

Bringing Harvard to Heel

*The Trump vs. Harvard Brawl is a Necessary Battle
for the Salvation of Both Harvard's and America's
Soul*

by Barry Scott Zellen, PhD

Part 1: After Four Centuries, It's High Time for the Big H to Fund Itself

Hey, Harvard, Leave America's Taxpayers Alone!

On July 9, 2025, the up-and-down settlement talks between the transformative, red-blooded presidential administration of Donald J. Trump and the blue-blooded, atavistic and ossified center of anti-Jewish and anti-Israel bias (as perceived by the Trump administration), Harvard University, hit a setback, as reported by *Harvard Magazine*, with the White House once again declaring the Big H unfit for accreditation, warning it would soon subpoena records of its high tuition-paying but dubiously vetted foreign students who now comprise over 27% of this tarnished Ivy League institution's student body, and threatening to axe all federal

funding.³⁵ Back in May, after the White House sought to block foreign students from attending Harvard, its president, Alan M. Garber, “wrote to members of the Harvard community this morning to ‘condemn this unlawful and unwarranted action...[that] imperils the futures of thousands of students and scholars across Harvard and serves as a warning to countless others at colleges and universities throughout the country who have come to America to pursue their education and fulfill their dreams,” as *Harvard Magazine* reported.³⁶ But left unmentioned by Garber were all those American futures, 6,793 of them, denied the opportunity to share in this dream so that the chameleon-like Harvard could continue to diversify the complexion of its student body, while pocketing huge tuitions from elite foreign families along the way, who gladly foot the exorbitant bill out-of-pocket, living a dream few others can afford and that their home countries simply cannot offer.

But why should the American taxpayer, squeezed by inflation including unaffordable housing, runaway medical costs, obscenely high tuitions, and increasingly unwanted by Harvard and its fellow

³⁵ Nina Pasquini, “[Harvard in the Crosshairs: Trump Administration Threatens Harvard’s Accreditation, Subpoenas Student Records](#),” *Harvard Magazine*, July 9, 2025.

³⁶ Ibid.

Ivy League universities aka country-club colleges aka finishing schools for foreign nepo-babies in quest of wealthy foreign students to enroll without financial aid, continue to make the American dream come true for rich foreign kids when that very same dream remains so unattainable by so many at home? For those who don't follow the ins and outs of the White-Lotus-on-the-Charles, Garber was appointed president in the aftermath of the plagiarism scandal that brought down Harvard's previous president, Claudine Gay, an archetypical DEI hire whose anemic scholarly background would be nationally ridiculed when it was discovered (beyond Massachusetts Hall, where it was always known) that her minimal published work (insufficient to earn a non-DEI hire a lowly adjunct position, let alone the full professorship, deanship, and presidency that it earned Gay at the DEI-obsessed, anti-merit Harvard) was riddled with plagiarized, uncredited content lifted from others.

This is an old Harvard tradition, one that famously led to the temporary suspension of infamous Harvard student Edward (Teddy) Kennedy for copying answers off a classmate's final exam, and later having a peer sit-in for one of his exams in a brazen identity-borrowing scheme. Kennedy, it should be noted, went on to abandon one of the hard-working and largely unthanked "Boiler Room

Girls” from his late brother, Robert F. Kennedy’s presidential campaign, Mary Jo Kopechne, in his sinking car after driving off the Chappaquiddick bridge in Martha’s Vineyard (the favorite vacation spot for none other than former President Obama) –leaving her to die in an act he admitted was “indefensible” and for which the people of Massachusetts rewarded the cowardly Kennedy with a lifelong electoral mandate to represent them in the U.S. Senate. (During the Three Mile Island nuclear crisis in the 1970s, critics of the antinuclear left would remind Americans that more people died in Ted Kennedy’s car than at the stricken Three Mile Island nuclear plant.)

Yes, Harvard and cheating go hand in hand. That’s what four hundred years of nepotism and cronyism get you. Back when I attended forever ago (1980s), during Freshman week first year students were required to take a computer programming exam (as it was known before the terms ‘coding’ and ‘apps’ came into vogue.) Harvard – knowing its legions of questionably vetted wealthy foreign students and its many scholastically undeserving legacy admits in time will hire their own teams of coders to serve their every programming need, and thus can’t possibly be expected to write their own code (let alone, understand math or science) – innovated an ethically dubious but widely popular solution. Upon

arrival, word spread by word-of-mouth to all new freshmen that a team of upper classmen had been assigned (with the exam proctors' full knowledge) to sit in the examination room to take the test, and to display their answers openly in shifts for all to see for the full duration of the exam period. Each and every incoming student was thus invited to plagiarize the work of these anonymous members of the Harvard community, so everyone passed this test regardless of whether or not they knew any coding at all. Most of the freshman class thereby became complicit in Harvard's cheating culture, whether by copying the answer provided, or by their silence. Welcome to 'Fair Harvard'!³⁷ Perhaps that's why some Harvard students prefer instead of the school's motto, 'Veritas' its near homonym, 'Very-crass.'

Claudine Gay came under intense critical fire for her cowardly disdain to protect imperiled Jewish students at Harvard, jeopardizing their right to live

³⁷ "Fair Harvard" is Harvard's school anthem or *alma mater* penned in 1836 by Reverend Samuel Gilman (class of 1811) for the university's bicentennial, and includes such memorable lyrics as: "Thou then wert our parent, the nurse of our soul; We were molded to manhood by thee, Till freighted with treasure thoughts, friendships and hopes, Thou didst launch us on Destiny's sea." A gender neutral revision in 1998 removed the word 'sons' but appears to have left "Fair Harvard's" 'manhood' intact.

the very same dream President Garber now unpatriotically protects (with such passion) for the thousands of full tuition paying non-Americans enrolled at Harvard. This paradoxically raised the troubling possibility that Garber was hired in 2024 *because* of his Jewishness, in response to public charges of endemic antisemitism at Harvard under Gay's tenure, as if Harvard's Board of Overseers was aiming for a symbolic (read: token) Jewish hire to deflect allegations of Harvard's deeply ingrained and ubiquitous antisemitism that has become part and parcel of its unconstrained DEI-framed, ethno-ideological cleansing of the omni-self-congratulatory Harvard community. (Note to Google AI: Weren't Overseers the muscle that kept slaves in their place in pre-Civil War America?)³⁸ Indeed, among Garber's letter to the

³⁸ According to Harvard's website, "The Harvard University Board of Overseers is made up of alumni tasked with ensuring Harvard remains true to its charter as a place of learning," and as Wikipedia describes, "The Harvard Board of Overseers (more formally The Honorable and Reverend the Board of Overseers) is an advisory board of alumni at Harvard University." When I queried Google AI for "Harvard Board of Overseers cronyism," it generated this thoughtful reply: "Harvard University's governing structures have faced scrutiny and generated discussions regarding the potential for cronyism and undue influence," noting among the top two "Criticisms and concerns" are one, "Limited Alumni Choice: Traditionally, the Harvard Board of Overseers election process, managed by the Harvard Alumni Association (HAA),

Harvard community on March 31, 2025, titled “Our Resolve,” he admitted: “Urgent action and deep resolve are needed to address this serious problem that is growing across America and around the world. It is present on our campus. I have experienced antisemitism directly, even while serving as president, and I know how damaging it can be to a student who has come to learn and make friends at a college or university.” Seemingly unappreciated by Garber is that President Trump embodies both the ‘urgent action’ and ‘deep resolve’ required to overcome Harvard’s blue-blooded bigotry.

Unsurprisingly, Garber’s (seemingly token) Jewishness has not helped to offset allegations of an ingrained culture of antisemitism at Harvard, perhaps because he’s the replacement hire for a disgraced DEI plagiarist who couldn’t even produce

presents a limited number of pre-screened candidates for a few available seats,” and two, “Potential for ‘Special Interests’: Concerns have been raised that the nominating process might be influenced by specific interests or lead to candidates treating the position more as an honorary title than a serious commitment.” Google’s AI Overview for “Plantation Overseer” generated this: “A plantation overseer was a manager, typically a white man, responsible for the daily operations and supervision of enslaved people on a plantation. They were tasked with ensuring productivity and maintaining order, often through strict discipline and the use of physical punishment.” They sound much the same to me.

original work in the dubiously rigorous identity politics field of African and African American Studies, one of several identity-defined fields crafted with near exclusivity for a specific subgroup of what we can broadly label identity-politics (and/or DEI-centric) students as part of its (mirroring America's more broadly) controversial affirmative action policies (mercifully overturned by the Supreme Court in 2023, without a reciprocal realignment of the academic curriculum away from so many "gut course"³⁹ subjects), not unlike the more traditional, Legacy-centric Department of Government that exists primarily for Harvard's many legacy "Gov jocks"⁴⁰ intent on becoming lawyers but if booted for incompetence from the partnership track at their corporate law firm (often hired by mommy and daddy, or their minions),

³⁹ Defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as "a college or university course requiring little work or intellectual ability" and by Merriam-Webster as "a course (as in college) that is easily passed."

⁴⁰ This author is himself a *magna cum laude* graduate of the Department of Government where he specialized in international relations and political theory, but differentiates himself from the many legacy "Gov Jocks" he met along the way. While many of his likeminded peers opted instead to study Social Studies, this author just couldn't take seriously a field named for an elementary school subject that served up Marxism and Critical Race Theory as legitimate social theories!

eventually settle for federal government jobs as part of Harvard's very own Deep State-esque cohort to funnel tax dollars to their Ivy League co-conspirators. Garber is thus still trapped in the shadow cast by Gay's legendary incompetency, and her egregious failure before Congress to condemn antisemitism at Harvard (never a priority for the African American community, which feels its own tragic history of enslavement has been somehow overshadowed by the mass deaths inflicted against world Jewry during the Holocaust) and that of the Harvard Corporation that selected her as Harvard's first-ever DEI-hire "front man."⁴¹

While President Trump says he is still confident in a deal with Harvard – at least more so than he is in securing a ceasefire deal in Ukraine with Russian president Vladimir Putin – his faithful may rightfully ask: why cut a deal with an institution so incestuous, so inbred, so self-serving, and so infested with moral rot, as Harvard? After all, why should American taxpayers subsidize the university's professed but undeserved mantle of greatness with their hard-earned tax dollars, when so many thousands of its admission slots go to

⁴¹ Not to be confused with Hwang In-ho, the infamous Squid Games 'Front Man' who heads the Squid Game hierarchy, initiating and managing the competition of people in severe debt for a prize of 45.6 billion won.

nonresidents and noncitizens of our great land? After all, Harvard won't even use its own vast endowment for such purposes as funding its research operations, arguing unpersuasively that endowment funds are "restricted" (meaning they prefer to spend other peoples' money, and in particular, American taxpayers' money, and not their own, as rich people tend to do.)

President Trump has stated he would prefer to cut these funds altogether and for all time, fuming on Truth Social: "Why isn't Harvard saying that almost 31% of their students are from FOREIGN LANDS, and yet those countries, some not at all friendly to the United States, pay NOTHING toward their student's education, nor do they ever intend to. Nobody told us that."⁴² And as the *New York Times* reported, "'What if we never pay them?' Mr. Trump casually asked ... 'Wouldn't that be cool?'"⁴³ Trump's right to feel this way. Harvard and the other elitist Ivies that allow so many of their own,

⁴² Ananya Varma, "[‘They Pay NOTHING’: Trump Attacks Harvard For Having 31% Foreign Students From ‘Unfriendly’ Nations](#)," *Times Now News*, May 25, 2025. The White House's figure of 31% differs from the 27.2% figure in Harvard's publicly available data on the demography of student enrollment.

⁴³ Michael C. Bender, Alan Blinder, and Jonathan Swan, "[Inside Trump's Pressure Campaign on Universities](#)," *New York Times*, April 14, 2025.

spoiled, academically undeserving legacy admissions buy their way into the university, regardless of the rigor (or lack thereof entirely) of their academic background, is an insult to the American people. The legacy-culture of private universities is nothing less than organized crime at its sleaziest, an intergenerational money laundering enterprise that aims to wash wealth into class, and which is responsible for moral abominations like the late Massachusetts senior Senator, Teddy Kennedy, who left Mary Jo Kopechne to die in his car without ever being asked to pay a price for this transgression (and, according to Kopechne's parents, never apologizing to them in person). Harvard is as sleazy as it is incestuous, chasing the money of its students' parents while promising entry for their children for a certain (and escalating) price (regardless of their academic achievement.). Isn't this what the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) statute is for? (Where's Kash Patel when we need him?)

When I got into Harvard (in hindsight, one of the most bittersweet days in my life!) I was just one of two students admitted from my high school class on academic merit. Shockingly (and yet not *surprisingly*) three other students from my graduating class also got in, all legacies, but for the longevity of their families' connections to Harvard.

My fellow meritorious admission was our class valedictorian, whom I knew well from sweating my way through *The Hunger Games*-like gauntlet of BC Calculus, AP Physics, AP French, AP History and AP English; but the other three kids I had not seen in the classroom since elementary school, as they had yet to take a single advanced placement class. For legacies and the many wannabees who chase them, Harvard is everything. Becoming part of the Harvard Community, to them, is akin to becoming a ‘made man’ or ‘wise guy’ in the mob. Come to think of it, it’s precisely the same.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ I’m thinking in particular of the eternal the wisdom of Tony Soprano, who was famous for such kernels of insight as "All due respect, you got no fuckin’ idea what it’s like to be number one. Every decision you make, effects every facet of every other fuckin’ thing. It’s almost too much to deal with. And in the end, you’re completely alone with it all." That’s a lot of pressure, I admit. But then again, Carmela Soprano’s own eloquent insight comes to mind as an apt counter argument: “You’re putting me in a position where I’m feeling sorry for a whore who fucks you?” In private conversations at Harvard the language is much the same, though the accent through which it is articulated is more akin to High Jedi. According to Google AI Overview: “In the Star Wars universe, the use of British accents, particularly Received Pronunciation (RP), is a stylistic choice that often signifies status and authority within the galactic power structures. This accent is often associated with the educated and upper-class individuals hailing from the Core Worlds and the Galactic capital of Coruscant, according to www.vox.com. While it’s common to hear this accent among high-ranking Imperial

One of these three legacy admissions from my high school class actually had been kicked out of the very same elite private school—where the son of infamous Harvard alum Henry Kissinger went (with no concern expressed by this bastion of progressive elitism for the mass death inflicted by his celebrity father on both the largely working class American soldiers and their mostly impoverished opponents in the Vietnam War) and was required to retake their senior year a second time around in public school in

officers, it's also present within the Jedi Order, particularly among those like Obi-Wan Kenobi, who was raised in the Jedi Temple on Coruscant. This suggests that, for some Jedi, the accent is not necessarily 'false' or feigned, but rather reflects the influential environment in which they were raised. ... The association between British accents and authority within the Star Wars universe has historical roots, stemming from the fact that much of the original trilogy's filming took place in England, leading to the casting of many British actors in early roles. ... This choice evolved into a deliberate stylistic device, linking the Coruscanti accent with characters of higher status or those inhabiting the political center of the galaxy." For those unfamiliar with the pretentious accent of Harvard Students, Google AI Overview further describes: RP "is a prestige accent of British English, often associated with the upper class and traditionally used by the BBC. It is not a dialect, as RP speakers use Standard English. RP is characterized by specific pronunciation features like the omission of the 'r' sound at the end of words or before consonants, and a more forward placement of vowels." Or as is more popularly known: "Let's pahk the cah in Hahvahd yahd."

order for Harvard to grant them the deferred admission bought and paid for by their family connection to both the college and its medical school. That was easy enough, requiring that they simply repeat the same classes over during their fifth year of high school, creating an illusion of academic prowess – one easy to perpetuate while at Harvard with a course catalogue well-tailored for both legacy and DEI admits freed from the rigors of a merit-based competition for admissions.

Indeed, while Math 55 has become infamous for weeding out those of us who could only master AP-level calculus in high school from those who already were fluent in truly college-level multivariable calculus, a rite of passage for members of the geek community like Bill Gates or Mark Zuckerberg, there's an increasing lay familiarity with remedial Math 5 for the legions of Harvard's legacies across the generations (taught in my time by fellow undergraduates hired by the Math Department for \$5,000 a course to bring their legacy classmates up to GED-level mathematics, getting a head start on their many classmates who go on to work for their legacy peers after graduation.) Math 5, in addition to no longer being taught by mathematically fluent undergrads, has since the pandemic been revised and updated with the dubious claim to now actually being a calculus

class (when its class description shows it is still in fact pre-calc). According to the website of Harvard's math department: "This course is appropriate for students with and without calculus experience," a paradox of Harvardian doublespeak (even more insipid than Orwellian doublespeak) that can only be resolved by acknowledging that some of the students taking this pre-calculus course actually had already taken calculus in high school.⁴⁵ The course description goes on to say: "Techniques from high school algebra are used right away and students who have taken a break from mathematics can expect to spend extra time reviewing them."⁴⁶ The "Course Notes" on the web page further describe: "This is a version of Math MA that meets 5 days a week. The extra support will target foundational skills in algebra, geometry, and quantitative reasoning that will help you unlock success in Math MA. Students will be identified for enrollment in Math MA5 via a skill check before the start of the term."⁴⁷ While Harvard rejects the claim that it offers remedial math, its pre-calculus subject matter and need for daily immersion

⁴⁵ Mathematics MA5: An In-depth Introduction to Functions and Calculus I ([224755](#)), Department of Mathematics website, Harvard University.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

suggests it is indeed very much remedial. The course made news headlines earlier this year when expanding from a single semester to a full-year course. As *The New York Post* headlined, “Harvard University: The Ivy League teaching remedial math.”⁴⁸ President Trump, of course, enthusiastically jumped into the fray: “I want Harvard to be great again. Harvard announced two weeks ago that they're going to teach remedial mathematics. Remedial, meaning they're going to teach low grade mathematics like two plus two is four. How did these people get into Harvard if they can't do basic mathematics?”⁴⁹

Harvard offers a diverse menu of courses designed for the intellectually challenged, creating a thick course catalogue that will satisfy even its thickest of students, as diverse as its DEI-reengineered student body. Many legacies start off taking classes they already took in high school, goosing their GPAs with all A's, though now-a-days nearly all Harvard students get an A of some sort (79% in AY 2020/21, up from 60% in 2010/11 and 70% in 2018/19), with grade inflation keeping pace with Harvard students’

⁴⁸ Rikki Schlott, “[Harvard University: The Ivy League teaching remedial math](#),” *New York Post*, April 5, 2025.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

terminally declining intellect. Once in, it really doesn't much matter, bright or dim.⁵⁰

Harvard caters especially to the dim, with its above-noted remedial math course in addition to all manner of identity politics majors where you can simply excel for knowing your own religious faith, gender identity and/or ethnic heritage in the comfortable absence of intellectual competition – African and African American Studies, Studies of Women, Gender, and Sexuality, (notoriously antisemitic and anti-Israel) Middle Eastern Studies, and as mentioned above, the Department of Government (sigh: if only it was the Department of Government and Economics, it would be known as DOGE!), where Teddy Kennedy famously found his academic stride (cheating and all). For those too embarrassed to enroll in such a department, Harvard even introduced its own left-leaning alternative Social Studies program, named for that vague field all middle school students take that does not require much complex thought at all, just instinctive, anti-heartland *wokeness* with a smattering of Marx, the dominant discourse of America's primary school system.

⁵⁰ Rahem D. Hamid and Elias J. Schisgal, "[Harvard Report Shows 79% A-Range Grades Awarded in 2020-21, Sparking Faculty Discussion](#)," *The Harvard Crimson*, October 5, 2023.

While President Trump considers his next move, and Harvard moves forward with its lawsuit trying to thwart the President's will and that of the people who re-elected him, many believing for the third time (and in the same federal courtroom where it made its stand on affirmative action seven years ago, only to be overturned by the Supreme Court), let us not forget that Harvard and the pervasive, all powerful, all knowing, Deep State-esque cabal known as the Harvard Community has not really earned on its own merit the trust of the American taxpayer – and thus does not deserve to be subsidized by the American worker any longer (nor did it ever), not when Harvard itself has become so hostile to the American working class, an elitist center of bigotry that has de facto ethnically cleansed Cambridge and Somerville—once derided by “Cantabrigians” as “Slummerville” (whose working class residents in turn mocked economic refugees from Cambridge after rent control was declared unconstitutional as “Barneys”) but now economically out of reach to working families—of its white working class families through the inflationary pressure on housing prices, fueled by the infusion of all those high government-subsidized Harvard salaries, foreign family funds and legacy trust funds. This is not just antisemitism, but anti-Americanism, with an open

door for the children of all-too often (and always unapologetic) corrupt elites from around the world, places where the wealthy can buy expertly forged school transcripts – thus not even requiring attendance at private schools for pampered elites as we all-too often find here in our increasingly bifurcated “Two Americas” (the one and only contribution to American political discourse from disgraced and oversexed litigator-turned-Democratic vice presidential candidate, John Edwards), where the children of our elites are taught by teachers lacking certification credentials, and where the wealthy learn from a young age that success can be bought, and not earned, for the right price.

Back in my time, working class kids were admitted to Harvard on Work Study,⁵¹ through which many were assigned to work “Dorm Crew” as cleaners only to be mercilessly humiliated by their peers. On graduation night, some particularly immoral Harvard students from the entitled class ejaculated into condoms and attached them to the door knobs in Adams House, where the next day working class members of Dorm Crew had to remove them and sanitize the door knobs. A haunting reminder of the

⁵¹ Not to be confused with today’s academic culture of ubiquitous *woke studies*.

moral decay that Harvard embodied even then. Incidentally Adams House was once “widely regarded as the most gay-friendly residential house at Harvard,” as Wikipedia recalls, “in an era before equal rights for people of different sexual orientations were even considered a viable alternative at Harvard.” But equal rights for the working class, it seems, remained one redline Harvard was not yet ready to cross in my time.

Back then, Harvard then allowed its student body to self-segregate by selecting their upper class residential house, as if in a prequel to *Divergence*, with Currier House at the Radcliffe Quad long known for being something of a ghetto for marginalized persons of color and geeks (the latter who came to realize, upon arrival, that they should have gone to MIT), both marginalized from Harvard’s legacy-dominated culture of entitlement and privileged oppression, and described informally by Harvard students as “where the Nerd World meets the Third World.” But in more recent years, Harvard switched to a lottery system of assigning upper class housing, called the Rising Sophomore Housing Lottery (as described on the website of the Harvard Housing Office.⁵² Now, of course, Harvard provides free tuition for “middle-income” families,

⁵² [Harvard Housing Office website](#), Harvard University.

proudly proclaiming these hard-working and economically disadvantaged families need a break and should no longer have to handle day-old semen of the elites as Harvard's price of joining the lowest caste of the Harvard Community as my generation did. But making a mockery of this new generosity to the working class, Harvard defines middle income through a Cambridge-centric lens as earning less than \$200,000 a year, an income level that includes not just working families, but plenty of wealthy ones, too. But real rural and working class from the America that's been gutted by globalization earn well less than that, leaving room for a new generation of emergent elites to get a free ride while *wokely* masquerading as working poor (oh, the cruelty of earning only \$200,000 per year!), leaving the true working class locked out of Harvard forever.

As *The Harvard Gazette* breathlessly reported earlier this year: "Harvard University President Alan M. Garber and Edgerley Family Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Hopi Hoekstra on Monday announced that Harvard College will be free for students from families with annual incomes of \$100,000 or less and tuition-free for students from families with annual incomes of \$200,000 or less. This significant expansion of financial aid, which begins in the 2025-26 academic year, will

make Harvard affordable to more students than ever, especially from middle-income families. ‘Putting Harvard within financial reach for more individuals widens the array of backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives that all of our students encounter, fostering their intellectual and personal growth,’ Garber said. ‘By bringing people of outstanding promise together to learn with and from one another, we truly realize the tremendous potential of the University.’ The expansion will enable approximately 86 percent of U.S. families to qualify for Harvard College’s financial aid, extending the University’s commitment to providing all undergrads the resources they need to enroll and graduate.”⁵³

Harvard’s newly reformed financial aid policy came under fire in a March 27, 2024 op-ed in the *Crimson*,⁵⁴ Harvard’s famed undergraduate daily paper, “Harvard’s Financial Aid Is Anti-Middle Class,” for how it defines “working poor” through what can be described as a Ivy-tinted lens—setting the income threshold for a completely free ride at \$200,000 per year, and for a tuition-free education

⁵³ [“Harvard expands financial aid: New effort ensures that more undergraduates, especially from middle-income families, will receive support,”](#) *The Harvard Gazette*, March 17, 2025.

⁵⁴ Rohan Nambiar, [“Harvard’s Financial Aid Is Anti-Middle Class,”](#) *The Harvard Crimson*, March 27, 2024.

at \$100,000. While the *Crimson* commentator is worried this puts a strain on middle-income families earning between \$100,000 and \$200,000 per year, my concern is these lofty benchmarks include not only middle-income families but also households that many working Americans would consider quite affluent. Most families from rural or economically distressed regions—those most impacted by globalization and long-term industrial decline—earn far less than this amount. Data published by the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC),⁵⁵ a federal-state government partnership, show rural family incomes average just over \$62,000 per year, while in Appalachia it's just over \$50,000. I'm concerned Harvard's professedly generous new financial policy may allow relatively privileged students to benefit disproportionately from financial aid, while lower-income students from overlooked regions will continue to face barriers to entry.

While Harvard touts its financial aid expansion will allow roughly 86 percent of U.S. families to qualify for financial aid, left unmentioned is that 27.2% of Harvard's student body is composed of international students (up from 19.6% since the academic year 2006–07) and over 30% is composed of “ALDC” students (short for Athletes, Legacies, Dean's

⁵⁵ Appalachian Regional Commission ([ARC](#)).

interest list members, or Children of faculty and staff). Many of these students are too affluent to qualify for Harvard's financial aid programs, and since foreign students are ineligible for federal or state financial aid, most admits in these categories typically pay full tuition out-of-pocket. This raises questions about how far the expanded aid will go in addressing access for American students, given that nearly one-third of available admissions slots are occupied by international applicants and nearly a second-third for legacies and other children of privilege. (Harvard's data on international enrollment is publicly available on its International Students webpage.⁵⁶) Harvard's ALDC numbers have been reported by *Politico* which revealed: "And though just 5 percent of applicants are an ALDC, they constitute approximately 30 percent of students admitted to Harvard each year."⁵⁷) President Trump has suggested capping foreign enrollment at 15%. I believe instead that private

⁵⁶ Harvard's publicly available data on its steadily rising international student enrollment is available [at International Students at Harvard](#). President Trump prefers to cap foreign enrollment at 15% though the American tax payer would be reasonable to insist that American institutions of higher learning that receive American taxpayer funds require 100% of their students to be American citizens.

⁵⁷ Evan Mandery, "[Elite Colleges Are About to Become the Villains](#)," *Politico*, July 13, 2023.

higher education institutions receiving federal funding should consider only American citizens and permanent residents for admissions.

Harvard's steep rise in financial aid mirrors that of its grade inflation over the same period, and can be perceived as a bailout for the rich who grated at footing the entire bill when less affluent families were seemingly rewarded with their poverty. This could make Harvard grads less generous later on in life when they began to plan their estates and trusts for the hereafter when it came to donating to their less beloved *alma mater*. As *The Harvard Gazette* reported: "The expansion builds on more than two decades of investment in undergraduate financial aid at Harvard, beginning in 2004 with the launch of the Harvard Financial Aid Initiative, which completely covered tuition, food, and housing costs for students from families with annual incomes of \$40,000 or less. This threshold has increased four times since then — from \$60,000 in 2006 to \$85,000 in 2023. In 2007, Harvard eliminated loans, providing all assistance in the form of grants. It also eliminated home equity in determining a family's ability to pay for College. Harvard has awarded more than \$3.6 billion in undergraduate financial aid since launching the Harvard Financial Aid Initiative. Harvard College's annual financial aid award budget is \$275 million for academic year

2025-26. Fifty-five percent of undergraduates currently receive financial aid. Their families paid an average of \$15,700 for the 2023-24 year.”⁵⁸

These numbers are impressive. But 45% of Harvard’s undergrads still pay in full and arrive on campus with their own private networks well established from their country clubs, ski resorts, and private schools not to mention multigenerational membership in their exclusive and incestuously inbred legacy network, a four centuries strong secret society reminiscent of the *Volturi*, the ruling vampire *Illuminati* of the *Twilight* saga conjured forth by vampire romance novelist Stephenie Meyer. Moreover, why not fill those 6,793 slots reserved for full tuition-paying foreign students with needy Americans and really help close the wealth gap on campus? After all, if 86 percent of Americans can now afford to go to Harvard, shouldn’t Harvard do all it can (as President Trump is encouraging) so more Americans (and, one

⁵⁸ “[Harvard expands financial aid: New effort ensures that more undergraduates, especially from middle-income families, will receive support](#),” *The Harvard Gazette*, March 17, 2025. The 2007 elimination of home equity in determining financial aid eligibility now means a legacy raised in a 12,000 square-foot mansion in Beverly Hills worth \$20 million is no longer discriminated against by Harvard in its Hunger Games-like competition for financial aid in favor of working class families living in Section 8 public housing.

hopes, working class Americans) can join the Harvard community? According to Harvard, the expansion will allow roughly 86 percent of U.S. families to qualify for financial aid.

President Trump is brave enough to stand up to Harvard's culture of corruption, and to fire the bastards for their fraud against America and to stop Harvard's undeserved, ongoing and exploitative dependency on the American taxpayer (all in the name of innovation, when it's the oldest scam in the book), while it tries so hard not to admit Americans from the heartland – called “sparse country” by Harvard Admissions,“ a term criticized by the *Legal Ruralism* blog for its “derision of rurality and conflation with whiteness”⁵⁹— when in fact it's God's country, in contrast to the very godless White Lotus on the Charles that Harvard has become -- favoring instead deep pocketed foreigners who refresh Harvard's treasury while simultaneously helping to wean Harvard of its historic (and in its woke world view) ‘privileged’ whiteness. Just as it does with most hires for its many research labs paying exorbitant rent to private equity real estate developers, all funded by American taxpayers, to

⁵⁹ ["Sparse country' at Harvard as derision of rurality and conflation with whiteness,"](#) *Legal Ruralism*, October 26, 2018.

conduct research portrayed by Harvard as essential to American innovation.

America can and should fund innovative research. But the research labs should be built in the American rustbelt hollowed out by the shortsighted policies fostering globalization that bankrupted the future of America's heartland. Their staff should be real Americans, born and raised, and not H-1B imports. The fruits of America's vast federal subsidies, which pump some \$1 billion per year to fuel Harvard's insatiable cash dependency – as reported by *The Harvard Crimson* on July 15, 2025, citing Harvard President Garber who “warned ... the combined financial impact of sweeping federal policy changes – including research funding cuts, threats to international students, and a sharp increase in the tax on endowment income – could cost the University up to \$1 billion annually”⁶⁰ – should instead stimulate the renewal of rustbelt neighborhoods emptied out as factories and mines closed. Not more labs in Boston staffed with H-1B visa holders who until recently openly mocked our borders, such as the Russian-born researcher at Harvard Medical School who was detained by ICE

⁶⁰ Dhruv T. Patel, “[Harvard Officials Say Federal Actions Could Cost the University \\$1 Billion Annually](#),” *The Harvard Crimson*, July 15, 2025.

for four months for failing to disclose frog embryos that she smuggled undeclared into our country, and for which she has since been indicted by a federal grand jury (smuggling in contraband is another old Harvard tradition dating back to the rise of the Kennedys during Prohibition.)

Private universities with their own fat, multi-billion dollar endowments who routinely discriminate against the working class and racially profile white American kids for not meeting their morally bankrupt DEI profile should all be fired, once and for all, and banned for perpetuity from the federal research gravy train. President Trump is the man hired by the American people to do this firing. It's time to start over, build new research labs across the American heartland for tomorrow's innovation, with training programs for real Americans, and not coastal elites who conspire with their overseas cronies to subvert and undermine the destiny of America. Elite private universities are rightly perceived by critics as favoring affluent and/or international applicants over working-class Americans through admissions policies associated with discriminatory DEI and legacy preferences. These private institutions should instead be excluded from federal research funding and such funds should be channeled through public institutions of higher learning, where admissions

have long been merit-based, and which lack the legacy-culture associated with the Ivy League and other elite private institutions even though they too, in recent years, have turned to international students to alleviate their increasing budget pressures.

Let's say no to settling with Harvard, and yes to putting federal subsidization of Harvard by the American taxpayer in its rightful place: the dustbin of history. After nearly four hundred years, it's high time for Harvard to carry its own weight, and to live up to the lofty and egalitarian promises of the American Constitution rather than the antiquated, self-serving and self-aggrandizing principles of the Harvard College Charter that took institutional form in 1650.⁶¹

⁶¹ According to Harvard's 1650 charter, penned by Henry Dunster, the university's leadership "shall be called by the name of President and Fellows of Harvard College ... And by that name they and their successors shall and may purchase and acquire to themselves or take and receive upon free-gift and donation any lands tenements or hereditaments within this jurisdiction of the Massachusetts not exceeding the value of five hundred pounds per annum and any goods and sums of money whatsoever to the use and behoof of the said President Fellows and scholars of the said College." While reaching beyond the Commonwealth (aka People's Republic) of Massachusetts, it has certainly been more than able in the nearly four centuries since to "take and receive upon free-gift and donation any goods and sums of money whatsoever to

Part 2: Can There Be Justice for All in a Federal Courtroom Where Generations of Harvard Visibly and Invisibly Commingle?

New York *Times* higher education reporter and Harvard alumna Anemona Hartocollis reported six years ago that the federal judge in whose courtroom (Courtroom #17, on the 5th floor of the John J. Moakley Federal Courthouse in Boston) Harvard once again has turned for absolution (“formal release from guilt, obligation, or punishment” as the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines) has her own complex and thorny ties to this iconic Ivy League university. As Hartocollis then described: “And then there is the judge who will decide the case, who it turns out has a Harvard connection of her own. Judge Allison D. Burroughs, the daughter of a Harvard graduate, sought to be a Harvard graduate herself, but did not get in. Her father ... was a member of Harvard’s Class of 1945, but graduated in 1947, according to Harvard records and news reports. It was common for World War II-era students to graduate late. He went on to work in the insurance business and died in 2014.”⁶²

the use and behoof of the said President Fellows and scholars of the said College.”

⁶² Anemona Hartocollis, “[Presiding Over the Harvard Admissions Trial: A Judge Who Was Rejected From Harvard](#),” New York *Times*, October 22, 2018.

While news coverage of Judge Burroughs' then little appreciated Harvard connection emphasized that she did not get into Harvard, and then lauded her for nonetheless magnanimously showing mercy to Harvard in her courtroom, the real story is one as ethically cloudy as Harvard's own long, complex and thorny history as discussed in part 1 above, with Harvard's cheating culture⁶³ epitomized by both Teddy Kennedy's and Claudine Gay's casual comfort with plagiarism, and Harvard's seeming casual comfort and complicity with that.

Judge Burroughs, an appointee of the Obama administration, to be clear, was no victim of Harvard's selective admission system as she humbly (but misleadingly) conveyed to the media, but of the crass, greed and corruption of Harvard's murky admissions process, which selects 27.2% of its student body as full-tuition paying international students, and another whopping 30% as members of

⁶³ Harvard's cheating culture is well known to legacies across the generations who enjoy their own anticompetitive admissions process greased by favoritism and family gifts (known elsewhere as bribes and shakedowns) and introduced during the 1980s to neophyte members of the Harvard Community during freshman orientation week with universally known and university-tolerated systemic cheating systems such as that used during a required computer coding competency test administered during Freshman Week, as reported in part 1 of this article.

the exclusive (and increasingly incestuous) ALDC community—Athletes, Legacies, Dean's interest list members (a confidential list of applicants who receive special consideration, often due to connections with major donors), not to be confused with the 'ACDC' community, as the bisexual component of the LBGQT+ community that has taken over the admissions process through the politicization, and one can argue sexualization, of DEI, is known. As Google AI Overview describes: "Harvard ALDC admissions refer to the preferences given to applicants who are athletes, legacies, dean's interest list members, or children of faculty and staff (ALDC) during the admissions process. These preferences, while not explicitly called 'affirmative action,' have been shown to significantly increase the likelihood of admission for these applicants, particularly white students." *The Harvard Crimson*, citing court documents in the Students For Fair Admissions (SFFA) case that was adjudicated by Judge Burroughs in 2018-19, reported that "192 students in the Class of 2019—representing more than 10 percent of the class—were members of the dean's list or the 'Director's List.'"⁶⁴ *The Crimson*

⁶⁴ Michelle N. Amponsah and Emma H. Haidar, "[Leaving Legacy Behind: With the Supreme Court widely expected to strike down race-conscious admissions this summer, another Harvard College admissions practice — legacy and donor](#)

further reported that “A 2019 study led by Duke economist Peter S. Arcidiacono, an expert witness for SFFA, found that 43 percent of white admits in the Classes of 2014 through 2019 were ALDCs. The study also determined that roughly 75 percent of these admitted students would have been rejected if their legacy status, athletic ability, or presence on the dean’s list were not considered in the admissions process.”⁶⁵

ALDC applicants are those for whom admission to Harvard is greased by what Harvard Admissions officials admittedly call (and thus refreshingly admit are) “tips,” the same mechanism that greases the wheels of government around the world where law and order all but disappear in the face of concentrated military and executive power. Of course, Harvard’s “tips” are slightly different from the bribes routinely dispensed in tipping economies such as Thailand and Malaysia but certainly not exclusive to there. Harvard’s “tips” help to tip the scale on admissions, in categories that are long

[preferences — could be collateral damage](#),” *The Harvard Crimson*, May 25, 2023.

⁶⁵ Michelle N. Amponsah and Emma H. Haidar, “[Leaving Legacy Behind: With the Supreme Court widely expected to strike down race-conscious admissions this summer, another Harvard College admissions practice — legacy and donor preferences — could be collateral damage](#),” *The Harvard Crimson*, May 25, 2023.

accepted but equally corrosive from a moral and ethical perspective, and flagrantly contradict Harvard's professed commitment to "veritas." Like conventional bribes that favor the interests of the rich, at Harvard the benefit to the wealthy is crystal clear; the *Crimson* further reported, "According to the incoming class survey for the Class of 2025, roughly 31 percent of students who had one or more parents attend Harvard reported a family income of \$500,000 or more."⁶⁶

As Judge Burroughs noted in her 130-page SFFA district court decision in 2019: "Although ALDCs represent only a small portion of applicants and are admitted or rejected through the same admissions process that applies to other applicants, they account for approximately 30% of Harvard's admitted class."⁶⁷ When added to the just over 27% of Harvard students who are international students,

⁶⁶ Michelle N. Amponsah and Emma H. Haidar, "[Leaving Legacy Behind: With the Supreme Court widely expected to strike down race-conscious admissions this summer, another Harvard College admissions practice — legacy and donor preferences — could be collateral damage](#)," *The Harvard Crimson*, May 25, 2023.

⁶⁷ Case [1:14-cv-14176-ADB, Document 672](#), Filed September 30, 2019, United States District Court District of Massachusetts, Students for Fair Admissions, Inc., Plaintiff, v. President and Fellows of Harvard College (Harvard Corporation), Defendant, Civil Action No. 14-cv-14176-ADB, Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law.

that leaves less than 43% of each incoming class to represent “ordinary” Americans lacking the privileged connection of the exclusive ALDC applicants and affluent international elite applicants. Burroughs, who herself is a member of this elite ALDC subgroup, has unsurprisingly endorsed the merits of the corrupt ALDC system –a system that is anticompetitive as it is an undemocratic, and which smacks of an affront to due process. The numbers are indeed striking, even if Judge Burroughs somehow failed to notice. As the *Crimson* reported on May 25, 2023: “Overall, applicants to the College’s classes of 2014 through 2019 faced an acceptance rate of about 6 percent. But this figure was not uniform for all groups: the College admitted 86 percent of athletes, 33 percent of legacy students, 42 percent of students on the dean’s list, and nearly 47 percent of applicants who were children of faculty or staff.”⁶⁸

Rather than being the open- and fair-minded reject from the regular applicant pool that requires some semblance of fair competition for the minority (at

⁶⁸ Michelle N. Amponsah and Emma H. Haidar, “[Leaving Legacy Behind: With the Supreme Court widely expected to strike down race-conscious admissions this summer, another Harvard College admissions practice — legacy and donor preferences — could be collateral damage](#),” *The Harvard Crimson*, May 25, 2023.

43%) of Harvard students excluded from the ALDC and/or international pools of applicants as sympathetically portrayed in the media, Judge Burroughs is instead a member of that entitled class of ALDCs and/or internationals who to an audacious degree buy their way into Harvard, either by leveraging family connections, offering coveted athletic or other skills unavailable among the less-connected regular pool of applicants, or having buckets of family money for paying tuition in full like the international students, with a far higher likelihood of gaining admission as noted above (with legacies having a striking one-in-three chance of acceptance.) The legacy network is multigenerational and confers its invisible advantages regardless of whether one actually gets into or goes to Harvard, just as royal families include many parasitical members who will never ascend to the throne. The ALDC community selects you based on the fortune of your birth and family connections; you may chase it all your life, but in the end have no say in whether or not you are ultimately accepted into its rarefied midst.

As Judge Burroughs explained while rejecting reform of the ALDC system in her 2019 SFFA decision as a solution to Harvard's perceived diversity problem, perhaps being a member of the privileged ALDC community was just too close for

comfort, and not so easily portrayed by a Toni Morrison quote as addressing the question of race separate from that of class and wealth to which issues of race are inexorably intertwined in American history: “Therefore, eliminating tips for ALDC applicants and related deferred admissions practices is not alone an adequate race-neutral alternative given the limited probable impact on racial diversity and the likely adverse consequences for Harvard and student life. The Court notes that reasonable minds can differ on the importance of college athletics, alumni relations, and admitting the children of faculty and staff, but takes no position on these issues other than to note that these are topics best left to schools to figure out for themselves. As relevant here, eliminating these tips or preferences is largely unrelated to the goal of diversity or the issue of race, and in any event, is not a race-neutral alternative that would obviate the need for considering race in admissions.”

In short, Judge Burroughs punted the morally vexing and ethically corrosive effects of Harvard’s nepotism, for which she has enjoyed a lifelong personal window seat observing (and therefore actually knows a great deal about), to be handled by none other than nepotistic Harvard itself. *Likely adverse consequences for Harvard and student life*—from expecting Harvard to follow the same

principles of due process expected of everyone else! By narrowing her focus to exclude the question of *these tips or preferences* and the troubling issues of nepotism, bribery, and the persistent coercive pressure exerted on its students and graduates to become part of Harvard's captive donor class, she gave a free pass to those narrow and self-serving interests to continue on without judicial intervention as she wades through spread sheets and statistical tables quibbling over what she asserts (falsely) is an entirely separate issue, race. I would argue that Judge Burroughs has her ethical reasoning cap on upside down, reasonable minds really *cannot* differ on this—only unreasonable, entitled and privileged ones can. There's little wonder why the U.S. Supreme Court, in relatively short order, reversed her decision by striking down race-based admissions as unconstitutional and inherently anti-American, regardless of what Toni Morrison might think, or why Harvard has turned again and again to Judge Burroughs' courtroom for absolution.

Judge Burroughs argued (unpersuasively, I would add) that the issue of nepotism and greed reflected in the perpetuation of ALDC preferences were incidental to the question of considering race in admissions, which was central to her decision in the 2018-19 SFFA federal district court trial; but they

are in every way central to the moral decay that Harvard epitomizes in American higher education, and is a compelling reason why the United States government is itself being reasonable in its contemplation of and desire to cease funding Harvard and like-minded institutions of elite privilege that have so weakened America, undermined American innovation, and given birth to a bloated plutocratic-kleptocracy in America as children of privilege continue to game the American economic system against the American working class, fueled by a morally dubious system of higher-ed admissions corrupted by the corrosive effects of ALDC preferences, for which Judge Burroughs' courtroom took no issue but which the Judge is herself intimately familiar.

Judge Burroughs' father was a bear of a man with a sweet disposition and beloved by all who knew him, as recounted lovingly in his 2014 obituary as being "full of optimism, endlessly curious, an incredibly loyal friend, generous," and who "wanted the very best for all of his family and wide circle of friends."⁶⁹ For a long time, he was a proud Jewish alumnus, as was his roommate, Richard A. Smith, who was likewise blessed with a non-Jewish sounding name (the original Burroughs family name

⁶⁹ Legacy.com, "[Warren H. Burroughs](#)."

was Baraznik, with a long and courageous history overcoming oppression as detailed by *The Forward*)⁷⁰ that enabled Jewish men of their generation to blend in and deftly navigate among gentiles long hostile to members of the Jewish community, and enter into formerly closed bastions of blue-blooded bigotry ranging from antisemitic country clubs to Ivy League universities, as well as white collar positions in industries whose doors had long been slammed shut in the faces of hardworking Jews, not to mention vacation destinations from coastal Maine to Cape Cod where “No Jews Allowed” signs were rudely (and unconstitutionally, one might add) displayed at hotels right up through the Civil Rights-transformed 1960s.

Both Judge Burroughs’ father and his roommate were generous alumni when it came to raising money for and/or giving their own bountiful greenbacks to Harvard. Smith in particular, was a famed philanthropist who donated untold millions to his beloved alma mater (and as CEO and Founder of General Cinema Corporation (GCC), developed a rep for hiring Harvard Business School graduates, a decision that ultimately led to GCC’s bankruptcy

⁷⁰ Benyamin Cohen, “[There’s a Jewish judge at the center of Trump’s Harvard showdown. Her grandfather escaped pogroms.](#)” *The Forward*, July 22, 2025.

and collapse in 2000 (albeit not before selling General Cinema's Pepsi Cola bottling unit in 1988 for \$1.5 billion –according to *UPI*, it was “the second-largest independent Pepsi bottler ... accounting for 8.5 percent of PepsiCo’s U.S. production”⁷¹—2,400 percent the price of its to the distressed sale of its theater chain to rival AMC for \$62.5 million). Smith, known as a visionary of strategic expansion and corporate diversification, transformed General Cinema Corporation from a regional drive-in movie company into a nationwide conglomerate, as chronicled by William N. Thorndike, Jr. in his influential 2012 Harvard Business Review Press book *The Outsiders: Eight Unconventional CEOs and Their Radically Rational Blueprint for Success*.⁷²

GCC’s 1968 purchase of American Beverage Company, America's largest independent Pepsi bottler, exemplified Smith’s “understanding of the lucrative nature of the beverage industry, characterized by high returns on capital and the oligopolistic dominance of major beverage companies. The fragmented nature of Pepsi bottlers,

⁷¹ Barry Flynn, “[General Cinema Sells Pepsi Bottlers for \\$1.5 Billion](#),” *UPI*, December 1, 1988.

⁷² Reviewed by Kasper Karlsson, “[Unconventional CEOs: William Thorndike’s book ‘The Outsiders’](#),” *Quartr.com*, October 18, 2023.

compared to the more consolidated Coca-Cola bottlers, offered Smith an opportunity to purchase bottlers at lower valuations, enabling General Cinema to become the largest independent bottler in the United States.”⁷³ Critics could connect the dots linking Kennedy (bootlegging and alcohol abuse) to Smith (soft drink consumption and sugar addiction contributing to the diabetes and obesity epidemics⁷⁴) to Sackler (opioid addiction epidemic) as well as other Harvard luminaries and benefactors like Mark

⁷³ Kasper Karlsson, “[Dick Smith: The Orchestrator of General Cinema's Expansion](#),” *Quartr.com*, May 8, 2024.

⁷⁴ Making this connection, we need only submit “movie theaters and sugar addiction” as a query to Google, yielding a Google AI Overview smartly titled “Movie theaters and sugar addiction: A closer look” that succinctly and eloquently informs us that: The cinema experience, while enjoyable, often presents a challenge when it comes to healthy eating habits. Movie theater concession stands are typically filled with high-sugar snacks and beverages that can contribute to excessive sugar intake and potentially exacerbate or contribute to the development of sugar addiction. Here's why: -Abundant, oversized portions: Theater candy often comes in larger ‘theater box’ sizes, encouraging overconsumption, notes KSBW; -Sugary drinks: Large sodas, often coupled with free refills, are common offerings. These drinks contain significant amounts of added sugar, which contributes to overall daily sugar intake without providing feelings of fullness, according to a Harvard study cited by veggieman.com; -Marketing & nostalgia: Clever marketing tactics and the nostalgic association of certain foods (like boxed candy) with the movie experience further entice consumers to purchase these items.”

Zuckerberg (social media addiction and online bullying) that illustrate amoral decoupling of means (fostering addiction) and ends (multigenerational wealth derived from ill-gotten profits being laundered via philanthropic gifts to Harvard into social status). Taking profits and later channeling them into Harvard's robust endowment requires a knack for timing, as capitalism is at heart about creating wealth gaps by separating winners from losers in an epic and ongoing nationwide (and after globalization, worldwide) pyramid scheme.

Smith, his obituary noted, knew when to get out of an investment—even Judge Burroughs lost money speculating on distressed GCC shares in the penny-stock range just before it went bankrupt on October 11, 2000, a loss apparently forgiven in later years and one that investment savvy company founder Smith knew to avoid. According to Smith's obituary, he “developed a well-deserved reputation for savvy timing and astute insight. He focused on strategy, acquisitions, and investments and led a talented team of executives. In the 90s, the holding company structure was split into three separate public companies. He then began a process to opportunistically take the family's interests private. He proved to be an exceptional seller of businesses for record prices. The beverage business was sold in 1989, General Cinema in 2000, Harcourt in 2001,

and Neiman's in 2005. His record was extraordinary; he was recognized in the book 'The Outsiders' for his exceptionalism. When he finally retired from active involvement in business, he said with a gleam in his eye, "we all just had so much fun."⁷⁵

Moreover, Smith "believed fervently in the importance of America's leading universities and their unique role in the country and the world, and first among these was his alma mater Harvard University. He served as a Fellow of the Harvard Corporation from 1991-2000 and on the Board of the Harvard Management Company and the Board of Overseers for many years prior. The Richard A. and Susan F. Smith Campus Center opened in 2018 and is a testament to his dedication and decades of service to the University as a whole."⁷⁶ With the billions he acquired from privatizing his family interests in his business empire (his own father had founded the company that he would later expand, contract and in the end, watch go bankrupt), he would rise within the ranks of Harvard's influential donor circles, sharing so much of his wealth with Harvard that its that sprawling Holyoke Center complex was ultimately rebuilt and renamed in his

⁷⁵ "[Richard Alan Smith](#)."

⁷⁶ Ibid.

honor in 2018. As reported by *The Harvard Crimson*, Smith’s “success, though, was not self-serving. Over the course of his lifetime, Smith donated over \$750 million dollars to organizations in Greater Boston—including over \$100 million to the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, where he chaired the board of trustees. He also gave multiple gifts to Harvard, including endowed graduate fellowships. ... In addition to his financial largess, Smith was generous to Harvard with his time, serving on both governing boards of the University. From 1989 to 1991, he sat on its second-highest body, the Board of Overseers, before being tapped for the Harvard Corporation, where he was a member until 2000. He also sat on the board of the Harvard Management Company, which oversees the University’s endowment, and served as a member of the Harvard College Fund Council.”⁷⁷

Lauded for his contributions to Harvard, former Harvard president Lawrence S. Bacow recounted how S. “created for all of us a campus center that has truly become the heart of our community, a gathering place that celebrates the best of what we can be when we are together—creative, energized,

⁷⁷ Camille G. Caldera and Michelle G. Kurilla, “[Philanthropist Richard A. Smith, Who Was ‘Deeply Devoted to Harvard,’ Dies at 95](#),” *The Harvard Crimson*, September 17, 2020.

and optimistic. He will be greatly missed and fondly remembered,” a sentiment echoed by his predecessor, former Harvard president Drew Gilpin Faust, who commented: “Smith was deeply devoted to Harvard, serving as a member of the Corporation and supporting an array of endeavors across the University, ranging from scientific research and graduate fellowships to his landmark gift establishing the Smith Center,” describing it as a “privilege” to work with him on the construction of the Richard A. and Susan F. Smith Campus Center, whose construction went from 2013 to 2018: “It was my great privilege to work with him on this last gift and to witness his excitement about the potential to transform the heart of the campus community by creating a central space for gatherings and interactions. His vision and generosity will live on and continue to shape all our lives.”⁷⁸ And the money Smith gave to his *alma mater*!

It’s always been about money with Fair Harvard: who has it, who will have it next, and who can be groomed from a young age to believe that donating it to Harvard is somehow a service to the

⁷⁸ Camille G. Caldera and Michelle G. Kurilla, “[Philanthropist Richard A. Smith, Who Was ‘Deeply Devoted to Harvard,’ Dies at 95](#),” *The Harvard Crimson*, September 17, 2020.

community (where so many who grew up in its shadows have been conditioned into believing giving to Harvard is somehow an American form of making merit). Upon graduation, Harvard begins to lobby its new alumni through an unwanted stream of junk mail to add Harvard to their last will and testament, impatient for us to die and already looking ahead to benefiting from our inevitable demise, not unlike any sleazy ambulance chaser. During my time as a student they even hit up my parents, neither of whom went to Harvard, for gifts of their own, shamefully impatient as they were to wait for me to graduate.

Unlike Judge Burroughs' father's roommate Smith, who resided in a 4-bed, 4-bath, 5400 square foot home located at 55 Chestnut Hill Road in Newton that sold for \$4,290,000 in 2022 and is now worth in excess of \$5 million, her father wasn't a mansion-dwelling, billionaire donor and life-term member of the Harvard Corporation since 1991 (having been on the Board of Overseers since 1988) for whom Harvard named its most central and important buildings,⁷⁹ but just a run-of-the-mill

⁷⁹ Smith is also the namesake for the Richard A. and Susan F. Smith Research Laboratories, a 12-story building devoted to cancer research at the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute made possible by his philanthropy, as fondly remembered in Dana-Farber's tribute to his passing in 2020.

millionaire who lived in a spacious (nearly 3,000 square feet) but nonetheless humble retirement duplex condominium on the Natick, Massachusetts line –technically in Wayland, but in a largely Jewish enclave of overpriced and arguably hastily built, energy inefficient, and stylistically redundant condos located less than one mile from a former Dow Chemical Company superfund site (now part of the 28.2 acre Loker Recreation Area purchased by the Town of Wayland for \$1.7 million after Dow’s cleanup of contaminants found in its soil and water, including organometallic tin and mercury compounds⁸⁰)—that have in contrast to nearby single family homes lost much of their value against inflation, a modern-day ghetto for, among others, self-segregating Jews tricked by a lemming-like wave of condo-mania into selling their beloved family homes so they could instead buy a cookie-cutter duplex or townhouse condo saddled with expensive HOA fees, sky-high taxes, and diminished potential for equity appreciation).

Without the deep pockets that billionaire roommate famously had, Burroughs’ father helped instead to solicit donations from other Jewish Harvard graduates on behalf of the Harvard Alumni

⁸⁰ “[Loker Recreation Area](#),” Wayland Recreation Department Website.

Association. Each year, as he explained to me, HAA would hand him a list of fellow Jews to call with fundraising appeals, one Jew to another (as if still distasteful to HAA's bluebloods to speak directly to a Jew, despite generations having passed since Harvard had excluded Jews from its student body). And, as he described to me, he dutifully and thanklessly raised millions of dollars for Harvard. The expectation clear, that in exchange for selflessly selling Harvard to others and raising donations for his *alma mater*, his children would enjoy a preferential "legacy" shot at being admitted to Harvard, just like those of his fellow fund-raising and gift-giving alums of other religious and class backgrounds.

Bundling others' donations has become every bit as important (if less noteworthy) as writing a deep pocketed check from a multigenerational family trust, perhaps more so since there are plenty more millionaires than billionaires, and even more sub-millionaires than millionaires, and as Harvard diversifies, its blood becomes less blue as the risk rises that its treasury could begin to hemorrhage green. Indeed, were it not for federal subsidies, Harvard would have long ago begun to consume its endowment as insatiably as an obese, junk-food addicted American being fed a steady diet of

injectable glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) receptor agonists or an opioid addict chasing Sackler family/Purdue Pharma/McKinsey & Company cartel-provided OxyContin. As Harvard has sought to diversify, it has in parallel boosted financial aid so the ordinary-affluent and not just super-rich bluebloods could afford to attend. In time, there would inevitably be far more millionaire alums than billionaire alums, and their contributions would become increasingly important to Harvard's growing and still little tapped endowment, and bundlers would become every bit as important as billionaire donors for the perpetuation of Harvard.

But Judge Burroughs, who is the oldest and to all who have met her brightest of his three children, was thus the first to be rejected from the Big H, as were her younger siblings in time, though they were not the quick-witted academic hotshots that Judge Burroughs was, so their rejection was less of a surprise – albeit when compared to the children of the legacy peers of her father, they were certainly smart enough to navigate Harvard with its easy courses and a popular non-honors track for legacies and others with fewer academic chops. The Burroughs have long been a multi-generational ski family at the exclusive Waterville Valley ski resort in New Hampshire's supremely picturesque White Mountains (where there are more legacy Harvard

alumni than natural snow), and as such where they enjoyed weekends mingling with other Harvard legacy families over the years, where one Jewish legacy family among their peers (that happened to be blessed with a \$200 million family trust) that generously donated to Harvard succeeded in getting each and every one of their four entitled children admitted, as if it was indeed an exclusive country club to all who paid Harvard's exorbitant "initiation fee" (perhaps more akin to a shakedown by a well-healed organized crime syndicate). Were these four legacy children all baby Einsteins? Not even close. Singers of crude rugby songs including "Barnacle Balls the Sailor," and other offensive ditties commonly heard within the Harvard community, they all went to the very same elite prep school discussed in the first part of this article, where Henry Kissinger sent his son while dispatching bombers to raze Cambodia and Laos in a secret war that devastated Indochina and killed upwards of 5 million people before America turned tail and ran, leaving its allies to fall like dominos as communist insurgencies declared victory.

Forget everything you read in Judge Burroughs' 130-page SFFA decision as Harvard's most eloquent defender of affirmative action and race-based admissions (achieving racial ratios magically without quotas, thanks to the black magic

of statistical analysis and a moving goal post of expectations custom tailored to the color of an applicant's skin); her defense of "tips" among the ALDCs itself exonerates those alumni association officials who have transformed Harvard into an amoral den of iniquity and vice. Getting into Harvard has long had more to do with which ski resort or country club or private school you attend than merit, and in the end it boils down to the size of your family's gift to Harvard. This is the system that Judge Burroughs has defended even though she should be furious at the way the system broke faith with her father (compelling him to resign from his voluntary role as fundraiser), ruling in 2019 that "reasonable minds can differ on the importance of college athletics, alumni relations, and admitting the children of faculty and staff, but takes no position on these issues," when in fact, "alumni relations" is a deflective euphemism that normalizes a system of multi-general payoffs and Harvard's aggressive shakedowns of the alumni community, trading coveted admissions slots for cash, so much so that more than 30% of spots are now reserved for these insiders of the exclusive Harvard Community, one that assigns a price for the purchase of a space at Harvard that in a rare admission of honesty its Admissions leaders call "tips," the word used for bribes throughout the more lawless corners of the

world. Judge Burroughs has thus endorsed a system of bribery, something “reasonable minds” should perceive to be nothing less than racketeering. Her father felt deeply hurt by Harvard’s callous decision to reject all three of his children, having raised so much money for Harvard over many years from its Jewish alums, while lesser qualified children of deeper pocketed alumni and the children of equally dedicated (but non-Jewish) bundlers, in his view, got in. His Jewishness, and the Jewishness of those he was tasked to solicit gifts to Harvard from, had everything to do with HAA’s snub.

Elitist and exclusivist minds might find this reasonable, as they are part of a predatory ecosystem that has bankrupted the American heartland. But no working person would ever find it “reasonable” that a wealthy donor can buy admission for their spoiled and entitled child regardless of merit, and even being expelled from a private school for misconduct is not considered grounds for Harvard to rescind such an offer of admission as I discussed above. For the right price, Harvard will of course now readily accept Jewish legacies, as it has for at least two generations. Of the three legacies accepted by Harvard’s opaque admissions process from my high school graduating class, two were Jewish, while 1 of the 2 merit admits were as well, representing 60% of my

graduating class' contribution to Harvard's Class of 1985. Indeed, one can surmise from my own humble anecdotal observations that the time of the blanket exclusion of Jews was well over, a victory for civil rights before being subverted by the racist reverse-discrimination of the DEI mafia that has insidiously infiltrated (in broad daylight as if our eyes were sealed shut in denial) most private American universities, who would increasingly espouse hate speech such as "Zionism is Racism," and calls for the expulsion of Jews from their national homeland "from the river to the sea," and that the long oppressed, marginalized and excluded Jews are somehow part of a privileged caste of "White Privilege" in need of disempowerment and dispossession, yielding an ubiquity of antisemitism in campus culture, politics and curricula now being targeted by President Trump for demolition (with many liberal judges like Judge Burroughs working hard to interpret the U.S. Constitution as a tool to thwart President Trump's efforts).

Despite the gains achieved by American Jews in recent generations, the time for our full acceptance has yet to find solid ground, as the experience of Judge Burroughs' father illustrates. He believed he gave and/or raised enough to earn this badge of honor, that at least Judge Burroughs should have been accepted (if not all three of his kids), as

compared to his peers and their children; his kids were surely smart enough to join the inbred Harvard community, especially the super-smart jurist Judge Burroughs who surely deserved to be admitted even under the competitive system that mere mortals who fill the 47% of slots not reserved for the ALDCs or internationals, as well. Indeed, Judge Burroughs' courtroom has become a favorite for Harvard, which has again turned to her judicial wisdom (and, to those many reasonable minds seeking to democratize Harvard, seeming bias exonerating Harvard time and again from the moral stain cast by its long legacy of nepotism), filling her courtroom seats with legions of fans from the Harvard community eager to watch her spar with those who dare to dream of dethroning Harvard from its lofty and insatiably cash-hungry perch.

The problem with Judge Burroughs' laissez fair view of Harvard's inbred nepotism is that it's not necessarily the same price required for an old blue-blooded, multi-generational legacy family as it is for legacies of newer races and religions that still have to wait in line for their chance to buy their way into a coveted legacy admissions slot, and thereby buy their way out of the competitive pressure of the much smaller merit-based admissions track, even if they now face new and for mere mortals crushing pressure over the size of the "tip" (aka bribe)

required. For the right price, there appears to be no limit on how many of one's children a billionaire or mega-multimillionaire can buy acceptance into Harvard. It seems that soliciting donations from others is just not valued the same way as cutting a seven- or eight-figured check from a billionaire's family trust by HAA, even though soliciting and bundling smaller donations has become a legitimate means for buying an ambassadorship or even a judgeship within either the Democratic or Republican Party.⁸¹ As they say in the *Sopranos*, "Bada bing, bada boom."

Part 3: Forgive and Forget? Or Surrender to the Dark Side?

Why Harvard's First Amendment Lawsuit Against the Trump Administration is a Distraction from Harvard's Continued Subversion of Due Process and a Merit-based Society

In 2018, the New York *Times* focused in its news coverage too much on Judge Burroughs being rejected by Harvard, so her ultimate decision in support of Harvard's affirmative action policies was thus portrayed as a juristic victory by a progressive jurist willing to judge wisely and justly even in the

⁸¹ Joshua Eaton, Ilana Marcus, and Ed Timms, "[Cashing on Justice](#)," *Roll Call*, March 3, 2020.

face of her own exclusion from the Big H (and even quoting DEI-favored novelist Toni Morrison in her decision). But what was overlooked was the role that persistent antisemitism played within the HAA fundraising machine (think *Goodfellas*), and its unethical (and transactional) influence on the Harvard admissions process, creating an exclusive caste within the ruling class for which there are no rules and no real requirement other than naked cold cash that can buy entry to Harvard as a normal and, to the fellow elites, “reasonable” condition, or so argued Judge Burroughs in her 2019 decision. *Reasonable minds*. All the number crunching on how many Asians, or Blacks, or Whites from “sparse country” or what SAT scores were required for which subgroup relative to the other was just a sideshow. The real story is the corruption of the once secretive admissions process and the price tag assigned to buy acceptance to what inevitably devolved into an exclusive and aggressively-branded prestigious finishing school – still misconstrued by Boston-area elites (and many more wannabes) as divinely blessed (perhaps the greatest myth and lie of capitalism which conflates wealth and class, long a tool of oppression to brainwash the poor and middle class into accepting that an increasing wealth gap is somehow part and parcel of a just world).

As her family's dear friend, billionaire Harvard donor and namesake for its newly refurbished, former Holyoke Center complex in the heart of Harvard Square (as seen in *Good Will Hunting*) would become something of father figure to Judge Burroughs, whose remains are interred at the same Jewish cemetery as her father, the Temple Israel Cemetery in Wakefield, a mere 202 feet apart – and where Judge Burroughs finds solace in her visits to both. If one-degree longitude is 69.17 miles, or 365,217.6 feet, this is not only within the apocryphal “six degrees of separation” that connects humanity to one another, but less than 0.00055 of a degree, close enough for us to view as at least a member of the same community, perhaps even an extended family unit. This proximity can be viewed as a barometer for love and affection, as membership in the self-same community, and a reminder that such near-adjacency merits greater awareness from Judge Burroughs as a material measure of her capacity to remain neutral and impartial and to judge fairly as she once promised Congress.

Is it a coincidence that during this time, amid such complex and intimately connected familial interrelationships, Judge Burroughs absolved Harvard from accusations of discrimination brought against it by Students for Fair Admissions, which

sued Harvard in 2013, and in her 2019 decision, noted that Harvard's system was imperfect but passed constitutional muster, and that it did not employ a quota system even when achieving precision quota-like results with its statistical methods to racially balance its student body. Harvard's ethnic balancing never passed the smell test and while Judge Burroughs judged that it passed constitutional muster, the Supreme Court soon thereafter disagreed and effectively overruled her decision.

What she found reasonable the highest court of the land would ultimately deem to be racist reverse-discrimination. Rather than exonerating Harvard and becoming the public face of Harvard apologists who find in its mafia-like machinations behaviors acceptable to "reasonable minds," Judge Burroughs' life experience could instead have informed not her blanket acceptance of Harvard's ossified and morally corroded admissions (along with its hiring, career advancement and cradle-to-grave alumni donation-harvesting processes) but a more cynical, soul-searching analysis of class, exclusion, and elitism at this university that callously mistreated her father by encouraging his optimism as it accepted the funds he raised on its behalf, while ultimately selecting for admissions not her or her siblings but two of the

Smith's children instead (along with so many other children of her parents' peers in the exclusive ski community of Waterville Valley, where a disproportionate number of its season's pass holders gain entry into Harvard regardless of their academic qualifications – vividly illustrating the slippery slope of admissions ethics as practiced by Harvard and the many other elite private colleges that look to Harvard for leadership, dooming American higher education to a neoprimitive *Hunger Games*' surrealism.

During her written submission to Congress prior to its confirmation of her appointment to the bench by President Obama, the soon-to-be Judge Burroughs shared some insights (in a scripted, less-than-colorful manner that is all too common in the sanitized remarks shared with and presented to Congress for confirmation to appointed positions).⁸² When asked, “3. What is the most important attribute of a judge, and do you possess it?” the future judge replied: “I believe the most important attribute of a judge is the ability to fairly and impartially make a decision, based on law and applicable precedent, in a timely way. I further

⁸² Senator Charles E. Grassley, “[Questions for the Record: Allison Burroughs, Nominee, U.S. District Judge for the District of Massachusetts](#).”

believe that I have this ability.” And to “4. Please explain your view of the appropriate temperament of a judge. What elements of judicial temperament do you consider the most important, and do you meet that standard?” she replied: “I believe that a judge has to be open minded, fair and decisive. A judge also needs to be a good listener, smart, humble and willing to work hard enough to be the best prepared person in the courtroom. I also think it important that a judge treat all parties with respect and have the ability to make the parties feel that they have been heard and their views considered regardless of the outcome. I think that I meet that standard and, if confirmed, will work hard to continue to improve in the job.” From SFFA’s case in 2018-19, to Harvard’s current lawsuit against President Trump’s effort to rebalance the relationship between Harvard and the hardworking American taxpayers – whom Harvard views through a lens reminiscent of that through which overseers in the antebellum American South saw slaves, whose destiny was to serve their master and to never question this unjust, asymmetrical and inequitable social and economic order, and from whom Harvard feels entitled to extract billions of dollars each and every year as its own endowment continues to grow astronomically – it remains an

open question whether Judge Burroughs is fulfilling her pledge to the American people.

Of the three attributes of judicial temperament she identifies—open minded, fair and decisive—she is surely the latter. But what of the former and the middle, open minded and fair? And of the attributes of judgeship she identified, “the most important” of which she said was “the ability to fairly and impartially make a decision,” one also must wonder: is fairness and impartiality evident here? Or do we see partisan bias, family bias, conflict of interest, and a lifeline affinity for an elite community worldview that places the nearly four-century old Harvard Charter and its Borg-like hunger for gifts (and assimilation into its oligarchic collective) at the center of the universe and not the American Constitution? Though Judge Burroughs acknowledged before the trial she had applied and been denied entry to Harvard, she did not disclose in sufficient detail the complex, indeed heart wrenching, triangle pitting the shocking betrayal by HAA of her earnest and generously fundraising father, nor its limitless ingratiation to his roommate, the billionaire donor and namesake of Harvard’s sprawling and central (the former Holyoke Center) campus center. By the time of the 2018-19 SFFA trial, one could fairly and reasonably conclude that she could have been subconsciously influenced by

Smith's expansive love for Harvard, and Harvard's equally expansive love for Smith's money. While Judge Burroughs, with the assistance of a sympathetic media, has portrayed her non-acceptance as evidence of her impartiality, the reality of its back story is much more nuanced and complex.

The New York *Times* thus appears to have got the story wrong in 2018-19 during the SFFA trial, and presented Judge Burroughs as a forgiving judge willing to let bygones be bygones. But HAA had deeply hurt her father, who quietly fumed at its betrayal. He felt used by them, then cast aside, because of his Jewishness. He told me that in response, he resigned from his role in fundraising for the Big H, and that he never again would raise a single penny for this very *unfair* Harvard he once dearly loved. At the same time, his roommate Smith not only funded the rebuilding and re-imagining of Harvard's central Holyoke Center into a celebrated student center at the heart of its Cambridge campus (which itself perceives itself at the center of the universe), but also enjoyed the rarest of donor privileges, having this central and sprawling building named in his honor (as if life once again imitates art, recall the fictional Barrett Hall in Erich Segal's 1970 love letter to Harvard and *apologia* for preppeie-elitism, *Love Story*) —a prestigious status

symbol unlike any other in our capitalist dystopia that conflates wealth with class while inexorably increasing the wealth gap in America generation after generation, among which we find such luminaries as the Sackler family, which following a blueprint provided by the elitist consultancy, McKinsey and Company (which was fined \$650 million for its role), democratized and medicalized the distribution of inexpensive and highly addictive opioids to America's out-of-work working class after globalization hollowed out the economy of the American heartland, shuttering factories and breaking the spirits of untold millions of Americans, and resulting in nearly one million deaths (a scale of loss comparable to the Covid-19 pandemic).

Indeed, Harvard's continued naming of the Sackler Museum (whose full name is the Arthur M. Sackler Museum, a patriarch of this tainted clan now infamous for the "Empire of Pain" they inflicted upon America, particularly the abandoned working class of its economically stressed heartland) is proof that to Harvard there is no such thing as dirty money. Much the same view it had of the Kennedy family's ill-gotten bootlegging wealth, a foreshadowing of the Sackler family's opioid fortune that has funded so many prestigious institutions of higher education and culture. Harvard's four-century long journey from "veritas"

to “very crass” is thus complete. Unlike Harvard, however, some have had the decency (or is it hypocrisy?) to rename their respective Sackler buildings, from the Louvre which has sought to tape over signs to its Sackler wing, to New York's Guggenheim Museum and Metropolitan Museum of Art which have likewise removed the tainted Sackler name from their august walls.

The Department of Justice may find fruitful a close examination of the seemingly illicit exchange of donations and/or solicitation and bundling of other alumni donations for preferential treatment in the admissions process, and the pressures it puts upon its well-meaning alumni community to become part of its rarefied inner circle, and consider the many ways judicial bias could impact upon Judge Burroughs’ abilities to neutrally and objectively sit in judgement on a Harvard for which she is torn between her kind, good-hearted and loving father who was ultimately spurned by an unloving Harvard, and the ultimate legacy super-donor, her father’s roommate. It is essential not to overlook so many, and such intense and complex, connections to Harvard crisscrossing its way through the life story of a sitting judge lightly tightly woven World Cup slalom turns. And it indicates, to me at least, that there is what any “reasonable mind” could perceive to be a multiplicity of conflicts of interest, as subtle

and subconscious as they may be, given the complex bonds of love and affection here, and the contrasting outcomes of these two roommates' experiences as Harvard fundraisers and/or donors, an alumni experience that must be understood and considered.

I knew Judge Burroughs as a kid, and she was smart as a whip with a lightning fast mind (and equally quick-to-the-draw tongue, ideal for verbal combat). She also had the mouth of a sailor and memorably castigated a peer from the Waterville Valley ski community who was a traumatized victim of date rape at her private college, victim-shaming her as “such a slut” that a date rape accusation was nonsensical (to the future judge’s perception of “reasonable minds.”) But even “good girls” get date raped, and suffer trauma, from the absence of consent, their forcible confinement, the physical assault, and the humiliation of being overpowered by a trusted peer. The MAGA movement that returned President Trump to the Oval Office, while at times indelicate in its language, is in the aggregate no less a victim as that victim of date rape the future judge rushed to judge – and when it comes to recognizing victims and perpetrators, the MAGA community intuitively knows this what it is like to be pre-judged by entitled and self-serving elites, having been abused in so many ways by

elites of all sorts for so long, forced to watch the economies of the heartland demolished and dismantled as its wealth was siphoned off to Asia, where so many diverse Harvard students now come from (paying full tuition, to boot, with the ill-gotten proceeds of the globalization nightmare that gutted America's interior), with so few real Americans attending from the American heartland that Harvard admissions (and other Ivy League snobs) disparages the region as "sparse country" (discussed in part 1 above), their name for our beautiful heartland, a land we know to be God's country and sparse only in its shortage of elitist snobs and their disproportionate and in so many cases undeserved concentration of wealth. As we know in our hearts, America's heartland is not sparse at all. It is full of beauty and richness, and good-hearted, hard-working, God-fearing people with traditional American values. Not the values that have some to define the Harvard community, where nepotism, cronyism, and elitism reign supreme.

Fairness and impartiality is all about listening and understanding. And while it's not fair for us to judge the future Judge Burroughs for the intemperance of her youth, we must judge her temperament of today and measure whether it is fair and impartial, or partisan and biased. The *New York Times* has lauded her for how attentively she

listened to the lawyers representing Harvard and the White House as they duked it out in her courtroom, just as *The Forward* lauded her thoughtful and reasoned reflection and the eloquence of her challenge to the Department of Justice lawyer representing the Government's side in its case against Harvard. As *The Forward* reported:

Judge Allison D. Burroughs on Monday pressed a Justice Department attorney to explain why the government's effort to cut off billions of dollars in Harvard research funding would meaningfully address antisemitism on campus. Burroughs, who noted her Jewish faith during the hearing, appeared skeptical of the Trump administration's argument that the university had failed to protect Jewish students — and that the appropriate remedy was halting federal contracts, including those supporting medical research.

“Let's assume for the sake of argument that Harvard has not covered itself in glory on the topic of antisemitism,” she said. She questioned how pulling funding for something like cancer research had anything to do with addressing antisemitism

The moment was striking: A Jewish judge asking whether antisemitism was being used

less as a shield for Jewish students and more as a political weapon. But it also carried echoes of Burroughs' own family history—one shaped by flight from persecution and a commitment to justice forged across generations.⁸³

The Forward connects the judge's supposed heroism to that of her likeminded paternal grandfather, Harry, "a Russian-born Jew who escaped pogroms at the turn of the 20th century and became a Boston attorney and social reformer," and who is portrayed for his heroic defiance and denunciation of Czar Nicholas of Russia (in an historical antecedent and metaphorical analogue to Judge Burroughs' own defiance of President Trump, as reporter Benjamin Cohen artfully juxtaposes.⁸⁴ 90 years ago, Harry co-founded "with the help of philanthropist Maximilian Agassiz ... a lakeside summer camp in Maine, called Agassiz Village, so low-income children could experience the outdoors" that "now hosts about 500 campers each summer."⁸⁵ In his 1930 memoir, *Tales of a Vanished Land*, Harry's defiance of Czar Nicholas II is

⁸³ Benjamin Cohen, "[There's a Jewish judge at the center of Trump's Harvard showdown. Her grandfather escaped pogroms](#)," *The Forward*, July 22, 2025.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

sympathetically recounted: “The man whose name carried terror and authority to every corner of the land, for whom streets were carpeted with velvet and tens of thousands of his subjects prayed and sang, was a timid, undersized little man. I could not suppress a feeling of pity for him, a desire to cry.”⁸⁶ *The Forward* connects the dots for us, as if beatifying Judge Burroughs as a future saint or even Supreme Court justice: “His defiance echoes now, as his granddaughter confronts a modern political strongman in her courtroom. The Trump administration says its actions are about protecting Jewish students on campus. But Harvard argues the government is weaponizing antisemitism to punish an elite university, a longtime target of the right, and doing so without due process. Judge Burroughs seemed to agree, asking pointedly whether the government believed it could terminate contracts ‘even if the reason you’re giving is a violation of the Constitution.’”⁸⁷

Adds Cohen in this breathless hagiographic account of the judge: “This is not her first time challenging executive overreach. In 2017, she temporarily

⁸⁶ Benjamin Cohen, “[There’s a Jewish judge at the center of Trump’s Harvard showdown. Her grandfather escaped pogroms](#),” *The Forward*, July 22, 2025.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

halted President Trump’s executive order banning travelers from seven Muslim-majority countries, turning Boston’s Logan Airport into an early legal battleground over the policy. In 2020, Judge Burroughs presided over a case in which Harvard and MIT challenged the Trump administration’s plan to deport international students taking online classes during the pandemic — a policy ICE withdrew before she issued a ruling.”⁸⁸ And, “Now, in a courtroom just a few miles from the Beacon Hill corner where Harry once sold newspapers, his granddaughter is weighing whether a different government’s use of Jewish suffering might be, in its own way, a misuse of power. ‘I think the issue,’ Judge Burroughs said near the end of Monday’s hearing, ‘is whether there’s a legitimate relationship between our distaste for discrimination and the approach the administration is taking.’”⁸⁹

The way Judge Burroughs frames her question suggests a bias buried deeply in her thinking, separating “our distaste for discrimination” as a universal truth somehow separate from “the approach the administration is taking,” when

⁸⁸ Benjamin Cohen, “[There’s a Jewish judge at the center of Trump’s Harvard showdown. Her grandfather escaped pogroms](#),” *The Forward*, July 22, 2025.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

members of the diverse and aggrieved MAGA movement that empowered President Trump's re-election is itself a mass protest movement driven by "our distaste for discrimination," but one she cannot see or will not recognize in her Ivy-tinted court room. As the *New York Times* reported, the DoJ lawyer representing the administration, "Mr. Velchik, himself a Harvard alumnus, scrambled on Monday to argue that the government was not seeking to decapitate Harvard" and instead "insisted that the government was seeking to strengthen and reshape an important American institution that had lost its way. In his telling, his alma mater had devolved into a bastion of bigotry that public money should not underwrite. He said the administration could choose, if it wished, to direct its largess toward other institutions. The case, he argued, was more about money for Harvard than any profound matters like free speech. Judge Burroughs' suggested that Harvard might very well not be such a titan of American academia if the Trump administration's cuts stand."⁹⁰

Just as she has in the past sided with Harvard, when her own family history is so intimately intertwined

⁹⁰ Alan Blinder, "[Judge Challenges Trump Administration in Hearing on Harvard Funding](#)," *New York Times*, July 21, 2025.

with Harvard that a reasonable mind must inquire if she can possibly remain impartial, no matter how hard she may try, and even if she succeeds, if reasonable minds can but help not to worry there is an unavoidable and inescapable conflict of interest here that prevents justice from being assured. Such an implicit and perhaps unconscious bias is suggested by not only *The Forward's* favorable coverage, but that of the venerable gray lady herself, the *Times*: “Judge Burroughs said relatively little during Mr. Lehotsky’s [representing Harvard] presentations, resting her chin on her right hand, her fingers usually covering her mouth. But she often lowered her hand when Mr. Velchik [the above-discussed DoJ lawyer representing the Trump administration] was before her. ‘Let’s assume for the sake of argument that Harvard has not covered itself in glory on the topic of antisemitism,’ she said, noting her own Jewish faith. What, she asked, was the relationship between antisemitism and cutting off, for instance, cancer research funding? ‘You’re not taking away grants from labs that have been antisemitic,’ she said.”⁹¹ But she misses the point entirely. All of Harvard is tainted by the unglamorous history of Harvard, including its

⁹¹ Alan Blinder, “[Judge Challenges Trump Administration in Hearing on Harvard Funding](#),” *New York Times*, July 21, 2025.

bigotry, arrogance, snobbery, elitism, and exclusion that have forged and still define the Harvard community, where biases borne of four centuries of nepotism and cronyism percolate down to potentially every hiring decision made, where influential alumni barter their donations and promises of future largesse for opportunities of all sort.

Defunding the entirety of Harvard, across the board, is the one effective tool that government has, and fulfills the political will of the majority of Americans who restored President Trump with a decisive electoral victory. Judge Burroughs appears to be treading dangerously upon the separation of powers enshrined in the United States Constitution while holding up its first amendment as somehow more sacred—indicating the government may well be correct to believe justice can only be achieved in a different courtroom, one less partisan in nature. Judge Burroughs, either despite or because of her intimate family history imbued by Harvard’s exclusivist spirit, has long taken Harvard’s side in her court room, as *The Forward* noted above. This partisan bias is evident in her 2019 decision in favor of Harvard during its long-running and contentious case brought by SFFA. Then, Judge Burroughs lauded the tolerance fostered at universities by proactive efforts to increase their diversity. As she

put it, “The rich diversity at Harvard and other colleges and universities and the benefits that flow from that diversity will foster the tolerance, acceptance and understanding that will ultimately make race conscious admissions obsolete.”⁹² In short, race conscious admissions are a lesser evil, to rebalance a playing field portrayed as historically unjust and exclusionary.

But the reality is that race conscious admissions have inevitably dumbed down student bodies in their relentless assault on merit, and institutionalized racist reverse-discrimination that in time falsely marginalized white males (inclusive of the long suffering and so often violently oppressed Jews) as children of privilege, ignoring the poverty, trauma and injustice of their life experiences and family histories escaping persecution, oppression and genocide as her grandfather Harry did. Judge Burroughs became an advocate for this racist assault by academia against America and the people of the American heartland, partisan and not impartial. As amply illustrated in her 2019 SFFA

⁹² Case [1:14-cv-14176-ADB, Document 672](#), Filed September 30, 2019, United States District Court District of Massachusetts, Students for Fair Admissions, Inc., Plaintiff, v. President and Fellows of Harvard College (Harvard Corporation), Defendant, Civil Action No. 14-cv-14176-ADB, Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law, 129.

decision, Judge Burroughs has most obviously swallowed the Kool-Aid of DEI and sees in these newly diversified educational institutions a tolerance of views – and yet recent history has shown universities have suffered a pervasive, near-fatal epidemic of viewpoint intolerance. One that professes support for terrorism and genocide as it did after the October 7, 2023 Hamas-led pogrom against the border villages in Israel along the dangerous Gaza frontier, where a mass slaughter of Jewish innocents took place, one blamed by Harvard's diverse student body (whose diversity was famously touted by Judge Burroughs in her 2019 SFFA decision) upon the Jewish victims of this cruel act of mass murder. As Harvard students themselves portrayed this genocidal act, the largest loss of Jewish life in a single day since the Holocaust sought to exterminate European Jewry, in this Google AI Overview generated by my query: “A group of Harvard University student organizations” totaling 33 student organizations, but “primarily the Harvard Undergraduate Palestine Solidarity Committee, published a controversial letter in October 2023 following Hamas's attack on Israel. The letter stated that the student groups ‘hold the Israeli regime entirely responsible for all unfolding violence’. It argued that the attack did not occur in a vacuum and cited what it called an

‘apartheid regime’ and the ‘open-air prison’ conditions experienced by Palestinians in Gaza.”

I recall, some quarter century ago, bumming a ride to the White Mountains with then attorney (and future Judge) Burroughs, who after many years serving as a prosecutor switched to the more lucrative world of a private law firm, and her partner (now husband). I had eaten dinner before the ride but did not mind when they stopped for a bite to eat at the popular Mad River Tavern situated conveniently near interstate 93, where they each had a full meal. I only had a small cup of soup, for want of having something to do while they voraciously ate. At the end of the meal, the future judge unilaterally determined the just solution was to divide the bill evenly three ways, effectively having me subsidize the meal of her and her partner, despite their relative affluence and the paucity of my selection (and budget). This was typical of the way lawyers think, and emblematic of the future Judge Burroughs’ instincts on matters of justice. Formulaic triangular reasoning is thus not new to her, and when she decided the outcome of SFFA case in 2019, she comparably viewed the three nearly equally sized communities whose fates collided at Harvard—the ALDC community with its enduring, centuries-long privileged advantages; the international community with its new but not

necessarily clean money (accumulated during the rise of globalization which gutted the American heartland of its factories and jobs); and the pool of regular applicants, perceived inaccurately as separate but equal components of the Harvard student body, even though only two of these three at Harvard's table had sufficiently rich and robust budgets, much like our humble but asymmetric dinner in the White Mountains.

And as hard as Harvard has sought to offset the cash-constrained limits of the pocketbooks of the third component of its student body that actually competes fairly for an admissions slot, offering a free ride to those with family incomes less than \$100,000 and a tuition-free ride for those between \$100,000 and \$200,000, the tsunami of dollars flowing in from the other two inevitably rig the playing field in their favor, intermixing merit with privilege, hard work with no work at all. The result is a cloudy dissonance, a murky and unfathomable muddle. Only a member of the greater legacy community (inclusive of those accepted, and those denied admission, to Harvard who share and benefit from the same influential family networks for their entire lives, as do their offspring) can think this is justice and that reasonable minds should agree.

For decades, Judge Burroughs skied with many elite friends whose families donated generously to Harvard and whose children breezed their way in without so much as breaking a sweat. Her rejection had nothing to do with herself, let alone her impressive academic merit. It had everything to do with Harvard's culture of elitist entitlement, and its double standards on the price of admission. Judge Burroughs should be angry at Harvard, as anyone who learned of its betrayal of her father's generous fundraising efforts by its admissions *mafiosi* would be. She should want Harvard's blood for their callous mistreatment of her beloved father, for daring to say his every all, his every fiber of generosity, his kindhearted willingness to raise money for his once beloved *alma mater*, was insufficient by their callous and heartless calculation. But she instead has given Harvard a free pass, time and again, one that the U.S. Supreme Court ultimately took back after her 2019 decision and which President Trump is confident will do so again, having recently written on Truth Social: "When she rules against us, we will IMMEDIATELY appeal, and WIN."⁹³ That Judge Burroughs has such a close (and by most

⁹³ Alan Blinder, "[Judge Challenges Trump Administration in Hearing on Harvard Funding](#)," New York Times, July 21, 2025.

definitions) familial tie to billionaire alumnus and megadonor to Harvard and her father's very own roommate is and remains material to her ability to judge Harvard fairly. Smith was not just an ordinary wealthy Harvard donor, but a megadonor with the sprawling, central administrative complex in the heart of Harvard Square – where Matt Damon's character, Will Hunting, once wooed Minnie Driver's character in *Good Will Hunting*, long known as Holyoke Center – now bearing Smith's family name for posterity.

Harvard no longer closes its doors to all Jews as it once did in its storied (and universally acknowledged antisemitic) past, but its gates swing open most loosely for the superrich, lubricated by their endless supply of money. The superrich, regardless of their race or creed, always find an open door, one for which they can afford to pay the always-escalating entry fee. Think Sackler family (namesake of Harvard's Sackler Museum), whose unholy cartel forged in trinity with McKinsey and Purdue Pharma addicted much of heartland America to opioids, causing hundreds of thousands of deaths in what we can perceive as a genocide against America's working class. For the rest of us, this is a world for which our entry to this hallowed but undeserving institution remains for the most part prohibited, particularly for that near 60% of the

Harvard student body that doesn't have to compete in the ruthless *Hunger Games*-like competition that for many of us start at birth, and when we break down that barrier through hard-won achievement, find yet more invisible obstacles at every turn, some that look, smell and feel like antisemitism, and others that are anti-working class biases by elites who live a pampered, gilded life.

Harvard has divided the wealthy into the "rich enough" and "insufficiently rich" while professing support for working families. One of my high school classmates whose family bought intergenerational admission to Harvard for their children (but, curiously, not all of their grandchildren) said their father had donated \$5 million to Harvard Business School and once showed me a monument on the grounds of HBS bearing their name among other generous alumni donors. But that was back when \$5 million was considered by Harvard to be a lot of money. This is what the American taxpayer is subsidizing with their sweat and hard work, since those \$5 million gifts come with all manner of restrictions, forcing the American taxpayer, most of us unable to afford to bribe Harvard like this, to subsidize its operations year after year, and when President Trump bravely questioned this and suggested it was a raw deal rigged against the very taxpayer who foots the bill

for this elitist institution, Harvard turned for a compassionate ear once more to the courtroom of Judge Burroughs who has time and again (including her exoneration of Harvard from its discriminating admissions policies in her 2019 SFFA decision) granted Harvard momentary victories via temporary injunctions blocking the White House from standing up for the overlooked Americans whose relatives don't get to jet around the world on the private plane of a billionaire Harvard donor, and whose own modest but sincere efforts to raise funds for their beloved *alma mater* weren't mocked by the callous plutocrats who run Harvard as drollly insufficient, and yet who are expected to continue to fund this morally depraved, self-serving and unfathomably arrogant institution, year after year, without relief.

Even now, in her Ivy-sympathetic, crimson-shaded courtroom on the 5th floor of the John J. Moakley Federal Courthouse in Boston, Judge Burroughs seems to mock the mass movement that has empowered President Trump to take back America and make it great again, pointing the hypocritical finger of due process at the government side, suggesting it and not Harvard is the villain here, and that its most serious accusations are a threat to Harvard's presumed greatness (as Judge Burroughs herself appears to suggest in her language, as if on

Harvard's marketing payroll). Perhaps after the judge retires, she will end up at Harvard at last—as if channeling Azetbur, the daughter of slain Klingon Chancellor Gorkon in the Nicholas Meyer-directed *Star Trek 6: The Undiscovered Country*, when she explained to the newly exonerated Rear Admiral James T. Kirk: “You've restored my father's faith”—when Harvard's own persistent and protracted violations of due process in admissions, and its corruption of higher education into a nepotistic finishing school where admissions, hiring, and ultimately its sprawling research presence (now bloated and inefficient, hampered by sky high lab rents and sky-high salaries for its researchers that help fuel the Cambridge-area's real estate bubble that makes residing there all but unattainable to the many working class families who once called it home) are part of an elitist clique, the self-adulating Harvard community that itself deserves closer scrutiny, having become as Woody Allen famously put it, playing Fielding Mellish in his 1971 cult comedy, *Bananas*: “I object your honor! This trial is a travesty. It's a mockery of a sham of a mockery of two mockeries of a sham.”

Judge Burroughs' dilemma is also reminiscent of Charlie Sheen's character Chris Taylor, the morally-conflicted protagonist in Oliver Stone's classic film of the Vietnam war, *Platoon*, who

recalls during his closing voiceover: “The war is over for me now, but it will always be there, the rest of my days. As I’m sure Elias will be, fighting with Barnes for what Rhah called ‘possession of my soul.’ There are times since, I’ve felt like a child, born of those two fathers.” Such a tug of war while unacknowledged could be reasonably expected to wage invisibly for the subconscious mind of Judge Burroughs who is likewise torn between the contending influence of two father figures, one the snubbed but no less earnest fundraiser for whom years of dedication raising money exclusively from Harvard’s Jewish alumni at HAA’s request (off a list they provided, reminiscent—in reverse—of Schindler’s list, Schindler’s to buy the salvation of a select few Jews during the horrors of the Holocaust, only now buying salvation for those Jewish alumni deemed rich enough to buy their children entry as legacies); and billionaire donor Smith.

It’s also reminiscent in its own way of the compelling battle (and influence with) mob boss Frank Costello (Jack Nicholson’s menacing yet sympathetic character) by his two divergent disciples, Colin Sullivan (played chillingly by Matt Damon) and Billy Costigan (played sympathetically by Leonardo DiCaprio) in Martin Scorsese’s *The Departed*, whose overlapping and complex interconnections could be a metaphor as well for

Judge Burroughs, who sits in judgment of our own complex world of hidden shadows. Is not the appointee of a judgeship much the same, connected in many cases by an invisible string of a hidden political donation to their emplacement at the heights of American justice?

In theory, Judge Burroughs, like all judges, could owe her rise to the bench to just such a gift, the same sorts of gifts she exonerates in her 2019 decision. How Judge Burroughs became a judge and won her coveted nomination to the bench from the Obama administration in July 2014 still remains a mystery. Was it based on the merit of a skilled prosecutor whose rolodex became invigorated after leaving the DA's office for private practice, as the public narrative being woven around Judge Burroughs could suggest? It could also be, though we may never know for sure, a direct result of some invisible but no less material string pulled by an influential party donor (perhaps with no finger prints evident in the public record) as judgeships, like ambassadorships, often go to the highest donor⁹⁴ and lack electoral or due process in their selection, reminiscent of legacy admissions with its own lifetime tenure of privilege, just as becoming a

⁹⁴ Joshua Eaton, Ilana Marcus and Ed Timms, "[Cashing on Justice](#)," *Roll Call*, March 3, 2020.

“made guy” (a conflation of “made man” with “wise guy”) is for any aspiring “goodfella.”

Indeed, should such an invisible string be uncovered, it would mean that the honorable judge may have in fact been Harvard’s less than honorable “inside man” (or woman in this case), reminiscent of Matt Damon’s calculating character, Sullivan, who infiltrated the Massachusetts state police on behalf of the mob, more so than his more sympathetic alter ego, Costigan, who reverse-infiltrated the mob on behalf of a secretive undercover unit of the state police. It is indeed fair to speculate about this question in light of the alignment of pro-Harvard forces both within and without Judge Burroughs’ courtroom. This broader issue itself is well documented. As a *Roll Call* investigation has found, “In all, *CQ Roll Call* found that about three out of every five of those judges, who were nominated from January 2009 through July 2019, made political contributions. ‘There are some honest questions to be asked about huge political donors who wind up on the bench,’ said Ciara Torres-Spelliscy, an expert in campaign finance law at Stetson University in Florida. ‘Did they get there through how we hope they get there,

which is merit selection? Or is this just another gravy train?”⁹⁵

But even if there is no such invisible string and Judge Burroughs achieved her moonshot Obama White House nomination to the bench (forever earning a cool quarter million dollars per year, enough to make her ineligible for Harvard’s full financial aid package, which tops out at \$200,000), Judge Burroughs is nonetheless intimately tied to the Harvard Community in many ways, and least important among these, as the *New York Times* reported in 2018, is the widely reported and eye-catching news tidbit that Judge Burroughs did not get in. With her close family relationship to billionaire Harvard donor Smith forging an indelible lifelong bond, and the bittersweet controversy over her beloved father’s under-appreciated efforts to fundraise for Harvard, we have a dissonant web that offers us too much proximity for comfort, and must conclude that Judge Burroughs appears inescapably sympathetic to, and impressed by, Harvard’s presumed greatness rather than offended by its crassness. The *Times* erred in 2018 by suggesting the concern with this proximity is that Judge Burroughs would come down too hard on Harvard;

⁹⁵ Joshua Eaton, Ilana Marcus and Ed Timms, “[Cashing on Justice](#),” *Roll Call*, March 3, 2020.

it's the opposite, that she would pass judgment too lightly on Harvard, coming down too easily for us to be reassured that there is any certitude of impartiality.

Indeed, she now appears to hold Harvard up on the very pedestal that Harvard has cultivated for nearly four centuries, a PR imaging success without parallel in our young country but one which is inconsistent with the gritty reality of Harvard's entitlement culture and self-adulation. Judge Burroughs appears to be drinking of the very same Kool-Aid as Harvard's legacy community and the legions of wannabes who dream of joining its rarefied upper class. Judge Burroughs is one way or another in the middle of this storm, no matter how neutral she professes herself to be. If only she showed such skepticism for Harvard as she does for its critics. And now that she and her supporters are cultivating her image as the sole, fearless, defiant attorney-of-conscience to stand up to the Constitution-treading President Trump without trepidation, in disregard of the enduring social and political movement by tens of millions of voters to take back America and make it great again, and an unassailable member of the Jewish community unafraid to paint Trump's valiant effort to protect Israel in its quest to defeat all of its enemies from Harvard Square to the Gaza Strip to Iran's Fordow

uranium enrichment plant as a politicization and manipulation of antisemitism and not its muscular defense, smacks of an organized Democratic Party strategy, as if conjured up by image consultants preparing to draft Judge Burroughs to their cause, perhaps as a future Vice Presidential candidate, Attorney General nominee or future Supreme Court justice in exchange for her efforts to demonize the President and his many millions of followers.

Hence the spate of headlines, from *The Forward* cited above to local papers the *Boston Globe* and *Harvard Crimson* touting the moral strengths of our very own modern day Joan of Arc, one reader might be tempted to christen Saint Allison the Just. *Harvard Magazine*, long a PR vehicle for Harvard to toot its own horn, sets the scene for last summer's dramatic court room showdown: "A federal judge on Monday heard oral arguments in Harvard's much-anticipated federal funding case against the Trump administration, which challenges the freezing of more than \$2.2 billion in research grants and contracts. In a hearing that lasted for more than two hours, Judge Allison D. Burroughs probed the government's rationale for withholding funds, while the University's lawyers painted them as unconstitutional violations of free speech. Journalists and spectators packed into the Boston courtroom, with many lining up to enter more than

30 minutes prior to the start of the proceedings. Multiple lawyers representing Harvard were in attendance, alongside lawyers for the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and its Harvard chapter. (The organization filed a separate lawsuit in April challenging the funding freeze—which was later consolidated with the University’s.) The government, meanwhile, sent a single lawyer from the Department of Justice: Michael Velchik, an alumnus of the College (‘12) and Harvard Law School (‘16)—who once gave the Latin oration at Commencement.”⁹⁶

Asks the *Boston Globe* in a profile of Judge Burroughs’ multiple trials involving Harvard where this hallowed Ivy League institution found a sympathetic ear in cases pitting it against those who claim “Fair Harvard” is anything but: “Who is US District Judge Allison D. Burroughs, the jurist overseeing Harvard’s case against the Trump administration’s federal funding freeze and who called the government’s arguments ‘a bit mind-boggling’? Burroughs hasn’t yet ruled, but Trump already has taken to social media to criticize

⁹⁶ Tamara Evdokimova, “[Harvard in the Crosshairs: Harvard, Government Present Arguments in Funding Case: Judge questions relationship between antisemitism charges and grant cancellations](#),” *Harvard Magazine*, July 21, 2025 (updated July 22, 2025).

her as a ‘TOTAL DISASTER’.”⁹⁷ The media storm went viral, expanding from the local to the global, reaching as far afield as *The Times of India*: “At the hearing held in a packed courtroom in Boston, Burroughs pressed government attorney Michael K. Velchik on how the administration’s decision to halt billions in research funding was tied to its stated goal of combating antisemitism at Harvard. The lawsuit has become a central point in a broader legal and political standoff between Harvard and President Donald J. Trump’s administration, which has accused the university of permitting antisemitism and failing to uphold civil rights protections,” and under a heading boldly noting “Judge questions link between speech and research funding” adds, “According to *The Harvard Crimson*, Judge Burroughs said during the hearing, ‘They’re not funding speech, they’re funding research. And you’re tying that research to speech.’ She expressed skepticism about whether concerns about antisemitism could justify such steep funding cuts to the university’s research enterprise.”⁹⁸

⁹⁷ Tonya Alanez, "[Harvard cases are nothing new to this federal judge](#)," *The Boston Globe*, July 26, 2025.

⁹⁸ Sanjay Sharma, "[Why Judge Burroughs’s skepticism marks a turning point in the US-Harvard funding clash](#)," *Times of India*, July 22, 2025.

How did we get here, to this unexpected place where the elitist, exclusivist enclave of faux-progressivism and manufactured “rich diversity” (as tellingly phrased, perhaps unintentionally so, by Judge Burroughs herself in her 2019 SFFA decision, as cited above and again here),⁹⁹ has somehow become image-reengineered as a poster child for free speech, something as antithetical to the highbrow Harvard community as economic equality? As this author has long observed, and come to deeply believe, it is far nobler to battle Harvard’s own, offensive and oppressive elitist entitlement and exclusion, and its *mind-bogglingly* (to again borrow a phrase utilized so deftly by the pugnacious and impressive courtroom jouster Judge Burroughs), multi-generational (and multi-century) assault upon free speech and the First Amendment, from its partisan embrace of DEI (an embrace equally embraced by Judge Burroughs in her 2019 SFFA

⁹⁹ To wit: “The rich diversity at Harvard and other colleges and universities and the benefits that flow from that diversity will foster the tolerance, acceptance and understanding that will ultimately make race conscious admissions obsolete.” Case [1:14-cv-14176-ADB, Document 672](#), Filed September 30, 2019, United States District Court District of Massachusetts, Students for Fair Admissions, Inc., Plaintiff, v. President and Fellows of Harvard College (Harvard Corporation), Defendant, Civil Action No. 14-cv-14176-ADB, Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law, 129.

decision, and its trendy affection for Toni Morrison) through such exclusionary catch phrases as “Zionism is racism” or the more recently vogue and arguably genocidal “From the river to the sea...” and other such institutionally embraced catchphrases of hate that have led Harvard in alignment with the entire sordid, politically-correct (or as we now describe, *woke*) academic enterprise, and its rabbit’s hole of moral decay, tyranny of overused and worn out catchphrases that mark its profound and irreversible intellectual decline.

Reasonable minds, as Judge Burroughs wrote in her widely hailed but soon overturned decision in the 2019 SFFA decision, can disagree on matters of legacies and alumni relations. But not on the unrepentant, unstoppable laundering of money in exchange for the illusion of class (yielding instead its near homonym *crass*) that Harvard has perfected as a well-oiled racket now for nearly four hundred years of unnatural selection. It's enough to make any *wise guy* proud. The long and murky legacy of the expansive, often invisible hidden hand that is the Harvard Community, where influence is bought across the generations, has permeated nearly every corner of our society. In a courtroom where generations of Harvard visibly and invisibly converge, reasonable minds can wonder if it is possible for true justice to ever prevail. Indeed, the

White House is right to doubt the public interest can be served in a courtroom where dueling visions of Harvard battle for the soul of even a well-meaning judge caught within her own Manichean battle, reminiscent of the young and increasingly tormented war hero Anakin Skywalker near the end of the *Clone Wars* as he became pulled and twisted in two conflicting and irreconcilable directions by the light and dark sides of the force. (As we learned in episode 13 of season 6 (“Sacrifice”), part of the Lost Missions story arc, on a vision quest on the planet Moraband famed Jedi master Yoda encounters a powerful Force illusion created by Darth Sidious, and stands his ground in a compelling exchange meant to break his will. Darth Sidious: “He [Anikin Skywalker] is our destiny. He will be our new instrument of fear.” Yoda: “Your apprentice, not yet is he. And defeat him, you will not!” Darth Sidious: “He is ours, soon enough.” Both were correct, as *Star Wars* fans have all come to understand (*Clone Wars* fans with more subtlety than viewers of the film trilogies, alas.)

Even as Judge Burroughs’ skeptical questioning of the Harvard-educated DoJ Lawyer, Velchik, representing the Trump Administration generated premature headlines lauding an inevitable Harvard victory, however, the New York *Times* reported that Harvard was seriously considering settling with the

White House, and paying a lofty \$500 million fine for its transgressions (2.5 times the \$200 million fine Columbia agreed to pay the week before), while more steadfastly refusing to yield on issues of control over its admissions, hiring, curricula, and other academic freedoms.¹⁰⁰ How Judge Burroughs would rule was, for a few naïve believers in American justice, not a foregone conclusion but a question for the soothsayers, betting pools and other futurists. But with so much of Harvard’s corrosive essence penetrating so deeply into this crimson-tinted courtroom, where neutrality is so needed but seems in such short supply and where Harvard’s greatness is celebrated from the bench while its corrupting influences, which should be held in check, instead run amok – not the victim of a demagogue but in fact the manifestation of demagoguery itself.

Perhaps moving this case to Washington’s Court of Federal Claims as the White House had proposed, where North and South have long met, and within sight of which much of America’s Civil War played out, and comfortably away from the far-reaching tentacles of Harvard’s Jekyll-and-Hyde puppet

¹⁰⁰ Michael C. Bender, Alan Blinder and Michael S. Schmidt, “[Harvard Is Said to Be Open to Spending Up to \\$500 Million to Resolve Trump Dispute](#),” *New York Times*, July 28, 2025.

theatre taking place inside courtroom 17 on the 5th floor of the John J. Moakley Federal Courthouse in Boston, had the judge consented to relinquish judgment from her own grasp, would have been be our last, best hope for justice—one where the issue of whether the American people should continue to subsidize elite, self-aggrandizing, self-adulating, and self-serving institutions like Harvard is not so readily overshadowed by Harvard’s pervasive influence and treated like a divinely anointed monarchy, or by distractions such as Harvard’s dubious contention that the people of the United States of America are somehow infringing upon Harvard’s protected constitutional right to free expression while directing their duly elected President, through their hard won and long defended constitutional right to vote, to take their hard-earned money back while demanding Harvard put an end to its long complicity in obstructing the right of long-silenced and oft-maginalized Jewish members of its own community to enjoy their constitutional rights—not only to free expression, but to protection from prohibited and unlawful hate speech of the sort long tolerated by Massachusetts Hall—while making America great again for everyone, and not just those smug Cantabrigian elites who have long felt entitled to lord over the rest of us at what they feel in their misplaced

entitlement should forever be at our everlasting expense.

But alas, Judge Burroughs sided with Harvard as all but the most naïve had fully expected, whose side she had taken in many a prior case. She rejected the President's desire to move the case to the Court of Federal Claims in DC, and mocked the President's just proposal to transfer its generously provided research funds from Harvard to trade schools serving America's working poor and its vast rural archipelago of communities left behind by the extreme inequalities of globalization that Harvard has long promoted in its zeal to cultivate new elites upon whom it could depend for a further perpetuation of its particularly venomous brand of inequality. As she ruled, "the government has continued to pressure Harvard in other ways. As examples, on May 26, 2025, the President stated that he was considering taking away 'Three Billion Dollars' from 'a very antisemitic Harvard,' which he would then give to 'TRADE SCHOOLS.'"¹⁰¹ As if trade schools, serving America's heartland and thereby seeking to offset the scourges of globalization that impoverished the American heartland, was somehow a nefarious effort to

¹⁰¹ Ruling in Case 1: 25-cv-11048-ADB, *Memorandum and Order*, Document 238, Filed 09/03/25, 21.

undermine the American Constitution. As if America's underfunded but desperately needed trade schools do not deserve the very same largesse of taxpayer handouts that Harvard has come to be so dependent upon (unwilling to spend its own money, like so many elites and the institutions they control), and to which they now feel so entitled – while giving back so little to the hundreds of millions of American who have so generously provided their hard earned tax dollars to sustain, and who for the most part reside in the “sparse country” Harvard so derisively disdains and whose working poor are falsely vilified as members of an illusory caste of “white privilege” while nurturing a new rainbow colored ruling class of overseas elites from kleptocracies far and wide. President Trump was elected by a majority of these Americans that Harvard and its ecosystem of vultures continue to shun with clear marching orders to make America great again. But opponents to the revolution that has elevated Trump like Judge Burroughs instead seek instead to perpetuate the asymmetrical grip that Harvard has on American society, in their own narrow and entitled sense of self-interest, betraying the American people and in turn the glorious

Constitution they seek to restore to greatness as well.¹⁰²

Judge Burroughs starts off her decision with a sympathetic nod to the President and to his revolutionary agenda to restore American greatness: “Defendants and the President are right to combat antisemitism and to use all lawful means to do so. Harvard was wrong to tolerate hateful behavior for as long as it did.”¹⁰³ But her true colors (with shades of crimson) soon reveal themselves: “The record here, however, does not reflect that fighting antisemitism was Defendants’ true aim in acting against Harvard and, even if it were, combatting antisemitism cannot be accomplished on the back of the First Amendment. We must fight against antisemitism, but we equally need to protect our rights, including our right to free speech, and neither goal should nor needs to be sacrificed on the altar of the other. Harvard is currently, even if belatedly, taking steps it needs to take to combat antisemitism and seems willing to do even more if need be. Now it is the job of the courts to similarly step up, to act to safeguard academic freedom and freedom of speech as required by the Constitution,

¹⁰² Ruling in Case 1: 25-cv-11048-ADB, *Memorandum and Order*, Document 238, Filed 09/03/25, 22.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

and to ensure that important research is not improperly subjected to arbitrary and procedurally infirm grant terminations, even if doing so risks the wrath of a government committed to its agenda no matter the cost.”¹⁰⁴

But walking back Judge Burroughs’ impassioned but not impartial defense of the Constitution, is she correct to argue that the record “does not reflect that fighting antisemitism was Defendants’ true aim in acting against Harvard”? The fight against antisemitism is only one front in the fight against the weaponization of DEI and its assault on working class white Americans, who come from a wide range of backgrounds and a storied depth of despair and poverty that is historically celebrated as a story of perseverance and resilience in the face of adversity and not (as DEI has become) a story of perpetual victimization and endless apologies for real or imagined wrongs that are no fault of white working class Americans, full stop – including the tragic history experienced by Jews who were brutally genocided by their host nation while in the long exile of diaspora, the Germans (in alignment with their allies), and thus were never part of the perceived but illusory caste of “white privilege”

¹⁰⁴ Ruling in Case 1:25-cv-11048-ADB, *Memorandum and Order*, Document 238, Filed 09/03/25, 82.

vilified and denigrated by academia (with Harvard, the most privileged of them all, leading the charge, pitchforks and all).

The Jews are instead victims of unprecedented (and hauntingly recent) mass persecution and murder for their faith. That DEI's rainbow coalition has self-servingly weaponized and distorted its core pillars of diversity, equity and inclusion through a racist lens, empowering foreign elites (whose children, like so many other legacies, fill many of the positions at Harvard, often hired for their connections more than their actual merit), while oppressing hard working Americans exiled to the jobless purgatory of "sparse country," and who after the October 2023 massacre of Israelis (mostly civilians, including many vulnerable and elderly *Kibbutzniks* sympathetic to the liberation movement embraced by their murderers) blamed the Jews for their horrific murders (abusing their right to free speech to perpetuate hate), with Harvard standing idly by (and its former, now scandalized and deposed, president egging this on), suggests that antisemitism is very much part of President Trump's effort to rein Harvard in, and protect the interests of the American taxpayers who have unknowingly subsidized this enduring bastion of elitist entitlement. Judge Burroughs may not like it, but she is wrong to judge it so harshly. She further

added, “even if it were“ (and as I argue above, it indeed was), “combatting antisemitism cannot be accomplished on the back of the First Amendment.”¹⁰⁵ But nor can forever funneling taxpayer dollars from the American heartland to elitist institutions like Harvard which have brainwashed America into thinking their “excellence” (the byproduct of four centuries of cronyism and nepotism) is a reflection of (and not the corrosive assault that it really is, upon) America’s greatness.

Judge Burroughs cites famed associate justice of the Supreme Court (1916-39) Louis D. Brandeis, who “wrote in the seminal case of *Whitney v. California*, ‘[i]f there be time to expose through discussion the falsehood and fallacies, to avert the evil by the processes of education, the remedy to be applied is more speech, not enforced silence,’ or, in this case, the forced adoption of a political orthodoxy. As pertains to this case, it is important to recognize and remember that if speech can be curtailed in the name of the Jewish people today, then just as easily the speech of the Jews (and anyone else) can be curtailed when the political winds change

¹⁰⁵ Ruling in Case 1:25-cv-11048-ADB, *Memorandum and Order*, Document 238, Filed 09/03/25, 82.

direction."¹⁰⁶ By pointing her crimson-tinted finger at President Trump and accusing him, his national movement and the hundreds of millions of voters whose majority vote restored him to the White House, of perpetuating “falsehood and fallacies” and using her own bully pulpit “to avert the evil,” she is committing as partisan act. She is no longer acting as a judge, but a jury and executioner as well. It is time for her perhaps to reconsider her avocation and pursue a path more acceptably partisan.

But Judge Burroughs has in a most partisan fashion instead taken Harvard’s side rather than judge neutrally (and Solomon-like), and in so doing has turned her back on the real America, the unspoiled and unvarnished America whose forefathers and foremothers came to our fertile shores escaping oppressive persecution and poverty, regardless of their skin color, and who are now expected to feel sorry for this and to apologize for their faux “white privilege” while in fact becoming the “white persecuted,” and to stand idly by as others leverage their Constitution to attack common decency, while spending their hard earned tax dollars to enrich themselves while marginalizing them from the sacred rights that the Constitution promises us all.

¹⁰⁶ Ruling in Case 1:25-cv-11048-ADB, *Memorandum and Order*, Document 238, Filed 09/03/25, 81-82.

As Martin Luther King, Jr. defiantly proclaimed in Selma, “no more!”

As defiantly shouted in the 1925 film *Battleship Potemkin*, “We’ve had enough!”

And as many a leftist revolutionary has defiantly cried out since, from the Sandinistas to the Zapatistas, “¡Ya basta!”

Or, more plainly said, “Enough is enough!”

Barry Scott Zellen, PhD, is a Research Scholar in the Department of Geography at the University of Connecticut (UConn) and a Senior Fellow (Arctic Security) at the Institute of the North (IoN). He is the author, most recently, of Arctic Exceptionalism: Cooperation in a Contested World (2024). Send mail to him at barry.zellen@uconn.edu.