Hannah Fry

by Miles Mathis

First published March 30, 2025

[OK, do you want to hear something really weird? Either Fry or Youtube must be reading me, because just seven days later, she is gone from my Youtube feed. Wow, like Bullwinkle, I don't know my own strength. Since they seem to be caught in my Jedi mind trick, let me say that what they most want to do next is to stop suppressing numbers on my friend Steven Oostdijk's pi=4 video, and put up the real number it has gotten since publishing.]

This paper immediately went to the front page on a search for "Hannah Fry fake" at Yandex and page two at Yahoo. Google will not field that query, leading with the answer "No, Hannah Fry is not fake". Except that, Google, I was not asking for YOUR OPINION on that search, I was asking you **to do that search**—allegedly what a search engine is for. But Google Search no longer understands that it is a search engine, believing that it is now a gatekeeper to the world.

I just became aware of this . . . person, and so this warning today. I think she is a minor celebrity in the UK but is just getting known in the US, via this promotion at Youtube and other places. She suddenly began being promoted to me there a couple of days ago, and I seriously wish she would go away. I consider her yet another evil spirit trying to sell herself as the opposite. You are about to see why.

She is currently the professor of Public Understanding of Mathematics (Math Propaganda) at Cambridge, being formerly at University College London. Until recently I take it she was most wellknown for a sickening 2014 TED talk on the "mathematics of love". Ick. We will come back to that.

In 2018, Fry presented *Contagion! The BBC Four Pandemic*, about the possible impact of a flu pandemic,[37] in which she said " ... we are about to simulate the outbreak of a fatal contagion throughout the UK. ... if I can succeed this will save lives when, not if, a real pandemic hits."[38] The programme used Haslemere, Surrey, as the site of the first simulated infection, and coincidentally in February 2020 the town saw the first recorded case of a person

contracting COVID-19 from within the UK.[38]

Coincidentally? Right. Yeah, now you see why I am here. From that alone we can peg her. We can also peg her from this:

That's her using math to find a serial killer. So you can see they are using her for all their projects. I would like to send all my readers to the comments section there to swamp it with negative comments. Tell her you know serial killers are fake and who told you so. While you are there, visit her other pages and tell her what you think of them.

We can also peg her for this:

She has presented further programmes for the BBC explaining the mathematics behind COVID-19 and other pandemics.[48] Around this time, she began a podcast *DeepMind* created for the artificial intelligence company, DeepMind.[49]

In July 2022, she presented the BBC Two documentary *Unvaccinated*, in which she investigated why a portion of the British population remained unvaccinated against COVID-19.[52] Reviewing in *The Daily Telegraph*, Anita Singh described the show as patronising, commenting that Fry's attempt to explain statistics using "jelly-bean roulette" treated the unvaccinated people who chose to appear in the show like "six-year-olds".[53]

Not only selling Covid and fake vaccines, but also selling AI vaporware.

In 2019 she gave the Christmas Lectures at the Royal Institution, which is really sad because these used to be given by heavyweights like Michael Faraday, John Wallis, or John Tyndall. Fry's lectures were on "Secrets and Lies: the Hidden Power of Maths", where the first lecture was on "getting lucky" and the third was called "how can we all win?" Yeah.

Fry pretends to be working class Irish, but you can be sure that is a lie. She talks about her Mom but never names her, so I couldn't find a maiden name. But her promotion tells us she is probably related to the peerage Frys, including fellow actor Stephen Fry.* She is not from Ireland, but Harlow (north London). The Frys were baronets in two lines, both recently extinct. Those Frys are related to the Foxes of Cornwall. They are the cocoa Frys, and they are also related to the Cadburys. Also related to the Heber-Percys, who link them to the Manners. The Manners are Dukes and that is our link to the Stewarts. In another recent line they link us to the Herberts, Earls of Carnarvon, and the Howards, Earls of Arundel, taking us to the ruling Stewarts a second time. The Frys are also Penroses, so annah may be related to Roger Penrose. To get a good idea who these Frys were, see Maj. Gen. Sir William Fry, Order of the Bath, who was governor of Isle of Man until 1926. He was in charge of the administration of Ireland before that. He married the Jewish Ellen Goldie-Taubman, of the Nunnery Estate, Isle of Man. She was also a Curwen and a Christian. Through the Hornbys, these Frys link us to the Russells who link us to the Stewarts a third time.

Out of curiosity, I looked up Roger Penrose. He is indeed peerage, coming from the Penroses of Dublin, being closely related to the Fitzgeralds and Brabazons. See the Penrose-Fitzgeralds. This again indicates to me some link between Penrose and Fry.

One of Hannah Fry's promoted videos at Youtube concerns the math of dating sites, and she shows us the result of polls indicating that women tend to find most attractive men their own age or perhaps a bit older. As if we needed a PhD in math to tell us that. The "problem" is, the same cannot be said for men, who find early 20s women the most attractive, no matter how old the men are. Fry almost audibly clucks her tongue at this, and we are meant to understand it is the cause of all dating problems. It may well be, but Fry might as well cluck her tongue at God or nature, or at Serengeti lions for preferring to eat meat instead of grass. It is a fact of human biology and blaming men for it won't change anything. Does she really think men can be educated out of this "prejudice" by the use of higher math? No, men can't be scolded by older women into preferring older women, just because older women desire it. Life simply doesn't work like that.

Fry should be smart enough to figure out what Nature is up to here. Nature is pointing men at those young women because they are the ones most likely to have healthy children. That is the time to have babies. Pointing men at over-40 women makes no sense as a matter of biology, and the sex drive is a matter of biology. It isn't a matter of pairing everyone up by age, it is a matter of producing the

healthiest children, so of course Nature is going to point men at young women. Yes, it would be more convenient as a matter of dating if older men could be pointed at older women, and that is true for men as well as women. I say that because most older men will never have any success with younger women, so this makes them just as miserable as the older women. But because older men still have sperm just as viable as younger men, they have to continue to be pointed in the same direction they always were, no matter how old they get. That isn't going to change, so there is no use scolding us for it. It is strictly equivalent to scolding gays for liking men, or scolding women for liking providers. Most of these women would never think to do that, but they think it is OK to blame men for being men.

Fry's first book from 2015 is entitled *The Mathematics of Love*. Again, ick. In it, she promotes—among others things—the old Secretary's Rule, or 37% rule, whereby the first third of potential partners are rejected on principle.



Just so you know, it is called the 37% rule not because you reject the first 37%, but because using this method gives you a 37% chance of picking the best candidate. So not a great method regardless, even if it proved to be true. It means your chance of going wrong is still 63%, so you might as well just go with your intuition. Or, even better, ignore the math and listen to Nature.

Fry should write a book entitled *How to be Wrong about Everything all the Time*. Women have gotten the worst advice imaginable for decades, and this is just more of the same. I will give them the opposite advice: don't ever reject anyone on principle or based on some equations. Love is never a matter of odds, it is a matter of beating all odds. If the gods have sent you someone, give them every benefit of the doubt, rejecting them only for strong cause. Lack of attraction being number one, but also including meanness, lack of common interests, or other obvious incompatibility. The fact they happen to be in the first third of probable suitors has nothing to do with it, since you cannot predict your number of suitors. This could be the last one for all you know, so treat every one as precious.

Also consider this fact, which I have learned from experience: the gods of love do not like to be treated with contempt, and if you start blowing off suitors based on mathematical models or any other asinine reasons, they will dump you with maximum force. In my youth, I had many girls blow me off for no

reason or terrible reasons. One blew me off because her new computer had arrived and she wanted to set it up. Many blew me off because "the timing wasn't right". They weren't ready for me. I tried to warn them it didn't work that way: I was there then, so they had best *get* ready. If you don't make the time for Prince Charming, he moves on. You miss your chance forever. In saying that, I am not giving myself airs, I am telling you what several of them admitted to me later, with much regret: they never again met anyone like me and the chance never came again.

In my experience, young women are lost in their own little worlds and never give most guys a chance, for whatever reason. Some are chasing careers, some are involved in causes, but most are just lost in a fog of bad advice and general incomprehension. Victims of the modern mindstir, believing in serial killers, rape statistics, Presidential assassinations, boat sinkings, and Modernism in general, they are adrift in a sea of manufactured fear and confusion. In this state, they can hardly judge a new suitor rationally, no matter how much math they know or do not know. So it is a miracle people still get together at all, and if it weren't for the persistence of young men, *they wouldn't*.

Young men don't proceed on any mathematical rules, I assure you. They exist wholly on desire. Nature pushes them and they move. They bounce off every woman that attracts them, testing her for compatibility. And, unlike women, they really *do* give the benefit of the doubt, because they *want* it to happen. They want to believe this girl is the Princess Charming, the one that will answer their dreams and have their children. The time is never not right, since they were born ready.

Or at least I was. The old-school standard guy was like that, though I guess that has changed, too. That has been beaten out of us by the new milieu: the new world doesn't offer that, only a wall, so we take what we can get. The whole idea of a suitor is outmoded, and all that is left is "hooking up". You hook up for a while in a hangdog way, until at last one hook-up holds semi-permanently and you call that a relationship until it no longer does. You may accidentally get someone pregnant, and so you have a family. All strictly sad and pathetic, not resembling love in any way, so the mathematics of love in the modern world must be a misnomer.

Can Fry's mathematics of love reverse that? Of course not, since it wasn't meant to. She is an agent of Operation Chaos like all the rest of her cousins worldwide, so everything she does is done to break you and keep you broken. Your only hope is to turn off that channel completely and return to Nature. Specifically, welcome your next suitor as a potential gift of the cosmos, doing all you can to see him in a good light and make it work. Yes, it may not work, since some meetings *are* accidental or negative, but don't let it later be said you missed Prince Charming because you were late for a sale at Bloomingdales, or because the latest episode of Sex in the City was dropping, or—perhaps worst of all—because you hadn't planned to get married until you were 30. Nature doesn't fit her plans to your schedule, you fit your plans to hers. Remember that. Always be ready for anything positive, or it will pass you by forever.

*Fry's idol is Oscar Wilde, so that tells us all we need to know about him. Like the Frys, Oscar Wilde was a Curwen and a Christian, indicating Stephen Fry is actually a relative. They all link to the Percys, who then link to the Stewarts. Which explains why Fry has played Wilde. As I have shown you many times, that is how it is done, with actors playing their recent ancestors.