARE GENETICALLY DRIVEN

In order to appreciate that moral values are genetically driven and in this case by *shared* genetic heritage of all humans, this is what we do. First we consider the moral values about prostitution across the globe by ethnicity.



What you note here is that the pattern of distribution of moral values regarding prostitution is remarkably uniform across the globe. By the way, this uniformity was not the discovery of the good folk of University of Michigan responsible for World Values Survey. The data was collected by them, and this is Q183 of Wave 7. The *regularity* was my discovery. And then you make the strong inference that it is due to the genetic material we all share, around 99.9% of the DNA letters that are identical across the entire human race that is what produces this remarkable regularity. Thus it is not a speculative leap that moral judgments are part of our human nature, and in this case you can see that prostitution elicits similar moral convictions in distribution.

Then we can generalise this to judgments about Zulf, or Harvard, or Bill Gates, and we can easily come to a good conclusion that is rational that all human beings who are aware of the situation will make moral judgments that are individual

about us and this is a facility that is fast and intuitive. Harvard's and Zulf's and Bill Gates' reputation depends on moral value judgments of people. Since I am an immortal genius, people will make this judgment in billions over time, and they will judge Bill Gates and Harvard too. The key point is that human nature does not provide exceptions in this regard. To the extent that anyone pays attention to a situation, sooner or later they will invariably make moral judgments. And their moral judgments will determine whose reputation is what. They are the final arbiters of reputation.

This is not a matter of random subjective opinion. This is a feature of universal human nature. Now you can believe that things work differently; that is *delusional*. Things work the way I am telling you. It's not even all that difficult to see this.

4. SET THEORETIC PROBLEM WITH ONLY WHITE TENURES FOR HARVARD

Bill Gates insists that only white tenure for Harvard Professorships is better. This is irrational and quite simply so. Harvard would, to be simple, want to increase some sort of total productive talent in their faculty.

Suppose total productive talent τ of people is a real-valued function. We let H be the set of all human beings on Earth. We let H_w, H_n denote white and nonwhite populations of Earth. Then we have $H = H_w \cup H_n$ and we use the convention that mixed white-nonwhite ethnicities are all in H_n . Now Harvard wants to solve the problem:

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{S \subset H, |S|=K} \tau(S)$$

where

$$\tau(S) = \sum_{\sigma \in S} \tau(\sigma).$$

Since $H_w \subset H$ we immediately have

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{S \subset H_w, |S|=K} \tau(S) \leq \operatorname{argmax}_{S \subset H, |S|=K} \tau(S)$$

This is simply a consequence that $\tau(\sigma)$ has more values when $\sigma \in H$ than when $\sigma \in H_w$. Bill Gates is making the highly nontrivial claim that restriction to H_w for Harvard professorships is better but that is not rational. The best person for a professorship is obviously better if chosen from $H_w \cup H_n$ than just from H_w .

5. EXAMPLE OF POVERTY OF RATIONALITY AND JUDGMENT OF BILL GATES

Bill Gates has made the following two judgments which ensure that no one in Mathematics can take him seriously.

- He has literally said I. M. Singer is not good
- He has said Ronald Fisher is a better mathematician than William Feller

These are not gaffes, but the judgment of extraordinary ignorance. I. M. Singer was the analytical powerhouse behind Atiyah-Singer Index theorems in the sixties, which is one of the deepest explorations of the relationship between analysis and topology in history. The space of $SU(2)$ instantons on the four-sphere has its dimension determined by a simple application of Atiyah-Singer theorem and this is of course the ADHM construction. On the second, Ronald Fisher is a brilliant naturalist and statistician but he is not even in the same league of mathematical genius as William Feller.

This is an irrational man whose racial supremacy theories permanently blind his abilities to judge talent in nontrivial subjects. He himself is not in possession of any scientific, mathematical or even technology genius. All that is pure fake propaganda.

6. I AM PRINCETON MATHEMATICS

Princeton Mathematics has been ranked in the top 5 best mathematics programs in the entire world for many decades and is still the top. I graduate magna cum laude from Princeton mathematics in 1995. I won the award for the best thesis that was publishable that year. And I took John Morgan's seminar on Four-Manifold Theory and am quite familiar with Geometry and Topology issues that I applied directly in Four-Sphere Theory. I am just stunned that a man like Bill Gates who has no undergraduate degree goes around even remotely judging my abilities in Mathematics. Obviously I will be a thousand times more knowledgeable than him. I'm Princeton Math; he's not. He's a high schooler.

7. DAN STROOCK IS NOT ACTUALLY AWARE OF MY MATHEMATICAL TALENTS

My mathematical talents were never in analysis. They were in topology and geometry. Frederic Bien taught Differential Geometry at Princeton my sophomore year, and I did quite well, even with Steven Gubser being in that course; and I took Algebraic Topology as well, with William Browder, and found it challenging but did very well after a lot of help from my friends like Peter Oszvath who was a graduate student. My natural intuition for geometric issues were strong enough that many decades later I was successful with a full theoretical physics with Four-Sphere Theory. None of this is really Dan Stroock's forte. He's a great analyst, of extremely good pedigree. He was in the loop with Marc Kac and Henry P. McKean, people of the Courant orbit. For whatever reason, things went south and he decided I had no talent in mathematics. This was at least his view, and it's not true, but I am too old and mature to care all that much.