---

imho = in my humble opinion

This page is pretty good: ████████████████████████

(reminds me of meeting a jewish boyfriend's dad once... My boyfriend had had problems exchanging something at a store, I suggested buying another and using the new receipt to return the old item. His dad spins to look at me and goes, "You from Brooklyn?!??" (where he grew up))

On 9/6/09 10:56 AM, "Jeffrey Epstein" <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

sorry ,, what is imho.. in brooklynees , not what i think you wanted to suggest

On Sun, Sep 6, 2009 at 9:35 AM, ████████████████████████> wrote:

Like the elves in Lord of the Rings. I think immortality is so seductive it's got these guys a bit mesmerized, but I like that people are interested in researching aging. The singularity part is a bit confusing – too many different definitions floating out there for it to be a meaningful concept at this point, imho.

My friend apparently went to hear startup funding pitches at Singularity University not the Singularity Summit.

I'm sending you the book we talked about "The Making of the Atomic Bomb." Not only does it go through the evolution of discoveries in physics it traces the human side of how this project came together, starting with Szilard's framing of his ambitions (based in part on HG Wells's writing ie. The Open Conspiracy) and how personal dreams and interactions produced the collaboration.

On 9/6/09 7:10 AM, "Jeffrey Epstein" <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

most are goofballs. however, there seems to be a kernel of an idea , here and there ,, even if by accident. , I know little about them, have met many, the contention that though most people are afraid of death, they are as concerned if you tell them they will live for 1 000 years

On Sat, Sep 5, 2009 at 8:33 PM, ████████████████████████> wrote:

I know some of them – not Eric Baum. I liked his criticism of engineering as creating static and nonevolutionary design. I'll try and apply that to my work in scientific innovation: code and evolve, simple publication results are static. He has a nice framing – robust programming – that computational science as a whole might benefit from, going beyond his CAD apps. There is a similar idea to his notion of modularization in the study of scientific progress called black boxes – the components we build future results on (another aspect to my research is the consequence of the internet making these opaque component boxes transparent).

I don't know Peter Thiel (funder of singularity institute) personally, but found him interesting at one point a few years ago since he comes from the same Ayn Rand and Stanford background as I do. I saw him speak on the singularity at Google about a year or so ago and didn't think he knew what he was talking about and lost interest. In fact, I'm not sure those Singularity guys are being precise or scientific about what they're doing, generally speaking. Might not be an issue for you but makes it less interesting for me. Wouldn't mind chatting with Norvig and maybe a few others though, and I know Michael Nielsen personally and like him.

Brockman asked me about them a few weeks ago and he questioned the lack of involvement by women. I agree that's weird. I told him Thiel was gay and he was surprised at his own prescience!

A good friend of mine went to the singularity summit a couple weeks ago. I'll ask him about it.

On 9/5/09 7:54 PM, "Jeffrey Epstein" <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

█████████████████████████████████   i'm going to search this domain for more people