

**From:** "Charles L. Harper Jr." <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Jeffrey Epstein <jeevacation@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Re-send: quick update  
**Date:** Fri, 30 Apr 2010 14:18:11 +0000

---

Many thanks for your quick reply Jeffrey.

I've acted upon it immediately by sending a letter to Max Tegmark.

I have asked him for initial confidentiality, but (as we agreed in our initial discussion) have explained that the identity of the donor would not be confidential in this project, and that the essay contest would generate both 3 prizes and invitations to the winners to attend the research exploration-of-possibilities meeting in NYC or in Florida (or Virgin islands??).

I have suggested a possible 6 months timescale as follows:

Design / organizing time:	3 weeks ?
Advertizing time:	1 month ?
Incubation time:	4 months?
Judging time:	1 week ?

This would allow the meeting to be held 7 months from the time of the start if the essay contest project.

Judges for the project would be

chosen (mostly) from the first 5 key selections for the meeting attendees. Inviting busy highly distinguished people to come to a meeting

such as we have in mind usually requires a lead time of something like 9 months.

(People, for example, like Artur Eket, Anton Zeilinger, Vletko Vedral and Scott Aaronson)

Therefore the timescale can be meshed OK without excess delay. Unless you wish to rush.

I think that an "incubation time" of 4 months is minimal for development and submission of a competition paper.

This could be pushed-up to 6 months. I'll be interested to know what Max Tegmark thinks.

Note that the judging of the contest could be developed interestingly as an in-person one-day activity involving the judges and, say, 6 finalists. This could be done the day before the research meeting.

That would be an interesting "twist" but would add an extra cost for T&L, etc.

Allbest,

Charles Harper

FYI, Note that 2010 marks an interesting anniversary that we might reference in an attempt to seek deep insights at the interface between cryptography and biology:

70 years since Claude Shannon's MIT PHD thesis

(suggested by Vannevar Bush, titled "An Algebra for Theoretical Genetics)

which sought to apply his emerging insights into what became modern information theory into the mathematical formalization of genetics:

(See, from: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Claude\\_Shannon](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Claude_Shannon)):

...While studying the complicated ad hoc circuits of the differential analyzer, Shannon saw that Boole's concepts could be used to great utility. A paper drawn from his 1937 master's thesis, *A Symbolic Analysis of Relay and Switching Circuits*<sup>[5]</sup>, was published in the 1938 issue of the *Transactions of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers*. It also earned Shannon the *Alfred Noble American Institute of American Engineers Award* in 1940. Howard Gardner, of Harvard University, called Shannon's thesis "possibly the most important, and also the most famous, master's thesis of the century."

[Victor Shestakov](#), at Moscow State University, had proposed a theory of electric switches based on Boolean logic a little bit earlier than Shannon, in 1935, but the first publication of Shestakov's result took place in 1941, after the publication of Shannon's thesis.

In this work, Shannon proved that [Boolean algebra](#) and [binary arithmetic](#) could be used to simplify the arrangement of the electromechanical [relays](#) then used in telephone routing switches, then turned the concept upside down and also proved that it should be possible to use arrangements of relays to solve Boolean algebra problems. Exploiting this property of electrical switches to do logic is the basic concept that underlies all electronic digital computers. Shannon's work became the foundation of practical [digital circuit](#) design when it became widely known among the electrical engineering community during and after [World War II](#). The theoretical [rigor](#) of Shannon's work completely replaced the *ad hoc* methods that had previously prevailed.

Flush with this success, Vannevar Bush suggested that Shannon work on his dissertation at [Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory](#), funded by the Carnegie Institution headed by Bush, to develop similar mathematical relationships for [Mendelian genetics](#), which resulted in Shannon's 1940 [PhD](#) thesis at MIT, [An Algebra for Theoretical Genetics](#)<sup>[6]</sup>.

In 1940, Shannon became a National Research Fellow at the [Institute for Advanced Study](#) in Princeton, New Jersey. At Princeton, Shannon had the opportunity to discuss his ideas with influential scientists and mathematicians such as [Hermann Weyl](#) and [John von Neumann](#), and even had the occasional encounter with [Albert Einstein](#). Shannon worked freely across disciplines, and began to shape the ideas that would become information theory.<sup>[7]</sup>

On Apr 30, 2010, at 9:01 AM, Jeffrey Epstein wrote:

didn;t get the note.. however i agree to all.. with adjustment , first prize 15k send 10 third 5, fqi. 25 for overhead. re your time , i agree that this time its a no cost. nut would like to explore a more formal reationship

On Fri, Apr 30, 2010 at 8:41 AM, Charles L. Harper Jr. <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Jeff!

I am re-sending my note from last Friday (see below).

The idea of linking with FQX / Max Tegmark follows two logics having to do with avoiding the "already known-persons bias"

which tends to identify hot talent "too late" when a talent-scout like me does research to get a list of key names.

The key to getting to the core of innovation is to be sure to include a component in a search to identify relatively unknown persons

who are young emerging hot talent. Such people are not unlikely to become well-known in the future, but they are not well-known by reputation now. In any case:

-- FQX is a global talent search network in areas overlapping with research in cryptography, and specializing in outside-the-box thinking.

-- FQX has lots of experience with scientific essay contests. These competitions work well in the community of math and physics whiz-types.

(I've done several and they work very well in the reputational dynamics are well-organized by connection with very highly distinguished field innovation leaders.)

-- I'd expect Max Tegmark and his colleagues to be quite interested in the topical area of inquiry you are proposing.

Again, please see below for my note sent last Friday.

Allbest, -Charles Harper

Hi Jeff,

This is a quick update note on the plan to develop a 2-day meeting of 8-10 people in NYC or Florida to explore the topic:

(possible title):

{Explorations for investing to open up new domains of deep insight in science and technology. Series}

Research Symposium #I. Cryptography and Nature: Are there new deep insights to be discovered?

--- in mathematical theory

--- in quantum mechanics

--- in relation to biology

I have done enough preliminary research to identify a set of hot names. Some of these are people we would ask for nominations of very bright younger investigators they could draw to our attention to. (For example Artur Ekert and Anton Zeilinger.)

IDEA: Develop this project initially via the FQXi network via an essay prize contest. Then invite 3 or so of the winners.

Possibly this could be age-limited (say to 35 and under?). For a budget, see below.

I have two quick questions:

1. My next step would be to put out a few key letters (such as to Ekert & Zeilinger) and/or negotiate with FQXi via Max Tegmark.

Should I: Take action? or Keep planning for now?

2. On my own role: Because this is an initial exploration and because it is not too big a deal to develop, and because my time is limited

due to the fact that [REDACTED] in a new job situation and have already a serious MIT-focused project in process with the Philanthropy Roundtable,

I am happy to do this on a no-cost basis presuming a modest effort situation.

Or are you looking for a more engaged "fully professional" engagement for this initial exploration?

Let me know what you think.

Allbest,

Charles Harper

Cell: [REDACTED]

PS. Do you know Vlatko Vedral (Oxford) ?

\*Budget (conceptual, not negotiated. Off-the-cuff):

Prizes (3): \$40,000. Top: \$25,000, 2nd: \$10,000, 3rd: \$5,000

FQXi administration and advertising: \$35,000.

Total: \$75,000

--

\*\*\*\*\*

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Jeffrey Epstein

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to [jeevacation@gmail.com](mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com), and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments.