

**From:** "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>  
**To:** Joichi Ito <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: "Genius" finding  
**Date:** Thu, 19 Feb 2015 02:43:17 +0000

---

good idea

On Wed, Feb 18, 2015 at 9:39 PM, Joichi Ito <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Yes...

BTW, I am going to recruit, possibly, Cynthia Greenleaf, Jonathan Fanton's wife, to help. Jonathan is now the president of the American Academy and Cynthia was Associate Provost at U of C and until recently an executive search person in academia. They have experience with the Macarthur Fellows and have access to all of the stuff flowing through the American Academy... So I am definitely tapping into that pipe.

[REDACTED] also going to FOO and Sci FOO this year and will be very systematic about it. I'll use some sort of algorithm on the attendees to figure out who to meet.

We're also doing two faculty searches and now am screening all of the incoming applications and nominations.

- Joi

> On Feb 18, 2015, at 9:34 PM, Barnaby Marsh <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

> Yes, exactly - this is how it is at Harvard too, but very soon people know  
> who the top minds are, and which are impostors - word spreads, and those  
> with the good minds get invited to lunches, talks, the american academy,  
> etc. there must be some way to crack this...

>

> On 2/18/15, 9:27 PM, "Joichi Ito" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

>> I think the brute force way of getting the interesting <sup>3</sup>attractors<sup>2</sup> labs  
>> like George's to give us a list of the people who they think would fit  
>> this model.

>>

>> The problem is, and I'm working on this at MIT, most researchers and post  
>> docs are sort of <sup>3</sup>undocumented immigrants<sup>2</sup> that we don't normally track<sup>5</sup>

>>

>> - Joi

>>

>>> On Feb 18, 2015, at 9:23 PM, Barnaby Marsh <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>

>>> On the right track- like the bayesian method. I think that the  
>>> environment matters a lot too- the people that we look for aggregate in  
>>> places like Cambridge, where they can be with others who they can  
>>> resonate with. My guess is that many times they might not have formal  
>>> positions, but are visitors to labs, research groups, etc. Is there any  
>>> way to get lists of such people???

>>>

>>> From: Joichi Ito <[REDACTED]>

>>> Date: Saturday, February 14, 2015 at 8:10 AM

>>> To: B Marsh <[REDACTED]>, Jeffrey Epstein

>>> <[jeevacation@gmail.com](mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com)>

>>> Subject: Fwd: "Genius" finding

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> Sent from my iPhone

>>>

>>> Begin forwarded message:

>>>

>>>> From: Scott Page <[REDACTED]>

>>>> Date: February 14, 2015 at 07:16:47 EST

>>>> To: Joichi Ito <[REDACTED]>

>>>> Subject: "Genius" finding

>>>>

>>>> Joi,

>>>>

>>>> I've been thinking about your question of how to identify amazing people.

>>>> Here are several thoughts that don't necessarily cohere.

>>>>

>>>> I think your approach has to depend partly on the goal. The algorithm

>>>> I would construct to find the next great artist would differ from one

>>>> to find a teacher, mathematician, cancer researcher, brain scientist,

>>>> etc... If you're totally wide open as to subject area, then it seems

>>>> to me you want to cast a wide net.

>>>>

>>>> I would be tempted to try the Bayesian Truth Serum and ask something like

>>>> Pick a really smart friend, who would that person say should win a genius award.

>>>>

>>>> Rather than try to identify people, you might instead seek out

>>>> papers/projects/programs/ideas and then identify the person after the fact.

>>>>

>>>> You might want to consider asking people for the "coolest thing they know that's NOT on the web (yet)

>>>>

>>>> So much filtering and assessment already goes on that most programs

>>>> free ride on that -- giving award to people who have already won

>>>> awards. This suggests that one place to look is at the "losers" -

>>>> contact MacArthur, NIH, NSF, DARPA, GOOGLE, and ask who do you regret not funding?

>>>>

>>>> Once you've got a long list of possibilities you have many options.

>>>> Here are some you may not have considered

>>>>

>>>> You could also pay people on mechanical turk to write up little

>>>> blurbs on each one and then seed them on Facebook, Twitter, etc.. and

>>>> then only look at the ones that get retweeted.

>>>>

>>>> You could use Matt Salganik's pairwise comparison website.

>>>>

>>>> hope this helps. Happy to think more.

>>>>

>>>> scotte

>>>>

>>>> --

>>>> Scott E Page

>>>> University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

>>>> Santa Fe Institute

>>

>

--

please note

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 JEE

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. copyright -all rights reserved