





The Velocity of Significance and Ideation

An Interview with Scott Douglas Jacobsen of Insight Journal, and A Book and Dissertation on the Detection of Profound Giftedness

Author

Author/Editor: [Dr. Mattanaw I.](#), Formerly “[Christopher Matthew Cavanaugh](#)”, Retired

- Masters Business & Economics, Finance, [Harvard University](#) (In Progress)
- B.S. Psychology, [University of Maryland](#)
- B.S. Computer & Information Science, [University of Maryland](#),
- B.A. Philosophy (Nearly Completed, 2003), [University of Maryland](#).
- [Mensa Lifetime Member](#).

Former Chief Architect, [Adobe Systems](#)

Current President, Advisor, and Chief Scientist at Social Architects and Economists International

CEO, Playntext, CEO, PlainText

Contacts:

- cmcavanaugh@g.harvard.edu
- christopher.matthew.cavanaugh@member.mensa.org
- mattanaw@mattanaw.com

Resumé

- [Professional Resumé](#)

Copyright

Copyright© Mattanaw I., the author, for all but the interview questions, and for all editorial work performed and all revisions, and Copyright© Scott Douglas Jacobsen for the Interview Questions in their [original unedited state](#).

Syndication, republication, copying and storage, to any channel or location, is granted to Mr. Scott Douglas Jacobsen, provided there are no alterations to the contents including corrections of errata, provided links are preserved to their destinations on [Book and Journal of Mattanaw](#), and provided no revenue is generated. Any revenue produced by any party excluding the author requires contract.

Permission to use the document for scientific purposes, including comparative case studies, is provided to anyone, provided no revenues are generated, including charitable contributions related to the use, without contract with the author; and, so long as any and all ethical requirements of academic psychology are honored and are correctly planned, and used, and Mr. Scott Douglas Jacobsen also provides his authenticated psychometrics, to be verified by Mattanaw I. Those using this data for the study of intelligence must be included in their studies, else it is unethical. Required ethical disclosure of the experimental details, the ethical rules followed, procedural steps, and the results of the study to any participants in the case study, including the Author is required. It is recommended also to consult Mr. Jacobsen regarding any concerns he might have regarding other uses in any studies, if those studies use writings from other interviews he has conducted in the course of his work, that do not result to data here contained.

This text was sent or is being sent to all the acknowledged.

The Moral Rights of the Author are Hereby Asserted.

One can learn more about Mr. Scott Douglas Jacobsen at Insight Journal using the following links:

- <http://in-sightjournal.com/journal-overview/>
- <http://in-sightjournal.com/in-sight-people/>

Abstract

This article treats of the topics of how one can identify if another person is extremely smart, in the higher range of intelligence, and how one can identify who is a high intelligence charlatan, or else a high IQ person who might pose special risks to others in the general public. The author's relevant background

information is provided so the reader is aware of the author's true personal status regarding immeasurable intelligence. The primary area of interest is the immeasurable range, or the exceptionally and profoundly gifted. Relatedly, this article discusses how someone with very high intelligence might determine whether one is of appropriate company for friendly acquaintanceship for the purpose of mutual development. The informal method presented of making such determinations relates to the communication of significant ideas at high velocity, which is related to immediate problem solving. Over 5/6's of this article, including structure and editing, the total document, was written in twelve days, eleven for content, one for links and final proofreading. The reader will recognize the quality of the content, constituting thought-write-speed data. This means this publication itself is data on velocity of significance and ideation. This informal method is meant to be used by anyone, not only people in the High Intelligence community, because people in the general who might be at the most risk of predatory people are not those who would be in the high intelligence range, although it includes these people as well, as the author knows from dangers he faced. Interview questions from Mr. Jacobsen are answered under this larger theme of utilization of this informal method, which is applicable for the evaluation of historical figures, currently living individuals and oneself, for determining the value of a society membership, for recognizing the true difficulties of really psychometrically evaluating for actual intelligence scores in the immeasurable range, for use in self-protection against false claims, and for determining who might be predatory, either by oneself or through a trusted third party who can create safety. Sometimes this is required to support choices as to who to talk to or be interviewed by. It is then concluded that this informal method will be indispensable until a time when human evaluators, like myself, can be replaced with trustworthy computing systems that can do more advanced and comprehensive neuropsychometrics. Findings include, firstly, that there is a need to discontinue evaluation of historical figures through gossip and guesswork since the result is fabrication of this histories of real people, who's lives are being altered on record disrespectfully; secondly, that an informal method like that described briefly, must be utilized before automation can occur on the same skillsets more technically; thirdly, that those in the immeasurable range are really immeasurable; fourthly, that people are especially at risk of frauds who are founders of societies, particularly those that use home-grown tests, often created by the founders themselves. Future research and writings are expected to be added in new edits to cover the topics of statistical methods for expanding the range of existing tests that do not have norming issues. Additionally this being the first version of this article, the author is well aware of certain omissions and limitations in responses, and intends to return to correct these limitations. Most importantly the author will return to provide more formality to the informal method recommended for checking for the veracity or fraudulent status of individuals claiming to be in the exceptionally and profoundly gifted range. The author intends also to release his available testing from both his results of the Stanford Binet V, and the Wescheler IV, jointly confirming each other's results and in combination establishing immeasurable intelligence. A free copy of this book was or is being circulated to each of the influential figures acknowledged.

Contents

- Author
- Copyright
- Abstract
- Contents
- Edit History
- Acknowledgements
 - Thanks to Special Influences
 - Thanks to Other Authors
 - Thanks to Mr. Scott Douglas Jacobsen
 - Thanks to High Intelligence Community Groups and Friends)
 - Thanks to the First Lady and President, Michelle and Barack Obama
 - Thanks to Friends and Friends
 - Brief Thanks to Selected Colleagues
 - Thanks to My Many Lawyers
- Preface
- Introduction
 - Preparatory Thoughts
- Relevant Personal Background
 - My Retirement, Career, Education, and Interests
 - My History of Psychometric Testing
- Interview, and An Informal Method for Identifying High Giftedness, Using Velocity of Significance in Conversation
 - Opening Response
 - Answer 1: The General Plausibility of Scaling Intelligence, and Our Unfortunate Inability to Create Tests That Can Rank Measure It for the Immeasurable
 - Answer 2: Learning More About Intelligent People, and How they are Measured, and Intelligence Itself
 - Answer 3: Two Pathways in Life, And the Desire to Blend Them
 - Answer 4: Some Comments on Maladaptation at the High Range
 - Answer 5: Testing for Self Understanding, and Focusing on Personal Development
 - Answer 6: The Value of the Mensa Membership from My Perspective
 - Answer 7: Selected Readings of Interest from the Community

- Answer 8 Part I: The Suspension of Inquiry Concerning the Intelligence of Historical Figures
- Answer 8 Part II: The Evaluation of Living Figures
- Answer 9: A Process for Self-Protection from Highly Intelligent or Fraudulent Scammers
- Concluding Response
- Interview Query
- Correspondence
- References
- Admissions Pages of Mentioned Societies
- Glossary

Edit History

- *Final Data. Saturday, August 27th, 2023, 1:06 AM Payson, Arizona Time*
 - MD5: 3bb8464f0552b0aa3067ea1a088cd275
- *Superficial Edits, Minor Additions. Saturday, August 26th, 2023, 11:00 PM Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Proofreading, Links, Code Syntax: Saturday, August 26th, 2023, 10:38 AM Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Friday, August 25th, 2023, Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Thursday, August 24th, 2023, Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Wednesday, August 23rd, 2023, 9:21 PM Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Tuesday, August 22nd, 2023, 9:21 PM Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Tuesday, August 22nd, 2023, 12:16 PM Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Monday, August 21st, 2023, 5:41 PM Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Sunday, August 20th, 2023, 3:16 PM Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Saturday, August 19th, 2023, 2:55 PM Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Friday, August 18th, 2023, 4:38 PM Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Wednesday, August 16th, 2023, 4:38 PM Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Tuesday, August 15th, 2023, 2:23 PM Payson, Arizona Time*
- *Friday, July 1st, 2022, 1:32 PM Alaska Time*
- *Earlier edits from 2020 onward were performed*

Acknowledgements

Below are all those whom I'm grateful for, for various influences that relate to the contents of this text.

Each of the named folks below have received, or will receive, a copy of this text, excepting several members of the intelligence community whom I do not have updated contact information. The best method of contact will be utilized. In any case, I trust this will be received from publication within various shared groups and channels.

Thanks to Special Influences

I want to provide acknowledgement to some key individuals who have provided me support for my intellect in critical ways in formative periods, where I was not myself acknowledged for my own intelligence, despite having already been identified as gifted in youth. These people have been very important for my overall development into a person who has realized nearly completely his own potential. Initially, as a student, I performed very well, but later I became disillusioned with school, and adults, for being largely ignored despite offering kindnesses and obvious intelligence my entire upbringing. In High School I eventually decided to “drop out”, another term I don't like, and get my equivalency diploma (G.E.D). My future appeared somewhat dreary and uncertain at that time, although I was always extremely self-confident and mostly aware of the nature of my abilities. Independent reading and instruction at a local community college [Montgomery College](#) provided a few extremely great instructors who provided exactly the attention I was needing at the right time, and provided acknowledgement of my own distinctive giftedness. At that time, I was also fortunate enough to stumble upon courses on Psychology and Philosophy exposing me to moral philosophy, that included a lineage of thinkers who I already thought much like I did. This brought to my attention minds of people who were really like me finally, who were published because of a thinking style not unlike my own. I had no experience like this in my life until this time and it was like discovering profoundly gifted people that were hard for others to understand thought like I did.

The first I'd like to acknowledge is Bertrand Russell, the deceased eminent philosopher. Upon reading his works, I had the emotional discovery of someone who seemed to be a worthy mentor. I'm not sure all I learned from him, but his influence in my life has been extensive. His works created a pathway for a lifetime love and enjoyment of Philosophy and many other topics, since he was a generalist, and provided me thousands of opportunities for reflecting on a range of topics that I developed from that time to the present day.

Another mentor and teacher who had a great influence is the Philosopher Peter Singer. Peter Singer was an early exposure to professional Moral Philosophy, and convinced me of the importance of expanding our moral behavior to be inclusive of animals. I became a vegetarian in 2000, and vegan in 2001, almost solely due to reflections on his works Practical Ethics, and Animal Liberation. As a result, my buying and eating behavior, and social behavior, have been affected positively for decades, and by reading his

texts, I am especially contented and satisfied with my history of moral behavior, for my greatly diminished responsibility for the harms and sufferings of animals and other people. While reading one of his texts, I reached out to him at Princeton with a kind note, as an external student, simply reading his books without being enrolled in his courses. He was kind enough to respond and the simple and candid message from him is still appreciated and has provided some unknown level of encouragement. Reading his works in the same period of my readings of Bertrand Russell, he has also encouraged my love of book reading, and my desire to write a book of my own, including this one. I've read a number of his other texts and they have each seemed to be truthful and consistent, and worth utilizing for permanent self-alteration.

Mr. Scott Jacobsen, to my surprise, had already recently interviewed Mr. Singer regarding other interests, and I discovered long after Mr. Jacobsen had already written me with his request for interview, after I wrote the above acknowledgement to Singer, for another book I'm completing, more squarely covering moral philosophy. Peter Singer's interview with Mr. Jacobsen can be read in [Insight Journal](#). It was shocking to learn the same person interviewing me recently interviewed one of my favorite authors.

My community college instructor as I said was of special significance to me. This is Shuping Wan, a history professor I had from Montgomery College, a Chinese Immigrant, who gave me much needed attention and validation that was entirely unreceived in my years in High School. His teachings and his encouragements caused me to have durable success in academics after a long period of doing much more poorly before being in his class. He was the first instructor I had who would give highly personalized attention, and I was able to develop a relationship with him while I continued my studies at the college, which were always supportive. Recalling his courses I recognize his influence regarding my propensity to be highly unnationalistic, and my desire to avoid advertising generally to avoid false information. Interestingly for part of my career I found myself in digital marketing, but I shunned television for over a decade to avoid seeing anything too irritating. Advertising is too similar to wartime propaganda in my estimation.

These three people have especially influenced me for longer periods, either through many interactions or from many reading experiences, that were solitary. It is interesting to think of how much time I spent, in particular with Mr. Russell and Mr. Singer simply through paper. Hundreds of hours were spent reflecting on their thoughts and my reactions to them. Bertrand Russell was my first intellectual friend, I thought, at one point. I was recurringly saddened reflecting that he was no longer alive, and that my independent conversations were including a writer of now dead recordings. I think others must have had similar experiences, with authors who were greatly valued but were not available for conversation in real life.

Thanks to Other Authors

I have also been influenced regarding the topic of propaganda and media control by Prof. Noam Chomsky, and like Prof. Singer had a very short email transaction, which was humorously more cranky since my email was a bit rude, which is an irregularity for me (I was young), but his response did also provide some encouragement concerning willingness of various authors to be responsive to inquiries from readers who were enjoying their works.

I would also like to give kind acknowledgement to Mr. Daniel Dennett, author of *Breaking the Spell*, for highly intelligent encouragement regarding my non-commitment to any particular religion, along with Richard Dawkins, author of *The God Delusion*, who wrote a book also supporting my naturalistic and secular outlook. Today I ignore any mention of any deity as a totally unwanted advertising or sales solicitation and encroachment, and focus on the development of my own ethic that is effectively a religion replacement of better quality.

Mr. Dawkins has communicated his experience of death threats from his views, and this was supportive since I would experience the same personally once I gained a certain level of personal eminence. It also relates well to the subject matter of this interview around being cautious of others who might be intelligent but risky individuals, and many of the threats I received like him were via writings received from others.

I am grateful for Prof. Tao, who is working in an abstruse and esoteric field in which few works extend over the last 3 centuries, and without it would no have as much support on my efforts, like Professor Tao, to make changes to the foundations of Mathematics and diversely related fields.

Special thanks to Professor Donald Knuth, of Stanford University, for his publication of the book series *The Art of Computer Programming*, that comprises a life-work of the sort discussed in this book. This book has aided me in the planning of my project of creating a new computing system better founded on a more natural form of mathematics and logic.

Thanks to Charles Murray and Richard Herrnstein, writers of the very controversial work *The Bell Curve*. It is known and understood that the extent of negative publicity and reactivity to this work must have been greatly threatening, and this issue of reader backlash is related to the author's desire to support the diminution of problems faced by the desire to create honest scientific publications that help everyone. I obtained my first copy of the Bell Curve in my teens and remember having it in my possession at 17 years old and perhaps earlier. I fit into a strange demographic, both doing poorly in school, at the time, but also being immeasurably intelligent. Reading the demographics there were indicators that I would do extremely well, or extremely poorly, because dropping out of school I knew I would fall in the lower quartile group of performance in High School, and your publication stated that I would have a higher probability of having less life success. Since this is probabilistic, I did not take it negatively, but many in the public failed to recognize what was utilized was demographic and statistical.

There was no good cause for your being targeted, and your data supported my planning, even at that time, when it indicated I could be at risk.

In the present writing and my present efforts is an application of immeasurable intelligence to works, and to experience relating to the high intelligence community and the public. Even at 17 I thought there were some defects in the Bell Curve relating to global data, and this of course relates to ethics affecting the lives of the entire human population. Here are pieces of information that may be of utility for re-examining existing work, and in any event, in the later version, I will provide more details that relate specifically to The Bell Curve, and the flaws I've noticed that I've only more recently been in a position to provide elucidations for. This work is a preparatory step, with a collaborative mindset. The finding of flaws would not flaw the entire work, and could not; and knowing certain flaws, I am not permitted to join or begin a backlash towards you for your kind and extremely detailed work, that must have included an incredibly large amount of your mental time.

Thank you for supporting the intelligence community and the public with your attempt to compile relevant information that is usable to anyone who *can* continue the work. Here you are in the company of moral philosophers and the sensitive intelligent who are at risk, and I think it possible to cover all the ethical concerns that any may have regarding ramifications of true inferences of your materials and related publications.

Thanks to Mr. Scott Douglas Jacobsen

And of course, I thank Mr. Scott Jacobsen for this kind interview request prompting this writing. I think his efforts will make for a good comparative study, and will enable us to differentiate between those who are honest and those who have fabricated for various reasons including desire for self-elevation. The quality of responses received by Mr. Jacobsen appear to vary greatly as to quality and veracity. This interview has given me a chance to share more about my life than I've written before, and this goal is consistent with my *Book and Journal* that is partly intended to communicate my living autobiography, and his ethics related questions are related to the primary purpose of the site to gradually convey my total system of ethics.

Thanks to Intelligence Community Groups and Friends

Within the High Intelligence Groups there are two I want to especially thank, for their encouragement and friendship. The first is Mr. William Michael Fightmaster Ph.D., Psy.D, recently deceased, whom I visited a number of times at his home in Longbeach, California. When I first joined Mensa, I noticed he was into academic philosophy and psychology, like myself, and quickly on social media we found ourselves in many common conversations and engagements of very high quality. Conversation was better than I experienced in University Philosophy and Psychology course with peers. Through this

quality I think each of us were able to increase the level of community quality for a large number of other participants. He was already doing this on behalf of the community perhaps for years. After his passing the community does not have the same feel it once did, and I'm appreciative of the time I had with him, and his support. A friend with a similar interest and communication style was lost and has not been replaced.

I would also like to thank Mr. Michael Ferguson, who unfortunately very recently passed as well. He is the author of an article here cited *The Inappropriately Excluded* and his writing has had some influence on me and seems true to experience of others who are gifted in the high range, with some agreement to other works discussed in the interview. Mr. Ferguson was clearly very concerned about encouraging inclusiveness for very gifted individuals. We did not know each other well, but did engage in conversation regarding travel, both being retirees. He has also made numerous contributions to our groups and I'm appreciative of having had a chance to speak with this influential writer while he was still living. His passing was unexpected, and it seems he had plans.

I would like to thank Mr. Mark Siegmund, for kind stewardship and support within Mensa's EPG-SIG, the Special Interest Group for the Exceptionally and Profoundly gifted, and Professor Stefan Pettersson of Mid Sweden University, also for his kind stewardship and support relating to Mensa Sweden. Special International thanks too to Mensa New Zealand where I reside part time. Special *unthanks* to Mensa Australia, (or their social media gatekeeper) where I also resided, for *blocking* me instead of approving the request for entry to a Mensa Lifetime Member. I was unable to meet and converse with any Mensa Member in Australia, across much of the country, for having no simple way to converse with the community there.

Thank you to Professor Terence Tao, from UCLA mathematics, for various publications to the American Mathematical Society I found supportive, where we are both members, and for the publication of his book *Analysis I*, which supported me on some inroads into the topic of foundational logic and mathematics, also enabling me with some direction regarding my *Theory of Wanattams* (pronounced "One Atoms" and "Wan Atoms"), binding mathematics, computing, logic, to a new view on scientific realism (Wanattam, 2022).

I want to thank Chris Langan of Mega Society and his wife Gina, for two reasons. First for permitting my publications that relate to my study on editing to be published via their Ultranet group, for some brief but very hospitable chat, and secondly for participating in Malcolm Gladwell's book *Outliers* written partly about him. This section of the book prompted me to get psychometrically tested again after many years, after answering the matrix reasoning contained which was supposedly similar to one provided in a test in which I'm unfamiliar, but also like what's in the Raven. After getting retested I finally joined Mensa in 2014, although I qualified since I was very young. Parental misdirection resulted in my not being attentive to opportunities and I only returned to considering it after reading this book. Of course

thanks as well to Mr. Malcolm Gladwell for writing the book that lead to many personal advancements.

Thanks to Rick Rosner, whom I do not know personally, for introducing humor into the community and for making it clear that self-education includes dissertative thinking. I had one humorous interaction with Mr. Rosner, posting one time that I thought his ingestion of 50 vitamins a day might be a media stunt. Mrs Peters, mentioned below, introduced him to the conversation probably to prevent his malignment, which I agree is a kind move. Mr. Rosner responded, not that he does not ingest 50 vitamins a day, but that he ingests 70! Whether true or not, I now reflect on this as of highly interesting, and speculate that maybe Mr. Rosner is studying the reductionism of biology to its most basic levels as longevity relates to the most basic human life processes. Ostensibly it already is about longevity, but less obviously its about penetrating all of one's personal biology, and he is making himself a living example. Since I do this sort of thing too, having spent time tracking my nutrition due to my vegan diet for many years, including monitoring of some vitamin intake, in what I thought would be my incipient personal information database, my *Personal Form*. Reading this personal form I recommend using Chrome's PDF viewer, scrolling all of the way through to the end to see the development. This document also indicates a desire for precision and metrics, in a variety of [life's categories](#). This also illustrates my interest in life-artefacts which is discussed in the interview. I appreciate this from Mr. Rosner, and especially like his injection of humor even into the most complex of topics. As I write this I'm more curious to explore what he's written for Noesis.

Special thanks to Jonathan Crocker, Ed.D, for kind support on a number of personal and professional matters, for interesting conversation on a number of diverse and interesting topics, and for being an example of positivity in the intelligence community. John and I chat often, and he has direct access to me at all times over satellite. I have no cellular. Only 4 people do. He's a stellar individual.

Special thanks to Nathaniel Bar Fields for many useful introductions and for his kind stewardship of Elysian Trust, and to Roddy Young of New Zealand for his hospitality, and discussions which spurred ongoing thinking that resulted in my concept of [dissertative thinking](#), which relates to the need of the profoundly gifted to have options for equivalency doctorates, and enablement for achievement of many doctorates and not only one. Much is said about my view of dissertative thinking as it relates to significance and the velocity of ideas in the essay and interview.

Thanks for Paul Cooijmans, of Giga Society, whom I talked with regarding my purchasing of one of his tests for the high range, for his publications against bullying, including his personal history being bullied for being extremely gifted as a child, and for his interest and efforts at exploring new ways for those in the higher ranges to achieve self-understanding. Thanks also for some kind interactions as an acquaintance on social media.

I would also like to thank my many friends, acquaintances, and readers, who have provided good

encouragement over the years, and rewarding conversation in and from Mensa, Intertel, Elysian Trust, Triple Nine Society, Prometheus, Olympic, and Mega, and others. Special thanks to Karyn Hunting Peters, Editor and Former President of Prometheus Society, and the skilled admin team at HighIQ World, for founding and running an extra special community that has provided many exceptional experiences, online and face-to-face, making my venture into the high intelligence community in 2014 especially worthwhile and welcoming.

I am also thankful for my various societal memberships and groups themselves, and will discuss my views concerning the benefits of Mensa when that question arises below, in the main interview.

For those who are omitted, don't think I did not think of you or won't! I have a large network especially of former colleagues and have to spend time finding a way to include everyone.

Brief Thanks to Selected Colleagues

I have had so many colleagues over the years it will be a great challenge to select, so firstly I just want to thank all who have been kind and supportive in various ways. In the future, since more time will be available, for the upcoming print copy of this book, I will be able to include more individuals.

Thanks to David Hassoun and June Heider of Dolby Labs. These two colleagues and customers were of great support over the years, and I'm glad to still have great relations with them since our first meeting to collaborate on a [digital evidence solution between Adobe and Motorola Systems in which I was functioning as Chief Architect](#). Both David and June were running RealEyes Media, a trusted company that was a partner of Adobe on a number of *extremely* important initiatives. I was happy to discover they were acquired by Dolby in the somewhat recent past. Before the acquisition I was happy to provide kind support having them and their clients as customers. They are very intelligent people and I'm glad to have them around to potentially talk with, even if there are some passages of time.

Thanks to Brian Paget, creator and CEO of MeetMoji.com, former CTO-team at Adobe, CTO at SAP NS2, and Executive at Amazon. I've had the unique opportunity to support his recent efforts on an interesting startup I think others should know about called MeetMoji, which creates better communication and engagement with personality, enhancing software like Teams and Zoom that became especially popular during the coronavirus outbreak, making remote contact necessary! He's extremely intelligent and pleasant to talk with, and builds on conversation in a way that is uncommon, highly collaborative, and kind, exhibiting strong velocity of significance and ideation, which is the subject matter of this paper. I can see his product MeetMoji that is intended to provide inclusiveness and increased opportunity for self-expression, relating to the StopBullying Campaign, discussed in my thanks to FLOTUS/POTUS.

Thanks to Adam Kris, for many years working together on deals with stellar people. Work with Adam has supported the growth of both my company and my understanding of software related contract law and legal services. Without him I would not have met some of the amazing people and organizations I was able to be involved, including Mayo Clinic.

Thanks to My Many Lawyers

I would like to thank my Lawyers, Robert Regis, Tom Amodio, Kevin Boots, Kevin Fitzgerald, and Jimmy White for various areas of support over the last six years. Without your assistance I would still feel attacked by politicians and activists, and feel much more safe and comfortable than if I did not have your support. I speak to an extent on my handling of my Divorce proceedings, and my Land Related Case that had media and political attention, as you know, while I was a politician, in the State of Alaska. As a result I'm a trained lawyer, pro-se of course, but I could not have achieved that without your mentorship, and critical protections in times where acting on my own behalf is impossible. Sometimes I wonder how you all feel about the observation and re-use of legal materials, although I learned it is somewhat normal in the profession. Thank you for any examples of quality you've provided. Probably you did not expect being included on an article related to immeasurable intelligence, but this is who you were protecting and it will do good for the intelligence community at large, and the public, since this writing offers them special protections for self-understanding. The risks posed to my well-being were not only due to the politicians and activists, who are extremely numerous and dangerous, simply targeting me for having acquired a property creating social status, but activists and neighbors who became jealously aware of my intelligence and friends and family who turned on me during divorce. Additionally there were *entirely unrelated* social attacks digitally from people scattered across a number of countries, and while I can deal with that I cannot deal with everything. Huge incredible thank you! You are all personally amazing and noticeably highly intelligent, and are great people to know and talk to.

Additionally, as a result of this publication I may need your ongoing aid and assistance, since attacks come from all over, and your domains of expertise each come into relation.

It was an interesting experience having various financial and personal documents exposed as a result of this action, but this was not incompatible anyways with my extreme level of transparency and openness, which is already on my *Open Health and Identity*. This turned out favorably, and will be incorporated into **My Book and Journal* further. But presciently perhaps, there may have work to do regarding others, to add some humor!

Thanks to the First Lady and President, Michelle and Barack Obama

An extra special thanks must be provided to the individuals who provided me opportunity to deliver on

an initiative they created that is of great importance, the [StopBullying campaign](#), Michelle and Barack Obama. While working at [ASPA for the Secretary of Health](#) in 2010/2011, then Secretary Sebelius, I had an opportunity in a key role, to complete and deliver the StopBullying website under tight deadline. In this job I was also delivering PR materials for various other politicians of significance. The completion and release of [StopyBullying.gov](#) enabled me the pleasure to provide the steps necessary for a new announcement of this campaign publicly, and it was amazing to see the President and First Lady announcing my finished product on television together, speaking about the importance of reducing bullying and for providing assistance to those who may be experiencing chronic harassment, especially children.

I recall this work and now think about the relevance of that campaign, that is still living, and what it means for gifted education and protection of the minds of the profoundly intelligent, which is relevant to this publication. The profoundly gifted are often those who are profoundly sensitive and have a greater understanding and appreciation of ethics and care, and are willing to support others who don't exhibit that same level of giftedness, in the full range of individuals from those who may be disabled to the very smartest people who might be their peers.

As President and First Lady, I know you were both bullied too, by members of the public who are disrespectful to their own process outcomes of voting. As a politician in the state of Alaska, I too faced extreme bullying and have at least some understanding of what you may have experienced yourselves. It is odd that a campaign to support everyone regarding harassment would apply to the public harassment of those who kindly created it.

I was fortunate to work on your behalf for other initiatives closer to your direct experience, like your [HealthCare.gov](#) initiative, and other efforts relating to subsequent presidents too, later, which I am grateful for. These other ones cannot be mentioned in this document at present, but relates to security and briefing, for your administration and inheriting administrations. There is a legacy!

Our [Stop Bullying](#) work relates directly to managing various threats that could exist from individuals who become dangerous bullies. Experiencing first-hand many dangerous situations being targeted myself, for bullying by adults in various communities mentioned later, I'm aware that the importance of this campaign extends into adulthood into death.

Again many thanks to the President and First Lady, two obviously highly intelligent and compassionate figures, who indirectly involved me in this project delivering a message that is now more important to me than it ever has been, over a decade later.

[Thanks to Friends and family](#)

I would like to give special thanks to Alex Karakcheyev, Robert Calabro and their families including their extended families for great times over the years and abundant support. They were both colleagues at Health and Human Services who remain good friends to this day. Robert actually mentioned to me at work that I should consider joining Mensa, without knowing I had already been tested as a small child. Upon mentioning it I wasn't sure if I should say I was tested, so didn't mention it. Later recollections of this conversation contributed to my inclination to get tested later, but was a more distal catalyst since so much time had elapsed before my later adult tests.

There are many others I would like to thank, including old family and other friends, and my parents for other great support, but for that I would direct readers to my [acknowledgements](#) section of the *Book and Journal of Mattanaw*. This acknowledgement page will become my universal acknowledgement page for all my sub-books of the *Book and Journal of Mattanaw*.

A Note Regarding Applicability of this Essay's Contents

Those organizations and people I mention in my acknowledgements who have relationships with the high intelligence community are not immune in any way from the considerations in this paper, which applies both to myself and everyone else, which is important for me to state since even though I have ample respect, especially for those I acknowledge, I do not have so much respect as to fail to apply truthful thinking to all contexts; what is favorable is ready to be received by others, but this paper must cover some that is unfavorable, and whatever happens to apply and does apply, does apply. I apply this style of thinking, too, to politics and nationalism, and I'm strongly non-nationalistic. That I'm from the United States does not immune the United States in any way from my critical thinking and any truths that may be applied or even borrowed or learned in other nations. Anyone in the communities, like other large groups, must be aware of limitations of their groups and individuals contained. Like in the workplace, sometimes cultishness grows under a brand, and people become brand enthusiasts and allocate trust incorrectly to all within and all guiding that brand. It's like the workplace that speaks for all employees in public relations stating that as a rule they only have particular values, which of course were invented by those workplaces. Employee behavior is explained away, and the organization pretends propaganda results in uniform elimination of crime and poor ethics. There is nothing that I am not willing to apply true thinking to, including to friends and supportive organizations that have characteristics that are dubious, for whatever is specifically dubious. That is important regarding the objective of the interview, to convey the various ways that one might be scammed in groups that contain people who lie to you, and to us. If this were not the case, there would be a prescriptive reason separate from behavior that could be provided, that would state something like "everyone in our group and its founder would never do that" which is strictly unintelligent prejudice. If such were true, then there would be a very great level of goodness that would separate the group from the general population, that consistently exhibits misbehavior. Questions that exist in this interview would not be posed to me, if

there were not *existing* risks of cultishness, crime, scamming, and personal or group fraud. Probably everyone reading this now has been subjected to some kind of digital harassment and it is a mistake to think this and other behaviors would be absent from all groups at a certain size.

The above may sound somewhat harsh, but is ethically upright, and is simple intelligent thinking about one's context, and includes a willingness to let anything that is applicable apply to whatever it applies to. Else one is not scientific. All that is healthy, safe, helpful, honest, and truthful, is also applicable wherever it applies, and it certainly applies to the people mentioned above with variety and specificity which is the cause for their being included in the Acknowledgement, and for this I'm quite thankful. People and groups are divisible and sometimes an admixture of the above is present, and it is my view that we ought to think about communities with this in view, without having a prescriptive blanket outlook, that all that a particular group or society does, is consistent goodness. In this way most of our culture can and should be criticized, and without thinking thusly, the intelligent mind is blocking its own inclinations.

Preface

This essay is a response to a kind interview request from Mr. Scott Douglas Jacobsen of Insight Journal, on various topics of interest relating to the experiences of people of high ranging intelligence (Ref: [First](#), and [Second Correspondence](#)). He has posed a number of questions that are of good interest to the high intelligence community, and others who might have concerns about the credibility of certain intelligent figures. Seeing relationships between the various questions posed by Mr. Jacobsen, I have chosen, instead of only answering each individually, to provide a single combined response in an essay format, with a title germane to the conversation. The numbered, lightly deburred and reorganized set of questions themselves can be found at the end of the article, along with the original textual request and [correspondence](#). The [Contents](#) provides an index to the answers, which have titles for responses to questions. The questions are placed in-context, since they are longer and are not well suited for organization of the contents requiring succinct listing. The questions themselves, go along with the answers in the essay, but also appear at the end in the [Interview Query](#).

The [original request](#) is a standard interview with normal interview questions. Although a normal candid interview has qualities that are worthwhile, my answers and their seriousness deserve context that both informs the reader of my background and way of thinking about the relationships between all questions. This required me to develop on the topic of the velocity of the significance of ideas. The result, I hope, is a combination of a conveyance of a binding thesis and the retention of the feel of a normal interview.

Citations are in partial APA format. Any part of a cited document may be mentioned in passing using a variety of in-sentence styles, but can be easily located in the [references](#) section without confusion.

The [Glossary](#) contains items that are defined, but there are expansions on the terms to provide important conceptual discussion and implications.

There are many links from this document to substantiating documents on [Open Health and Identity](#), to [\[Customer References\]](#)[\[http://www.mattanaw.com/work-and-career-recommendations.html\]](http://www.mattanaw.com/work-and-career-recommendations.html) and other pages with various life artifacts. It is suggested that the readers familiarize with these pages and the contents, to get additional information on these documents, a survey of what exists, like my [OPM Breach Document](#) in order to fully recognize the extent of what is being shared. I only share here, what relates to this text, but in future editions and future upcoming books, these same references will support the readerships understanding. My intelligence scores, to be shared in the next edition of this book, will appear also be shared in [Open Health and Identity](#). To save time, some documents are not directly linked to, so some scrolling may be required. This would give opportunity to see some related materials, too, however, that have not been directly linked but are still relevant to the contents.

You'll notice as you read that this Journal is like a web of interrelated digital evidence, artifacts, and documents of relevance, somewhat like a personal online encyclopedia. As will be demonstrated by this work and in this work, this Journal will become an example of what human productivity is capable of at the highest possible intelligence and talent. This book is a sub-book or issue of the [Book and Journal](#). One will be able to buy print issues and the entire copy. This book in digital format will have an upcoming print edition with new materials. All issues will interrelate and this is a characteristic different from Encyclopedias like the Encyclopedia Britannica and academic journals, increasing quality, since all relates cohesively and one work is related to the others, omitting of course that specific articles of research from other authors can be of amazing quality. They just don't interrelate with entire Journal content, created by the *same individual* providing that quality. Writings productions rates will be shown to be such that this Journal will exceed in size the Encyclopedia Britannica. Again this demonstrates the immeasurable giftedness of the author, myself, which matches with intelligence scores and ideas explained in this text.

The [Book and Journal of Mattanaw](#) is over one million words and has incremented by 67,000 words in just twelve days. One can confirm by downloading the entire Book and Journal, now over 575 gigabytes. I allow for scientific processing of the sites data, and programmatic download can be done, but with much difficulty due to network bandwidth.

This book was written using a solution I created for the iPhone 12 Pro Max, with a peripheral lightweight bluetooth keyboard, carried while ultralight camping (although I was sedentary in Payson, Arizona). My normal word processing system and software solution I created is used on my Mac Air. I'm much faster on the desktop system than using this phone based system meant only for lightening my weight for travel, and this reduced the total output of this twelve day period of writing. Both quality of output and speed is increased using my complete software system on my laptop computer.

The entire software solution I've created for the distributed architecture will be shared openly, as a fork of the proprietary source code, open sourcing the entire solution I use. It will not enable anyone to achieve the same speed that requires my intelligence. But it will enable eventually, if plans come to fruition, a method for people to preserve their life histories. It will be seen in my answers that I am archiving the lives of some deceased figures of the intelligence communities as part of the same effort. Currently this is not easy, but I will describe more about that in the next edition of this book. It will be available on Amazon and my [Book and Journal](#) at [Mattanaw.org](#).

I anticipate some negative hostility from some readers, and simply note I have a background in computer security, and denial of service is impossible. I can recreate the site indefinitely and do not need 99.9% uptime. This relates to the question nine from Mr. Jacobsen regarding scamming, and safety, and is a reason why I find this interview and its answers to be of importance. My site did have a denial of service after the sudden death of a senator who trespassed on my property and the property of my neighbor, who created an access lawsuit expanding his gate blocking wealthy and locally famous neighbors from the State Park that is my backyard of my 80-acre retirement property in Alaska. There was also a slanderous article written about me and negative media attention at that time, called [One Man's Mountain](#), commenting that I owned the nearby mountain itself, trying to inflame activists. This mountain is McHugh Peak.

My architectural methods are a challenge to computer security and I can demonstrate eventually superiority through openness. I mention later that I had a title and role similar, but not the same as Edward Snowden. Being interested in security, does not imply I'm interested in hacking or leaking data, or do anything outside the normal use of browsers in the "light web" if one can call it that. Instead I'm interested in keeping to myself and gradually conveying a new security model that I use myself as an example. It will be demonstrated gradually that openness creates a better and more aware strategy of self-protection. This constitutes a challenge to the security profession but not a risk. It will improve it.

I have an open identity and unlike all, I can establish my identity and authenticate with this website. This also provides a datum in which to support authentication of my writings, and can be used to check against writing elsewhere, for plagiarism, and to counter claims of plagiarism. Since the velocity of significance and ideation and is so high, and my vocabulary uniquely superior (maximal verbal intelligence at greater than the 99.89th percentile to an unknown much higher percentile), exhibiting maximally improbable thinking, other writers would not be able to use the content effectively. I also include unusual word constructions that are linguistically correct but do not appear in dictionaries, and have a history of word coining, like Shakespeare. Unfortunately for Shakespeare, his works are not as verifiable.

Tone, style and density vary throughout, which is something I thought to preserve rather than alter. In a hybrid essay/interview format, it makes sense to use a denser style, in alternation with some chattiness.

This will give the reader a sense as to change in personality in highly intelligent folks, and this is supportive of their needs, and should encourage better expectations from others concerning their communication.

This also relates to the velocity of significance of ideas. Sometimes a non-academic style of communication has a greater velocity of information conveyance with simple speech, although this is often not recognized by listeners or readers. Other times, even simpler chat is welcomed and relaxing, and is a necessity in regular life, when new people meet for the first time and conveying too much significance is inappropriate. In some prior interview's with Mr. Jacobsen, this may explain some very short responses. Also in day-to-day interactions in the marketplace, one will use the same simple means of expression others use, and of course this is not something to peruse as evidence in itself against someone to confirm their non-giftedness. The profoundly gifted and regular people combine to use the same expressions. Those who are highly gifted can simply switch to more rapid development of ideas and significance when they want to. A requirement however, is that they can.

Being the first edition of this essay it is expected there will be necessarily overlooked errata. Readers are kindly asked to overlook certain blemishes to read through to the meaningfulness of responses, in a way that is not unlike real interactions in actual conversations, that usually contain many auditory and grammatical issues. If large logical errors are included that appear inadvertent, they probably are, and it would be greatly supportive if readers can use my [correspondence](#) information to contact me for corrections. If errors are merely typographical or punctuation related, there is no need to inform me as eventually I will notice them, after effects of automatic anticipatory sentence completion are overcome with time between edits.

This work will be more clear than works like that provided by Philosophers who have fame who were ambiguous, and torturous to read, like Martin Heidegger and Hegel, who are not only incomprehensible, they were incomprehensible due to their writing.

Introductory sections on my background and psychometric history are important for getting the most out of interview questions because then you'll recognize my authoritativeness and credibility, and that is important because readers of a text on intelligence would and should be especially suspicious. Once the authority and credibility is established, with background information and psychometrics in mind, the interview questions asking for guidance will make more sense, particularly since portions of the same information will be intermixed, but then out of context. The first sections are "context building" so you know me well enough to know where the answers are coming from. However, the casual reader can skip these to immediately jump question to question to see what might be of interest. Since there is good density the reader may want a second time running through the contents and in that second reading, it is useful to have those contextual readings complete. I think this is a good process for reading the text if initially there is not enough time or interest, but another reading is wanted at a later time. If not all is read

however, one cannot have a complete understanding of this document and responses, and anyone who sends along questions may be redirected to excerpts of the text, not out of any desire to not answer questions, but out of a desire to be fully listened to and comprehended, where comprehensions were missing. This is an expected way of responding when interviewers or listeners did not read material in which answers were provided, with great effort and care.

Some blemishes have been planned for, in fact, worthy of inclusion. Firstly, this provides opportunity to see reactions of readers who might not be understanding of small blemishes, and to separate them from those who listen and read through good quality communications to find meaning, wanting to both understand, and protect the writer or speaker, from thinking such blemishes reflect on their cognitive abilities and skills. Speech includes blemishes, but this is overlooked as we listen carefully. Grammar of spoken sentences has conveniently been overlooked by English teachers, who are punitive when they see mistakes in writing. This viewpoint of the author is supportive even of these English teachers, who will make mistakes when they speak with family. The full range of communications arise in the total productions of the human mind, and these blemishes tell use about the kinds of things nervous system's are doing while they try to share the most meaningful things that can be said, wherever and however they are communicated. Including deliberate superficial blemishes here speeds my publication, but also shows the reader the kinds of mistakes I make, showing also my support for the kinds of mistakes they will make. Together the contribution creates data in which to understand thoughts more precisely and scientifically.

If you keep a journal it is interesting to read your earlier thoughts because sometimes it appears to come almost from someone else, another version of you. A personal journal is a living autobiographical datum of earlier versions, and sometimes earlier versions are surprisingly rational. These rational earlier versions of your provide data about your, velocity of significance of ideas if well written and well thought, and self-mentoring from someone who both knows you, and appears old. This may not be the case for all, but it is the case for myself, and I'm certain it would be discovered to be the case for others who choose to write a log with discipline, similar to logs like I've kept for myself, like my *Book and Journal*, which is a culmination of earlier, more regular and standard self journaling, but with prescience, *Rational Times*.

This book was written in just twelve days, only eleven of which were for content; well, more than 5/6th of the book. This has *not* diminished the quality of the meaning, and indefinite time would not improve what is here included at this same length. Altering and editing would reduce the value of including what I could only think until now, and this essay includes changes as to mood and mentality which result in differing valuable data not altered by editing which results in gaslighting of data. Editing retroactively changes data. A certain amount of editing is necessary but too much alters too greatly the data needing to be conveyed. That so much was written in so short a time makes it so the entire article itself is data for its own thesis. It makes its own argument. It is not possible for those who are not immeasurably intelligent

to produce a work so quickly. The published book will include new good information, but this essay is canonical.

The 1/6th of this article written earlier, around the time Mr. Jacobsen first sent the interview, imagines him or a student more of the audience, than someone else in the societies. Notes are provided for answers to these questions, explaining why they have not been changed to match the tone of the remainder of the book written more recently. These sections show my mentoring capability, and kindness for supporting others in a way that is parental, even if I'm young. What is interesting, is these sections exhibit my manner of thinking when I was mentoring even as a teen. I had a tendency to be more parental even as a kid, particularly to my early friends who were close. It is interesting just how different these sections are from the rest of the article that is more scientifically supportive, and more intellectual. These seem more like hands on support of nice people, and read very differently from the rest, but are still of very good significance, delivered in an educator's disposition. These are my answers to questions two and three. I have ever-so-lightly touched these articles to provide thesis relevance, but otherwise wanted to retain them as data of unchangeable history. At the time of circulating this first edition, it will be locked so as to establish it as the data of my mind to the last date recorded in the [edit history](#).

The reader is asked kindly to be somewhat patient regarding certain topical omissions of importance, since the author is aware of many and will prepare a new edition soon to cover many of them. For example, it is known that there are many more ways people are individually affected by intelligence testing than those topics mentioned, particularly as they relate broadly to ethics and moral philosophy. Since I am a moral philosophy, I am aware of a very great range of connecting ethical issues that deserve treatment. The questions from Mr. Jacobsen control the scope of the conversation, but I would agree that covering more ethical areas of interest would still benefit the overall interview.

Additionally, it is known that the thesis utilizing my conception of "velocity of significance of ideas" within my informal method of analysis requires more scientific rigor, and it is hoped the reader recognizes my background in Psychology includes an extensive understanding of conceptual and logical validities, meaning again that I'm aware both that the rigor is required and what is required to make it rigorous. Furthermore, I'd like to cover the topic of Cognitive Biases as they relate to repeated false self-affirmations people make about their own personal psychometric scores, sometimes shared with others for many years, that were either not obtained with justifiable measures or were fabrications. Once one has communicated a particular score, or has stated one has a score one does not really have, I think many are very disinclined to honestly come forward with the truth later if it is not correct, and instead rationalize it. I will discuss methods of rationalizations and truth avoidance I've witnessed in detail in the next book edition.

Additionally, I am aware that there is less treatment of the statistical disadvantages of tests designed for the upper ranges, like those exceeding the range of the Stanford Binet V, or the Wescheler. Some of these

test that have not been normed with large populations of test takers, that apparently have more acceptance nevertheless than more questionable test of the upper range, need a fuller discussion concerning the scientific methods used and their limitations. The effects of having fewer Psychologists administering these tests must also be considered in detail. I accept that scaling of tests is in-principle how people would continue testing to see what their true range is after they have attained maximal scores on common tests like the Stanford Binet, but I would not agree that existing tests designs really do provide scaling that permits the omission of confirmation of quality through a sufficient test pool from the general public. Instead it appears to me that it is better to admit, until better tests are created, that it is better to admit one is immeasurable and that one cannot know one's true score as it relates to the remainder of the population.

Finally, intelligence measures do not appropriately measure growth rates of the brain and learning performance longitudinally, and this needs to be addressed, particularly because organizations like Google, from my understanding on incomplete explorations of the topic, has chosen to favor an ability to iterate and improve, and show development, over intelligence scoring alone. This is important as there may be evidence that those who are active and productive in technology and academia may be outperforming some who may measure a bit higher on other psychometric tests than they would. Personally I would prefer to hire a profoundly active and developing mind than one that is stagnant even if *all things considered equal*, the stagnant individual has a higher intelligence score on paper and is in the exceptionally and profoundly gifted range. This would be an example of a highly gifted person who, for various reasons, or for various deficiencies unrelated to intelligence, does not learn as effectively as expected over time, for having less power to iteratively improve on skills, and use those skill to create self-created feedback loops. Ethics of the workplace and hiring, and merit based inclusiveness needs to be further considered.

I would also like to address topics such as international intelligence, related national and racial topics (here it must be said that all large populations for all nations and races includes examples of immeasurable intelligence), topics related to the education of children and effects of impoverishment on testing, the desirability of promoting procreation among the especially intelligent, and other topics the reader could probably call to mind easily, for being controversial.

A copy of this work was or is being being sent to each of the acknowledged, according to those various means available to me. Readers and the acknowledge are then aware that they have mutually read the documents, which may create opportunities for various synthetic collaborations I see that are possible, and this authenticates my desire for relevancy and honesty of acknowledgement. This provides me some assurance that the next edit of the book will provide ample feedback from key readers, and a chance to answer any concerns that might arise in the newest edition. All correspondence will be archived. There are numerous ethical considerations that will be presented in the next version of this text.

Introduction

Preparatory Thoughts

This entire essay and interview could potentially be summarized as an attempt at determining how one might know or discover if someone is extremely intelligent or not, acting on one's own behalf, particularly at the highest levels of intelligence. While it might seem as though this is a simplistic issue that can be solved observing standardized tests, and perhaps some appraisal of historical or autobiographical information, this would not be adequate because it would be incomplete, and many people with special interests in knowing with greater detail the authenticity of certain authority figures claiming maximum intelligence would be put at risk and would be unable to find answers. One question posed by Mr. Jacobsen more difficult to resolve, paraphrasing, is whether one is a charlatan of IQ, or a kind of cult leader, even if this person apparently has made it into high IQ societies, and apparently has some autobiographical support. These people do exist, and I've come across them, and they are not easy to identify with certainty by members of the public. This is of special interest within the high IQ community that does know that people can slip in who do not belong, and members of the public who are misinformed by the often fabricated intelligence scores of living and historical figures. Personally I have been of interest, being also immeasurable, to risky individuals coming from within the High IQ community, who also claim profound giftedness but are certainly fakes. This included real risks to my person and well-being, and reached into personal life. Outside of the high IQ community, there are also concerns about highly intelligent people who can be special risks to others, either by defrauding people with a false persona, or by using their intelligence which cannot be well detected against them in ways that are malicious.

Of interest in this interview is answering "Who is or was a genius really?", although I greatly dislike this word and recommend its [disuse](#), and do not apply it to myself. The public has been misinformed regarding many influential figures of the past and are ready to ascribe intelligence estimations, despite the permanent poverty of data regarding these people. They oftentimes were never tested for intelligence. An example of figures for whom there are no intelligence figures are Isaac Newton and Albert Einstein. Despite lacking information, people nevertheless persist in applying large intelligence numbers ad nauseam pretending to know without data what their numbers would be and how they would compare with other historical figures. Interest in the sloppy application of fabricated scores to deceased people and living people of prominence leads to recollection of IQ values that are very high, results in a willingness to self-apply those same values. Here we learn about how to compare individuals more effectively and to compare oneself with people who might be extremely intelligent using an informal conversational method evaluating for the velocity of significance and ideation. Such an evaluation would lead individuals to recognize that they cannot have the scores of the profoundly gifted, and would allow them to understand that the process of identification informally really requires someone who is nearly as

gifted to provide estimates. The general population is unable to estimate the intelligence of any figure historical or presently living and must rely on third parties to provide the information. This creates risk for the same misinformation that is presently happening of depending on propaganda and advertising for understanding the relative intellectual eminence of certain people of interest. This topic is given extensive treatment later in the my conversation with Mr. Jacobsen.

The mode of expression of this book is related to the evaluation the reader might want to make about my intelligence, and I want the reader to have an immediately useful example of what I recommend to look for in the informal method of checking for the velocity of significance and ideation. I've made decisions about how to communicate in order that provide insight into how the highly intelligent may choose to relay information variously, although because I don't expect only the profoundly gifted to read this document, it is not the very best example of density of thought.

In order to create a greater readability and sense of the interrelationships between questions, and to provide something usable to anyone in the public, I have answered in a more in-depth essay format. Simply answering the questions would not allow me opportunity to share my tendency to problem solve in a synthetic interdisciplinary and interrelational fashion. This too relates to the above paragraph, since the reader wanting a tool for evaluation needs to understand that a person of high intelligence would want to do this. The quality of responses using this technique provide additional authentication of myself, and a good informational data set contribution to Mr. Jacobsen's existing responses that exist in Noesis, the Journal of the Mega Society. This will allow for a comparative study that is necessary to provide additional examples of varying levels of intelligence and samples of fraud.

An unwillingness to answer interview questions plainly without adding complexity of the mind would be a common trait of the profoundly gifted. How people answer questions is already how people typically get a feel for if someone is smart or not. Some of the earlier interviews include answers from people who I think will be identified as fabricators of varying degrees and on varying points. This essay will be edited periodically with additions as other important and relevant pieces of information come to mind that provide even greater clarity on this objective of providing sufficient contrast, so we can more clearly discern who is more intelligent and not. More will be said on this showing that I am still ethically sensitive as to the content of interviews coming from others including those who may have included fabrications of various kinds.

This question also relates to an interest some in the community have, for determining how smart their peers are and whether their peers appear to be people worth commingling with. Some repetitively claim [genius](#) status and create the appearance of being someone worth special attention. Established group leaders appear in social media groups and seem to be "always around" because of their status as administrators or moderators who's profiles are too visible. This creates what in marketing would be considered a large set of advertising impressions and the result is one becomes very aware of who they

are, without knowing anything about their intelligence. They convey an authority to purge members as they desire, creating a willingness of members to try to please them. Some of these administrators are certainly fabricators claiming not only leadership but also the highest level of intelligence commensurate with it. Leadership in the community is not really supposed to be related to having the highest intelligence, but kind stewardship. The very smartest members may not have interest in leadership. Oftentimes those in leading roles, are simply uncommunicative so one has no way to analyze their conversation to see if the praise they receive is deserved, but in any case. Criteria to become an administrator is not available to members. Later we'll see that maximum communication is required to provide evidence if one is claiming that one is a [genius](#); either in density of information or in quantity of high quality, jointly creating evidence of [velocity of significance and ideation](#). If one cannot, it is akin to claiming one is the "very smartest" but never saying anything. Some leaders of large groups really do say nothing at all, and by saying this I put myself at risk of being inappropriately dismembered, to provide some humor.

Once in the High Intelligence Community, one still has to evaluate others regarding risks of continued contact, including with these "leaders", and evidence is required to understand the nature of their authority, which means the production of various personal psychometrical artifacts, society memberships (since some groups are peripheral to the real intelligence organizations), and communication with a *very high velocity of significance and creativity* providing direct information for users who should be somewhat awestruck again and again. Otherwise they are unethically using their authority in a way to have a following that simultaneously believes in their messianic intellectualism, without providing anyone the opportunity of hearing from them, like a diety who does not answer communications or the Wizard of Oz.

At this point for disclosure I must state I am not a leader of any high intelligence community and so have been subjected, like an ordinary member, to unusual exposure to community leaders claiming immeasurable intelligence like mine who offer little evidencing quality of writing or speech containing ingenuity. This should be visible in public conversations where there is an audience and many potential participants and not only in concealed locations or in specific journal publications like this one. I am very active in the community and my many writings are popularly shared. I am certainly well-known in the community. My productivity creates a datum that any user can utilize to perform some good appraisal of my intelligence particularly if used in conjunction with my [Book and Journal](#). The primary willingness to write to others well in an open format is because a profoundly gifted mind that is highly productive will be flowing with thinking that is of this quality anyway. It takes no effort to produce and is part of my normal kind conversational style. However, nowadays, I also deliberately provide more content so the public has more information to use in order to truly evaluate my credibility, and I'm aggregating data on my textual contributions so as to have more substantiation of my own scores. Much more will be said about this in the main interview.

It must be mentioned that there are leaders who do interact a bit more than others, and there is a ranging on this point, but there are some who really are uncommunicative and appear to be generally unproductive. Those who might need to decide if these leaders are trustworthy have insufficient information for using the conversational evaluation method mentioned in this text.

The pathway into the intelligence community is not so strict as to prevent people from providing false documentation, and any and all societies that do have a rigorous approach, will still have people slip through with falsified original document copies. There is no Digital Rights Management with traceability existing for documents with intelligence scores, which is something I know about having been Chief Architect at Adobe Systems involved in digital evidence, and for my own organization that guides a large multinational corporations. My initial title at Adobe Systems was *Partner Solutions Consultant* which is a similar title to that of Edward Snowden. Some scrolling is required to review all relevant materials. Documents used for admissions are loose papers, and one can use white-out and put a new score on someone else's originals, or using other approaches kids use in high school to hide grades from parents. That's something I never did(!) but all are aware that this is easy to do. I've had a leader of a High IQ Community, lesser known, claiming very high intelligence scores, asking to see my psychometric exams, possibly to re-use my tests. It certainly seems the case that there is good risk of fraudulent admissions, using realistic documents or altered copies of originals.

Known figures are often unknown regarding their intelligence in these communities, because directories list their names but not their scores to see that they are members. One group leader in a peripheral community, who I like, informed me that her members are not all evaluated, and family members are granted admittance. I considered once becoming an administrator of this group after being asked if I wanted the responsibility by another member who is of good quality who also recognized the quality of all my communications with many members and himself. People who say they are in Mensa fail to appear in Mensa listings, and unfortunately, Mensa has separate directories for its international organization and for its subgroups for specific countries. However, they do a fairly good job with their directories and offer a good example for the total community, and are not unlike other groups in which I belong like IEEE, the American Mathematical Association, and Harvard University. All of their directories are comparable, and it may be expected that people are not always listed.

Misrepresentation is easy because people claim they are in when they are not, or say they "lapsed membership dues" but membership dues are cheap and can permanently establish intelligence lifelong, at an easy payment of about \$75 dollars a year or less. One can be impoverished and afford it. Seeing one person say it who really is a lapsed Mensan creates an example to follow for someone who is not to create plausibility. I have a [Lifetime Mensa Membership](#) and am visible both in the American and International Mensa directories. I am globally verifiable in Mensa by real Mensa members, since access to the directories are not open.

Apart from establishing membership credibility some people are just as unknowable as historical figures delivering fragments of content and no confirmable artifacts of any kind. Contrast this with being [open with identity](#). We have insufficient information concerning them. Productivity with artifacts of certification matters to establish authority in intelligence. Later there will be extensive discussion on the relationships between artifactual productivity and intelligence, both for living and for historical figures. One has to be a bit of an archaeologist or historian to understand the extent to which some are unforthcoming. One can be a silent leader and leave a tombstone stating “I was in Mensa” only.

Within the societies one largely trusts the admissions process, but one has to be cautious about specific individuals. One can not obtain the same personal information originally submitted to the societies for admittance. It is treated as PII (personally identifiable information) or health information by members seeking privacy, and one is disallowed to use it in college admissions, although it replaces any need oftentimes for scholastic tests—but one can use it for entry into the community. People can share with you their SAT score, but they won’t tell you their psychometrics. Contrast this with sharing it for [Harvard Graduate Admissions](#) and for obtaining employment and customers with as I did with my public [resumé](#), that mutually corroborates my LinkedIn Profile](<http://www.linkedin.com/in/mattanaw>) where there is a Mensa generated digital certification. In the next edition of this book, my intelligence scores from my psychologists will be shared.

Here it is worth explaining the severity of risks from authority figures in the public who misuse Mensa without being members. My judge in my land-related prescriptive easement case to be discussed, upon mentioning I was in Mensa for the purpose of communicating special needs regarding time to be comprehended fully, said “I’m in Mensa too” but was not in the Mensa directories. I asked about it in the community and a member told me they “just received her application in another name” that I confirmed was her maiden name. This is Anchorage Superior Court Judge Dani Crosby. This exhibits the extent of the issue since comprehension by this judge was not demonstrated and she used Mensa to pretend sufficient authority to try the case. Instead her judgement showed she did not comprehend my testimony and arguments, and did not read my early litigation. Since members may not appear in directories, it creates the security flaw of potentially having members from the public who are in authority positions claiming they too are in Mensa, when they are not, and cannot provide support for those with special needs. If a Judge cannot comprehend your case, a new Judge is required else there is a lack of justice. I was acting as my own attorney in this case for years through trial, as will be discussed later in more detail, and this judge confirmably did not comprehend me in legal proceedings, because one can compare the court recordings with summaries written by the judge of positions of both the Plaintiff and Defendants. She summarized my position poorly and omitted primary arguments. I have these documents and recordings in my possession. The other security flaw was that a member openly shared that her application came through, but I am not a part of the admissions process. This is akin to a university student learning of the application of an another university student, through unapproved disclosure. This again concerning a Superior Court Judge. I am glad for having received the information

but it was not obtained in a secure process. In any case she was not in the Mensa directories in either of her names, and I have no way to confirm if this judge lied or not.

In an academic setting, one cannot assume that one's peers will automatically be worth collaborating with or befriending, simply because they have made it through an admissions process that seems strict. Likewise your boss or manager at work could have a falsified history, which should indicate the importance of verification, particularly if they convey they have superior intelligence to yours but can never demonstrate it with human productions, and instead rely on holes in human resources. If one has made it through seemingly stringent admission for any form of organization, risky people are still risky, and quality of collaboration is unknown until one uses an informal method like that described in the interview to identify who is worth knowing well. If someone cannot communicate significance and velocity of thought and action I choose not to know them these days, from ample experience of risks, and an understanding of the falsity of prescriptivist equalitarianism that tells us that a high intelligence fraud is respectable, when what we want and need to know is that they are psychometrically inferior to their claims. Equalitarianism creates false respect resulting in self-neutering of intelligence and a proper appraisal of others who may not be worth commingling with on metrical grounds that relate to fraud at times. The community similarities wanted by gifted individuals relate to metrical similarities in people that are not fraudulent, and claiming brand membership is insufficient to convey that metrical similarities exist if fraud is occurring. Through Harvard University I have met some who were risky, others who were not, and people of varying academic abilities, so simply because one attends Harvard, or works for a brand like my former employer Adobe Systems, like myself, does not mean one is not automatically someone to be around. That is a bias of prescriptivist equalitarian thinking. Everyone automatically receives undue respect. With this lack of information other additional methods of identification than brand membership are required, and I will convey a simple informal method that can be used to create safety for members of the High Intelligence community, and the public alike. The method of utilizing the informal conversational evaluation of the velocity of significance and ideation is a proto-metrical method one has in the absence of others, that find usable differences in people, instead of prescriptively providing respect via nationalistic ideals of instant-equality with the result of being defrauded potentially. This basic process is usable for general determination of who might be worth talking with more, and later, maybe, more extensively, and for avoiding intellectual scam artists.

Substantial information is provided about psychometric testing and its limitations, in order to recognize that above a certain threshold limitation, namely the range identified as immeasurable by common intelligence tests, scores are harder to trust, because they come from tests that are of poorer quality. Many of those who are dangerous rely on scores that are untrustworthy from these tests.

Being an interview, the primary topic of interest is, of course, myself. But that is especially valuable and timely for this interview, because I actually do have the credibility and forthcomingness to establish my authenticity to an unusual degree, sharing legal documents, medical documents, [passports and other IDs](#)

and metrical information conveying profound inequality of mind and personal quality. This will be clear to the reader on completion of the article, particularly if links are followed to additional information provided.

Within the interview is a prolonged focus on my relationship to self-authentication, including my history, and artifactual demonstration of my own credibility. This includes details about my early life, career to present, and my history in Psychology and psychometric testing. Information about my skills, talents, and extreme productivity are included and have been witnessed by many. The tests I have taken are all credible tests trusted within the psychology community, and are widely applied for a range of purposes. These tests have a lower ceiling but indicate immeasurable intelligence, and are more trustworthy than those that attempt to statistically extend the ceiling of these normally used tests. In order to convey credibility, one has to be willing to share membership in societies, directory searchability, potentially psychometric scores if like myself one is really immeasurable, and artifacts of productions that have qualities matching. One cannot claim one has profound giftedness without being extremely forthcoming with personal documents, memberships, and must also be communicative.

I'm fortunate for having been identified as gifted as a child and as an adult. As a child, I was tested by a psychometrician within my school system. The school system in the State of Maryland is well known for the quality of its giftedness programs connecting with the Giftedness Programs at Johns Hopkins University. This testing in early elementary school constituted my first learning that I was exceptionally gifted. I've been tested a number of times since first being identified while a child, so longitudinally I have an entirely credible and verifiable background. I am very comfortable with my status psychometrically and am unworried about sharing personal documents and details. I have a background in [computer security in healthcare](#), and am confident about sharing more than others would expect would be reasonable to share, because I'm aware that openness counterbalances the desire for security in a large number of important ways. It creates the artifacts of primary source materials confirming memberships, intelligence scores themselves, authenticating identity details, and when combined with productive communication, all that is needed to establish intelligence claims as credible, while living and after death.

[Having this background](#) and a long history interacting with people of [high intelligence](#), being a [Mensa Lifetime Member](#), I have become adept at detecting who appears to be fraudulent in their claimed scores. It would be a mistake to think that people cannot be appraised and "sized up" with methods that would not be informal. I admit I have a rare knack for sizing people up, which is a social giftedness evidenced by the range of my career experiences and growths, that required exceptional social skills. Folks who are extremely intelligent, who are not autistic or have certain social deficiencies, can detect with little effort after sufficient social exposure signs of lesser giftedness, although there is guesswork sometimes related to the desire to provide too much respect, or too much initial time to gradually arrive at a determination. I've spoken with certain people for extended periods of time even after recognizing that they were

fraudulent so that I could learn more about fraudulent behavior personally, only to disconnect later. If there is a fairly risk-free but interesting fraud to talk to, much can be learned from the process! It is somewhat like talking to salespeople for enjoyment.

Once a method is arrived at for using more than just a knack for reading people regarding intelligence, but an actual process, it still must be an informal one, that is not unlike appraisal in skilled poker playing. If a high velocity of significance and ideation in conversation is not present, there is a very strong sign that the person being spoken to is not in the extremely high range. This is an informal cueing mechanism. A highly intelligent person communicates significance even in simple conversation using a basic vocabulary, and if they are able to utilize complexity and a high vocabulary, they can make it very obvious just how intelligent they are, almost whenever they want. This ability relates to the various subtlest measures of intelligence actually existing on IQ tests like the Stanford Binet, like ability to express and recall meaning in long sentences, see inside dense complexity to find meaning, and recollect with powerful conversational memory. Additionally there is strong recall of conversations over time indicating powerful long term or crystallized memory. If conversation doesn't have these characteristics or *build* over time, and there's too much repetition, there is a strong sign that someone being informally evaluated is not honest about their having profound giftedness.

These points about informal evaluation are useful for people who are highly intelligent, and people who are closer to average too, but trust in someone who is really not risky who can use these concepts, and the essay's proposed informal method of evaluation, on someone else's behalf is necessary for supporting people who are in the lower intelligence ranges, who could not do the same for themselves.

This informal process mentioned above is intended to be kind and is inseparable once learned from natural reading of people. Some may be concerned that use of such an approach may need to involve a form of unwanted probing that is what has given the field of Psychology some negative reputation. It involves conversation and not interview, and the person spoken to is not a patient. It's a potentially highly intelligent person who can be appraised in a regular conversation. Those who are being spoken with are also those who you might expect later to have special respect for some expectation that they really might be as gifted as they convey that they are. I've been in conversations in which I've been tested by other high intelligence community members in which they tried to "rough me up" mentally, and uniformly it goes the other way around in a surprising way. This is even with people who belong to the very highest societies. Afterwards kind acquaintanceship and friendship has resulted. Being "roughed up" often ends and doesn't lead to chronic toxicity. Instead sometimes it leads to somewhat uniform conversational normalcy. The objective of the first behavior is to perform an evaluation that I think should be substituted for the informal approach mentioned here that doesn't require such "testiness".

I take very seriously the application of my own ethic and professional psychological ethics to the study of intelligence, and think there are many moral concerns raised by the nature of the questions presented

by Mr. Jacobsen. Some issues include the need to eventually eradicate fraudulent claims of authority figures and cultishness that exists in societies. Considering the very large number of societies, there are too many that have founders who appear to have an excessively great level of authority and unreflective support and praise from members, and this has been identified as a hallmark of cultism in the book *Cults in America* that utilizes messiahism as a criteria of cult identification. I am unwilling to automatically call groups cults without a thorough analysis, thinking them to have many regular traits of human groupings, with *leaders* who are trusted, for the benefit of the members trying to satisfy social needs that often really are fulfilled, but still am quite certain that additional probing is required to eventually eliminate fraud, particularly of founders, and that some societies do have properties of being cults. One can read my partially edited but explorable work on *Cults* in my *Book and Journal*.

There is a very large number of ethical considerations covering much of life itself relating to intelligence, and I think the reader will get a feel for the degree of caring and concern the author really has in the course of reading the full essay and interview. The author himself faced many issues in his life relating to his intelligence, psychometric testing, and interactions with others inside and outside of the community. This included but was not limited to threat of death and criminal harm, veiled threats of death, likely poisonings, harassment, and digital messages intended to create harm in subtle ways. This was due to jealousy of intelligence and quality and level of productivity, from both sexes. The threats were most dangerous coming from within the community and peripheral social groups, but also existed outside the community in my career from those who recognized there was no way to compete or achieve more praise and attention. This is incredibly interesting too because I dislike competition and greatly prefer collaboration, but fully use my skills in talents and ways that to others indicate an imbalance that is insurmountable. To overcome this instead of competing they cause a large variety of other forms of harm.

Of particular importance to me is the ethics of transparency and honesty, and the respect of living and deceased figures for ensuring their current life stories and future histories or biographies come across as truthful. But not all care and this too is a problem.

General ethics relates to intelligence and to the problem solving of ethical issues. It requires the recruitment of good people with the finest minds, to work on human and animal related issues, to gradually extricate humans from cruelties that they have evolved within, that they continue to inflict without needing to. This is a cause for my work in ethics, and once again, I have to give my special acknowledgement to Prof. Peter Singer, and Lord Bertrand Russell.

Relevant Personal Background

Here I provide relevant personal background to provide special assurance to the reader of my own credibility, beginning first with autobiographical information, and second with my history of

psychometric testing. The information I share is largely open, and I am far more transparent than the average individual in my readiness to share personal details, even those that some may think require more stringent security protections. One can view my *Open Health and Identity* chapter of my *Book and Journal*, that provides actual government issued IDs, including my [passport](#), [birth certificate](#), [marriage certificate](#), [Harvard](#) and [Lifetime Mensa](#) IDs, [name change court order](#) (I do not have a pseudonym, and that is relevant to the interview], [pilot's logbook](#), [fingerprints](#), [retinal-scans](#), and miscellaneous medical information. My [resumé](#) is open and public and includes my extensive career history and listing of notable customers, and includes additional education related information and psychometrics. This is the same [resumé](#) my customers and employers have seen and used. I have a [LinkedIn page](#), that publicly shows nearly equivalent information, which conveys openly what is conveyed sometimes more privately via the formal resumé. It is important to me that there is a joint authentication of what is shared more discretely and what is shared openly. An observation of profiles in differing locations at differing times also indicates consistency of message, and identity. This can aid anyone reading who may have separate employment interests, since if I'm reading a resumé I do want to see public corroboration of materials, otherwise it seems possible that the person sharing may have included false claims hidden from view.

The introduction I wrote here is mostly unique to this essay and interview, but relates to a bio sent to EPG-SIG of Mensa, the Special Interest Group of the Exceptionally and Profoundly Gifted, run by Mark Siegmund, that I belong to and am very active within. It is reprinted in the *Book and Journal of Mattanaw* on my *Bio and Stats* section.

I will discuss my background in reverse chronology to give some indications of my current background, before moving backwards into childhood. A good discussion of my career history, education, interests and talents is important as it relates to appraising for giftedness. Currently I am a retiree traveling the world conducting, as one project among others, a field study in the interrelationships of "Homelessness and Wealthy Camping," but am writing on other topics of interest too, and of course this particular book. I recently returned from 8 months abroad in Australia and New Zealand, hiking and touring, thinking about my work in Moral Philosophy and publishing in my *Book and Journal*. This travel is part of a strategy I call 'hemisphering' which is an attempt to remain in healthful summer-like climates all year long. Once the season shifted to fall in the Southern Hemisphere, I returned to the north, and am now enjoying times in Arizona. That is where I am now writing before venturing off on a journey along the Arizona Trail, near Payson, AZ.

My Retirement, Career, Education, and Interests

Although I'm retired and have been for several years (an semi-retired briefly), I periodically consult under my business [Social Architects and Economists International](#). I [periodically invest](#) and provide guidance to corporations with especially [interesting projects](#). Between these occasional support and mentoring scenarios, I'm simply enjoying leisure time, pursuing my personal projects, which was an

original goal of mine in my early twenties. I've been able to create a lifestyle that combines [guiding corporations at very high levels](#), and the enjoyment of extra time to pursue projects that have no expectations of financial rewards, although I anticipate they will create opportunities for that too. This is important to know about for answers later in this interview around what highly intelligent people find important in their lives, and how it relates to constraints in the world. How to choose whether or not to live simply for extra time, or to pursue power and financial rewards to expand on life opportunities, or both. Extremely intelligent people may choose, or plan for, having no special worldly attainments, knowing well the difficulties and irritations of organizational hurdles. For some it is not worth it and I would be content if I did not have that too. But most are also aware that achieving a state of authority commensurate with intelligence is better; and better still is having good financial resources at the same time, so that one can have sufficient time to develop interests and blend them with powers achieved in authority. Early retirement is desirable, and almost as desirable as being wealthy enough to never "work for someone else" but "work for oneself only". I've been able to put the two separate paths together, of simplicity and financial rewards, but I am greatly aware, being a Determinist, that I could have simply died en-route. So it was important to me to be fulfilled one way or the other, making interesting personal progressions that were good enough regardless of unexpected life-outcomes.

Before retiring, when I was more active in the corporation I built, I was guiding large enterprises and government-related corporations internationally. I was recently liaison Chief Architect and Advisor to the internal Chief Architect of my customer Mayo Clinic, who reports into their Chief Doctor (Mayo Clinic is interesting for having a doctor-run corporation). Before that, I was Advisor at Spark NZ, a large telecomm provider headquartered in New Zealand that all in New Zealand are aware of. I also guided BC Pensions Corporation and PricewaterhouseCoopers together in Canada, that is like the American Social Security Administration, and General Atomics, a nuclear energy and drone related company in the United States, supplying the U.S. Military. I recently guided AbbVie, a large Pharmaceutical company globally, and Novo Nordisk, a Danish company, globally as well. I have many other notable customers to speak of, and the total number of corporations I've supported or have partnered with in my career are in the hundreds and cover many industries. Many are large and recognizable. Substantiation of this exists on my [Open Health and Identity](#) section of my [Book and Journal](#), my [resumé](#), and my [public LinkedIn page](#), particularly under the employment and projects sections which are extensive. In the next edition of this book I will [list them](#) all.

In my various roles I had wide reaching influence at the business level, in an organizational capacity and a technical capacity. Someone in advanced in business would understand that these are often divided, and it is *a serious challenge to the gifted* to finally combine them. Organizational guidance is technical, and architectural planning of large software systems and planning of large multi-million dollar systems is people related. Organizations have to change and re-organize staff, and job descriptions are altered and shifted. This requires people leadership and technical leadership combined. Specialization is very common for consultants but I'm much more general, although I did begin as a specialist too. I had to

work my way up and face *many obstacles* to achieving the generality I wanted, that is often dodged by attempts to obtain freedoms through small business creation. Later I did that but already I was elevated. These organizations, mentioned above, have depended successfully on my experienced judgement regarding large programs, with large budgets, and their technology success, affecting customers and employees and their families. I'm highly adept socially and am excellent at working with almost anyone who doesn't exhibit unplaceable hostility or faulty ambition. Otherwise I could never have the roles or support I've had. For the topic of the exceptionally and profoundly gifted, this is important because many who really are extremely gifted do exhibit powers universally, and this is the case for myself.

Before becoming President/Advisor and Chief Scientist of my own corporation, I was Chief Architect at Adobe Systems. Originally, I was hired into [Adobe as Partner Solutions Consultant](#), a job similar to that of Edward Snowden. My expected total compensation on hiring was \$180,000 USD, and over \$190,000 USD after being promoted and taking my role as Chief Architect, excluding stock and benefits. As President and Chief Arch/Advisor of my own company I made substantially more. Income information is important to demonstrate financial success, and for believability of my international travel that is continuous. In that role I was fortunate enough to form many external relationships on joint objectives, which enabled my career after leaving Adobe. Typically I was presenting to their many customers offerings and worked with their partners to find joint technology solutions that would work with my planning. Before leaving, as Chief Architect, I supported the joint sales and design of a digital evidence solution to be used by Chiefs of Police nationwide, wherever there was a successful procurement. This was with Motorola Solutions International. A goal of this solution was to improve evidence collection for police who were coming into contact with civilians who were adept on social media, utilizing their mobile phones. After this initiative, I was highly sought internally at Adobe by colleagues for other law enforcement, military, FBI and Intel related initiatives. I became an important internal employee guiding Adobe itself, particularly for State and Local, Federal, and Canadian government.

I was a young Chief Architect at the age of 34, guiding a joint project between Motorola and Adobe Systems, which is unusual for an employee of such a large software company that was not self-created, although creating your own org like Facebook is certainly very challenging. Now I am [42 years old](#). But by that time I already had extensive experience and had already delivered a solution [for the President and First Lady of the United States, and other politicians, from HHS Headquarters](#). This solution I delivered was [StopBullying.gov](#), which is relevant to some questions in this interview regarding avoidance of predators. Having been involved in this project I retain a special interest in spreading the anti-bullying message. At that time I was directly responsible for delivery of the solution doing much of it on my own, although some notable colleagues did provide excellent support. When I finished this product, it enabled Michelle and Barack Obama to announce the success on television, asking members of the public to get involved in their campaign. If I personally was not involved in this project or was suddenly incapacitated this project would not have been completed.

After this project I was able to work on several other initiatives also relating to [HealthCare](#), the President, and Secret Service, so not only once did I support him once, I supported him a number of times.

I've been fortunate to guide in many industries, too many to list, including media and entertainment at Food Network, and was a [Director of Development Operations at NASCAR](#) headquarters in Charlotte, NC, in my early thirties. I guided the [financial company Fidelity investments](#). More on my diverse industry experience can be found on my [public LinkedIn page](<http://www.linkedin.com/in/mattanaw>). I will share additional experiences as they relate to my productivity as they relate to specific interview questions.

Outside of business I've been very successful in [academic pursuits](#). For enjoyment in my free time, even though I'm more advanced oftentimes than professors, I attend [Harvard University](#), working on a Masters in Business management, and certifications in Finance and Economics, areas in which I already advised at the executive level, as one can see reviewing my [professional recommendations](#). I have nearly four college degrees, including three from before my graduate studies at Harvard. I hold a Bachelor's of Science in Psychology, a Bachelor's of Science in Computer Science, and a very nearly completed and deliberately discontinued a degree in Philosophy, at the very end, all completed excepting redundant foreign language courses, all from the [University of Maryland System](#).

Despite my financial and business success, many colleagues would be somewhat confused to find that my primary area of expertise is Moral Philosophy and Ethics. It's very humorous to think about it given the success I've had, and it does not diminish my experience in technology. This is the primary subject matter of my [Book and Journal](#), and upcoming books in preparation to be published. This is also the cause of my acknowledgements to Mr. Bertrand Russell and Peter Singer. I continued my studies and explorations into my own personal life ethic since I was a teenager, and this is my durable creation of personal interest that is disconnected with career success, although I did design/create/architect my own technology platform for the website and publication too. If I were only doing philosophy I would have been satisfied even without my career and academic advancements, although it was planned to have these advancements to support this interest in order to have credentials that would be attractive for potential readers and publishers. It would be much harder to write a book without a jacket that indicates a strong background in academics and business, and I knew that while still young.

My career progress has depended on creating many opportunities for myself repeatedly, and working steadily at it. I would interview while I was employed to keep opening relationships and finding new opportunities. This was after working very hard to initially find them in a state of extremely limited success having originally "dropped out" of High School. I have no data concerning this, but I would expect those who are profoundly gifted to be aware that life is easy and that there is no need for "a single opportunity to come along that will create success". Instead, hundreds if not thousands of opportunities

are created by an interactionism with reality, including opportunities that are detected that come along, that might not “be huge” but accrue together into long-term growth. I am aware that not all have the traits that contribute to being able to have opportunities that I have, and part of that is related to the ethics of appearance. My appearance has contributed to employers being willing to hire. But even more ethically important is the national availability of jobs if one considers global well-being, a topic of The Bell Curve. Once jobs exist in an environment and there is ability, the traits of intelligence make opportunities easier, even if one must work as hard as I did. I agree with this idea in the Bell Curve and to ignore this is to fail to recognize that inequality of mind relates to future income and business potential. I have an upcoming book that challenges equalitarianism in order to promote advancements in social justice. In order to advance ethics we need to admit inequalities that exist, and continue thinking about one’s we are aware of, like mental handicaps, which makes it obvious that the scale of intelligence matters. If one is extremely intelligent and multi-talented life is easy and if one opportunity is lost there is going to be another, and many more. Even in times in my life of poorer health, because I did have a significantly debilitating ideopathic inflammatory illness that would disfigure my face, my intelligence still made things easy, and there was a resilience and an easiness that existed enabling finding efficient things to do that would create rewards job rewards anyways. In the later print version of this book I’ll discuss my illness, that has now greatly alleviated, further. Even now I’m not too concerned with illness or injury as it might impact my ability to live well, since I expect I will because I find life incredibly easy. Few acknowledge or see that a huge differences between those with much lower IQs and those with much higher, and that fulfilling basic needs is mostly only hard for those with lower IQs, and again this is the cause for needing special care for the handicap, special education, and head-start programs for children, which was something my ex-wife was heavily involved in. She witnessed the challenges faced by Native Tribes in the State of Alaska, and poor conditions. One of a number of causes for the expected advancement of those who are highly intelligent is simply that problem solving is easy, and if they are universally and biologically gifted, everything is easy, including sex life. That is the full extent of the universality of giftedness, as it crosses over from intelligence strictly to general human excellences. Even where there may be obstacles related to especially high intelligence, in a want of an increase of power and prestige and better jobs, that seem appropriate to the IQ in question, it doesn’t mean that the jobs have gotten that much harder! The hard jobs are wanted for enabling the kind of thinking that’s desired, without which makes life seem harder. Additionally, the most intelligent would have the very easiest time living a frugal and simple life style and like myself I think some choose to live that way at least partly and think they would likely agree. The problems of living simply have challenges that relate to the difficulties of living well as a homeless person, but those problems are simple too for the highly intelligent. This explains the challenges of homelessness because most simply cannot find work and many would not be as smart. There are handicapped people living in the streets for a reason.

I don’t think this conclusion is prohibitive of having an actual datum of exceptionally and profoundly gifted who choose irrationally to self-inflict harm, with drugs (which is something I don’t do) and I do

not think having an easier life is prohibitive of choosing to focus on areas of life that relate to creation of a perception that life is not favorable, that is, focusing on what is not going well in one's life or focusing on other defects unrelated to intelligence. However I have many good traits apart from intelligence, and understand regarding the arising of really unfavorable conditions, including health conditions, victimization, and severe injury.

Later, in relation to the question regarding the Terman study, I mention I do not have fast and easy access to resources that provide information of supposed maladaptivity at the high range, so I admit that data across individuals may suggest discontentment. I only suggest that the discontentment is unrelated to ease of conditions that most would consider most important for obtaining happiness, and that what is wanted is something more. We can consider if those who are less intelligent would want to be more intelligent to easy almost all of their situations. Otherwise prodigies in childhood would find life hard, but that would not be characteristic of a prodigy. In my life I can say that the challenges faced by others oftentimes were not challenges and sometimes may not have been perceptible. As time goes on in my life I keep thinking "even when it was hard it was easy", even with physical ailments, divorce and sickness creating huge changes in my life and well-being, although such a statement might make it seem I'm unaware of gradations in easiness or hardness. Even choosing death when conditions are too suboptimal seems as though it will be easy for me, and I encourage others to have a long term life and death plan. Comments regarding death can be found on my reflections using find in my *Thoughtstream*, aimed at making death easier for animals, people, and caretakers who have to make decisions. No "salvation" or "life savings" is required in my life and I need no religious support whatsoever creating my own answers. Goodness is not hard either. If goodness is hard, then one must find wisdom perplexing, but that is easy too; and in either case, if one does not agree, one becomes something to be cautious about. When someone tells you you need salvation to me it indicates there is a serious problem they think they have, and I would quickly diminish trust, and would begin to think the person a potential scam artist for trying to convey a "solution" that exists for a problem they claim unintelligently is permanent for them.

One can tell from this I am not a follower of any particular religion, and think they mutually cancel for thinking they are culturally equal, while maintaining they hold the path to the afterlife that excludes the others. If there were an afterlife, that is where *all time* is spent, from what we are told, yet they permanently exclude each other. This is another cause for my wanting to push forward justice with my next book that challenges equalitarianism.

My interests apart from Philosophy and career, are athletic, nutritional, and travel-related, to be short. I'm extremely multitalented and in my youth I was dominant in sports, until I became disillusioned with academics and became excluded from pursuing varsity athletics. Physically I'm very fit, as one can see from my photo lifting weights, in a photo that does not convey my natural kindness, due to focus on performing well



Figure 1: Doing My Normal Weightlifting Routine at The Alaska Club, in Wasilla, Alaska.

More photos of me can be found on my [portraits and profiles](#) section showing some changes over the last decade.

There are few sports and games I am not adept at, and if I am not adept it is likely because I have not tried it yet, although I've tried and learned many. I enjoy swimming in the open ocean in Hawaii, excel in basketball, and am good at every sport I've ever played. This is important too, because exceptional giftedness of intellect can and does combine with physical sporting, and it would be a mistake to think a highly gifted individual is not powerfully athletic or not nearly universally athletic. Some athletes are assuredly profoundly gifted too, and it is interesting to consider what else they can do, outside of sports, while all are focused on what they do within sports only.

Regarding travel, I am an endorsed solo pilot with 103.5 hours in Cessna 172 aircraft. In my training I

obtained, thereby, a background in aeronautics and meteorology. In personal touring and corporate travel I attained Executive Platinum and Chairman Status with American Airlines, and in total flew over 1 million miles. In driving and touring I've extensively covered North America, Australia and New Zealand, driving approximately 750,000 miles or over about 1.25 million kilometers. Since then I've happily switched to hiking as part of my study and have hiked/walked/run thousands of miles in the last year. This is important too as it relates to the strong desire to be well stimulated as an intelligent person, and I find it important to often change to new and interesting environments in order to expand on my experience.

I've traveled to other countries and nations earlier, including South Korea, China, Egypt, Ireland, Bolivia, Costa Rica, and recently Mexico, down the Baja Peninsula in my all-wheel-drive touring van. In my travels I've dabbled in a number of languages, and have a history of training in Korean, Latin and Spanish, and have exposure to Arabic and Chinese. These travels are important because someone of high intelligence would often have international interests and be somewhat resistant to being stuck in one nationality. I'm strongly averse to nationalism and consider myself greatly to be a "global citizen" even if that is not realizable on papers. I have some interest in becoming a multi-citizen with Canada, Australia and New Zealand, having spent so much time living in these nations. Within the field of mathematics and within academia it may be more felt the influence of other nations and cultures, and I'm personally unwilling to be exclusively American in my interest and kindnesses. Additionally there are some who might think a linguist might be someone who could only be such; however, one can have all the accomplishments I've had, and more, and yet still be a linguist if extremely intelligent.

I have chosen only to write in English, and dabble in languages, because I'm aware that any time spent on other languages to fluency will diminish the rate of growth of my nervous system regarding increasingly complex information, requiring brand new concepts and not concepts synonymous to ones I already have. Although I will utilize internationalization of my site like I have for clients, providing it in a number of languages, using international domains I own, I will do so in a mostly automated fashion, particularly as autotranslation increases in quality. I will do so despite limitations. Meanwhile I will learn other languages to a rudimentary degree as I travel, to show respect and also to receive some stimulation from the process. But someone who is extremely intelligent like myself might favor the growth of their own creativity and satisfaction of curiosity over and above the learning of languages, especially because it hinders the ability to keep writing in a language that has the maximum audience. I believe this could cause confusion with international readers but substantial justification on time management can be provided, and no disrespect is meant, and still I am a linguist myself. One has to find a balance of priority. Intelligence tests, when not culture fair, are done in the language one knows, which means if one spends time learning other languages, it hinders the ability to score well on an intelligence test that tests for the upper range. Imagine you are a student, and you are learning concepts required by the English Miller Analogies Test. Changing to another language would diminish one's vocabulary for stifling the process of additional concept acquisition. One might say "Why would one want to not learn another

language too far simply to do better on a test?” Well if someone would not have the concepts to use for the test, and one cannot then achieve a higher vocabulary, then one cannot think with that vocabulary that would consist of new words. One then would be unable to think using those concepts. Significance and velocity of thinking and productions would relate to having those concepts and not not having those concepts, because not having those concepts is equivalent to having lesser development, and lesser power of thought. I don’t think this is the universal choice in the extremely gifted range as people can acquire languages quite well, but it is a choice for someone who wants to expand academic publication capacity. One should also consider that one would not have a vocabulary at the 99.89% as a minimum, if one did not focus on the language of choice for long enough; the meaning of this is that one could neither score as well on an IQ test verbally or deploy anything verbally at that level whatsoever, including anything that one dreams to produce academically, to have a fulfilling life doing maximal good for others. Language is a sensitive topic, and I’m much more sensitive about it too in real conversation than might be indicated in the writing above, and I would convey to the reader to be emotionally generous and charitable my actual agreeableness on this topic. Consider again that I am very non-nationalistic and consider myself an international and global resident. My many customers and relationships across nations has been of very good quality and I’m quite respectful conversing language and cultural heritage.

These interests and accomplishments should convey to the reader somewhat my range of interests, except for intelligence and specific intellectual areas of interest. First regarding intellectual areas of interest. I am unable to be anything other than an interdisciplinarian, and am studying the sciences, logic, mathematics, foundationally and interrelationally. Some of this will gradually appear in my Book and Journal as I’m able to write. Moral Philosophy and logic are topics of special interest for their interconnectedness with nearly all that can be thought, and these domains provide me plenty of to work on. Also important for this particular interview is that these topics blend with life, and personal development, and all that I learn I quickly incorporate into my own behavior, wherever changes seem to be required. I’m greatly for gradual overcoming of logical fallacies and various natural human and cognitive shortcomings, for personal self improvement, and moral advancement. This is of importance for the interview because some are challenged for becoming “otherworldly” if too intelligent, or too impractical, but my interest blends theory and practice, and I make changes to my behavior as I change my thinking. I’ve been working in this way naturally as a kid, but in a more knowledgeable fashion since I was a Philosophy and Psychology dual undergrad.

I also had a positively successful marriage relationship that lasted nearly 20 years. There were issues in the relationship which gradually resulted in my desire to file for divorce, but it was kind and amicable by far the majority of the relationship, and we greatly enjoyed our company together and spent most of our time without others around. All who have come in contact with the two of us would definitely notice a large gap in intelligence range, but would also say we conveyed fun and enjoyment consistently enjoying each others company, conversation and humor. Nowadays I view relationships as cyclical and think they have life-cycles that should have planned expectations of endings. If one were to live for thousands of

years I think it would be highly unusual for couples to want to remain together due to personal changes and need for new kinds of stimulation.

I did not have any children, partly out of knowledge that I would want to become extremely dedicated, which would take away from my various personal projects, the choice was mutual because my wife was in the field of early childhood education already. She would have been too focused on children for too long every day, before, during, and after work. Being in early childhood education while we were young, she would have been with young noisy children for years continuously had she had children. After divorce she had a child but this was after moving into a more senior consulting like role that was at a desk.

Despite not being a parent, I was a tutor to two young girls, both gifted, one placed in gifted education, for approximately eight years, from elementary school to into high school. I spent many days every week with these girls, including in the summer, and oftentimes had to communicate with teachers on behalf of their parents due to a language barrier between Korean and English. I grew up with close Korean friends which was a cause for my being given the opportunity to guide these children who were both smart and from a wealthy family. In many ways I thought of myself as a second father to them. I discontinued tutoring them once they reached age of maturity for self-protection, since males face some risks teaching more mature girls, and did so nearly immediately upon the maturization of the elder daughter. I wanted no risk of attraction from her. I was also a tutor to other children and adults, and being a good teacher, enjoying it immensely, I plan to resume teaching again perhaps later in my retirement, when I'm at a more advanced age.

Becoming a tutor to children and adults was not a difficult job selection and there was no learning transition. I was always a teacher even as a child, mentoring friends in important ways. It is important for me to convey this because some may think that the profoundly gifted have few social skills, due to television programming, but the reality is they have more powerful social skills on average, and only those with deficits would exhibit traits like the character on "The Big Bang Theory". They often are better at managing relationships and have very good family lives, like myself.

Part of the cause of my having had durable relationships with friends and family is my sense of humor, which is extremely kind, silly, childlike and goofy. I am greatly irritated by those who think joking is about demeaning people, or being incredibly sarcastic without explanation. I am also not fond of "practical jokes" thinking them often related to cruelty.

I was divorced in 2018, and handled my own divorce proceedings, after a single consultation with a very good attorney I acknowledged, and this provided me interesting legal experience, which is worth noting. After divorce, I decided to become celibate, not caring for the process of dating and various risks, and because of my desire to be entirely self-sufficient. I had a very healthy sex life that was plenty for a

lifetime. My current view that sex is largely repetitive and irrational, and I prefer not pursuing women because of my desire to actually self-protect from STDs for which there are no process controls whatsoever that are not foolish on inspection. But the strongest motive is self-sufficiency. But my disinclination to seek out women is interesting and relevant for this interview because it means there is no reason to ever regard my actions as predatory. Some who are predatory in communities using their supposed or actual authority are those who either want a special kind of attention, financial rewards or sexual rewards. I have no desire at all for sexual rewards. One can read more about my views on [sexuality on my growing chapter on that](#).

While I'm on the topic of predatory rewards and finance, I have to mention I'm already financially independent and retired, and have no need at all or want of money from others and don't ask. If I did have a project, I would provide transparency on transactions and would show results that are actually concretely beneficial. I also have no special desire for attention beyond that of an ordinary normal person who would want some audience and exchange on communication and some desire for readership. In behavior this is clearly evident in my lifestyle, in which I appear largely interested in my own thinking and activities, with no dependence on others to arrive at any fulfillment. Even in my early writings I indicated I had no expectation of any readership, and I would be somewhat satisfied in having almost no contact with others, although I also do enjoy being sociable and around others too. The purpose here is to indicate something very important for later questions: I could be used as an example of what is trustworthy and non predatory and compared with scammers and predators to discern what might be risky, and also I'm of a credible sort that has no tendency towards becoming as scam artist at all. This is mostly due to natural disposition, but is also the manifestation of really incorporating my own complex ethic into my lifestyle. Some of this is of more interest sharing today since I'm single, but earlier while married there would be less cause for others to consider any possibility that I would be predatory in any way.

Currently I do not have any specific country, state, or province of residence, since I'm continuously traveling. I do own an 80-acre parcel of land in the State of Alaska and lived in that state for quite a while. Originally I'm from near Olney, Maryland, a suburb of Washington, D.C., the capital of the United States.

My property in Alaska is very beautiful and has been contested legally for its special positioning, near Chugach State Park, a National Park quality preserve surrounding Anchorage.

My property was the catalyst for ultimately becoming a lawyer in my own interests, apart from the isolated divorce agreement. I had a trail access lawsuit which involved my shared driveway, in which I own 1 kilometer. This lawsuit gave me experience equivalent to that of the other notable attorneys also involved. Although I cannot represent others, I can actively represent myself very effectively, having acted as a litigator and trial attorney for nearly half a decade. I have no law school experience. I

performed depositions and was deposed, filed a large number of motions and counter motions, attended and asked for hearings with successful results, and performed witness cross examinations of many witnesses, including myself, for approximately 15 days at trial. Attorney's would recognize the value of this experience since this is more trial experience than many attorneys have at the outset of their careers. I did learn and retain lawyers as I mentioned above in my acknowledgements, and learned much from interactions with them, and they are the real professionals. It was amazing to witness their work.

My legal opposition included the Mayor and two Municipal Attorneys, the lead of a well known practice, and a third attorney who handled most of the Plaintiff's case, who had over 40 years of experience. Our first judge had to recuse herself for knowing her obstetrician was involved in trespassing activities on my property. Other judges, a senator, representatives, and a Hall of Fame runner were trespassers as well, and some harassed me directly, on my property and out in public. This case created some notoriety and while stressful, I found it rewarding.

I'm adept at contract law and IP management as well running my organization, and in my experience in sales and software sales historically. This also relates to my background in [digital security](#). If one has been in sales, one understands contracts fairly well even without attorneys being involved. This is important to mention in this context because it explains my additional overall interdisciplinarianism, and provides information as to the total extent of my activities. A challenge to the gifted is conveying actual interests because the talent and interest set is so large. I was simultaneously writing my massive [Book and Journal](#) and underlying technology solution, as I was guiding large corporations internationally, supporting the startup of a [President of a Global PR firm](#), as I was doing all my litigation and trial work and presentations, writing, editing, and negotiating contracts, managing all fairly well in parallel, without excessively changing my exercise, eating habits, and other healthy activities.

Despite being somewhat adept now at the law, as I stated, I do have attorneys representing me to deal with ongoing land related disputes and the large number of threats and crimes I faced from trail activists and neighbors, many of whom are either plainly dangerous, or are of high political or social standing in Alaska. This too included digital harassment and death threats, simply from purchasing a property with contested trail access, and from having a modicum of personal fame in Alaska. It is also partly due from my newspaper publications and my [Book and Journal](#) that created awareness of my intellectual capacities. I also have lawyers to support risks faced against members of the High Intelligence Community including risks of encountering fraud and personal danger. These legal arrangements and safety risks relate directly to the topic of this interview in which I have personal investment, so the reader can trust I take seriously the need to protect from potentially dangerous people inside and outside of intelligence related communities simply due to knowledge about my career and intellectual status.

This background information will provide good context for responses in the main interview, that are less directly related to my intelligence testing. There this material is woven into candid interview responses.

Here we can transition to my history of psychological testing which is also important for understanding my responses within the main interview.

For more about my life, one can use my [Book and Journal](#) which is intended also to be a living autobiography, and read about my views on [autobiography itself](#). My social media posts including life experiences and photos communicating in a regular social mode with less intellectualism and some humor can be found on my [SocialNuggets](#) experiential portion of my autobiography in progress. This exhibits some artful photography and interesting places I've visited. My camera roll and archived personal photos and some documents can be found in my [media archive](#). All my photos are transferred there, sharing private details, and the objective is total control of my digital assets, and complete non-privacy regarding my smart phone. I include my personal photo albums with personal photos I've collected over the years. It contains many gigabytes of data. This site is intended to provide many kinds of authenticating artifacts of what I communicate here and elsewhere regarding my life and intelligence.

My History of Psychometric Testing

My history of psychometric testing to my benefit is very clear and credible. I was fortunate enough to be tested early in childhood once, again in middle school, and twice as an adult, confirmed immeasurable, with ceiling results on both the WAIS-IV and Stanford Binet 5 (SB-V), both verbal and visuospatial. Having had the degree of confirmation that I've received, I have a somewhat hard time imagining what the life of a HighIQ fraud must be like, but I believe I'm uniquely situated for identifying the scam artist, and people who are really genuinely intelligent who might have malintent in the treatment of others, who should certainly be protected. Credibility is important to me and we will revisit this topic when the question of detection of scam artists is covered in the later interview. Here the objective is to give additional authentication and credibility of my background, and to supply context for those responses.

So already as a child I was identified as extremely gifted within my educational system in the State of Maryland. I was receiving mail at home from John's Hopkins University for enrollment in special programs the entire time I was in public school. However, my parents did not enroll me in this system, and did not place me in any special school, perhaps wanting to create some normalcy, but I recall also an aversion to excess driving. Instead, since I was highly physically active, they supported my pre-high school sports needs, and allowed me to play soccer where I excelled and was champion on a boys-and-girls team for many years, and also allowed me to play baseball. I did extremely well in education in my elementary years, slightly less so in my middle school years, and only briefly very well in High School, being on the honor roll only initially. Later I became greatly disinterested continued lack non-support from adults and teachers, and eventually dropped out of school to obtain my general equivalency diploma, G.E.D, although I did graduate and attended college on time. Despite doing poorly in school I scored very high on the G.E.D, and qualified for scholarships, but could not receive them due to some good financial success my father had in recent years before my exiting from High School, that was a

disqualification, because the scholarships were for the more disadvantaged.

Additionally, my parents did not put me in Mensa despite qualification, although they provided many hints that I would qualify while young. We did not discuss my giftedness, although I was not the only gifted member of my family. My sister was also intelligent in youth also scoring well enough for Mensa (but again she was not directed to join by our parents) and eventually she attended Harvard University for Physics, obtaining a Master's degree. From my understanding she was in a Professorship program but decided to discontinue for personal reasons I was not made aware of. After adult testing I joined Mensa in 2014, but as of my last speaking with my sister a couple years ago she was still not a member of Mensa herself.

I only finally decided once again to get psychometrically tested as an adult at about 34 years old. The cause of my wanting to get tested was twofold: firstly, I recently changed jobs from Director at NASCAR in Charlotte Headquarters, a job that not an excellent fit for a variety of reasons, to Architect at Scripps Networks, a media holding company in Knoxville, Tennessee, and found at that time that the role was uniquely suitable to my way of thinking, being provided a large set of complex responsibilities. I suddenly felt again very strongly a difference from peers and an empowerment from my new role. This made me wonder again about the full extent of my intelligence. Secondly, my ex-wife at the time was reading the book *Outliers*, by Malcolm Gladwell, featuring Christopher Langan of Mega Society. In that book there was a matrix reasoning problem that was supposedly at the ceiling for a particular test I'm unaware of, although it resembles problems on the Raven that I encountered in middle school. I do not know the specific source of this matrix problem, testing visuospatial patterns, but I was able to quickly answer it correctly, to her astonishment. It was a while since I thought about intelligence and this renewed interest. Following that experience, I decided to take the WAIS-IV and later the SB-V and performed as indicated earlier, thoroughly confirming prior scores from childhood, and gaining entry into High Intelligence Communities including Mensa. I'm now a [Lifetime Member of Mensa](#), and have been a member since 2014. Both of these tests were performed by separate Psychologists. My first test in elementary school was also performed in private by a psychometrician who was perhaps a professional psychologist. My test in middle school was a group test that was performed by a proctor. All four tests confirm my intelligence and my response to the test question in *Outliers* provides fifth informal confirmation. Outside of gaming in my middle years as a youth these were the strongest test or test-like indicators of my actual intelligence range, which is confirmably immeasurable.

After receiving ceiling results for a period of time I explored other tests in consideration of getting a more accurate result for the higher ranges, and investigated the Titan Test, some tests created by Paul Cooijmans, and the Miller Analogies test. I was also exposed to tests created by independent and apparently untrained test-designers who were clearly creating tests of poor quality, giving people opportunities to pretend they certified to the same ranges as those tests struggling to make such measurements reliable and trustworthy. My conclusion from my examination of the better looking tests,

excepting the Miller Analogies test, were that they were risky to take. For a period I enjoyed taking the Miller Analogies test practice exams but ultimately decided they didn't quite represent true IQ tests, and I was instead satisfied with my ceiling verbal score on the SB-V, which was already maximum at 99.89%. My reasons for thinking the MAT is unreliable is given later in the conversation with Mr. Jacobsen.

Having training in Psychology, I am qualified to be a Mensa Proctor and considered performing this role, but have not yet decided to move forward with it because the prospect of failing many candidates seemed depressing. However, at any time I can be a Mensa proctor and begin testing folks from the public with the Mensa test.

This experience revisiting psychometric testing to get a better self-understanding has been very rewarding, but initial want of better interpretation of the meanings of the tests did cause me to have a period of excess thought towards the subject, but this was also due to my having lingering interests from tests already taken recently. My training in Psychology encourages the use of test batteries, or using a number of test to come to jointly measure more comprehensively. The differing results will together provide one a realistic picture of what one's true capabilities are, and even for those who are unhappy with their results eventually a trend is indicated and one would feel that one would not be able to perform much better. If a better performance were possible it would only be slightly higher, and so the test taker can be satisfied that they know the true extent of their potential on the tests. In my case I have ceiling results which mean the tests designed cannot score any higher in crucially important areas, and so in order to more fully understand my intelligence I would require puzzles and problems that scale to greater complexity than those that exist in the Stanford-Binet V, Wechsler and other well developed tests. A test battery tailored to my needs would need to include tests designed for people who are in the profoundly gifted range, to see just how far it is possible to continue answers of growing complexity. However these tests have limitations that make pursuit of them less credible in my estimation, including some that appear to have more support, but still very limited application.

There are questions in the interview regarding the value of Mensa, and the value of accomplishments over tests, and here I can say that I certainly experienced a kind of closure to prior life of lack of acknowledgement through my results on these tests, and this connected well at the time with additional growing confirmation of my talents in my career development. Instead of thinking I did need to have additional career accomplishments, I was more self-satisfied knowing I did not require any additional external acceptance; instead what I had was closer to proof.

But what I have to say regarding the value of accomplishments I think will be of great value to the community but I convey it as the value of productivity in relation to the [velocity of significance and ideation](#).

Today I still study intelligence but prefer to think more about the meaningfulness of using productive output in volume and quality as it relates to significance and velocity of ideas, which relates to our perceptions of the validities of IQ tests and our informal appraisals of the intelligence via communications outputs of others in all text and media formats. Within my *Book and Journal*, I have a section called *ThoughtStream*, where I'm conducting a study on editing and productivity in which I'm the sole subject. The High Intelligence Community has been exposed to writings from here for many years. There I utilize my typing skills, which are very powerful, to rapidly record thoughts as I have them in a timed manner, and many of these postings are entirely unedited, using no spell check, grammar check, or any supporting editing tool. I make very few spelling errors or typos. The resulting thoughts constitute data that can be tested by software systems, like an AI checking on one's ability to verbally convey logically written material with a high vocabulary accurately, with high significance, and novelty. Already there are tools that can be used to estimate the age of an author's writing, which provides a sort of potential ratio IQ measurement. This page provides many postings with information that can be used to corroborate my views as to the velocities in communicating complex ideas, and productive power. I have very strong touch-typing, blind-typing skills and produce writing as I think it, oftentimes without any need for alteration. My typing speed is typically between 80 and 100 words per minute and sometimes in excess of 100 words per minute. I am certainly the fastest typist I've ever met committing finished quality writing directly to the computer. It is important that it is known that this typing is immediately from the mind into nearly finished and usable output. In college I transcribed lectures, and as an adult, I've wowed colleagues and customers typing as I guide meetings, even as I answer questions, live on a screen for everyone to see, making nearly no errors. I've gotten comments that I sound like AI on screen sharing applications that have accidentally transmitted keystroke sounds. I've become well known in my field partly for my typing skill. Typing speed in a nearly final state, with a kind of thinking I call "Dissertative Thinking", for conveyance of information that one could consider Ph.D dissertation trending novelties, in spans of time in tens of minutes, clearly showing productive abilities that are not lopsided compared with mental capacities. The High IQ Community has been exposed to publications coming directly from my mind, in a timed fashion, that one must consider remarkable; and these writings were unedited. Typically, as a result of lack of editing are some minor typos that I publish "as is" to determine the extent that people are willing to read meaningful material despite blemishes, under the idea that in everyday verbal communication people listen through grammatically errored speech to hear the message. Some have disliked this, but many in the upper ranges have taken no issue. There are very few errors in this raw data, but some utilize the findings of tiny mistakes to fault entire writings they know very well are much higher quality productions that they could create with more time. I regularly publish my writings in the EPG-SIG community on Facebook and many other groups and have received very good but infrequent feedback. Some of these writings are very dense.

I created a software solution and publication tool that exhibits Mattanaw.org, my Book and Journal.

Mattanaw.org is becoming a very large datum of intelligence information. The platform was designed for maximizing speed in output, but this is not the only objective, as dissertative articles are also being prepared, along with books, and of course the entire work comprises my total Book and Journal and Archive. In the near future it will exceed five hundred thousand words, if it does not already, and is many Gigabytes for the large number of photos and videos contained, including my personal photo archive from when I was young. Also contained are scans of old notebooks and my *Personal Form* which was used to collect life information in a range of life categories covering my total behavior, as mentioned in the acknowledgements speaking about Rick Rosner. This total Book and Journal certainly exceeds in total size in bytes any journal produced by any society, and recently, a rate of growth in words greater than the journals produced by most societies. It is expected that it will overtake in length probably the Journal Noesis at some point in the near future, and if that's not accurate, it's nearly true, and would simply require qualification. Being a skilled programmer and software architect I will be comparing my Book and Journal with that created by other societies, to compare relative value and productive power. A conclusion that is certainly of interest is that my own productive power is larger than the writing of large IQ society groups in their publications. Additionally, it is already known that in system creation my productive power exceeds groups in large corporations in creating software, and this was the cause for my eventually becoming Chief Architect and an Advisor guiding many massive organizations. It is interesting sometimes to mentor teams struggling with something I can build entirely on my own. I demonstrated the building of complete systems by myself, with low effort, within Adobe Systems while I was there, doing the visual design, architecture, full-stack programming, and sales afterwards with executives.

It is important that the reader understand that the author knows that this is a testable hypothesis. The writings of the author are all publicly accessible and can be downloaded with scripts, for analysis and quantification. In my career I've performed analyses on many websites, and did so using automation. As an example, it is possible to download the Mega Website and compare it directly with the downloaded *Book and Journal of Mattanaw*. To not allow download of the entire site consists of some data concealment although there may be good reasons to do so, but currently both Mattanaw.org and the Mega Society do not prevent programmatic download. In the future the I will be completing comparisons of my website and the sites of groups, and will compare them for size and quality of contents. Bidirectionally I would encourage others to do the same, for their own confirmation. It is expected that within the next five years, in quality of contents and in size, the *Book and Journal of Mattanaw* may exceed each and every publication in total of all intelligence societies, taken separately, and some in combination.

In the future I may be willing to hand over the data for analysis on a large hard drive.

More detail on my level of productivity is necessary. I am typing this portion as I near completion of the essay and interview. Before this sentence it is now 41,498 words, which in manuscript printing is 138

and one third pages, assuming 300 words per page. Upon completion it should be about as long as a single issue of Noesis of Mega Society.

The productions of Mega Society and other Societies are the work of a number of members for each issue and is never from a single writer. This particular response to Mr. Jacobsen took several years, but the delay is due to other activities and waitfulness for readiness, and is unrelated to the rate of completion, and much other work was done in this time period. Approximately one sixth of the contents of this essay were produced in Payson, Arizona, and the time period can be seen from my [edit-history](#) that shows it 5/6ths was finished in just 7 days (Today is Tuesday the 22nd and I've just started writing, and was started on the 15th. In 7 days I've completed the writing and most of the editing of this essay, which will be completed tomorrow. This indicates my productivity is near the rate of entire issues of Noesis, but also includes the editing, the technology of web presentation, production, publishing, and design and format, which is simple by design. Actually, the author admires earlier web editions of Noesis that had a durable simplicity, and would verify this as a good design on years of Software Architecture and Visual User Interface Planning for all formats, omnichannel. I have planned many types of applications for many types of customers for any and all formats, and this might be expected of a Chief Architect of Adobe Systems in particular, known for visual presentation, publishing, and printing, although they also lead the enterprise web platform space, even for digital paperless transformation initiatives for legacy paper-based systems like for government forms and data-systems. These are not the only areas in which they lead. This also included design of the forms and the output, and storage, and total user interaction, in other words total systems. My current system is a more advanced system than most despite the appearance of simplicity and I alone created it. It too has the simplicity of the older versions of Noesis (the new version of the Mega Site and Noesis are unusually nice for the High Intelligence Community too), so I can verify for Mega that their publications are of good quality from a web and print perspective, even if they too appear simple, and I hold this opinion even if there are some improvements to be made. My history is both for the most modern systems and for legacy systems and this judgement applies even if people wanting something more modern wouldn't understand, and this is a part of customer support and planning. But to continue my rate of production for a single issue about the size of Noesis is about 7 days or less, for myself. Thinking about my total life, and time spent enjoying time off from facile writing, I believe my book publication rate now would be about one book per month, of about the length of a varying-lengthed dissertation or book manuscript, perhaps at a maximum of 250-300 pages. Again this includes no support, excepting perhaps for final printing but that is cost dependent, and is only a "send it to the printer" concern. These books will include artworks, diagrams, mathematical formulae, and figures of all varieties, and pointers to videos. In web and perhaps mobile applications, another area in which I'm Chief Architect, there will be playable video and audio files. Currently a limitation on my site is that my YouTube media distribution has been cancelled, since streaming video is of lower quality self-delivered. But soon I will easily make all my videos available again, and there are hundreds that were already showing, in my [Book and Journal](#). There is no shortage of dissertative ideas

for works, and I'm unprotective of them, and only life shortens what I can write from the innumerable set of ideas I have ready or will have. I am very selective of what I'll write about nowadays because it must fit into my total work for my *Book and Journal*. Links to draft pages of this Book as it stands now (there is much that is very complete that requires editing, but is waiting on my study on editing that will soon be finished, and each of these relates to dissertative book writing at high velocity of significance, and will be independent sub-books. Each sub book according to the above could be produced in a month or less, and I'm actively now on that trajectory for my timeline. At a rate of one month, this implies in the next 40 years, if I live to about 82 years old (I'm a Vegan and this is near the average male life expectancy, although I don't really expect that), I would produce 440 separate books that would comprise my total *Book and Journal*, and if I average 250 pages per book, that would be approximately 110,000 pages of new material from this point onward. If one looks at the Book and Journal carefully, and compares it with older versions of the site, one can see really it appears this is a correct estimate. I do have archives of previous versions of the site created with programming, so edit history is somewhat complete, but I rely on archive.org for older versions, going back to 2016.

Note: Returning to this nearing completion of this book, it is now more than 66,000 words, more than 200 pages, and is nearly than 300 pages of double spaced manuscript. New content is far more than 5/6ths of the total publication, and total time writing is twelve days. It is longer than the recent few issues of Noesis. Because this was enjoyable and comfortable to write in only portions of days in the [edit history](#), I now estimate I will be able to produce a book per week at a maximum, and a book per month at the minimum. Instead of 440 works in 40 years, I maybe able to produce 880 every two weeks, and perhaps 1760 if my editing speed improves, and I expect it will. Being realistic, I think I may produce as many as 1000 book dissertations before I die, without exaggeration, estimating conservatively. This claim is not a boast and is metrically supported by the velocity of this work and work to date. The reader can decide if they think this work includes significance and ideation, but it is clear to me that it does. It will outpace reading rates of audiences and comprehensibility for everyone it seems, unless someone of profound giftedness who is young devotes themselves to reading my works as they appear in a disciplined way. But comprehension would be needed testing for verification of these and earlier works, and for that I offer [Certification](#).

The implication appears to be that my Book and Journal will outtake the entire production of Noesis combined with other journals of other intelligence societies, including all contributors. If this is not the case, again, it is nearly the case, and either way, will be quantified, and is quantifiable to others. My site has an open programming interface to the public, so I invite others to perform scientific comparisons using my open data.

The platform is also my media archive and the scaling of my media is also happening with a similar velocity, although it is the primary cause of storage growth costs. This topic could spawn a similar

conversation to the above paragraphs, but for now I will simply say the scaling is similar and happening *in parallel* to the writing, meaning I'm actively photographing, and transferring data to my server for archiving and dissemination; and again, being a total architect of systems I have planned the digital asset management system of large corporations, and my media archive has already scaled *past* what large billion dollar companies can produce and manage, and they have entire levels of buildings fully staffed with hierarchies of employees, and external software vendor product relationships that can't do what my planning and software can do, that I created.

So in the world of individual productions for both the high intelligence community, book authorship community, and technology community, I have something that indicates that I'm producing at a level of hundreds of people and on differing parts of the overall information dissemination solution.

Some may read this and think this somewhat rude to make such a comparison, but comparative case studies are necessary for understanding human differences in intelligence and talent, and is scientific. If one is profoundly gifted then one ought to have productive powers that are impossible for others, and impossible for nearly everyone considering the IQ rarities. I exhibit both. Comparison of data from people's work and behavior is zoologically necessary to understand the human species, anthropologically. Large technology companies already require me to perform analyses for them doing similar efforts, and in digital marketing others are collecting and comparing user analytics without anyone's permission sometimes, but oftentimes via contracts with customers that the customers don't understand. These are those automatic "opt-in" marketing and free-use contracts that imply usage of information in exchange for software. This is not my interest but it gives the idea that people have already provided permission even for this business activity that's quasi-scientific, and having given permission for this there is very little reason to be concerned with ethical scientific research related to this type of comparison of my Book and Journal with other Journals, where people have given there permission. This would means Journals would be not really allowed to compare themselves with others, competitively, and they need to. But my efforts are not competitive and are very collaborative, and that should be evident by my willingness to permit others to peruse my data, that takes abundant time to create.

The rate of production is related to my thinking rate, which provides measurable dissertative thinking and prepares the way for the formalization of the [significance and velocity of ideation](#) psychometrically. Type speed is already a quantifiable measure. Dissertative thinking is exhibited, to remind, on my [ThoughtStream](#). This chapter provides many short timed writings that are straight from the mind into publication. I write them and immediately publish them with CLI command. Once finished they are nearly instantly published. I've considered what it might take to publish from my mind but I do not have technology to do that. If I did, it would verify the existing recordings there. Not all recordings there are fast dissertative thoughts, but many are. I provided an example within the community recently, called "[Linguistic Associative Graphs, Brains, and Adaptive Organs Like Skeletons](#)", written in approximately

40 minutes. Many examples of this can be found on my *ThoughtStream*. There are some very long postings taking less than 30 minutes at high density. These provide smaller chunks of incremental velocities. It is important to know I can write like that much of the day everyday with facility, and this is how I enjoy my time. Not all writings are entirely true to typespeed, meaning maximum typespeed, because I'm just leisurely typing, and taking space for coffee, water and enjoyment. In other words, I am faster than these posts would indicate, and in the future will video-record my typing, to provide evidence of dissertative throughput and neurological bandwidth. Yet they are still quite fast—and all are impressive. Some are more true to type speed, and as part of my study on editing I will share my data, much of which exists on this ThoughtStream page, that on reflection, will be seen as appropriately named. These are unedited streams of consciousness writings with few thoughts omitted; but unlike James Joyce they show comprehensibility and clarity. Writings like his and others create a false eminence, not diminishing what happens to be true of their actual contributions. Readers join in Dublin to celebrate his writings annually, as I learned reading part of *Ulysses* in Dublin almost twenty years ago. If he was living he would be a kind of cult leader on the basis of ambiguities he created, at least partly. This writing is important because it shows how *even the apparent significance* can be mismeasured informally by those not intelligent enough, with the result that the author is excessively admired. His work is fiction and cannot be as significant!

People within the High IQ Community including friends aforementioned would have already witnessed responses to comments at good density that would have seemed to appear at an impossible rate. FaceBook can be used to verify that my mental processing time from reading to response entered is extremely rapid, and in a social context exceeds what is written elsewhere, because it is more conversational, although style would be not dissimilar to what is found here, which would further verify that speed of writing there results in nearly final material.

Currently my limitation on rate of production relates to editing itself, but my interests have shifted to rates of editing productivity and not the timed recordings of raw material at good quality. It is expected that editing rates will also be demonstratively profoundly gifted, as I will be able to edit all of my own materials without any external support, and finished books will also include finished editing, at a rate of 1 book per month towards 440 in 40 years. This would then constitute dissertative editing, which would further substantiate the need for a update to our doctoral thesis production process and artificial limitations put on the profoundly gifted stifling their advancement.

By making this publication totally open, and continuing to produce for it, makes it possible to really compare people in the exceptionally and profoundly gifted range with one very exceptional example. The *Book and Journal* itself also demonstrates, more than productivity of merely text and audio-visual media, but the life enjoyment productivity of the author in travels and so on that one might assume would be offset with extreme writing generativity. On the contrary, it is very easy for me to produce materials at this rate, and I spend an abundant amount of time in my retirement simply enjoying my

many interests, particularly travel and athletics; and being retired I have already provisioned for a longer life of extra enjoyment, which is a result of [superior planning concerning all life categories](#), also documented. This includes [attentional management](#), using a system in which I created and am self-trained. This system involves planned control of where to direct my mind, without diminishing, but enhancing, spontaneity and stimulation. It is to be anticipated however, that some will nevertheless persist in stating that such productions would only be possible if one has given up certain goods in life, but the Moral Philosophy and data will support that the good life created is one that is inclusive of the work and results in the media artifacts that demonstrate that. The same appears to be true in lives of young people who are producing beautiful and interesting media for social applications where “selfies” were earlier frowned upon. Overtime complaints about self-interest have changed to joining in, and the creations of people on these communications tools show their planning of their media productions enhances their lives, and the lives of others who they are sharing with.

There is a question in the later interview asking about the value of producing works for the greater good and attaining other kinds of accomplishments, and this directly relates to the above efforts in proving productive power. Some outside of the High Intelligence societies may want to claim that those within are simply not as productive as some in Academia, and do not produce the same level of quality. My academic success, and corporate success, and level of productions in my personal work, with is a Moral Philosophy and Ethic, is a combined effort at good public works and maximum accomplishment. It is also from someone who has accomplishment, but also has, ceiling intelligence scores. I am distinctly aware, from observations of the typing skills of others, from the observations of the productivity of teams in a school environment and within business environments, that the level of productivity I am producing is definitively impossible for others. I am not sure if there is anyone who can outperform me in terms of total productive output, at extremely high significance and high creativity. Again this is with no competitive interests.

For quite along time I shared my travels on Instagram and on Facebook, and received many responses either inquiring about my lifestyle, or by sharing fun interest about the contents of my videos and photos. These exhibit an interest in fashion, the arts, designs, beautiful hotels in which I lived for years, and scenic landscapes from national parks all over North America. I have over 1,000 nights living in Marriott hotels recorded (some are from credit card loyalty expenditures, and have Lifetime Marriott Platinum status, and have been a Titanium member. I also have upwards of 500 nights on other hotel platforms living around in AirBnB's and other hotels. I alternate between a lifestyle of luxury in products, and now I'm wearing a 10,000 dollar Breitling watch, and hotel living in places like Marriott's Mauna Kea resort in Hawaii, and living very fruttally as a hiker, studying the *Overlaps of Homelessness and Wealthy Camping*, another upcoming book of mine intended to find the true obstacles to resolving homelessness related complaints. I live an extraordinarily rich lifestyle of travel seeking quality of enjoyment, food, and museum-like quality stimulation.

These productions are very fulfilling given my personal non-financial objectives, but again, I am very fortunate for being able to combine this leisure time effort with my corporate and academic life. This relates to the question asked in the interview regarding the finding of suitable employment.

The system I use to create my publications has been used to create very lengthy proposals and analysis documents recently for AbbVie, Novo Nordisk, BC Pensions Corporation, PricewaterhouseCoopers, and Spark New Zealand, and earlier variants on my home grown technology were used at Adobe Systems, General Atomics, Food Network, and for various government customers.

This technology was used for the publication of this interview and essay, and will be used to generate future published books and articles. It is worth millions of dollars measured in hours spent at my rate, which is quite high, and revenue from my customers who have paid for their various deliverables, and this is confirmable by payments to my organization to date. I am the sole creator of this software solution with no outside support or contribution whatsoever.

This *Book and Journal* is also larger than websites of huge customers I have had in the past, since at a certain scale passing data is too difficult and testing is too challenging. At a threshold, a total textual work, or set of content, becomes very difficult to edit, and in fact, in comparison with the journals of societies and individual blogs that exist on the internet, I may have an example of one of the hardest sites to process and edit, which is also something only manageable by an intelligence that can support that. One must be able to recall with both working memory and long-term memory very large quantities of files and their contents. This will become increasingly more evident over time as the number of files and quantity of text grows.

There is also a massive quantity of digital asset content, which relates to the total digital assets a person or organization might possess and need to archive and distribute. This is an area where I also have consummate expertise. Most enterprise websites I have provided architectural scaling plans for have had less digital assets than I do.

The types of sites that would have a greater amount of digital asset content would be those sites that have huge amounts of video content, like those providing streaming videos with massive libraries, but oftentimes sites offload those videos to other providers, simply because they face limitations on management capacities of their teams. Already my own ability to manage my assets is greater than those that offload them, and I'm just one person. However I also architected and programmed my system that manages the assets. Admittedly at the moment, my video assets are offline due to my cancellation of a YouTube service, but I will have little difficulty reincorporating those same videos, and already the hard copies are managed by the same site, even if the media players do not currently exhibit all of them. The point of this is that people individually and collectively have a hard time organizing their important property, including photo albums, videos, writings, documents, and so on, and cannot manage retaining

and preserving them, but I am able to mentally manage them, organize them, and preserve them, in a capacity larger than large corporations without any external assistance.

Part of the purpose of my software system is to enable people eventually to be able to preserve their life and family stories the way that I am able to do it.

I have shifted personally from an interest in psychometrics and intelligence measurement in a traditional sense to psychometrics and intelligence measurements as they relate to productivity and communication. This would be the metrical analytics of change and composition of human productions and their velocity of significance and ideation.

I am aware that most do not have my typing skill, and while I would not use written materials as the guide for understanding the intelligence of another, and would rely on verbal communication with speed and significance and creativity, I do think one is at a lack if one cannot do similarly in writing. This is because the outputs of academics is ultimately going to be in writing, and if one can create long and significant works with little more than thinking with few edits, one has gone very far down the path of consummate productivity, that one connects with “genius” (although I don’t like that term), which is exhibited by incredibly productive people in history.

My test scores will be revealed, and the tests provided although more trustworthy will be discussed regarding issues and limitations and these will be inherited by societies with issues that will face more, because even the Stanford Binet V and the Wechsler have severe problems.

Interview, and An Informal Method for Identifying High Giftedness, Using Velocity of Significance in Conversation

Opening Response

The informal method utilizing [significance and velocity of ideas](#) is not only applicable for utility comparing living people, it has some utility for understanding historical figures, through an analysis of their productive works, converted into analytical tools like AI and machine learning. Because it is useful for living and historical figures, it is universally applicable to all humans. Taking what people are able to do in their higher quality analyses of conversations, one can make a software system emulating the skills of the conversation evaluator. This has not been accomplished but is incipient, and the author expects this to eventually occur. ChatGPT shows some promising usefulness I hear, although I don’t use it. A manual informal description is required before there is an automation substitute. This is based on long experience guiding corporations who are often interested in replacing workers with systems performing the same jobs. However, historical finished productions are edited, and the time to completion is

unknown; which just means that historical works that are complete and growth is often unknown because revision histories are lost. This is highly relevant to the analysis but it does not mean that no analysis can occur on only the results of thinking people. In my work I'm interested in both quality of finished products and growths of learning in brains and resulting changes in productions over time. More will be said below regarding this concerning the question of historical figures, especially as it relates to dissertative thinking and velocities of significance and ideation, and change deltas.

The informal method mentioned is described in passing as the related topics are developed. Instead of explaining this concept in depth out of context, it is explained gradually in context, where there are many examples to be shared, in relation to the interesting questions posed by Mr. Jacobsen.

Questions concerning the well being and interests of Highly Intelligent figures is also related to this method, that is used separately as a method for appraising quality of thought and output. This includes the question as to why some highly intelligent people appear to be unproductive. Lack of productivity is a sign that there are certain other parts of the nervous system that may not be as sophisticated as the intelligence of the individual, but since there are many ways to produce recordings, executive function is questioned if one has been unable to become productive somehow. Consider that the extent of the planning of my work and software and skill acquisitions of computer programming, software design, typing, and a huge array of other skills was required to create a total usable system for conveying significance fast. Conversation is not only verbally performed, of course, but is also written, and is present in artworks. If there is an excessively lopsided difference between claimed intellectual prowess and productions, meaning there is a low velocity of significant ideas in recordings, it too is an indication that if there are not other debilitating issues preventing production, the claims of extreme giftedness are at least partly fraudulent. There would have to be very strong reasons provided for remaining inactive having gifts, wanting less feedback on behavior, and no claim can be made that only thinking provides all the feedback needed, because I can make the claim that happens to be true, that I can do the same, and yet no mind is so powerful as to not require environmental feedback from sophisticated thinking. Otherwise the smartest of all children need not do anything in a very short time. In the High Intelligence community there are many variations in intelligence, and one is expected to have gradations and selectivity in fraud, to fill gaps, and to present strengths as greater than they are. Great unproductivity is a decrease in the total velocity of total communicativeness of significant ideas. Whereas, those who are extremely productive "omnichannel", meaning on all communicative channels available, they are more likely to be extremely gifted. This accounts for our expectation that highly gifted individuals producing masterworks of various kinds, and large contributions of written materials, really were extremely gifted. However, it is possible for Highly Intelligent people, to be "locked up" in their minds, having other deficiencies related to communication, including disease or difficulty with motor systems, making it hard to create works worth retaining and sharing. This topic relates to claims of "genius", a word I'll keep saying I dislike when I have to mention it. If there is no evidence of great productions and works, in their various ways of appearing in life, in work careers and in books and writing, then there is no "genius",

particularly if the person has no illness or deficiency like those mentioned above, which would cause us to want to look further into why their mind cannot result in actions evidencing in a non-lopsided way, the quality of their minds. Without any illness, it appears they are lacking communication skills directly related to their minds, which would low velocity of significant ideas in conversation too. If one can speak, or sign, with great velocity and significance of ideas, unhindered, then one is providing “potential recordings” that would provide evidence if there were not other physical or nervous obstacles to make those recordings. People of high repute in the academic community can and have dictated incredibly high quality materials showing obviously the quality of their minds. Bertrand Russell, using an anecdote, would think about his work until he had a clarity he liked enough to simply dictate it to his secretary who would type it. I use an alternative strategy I think is superior, but that strategy does seem to indicate the plausibility of this possibility. One can be very powerful in dictation. But there are highly intelligent people who do lose their speech too, from strokes or other health events. These considerations make it plain that communication is a vitally important component in determining if someone is really intelligent or not, and these together support the view that an informal method of using communication to appraise velocity and significance of ideas is of good utility for determining if someone is extremely gifted, in the highest ranges. In the worst case, it can be used to determine if some are frauds. Charlatans do exist and they do not fare well on this informal measure. In the future they will be detected automatically, as finally, this informal method and skill is built into software systems that can do the same work that a highly intelligent mind auditor can do.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen:

*Question 1: The most legitimate intelligence test scores tend to come from comprehensive tests with money and research dumped at them, e.g., the SB and the WAIS. Yet, their ranges are fairly tight around 40/45 to 160/155 on S.D. 15. Some statistical, psychometric techniques, e.g., Rasch-equated, have been employed by individual experimental psychologists, e.g., Dr. Xavier Jouve, to extrapolate for claimed scores at 175 S.D. 15, for example. Alternative tests made by independent test constructors are interesting and vary in quality, though have a far larger quantity. In the article, bluntly, you state, “140,150,160,170,180 are the numbers immediately grasped by liars and exaggerators.” When using alternative tests, more than the first test attempt to claim a score at 140, 150, 160, 170, and 180, what are first thoughts coming to mind to you?

Opening Response for Answer One

Before moving on to my answering of the main question, I want to handle the following embedded concern about a portion of my referenced article: ‘In the article, bluntly, you state, “140,150,160,170,180 are the numbers immediately grasped by liars and exaggerators.”’ The cause for this particular statement, which is strictly true, and something I’ve experienced many times, is that people recall what a high score

happens to be from their cultural recollections, and falsely self-attribute those same scores, which are round numbers. These are easier to recall than say, 97, which may figure into the statement “My intelligence score is 97”. To provide a high example, we hear that some historical figure has an IQ of 160 over and over, and that another has 180. These are fabrications because of a lack of actual test scores for historical figures and their supporters acting as information marketers, who are the causes of these messages. These are applied to historical figures to mean that they are “geniuses”, although few in the public really understand what these numbers mean, or how high those scores really are, and whether or not these figures are really as smart as those numbers indicate. They later recall these numbers more easily and then, when they falsely pretend a score for themselves, they choose those same numbers. I’ve heard this so many times from fraudulent claimers boasting about their “smarts” having no idea of psychometrics that I’m certain this is the explanation. My father has done this before choosing the score of 160, and while he is moderately intelligent, he has no idea what is IQ is. He simply grabbed what he heard Einstein’s IQ was, which of course is also false, and again, people chose that number, because they heard that is what a geniuses score would be, but they have no information about Einstein’s testing. There is an additional reason, however, which should be more obvious, and it is this. It is unlikely that if a person has a particular test taken, that their score will be a round number such as this. Suppose one has really scored in the 160s, but hasn’t had their score revealed to them. There is only a 1/10th chance that their score is 160, and not 161-169 (disincluding the diminishing probability of the intelligence increasing from 160 to 169. In that case I could choose another range, say, from 156 to 165 and say again, that the person scored is somewhere in this range but doesn’t know what the score is. In that case the more probable score is either 155, 156, 157, 158, or 159). The same is true for any of the other sets, 140-149, 150-159, 160-169, &c (also disincluding the diminishing probabilities of the higher numbers individually). The propensity to choose a round number combined with the rarity that it would be a round number, and the rarity of even having that score, combines to indicate that the person simply stating their IQ simply doesn’t have that score. If someone says they have an IQ of 200, it’s even more of a round number. Why did you not tell me it is 223, and not 200? The use of the round number is an indication that someone is lying regarding their IQ, and if they are that intelligent they would have the awareness to present a percentile figure and not an IQ score in any case. I’ve noticed this time and again in the misattribution of IQ scores to untested historical figures, living actors, and to people themselves who are simply trying to tell others that they are “geniuses” but of course, they have not been tested at all.

Relating this to the detection of scammers, a question later in the interview, I would immediately utilize unproductivity as a “red flag” that they are really lying. But I don’t require that it be a red flag either, because from conversation, I already know they are lying.

What is great about the informal evaluation method using [velocity of significance and ideation](#) is that one more quickly knows that my father was incorrect by listening to him. It has general application and immediately reveals one has a score that is not profoundly intelligent, and while it is usable for

estimating anyone to a degree, obviously without psychometrical precision, it is *more easily used* by an immeasurably gifted person to see another is not immeasurably gifted.

The remainder of the question is handled extensively below.

The General Plausibility of Scaling Intelligence, and Our Unfortunate Inability to Create Tests That Can Rank Measure It for the Immeasurable

There are very difficult norming requirements for tests exceeding the range of the Stanford-Binet and Wechsler, meaning that a very large sample pool of test participants must make themselves available in order to validate the test scoring, and ranking with the general population. This is applicable in two ways: firstly, the maximum one can score is approximately or equal to the 99.997th percentile on the total test, that is comprised of subtests that themselves have maximum IQ scores at the 99.89th percentile. One can reach the limit by getting maximum scores on subtests or the total test, which would also mean, that the maximums were reached for subtests only at the 99.89th percentile. I don't think this limitation has been overcome except for some tests that are not themselves IQ tests, but academic tests, that supposedly correlate well to IQ tests. These tests, the academic ones, do have some credibility to me, for establishing higher capabilities. Especially the Miller Analogies Test, although that test is not culture-fair, and has some definite limitations for testing people not very well exposed to culture in the English language. It also has a deficiency in that it is verbal focused and relates mostly to specific subtests that on IQ tests have a ceiling at the 99.89th percentile, making correlation to FSIQ a confusing issue. It correlates more directly to verbal subtests and extrapolation would be required to really understand the relationship between MAT scores that are higher, subtests that ceiling at the 99.89th percentil, and FSQI that is higher but utilizes subtests from the visual domain. It cannot be used to provide a raw IQ score, in the same way as a true IQ test can, but is purported to able to provide rank differentiation at a higher level, of 8 Standard Deviations, as published by Pearson. That would be an IQ of 300, at SD25, and a rarity into the billions. Later I will discuss this test in more detail, and will share some critical flaws, other than those already mentioned. This test is well normed from my understanding, meaning many test takers have used it with results being processed, using participants as human experimental subjects without disclosure (like the SAT), making bell-curve distribution possible, but someplace between 3 and 8 standard deviations there is definitely a norming issue, due to lack of test takers to establish rarity. Billions of people have not taken the test. That means after somewhere between the 99.89th percentile and IQ 300 territory meaningful comparisons between participants regarding IQ will be harder to justify.

Scaling of the MAT appears to have some meaningfulness because the method of scaling appears to have uniform growth characteristics—the test is only comprised of analogies so more analogies are simply added, and those who can answer more, have scaled past other test-takers who simply couldn't answer as many questions. I have related the scaling of the test to scaling of a chess-board which can begin as a 2x2 matrix with a few pieces, to any larger matrix, not only an 8x8 matrix as it currently is. The game would

become increasingly harder to solve as the board increases in size, and the current size is fun because it offers a level of challengingness that many enjoy, but is not so complicated as to make it unfun to play, when out of the range of comprehensibility. Chess is already incomprehensible at an 8x8 matrix for much of the population. This example would be like the scaling of a visual problem solving matrix on visual portions of IQ tests, and one wonders how the MAT could relate given it is not visual. But the purpose of the illustration is to convey the scaling idea. Problems on the IQ test all scale in complexity until participants are unable to answer questions on all subtests that vary, and eventually one runs out of questions if one is very talented in a specific domain, although some subtests resemble complete IQ tests on their own, and for these tests I have maximum scores, both verbal and visuospatial.

An interesting challenge to the MAT test is why it scales to 8 standard deviations at all, and why not 12, or 14, or more? Why not scale it like a chess board to infinity? What is the purpose of scaling the test to an IQ correlate of 300 if no one on the planet can come close to scoring that high, and nobody does come close.

The way the MAT test is scaled is by including a very large set of analogies making conceptual comparisons using words that are simple to understand, providing some easy answers, scaling those until they are rare and challenging, like a vocabulary exam, and also by increasing the complexity of the comparisons that are demanding on culture dependent factual knowledge, that one must understand well or the comparisons might be unsuccessful. The set is huge so it exceeds what people can remember as far as concepts, and what they could learn relating to potential studies and experiential learning. But at 8 standard deviations there is some cause for the largeness of the analogy set, which is big enough to make it impossible for people to score well on, with all but one person scoring at 6 SDs, which would correlate to an IQ of over 250, although I question that correlation for lack of data and a range of other reasons. But that means nobody but one person has scored between 6 and 8 standard deviations and that person barely scored over 6 SDs. This means nearly zero people have scored that high, yet the test is claimed to score that high.

Would it discredit the test if more analogies in other languages were utilized, or all languages in which we have sufficient conceptual knowledge, to account for the linguists who obtained knowledge who would also like to be tested, making it culture-fair, by including all of them? Why not scale it more, or replace concepts with interlingual concepts. The effect of the culture-unfair nature of this test is that not all concepts someone might know would be in the test pool, including not only concepts of other languages that are unique and asynonymous, but concepts in specific fields that are not covered. I have extensive understanding of concepts that I can clearly see from experience are entirely disincluded from the test and it appears this relates to the manner in which Pearson has aggregated concepts.

What of the ethics of including all the concepts of immigrant minds versus not? What are the ramifications for those in the highest range who cross over national and linguistic boundaries? Why not

include all concepts that exist!? If such a test were created, probably the range would be some large number over 20 Standard Deviations, and would be impossible for earthlings into the distant future. This would be like the chess board that has grown to a 160x160 matrix with many more pieces, being figurative. But would that debunk the test, for testing impossible giftedness? Already that is what it does, and it does this by testing for concepts that no-one learns or wants to learn too, out of differential interest that *does* relate to effectiveness in life, and moral self-guidance as to values of study. It tests for concepts that exist in the history of clothing for example, something I'm not too interested in despite enjoying fashion, for knowing with executive function what to omit from my life in order to pursue excellences. Areas of music and so on that seem to be of popular musicology are also included, but one can be very wise to eliminate that as a detailed study in one's life too. Interests management is important to overcome [procrastination](#), and while some are interested in textiles, like kinds of hats, and musicologists may be interested in older styles of music and their history, one is smart to omit whatever one is not interested in to pursue real life objectives and this conflicts with testing for these things. What the intelligent person omits from life is *very* important.

If foreign language concepts were added, they would be as unlearned in the general population as concepts from other languages. This might be interesting for those committed to the learning of other languages thinking it provides evidence of intelligence.

It should be mentioned that this test appears to be one easily released by Pearson, because they have a pool of concepts from textbooks that appear in glossaries and the like, and all it takes is the formation of combinations of concepts from this data set to create a pool large enough to support the simple tests they create and publish. The cause of the selectivity of concepts requires justification that I think does not exist, and instead, the focus is on inclusiveness in the English language what Pearson happened to aggregate.

Pearson can have a good earning revenue even if they don't believe in the test and it is true that it doesn't have extremely widespread application, not being a choice test for college admissions. The ease of release relates to the ease of earning despite having a somewhat low number of test takers compared with the SAT.

At one point having fun with MAT study guides that actually makes a good source of study of human knowledge because it covers so many area categories, I created a system of a combination of a hierarchical directory tree, with spreadsheet data nodes, making a sort of database containing structured MAT data that had Pearson concepts in it from study guides, and any concepts I would add. But after a period of enjoying learning with this method, I realized I didn't care about learning concepts about clothing, and certain cultural areas in which there isn't sufficient cause justification for the time expenditure, which again, limits the executive function component of the test. I noticed at that time however, I could think of other categories of understanding that were disincluded, like medical and

technology concepts. For example, having been exposed in youth to the Merk Manual, I knew definitely many concepts in that text were not in Pearson's pool of concepts and that could be because Pearson publishing does not issue that text, and therefore doesn't have those concepts in the test pool. To me this reduced chances that if I took the MAT I would be unable to exhibit my full potential, and it does mean there is favoritism regarding interests in test subjects.

The MAT is a relatively risk free test to take and one can be examined by it without any of the side effects of an IQ test, because one simply doesn't care if one scores poorly and all do, considering the relationship to what a 100% score would be. This is another interesting limitation on the test because one feels like the results are somehow inapplicable for not mattering. This is only partly the case, since I still think there is some correlative validity, relating to the propensity of highly intelligent people to master concepts fast, coming from those in which *they were really exposed and were interested in seeking* and really those who are highly intelligent are more stimulated in a normal environment, seek information curiously, but on topics they are interested in, and not those they are interested in omitting, and they do retain conceptual data better, and automatically perform better on these tests. Profoundly gifted kids vacuum information and seek new information out of great curiosity, but environments are often less stimulating, children choose their interests, and some level of natural interests and *disinterests* steer highly intelligent kids toward and away from, concepts that appear in this test. Intelligent problem solving results in how to divide life into what is entirely unexperienced and what is experienced deeply.

As an example, we can compare with the subtest measure on vocabulary from a normal IQ test, which has some similarity. I score 99.89% on this test and there is no scaling past this further, so I cannot test any higher. That's as long as it is normed with the regular population. I perform very well on the MAT practice tests and have seen for myself without taking the actual test that it confirms my scores. This is due to my being able to absorb information from my environment, my being well-read on areas of interest, and so on. I score very high on this test even though I was understimulated outside the domain of athletics from middle school to the end of high school, and was discouraged away from reading that entire time. I read very little except towards the end of High School, yet like a kid vacuuming information, I still obtained very good conceptual knowledge across domains. However, it was not until *later* that I became highly interested in self-study, and I know from my recollections of all my learning experiences, that I did not learn the concepts required to do well on this test or the similar vocabulary section of the Stanford-Binet 5 until self-directed study around the age of 18 onwards. I did not look into the Miller Analogies test until after I was 34 years old, and by that time, I read far more probably than most in Mensa (going by the time commitment versus what I see around me and results of conversations), and I didn't read almost anything outside of school while I was younger. My family did not encourage reading. This implies that those who are profoundly gifted cannot use their native capacities on the test, without conceptual mastery because they would do poorly, and those who did not read in youth or come from other nations cannot really utilize the test, depending on the time lost learning concepts of other languages, or not learning concepts at all, as with some native tribes.

A cause of my not wanting to take the formal Miller Analogies Test relates my not wanting to forever take academic examinations, and because in choosing which I might want to take for grad school, I wanted one that would be as widely accepted as possible, and the MAT simply is not accepted at as many schools as the GRE or the GMAT. The SAT, GRE, GMAT, LSAT and MAT are all considered test correlates to IQ, but having already testing with maximal scores on an IQ test, which is best, because it *is* the intelligence test that these tests are hoped to correlate to, selecting which one and deciding upon the time commitment for self study is important. What else does the test do for me for college admission for graduate school? This was a question I had, and I found anyway that I did not really need it for admission. But ultimately I did not take any of these anyway, finally realizing my immeasurable intelligence scores were adequate enough and I didn't need more testing, and my application for college and my employment screenings already include my [resumé](#), that has my psychometric information already included on it including my maximums, which state I'm smarter than most at Harvard already. I also wouldn't need any of it anyway being advanced in my career past having any need for education, since those obtaining a number of doctorates wouldn't be able to have the job that I obtained anyway, for rarity, competition, and difficulty. My job is what college degrees were for and not the other way around, if one was not wanting to simply teach as a professor.

One might wonder why I am spending so much time on the MAT, and that's because it is a critical point of interest considering society admissions at and above the 99.997th percentile, and it is the only test the Prometheus society accepts presently. But taking that test doesn't *get you into* other societies that are higher, like *Mega* which doesn't include it as an option and requires more tests that was created by Mega's creator, Ronald Hoefflin, unless he had support. This means if you want to take a test to get into Mega you need *yet more* tests, that we will see are more dubious than the MAT, and the MAT does have serious limitations. These two societies do not accept any test that is an IQ test, that is in the ranges I included above for the Stanford-Binet 5 and the Wechsler, *or* those that have a similar heritage that have been extended, or are much older.

What I still like about the MAT is that it is still widely accepted and popularly used, whereas tests for the Higher Range past the Stanford-Binet V and Wechsler in extended ceiling tests are used infrequently by Psychologists. This is a cause for their not being accepted by Prometheus, but Prometheus then accepts the limitations of the MAT. Since neither Mega nor Prometheus accept these tests, it indicates an unwillingness to use them that is meaningful for the purposes of deciding what to take, and for suspecting that justifications relate to problems with these tests, even if they are seemingly in the same lineage as the tests I took.

There are other unpopular tests that are very close in similarity to the standard Stanford Binet 5 and Wechsler tests I took. At one point I considering taking the Cattell and the "Woodcock Johnson" (?!), but I could not find any psychometitor in either of my home locations at the time who administer it. By

psychometitor I mean professional Psychologist who is skilled in test administration. They are also trained and have a reputation connected to proper administration of these tests for all people in the population. They also have ethical standards and relationships with organizations to which I was exposed when I obtained my degree in Psychology. Being infrequently administered, there are risks using these tests and the credibility of the Psychologists is more questionable for using them over others that are more standard. One cause for taking the Cattell, is entirely to inflate the resulting IQ scores, simply by taking the reports, written with standard deviations of 24. On the Stanford Binet V, I mentioned that one can score 99.89 percent rarity for subtests with maximum 145 subtest IQ, and an FSIQ combination result of up to approximately 164, at 99.997 percent rarity, at SD 15. Those same scores on the Cattell are 174 and 198, so it simply *looks better* to others to claim higher scores, but nobody being told understands only the percentiles should be used to stop this practice of confusing others. There is also a practice of translating scores of one test to the scores of another, so those who didn't take the Cattell will say they hit the ceilings at 174 or 198, without telling you they never took it! Einstein's score, which is unknown, is communicated to be 160, but his score on this test would be 198. They are the same score! They are based on subtest scores of 145 and 174 that have not been tested any higher if one scored maximally!

Despite being hard to find these tests, they appear *more* popularly used, and *not less* than extended ceiling tests going past my immeasurability marks. Being largely unused, and unpopular, being administered by only a few Psychologists at a distance, I thought it an odd choice to trust them. How do these Psychologists work out issues with administration of the test and proctoring and scoring, if there are so few in the community to provide mutual support. What is missing from intelligence tests of the High Range is that there is limited testing of the *administration of the tests* and correction of issues in the administration that should result in not providing scores, among many other issues that simply result from testing instrument. Many would not think of this not coming from the area of enterprise technology, where people recognize the many ways that products fail, and the many errors that tests can contain, if there is insufficient testing of the instrumentation. I don't think those only in the sciences outside of mission critical enterprise and government technology would recognize this as easily either. Testing in technology is not a simple matter, and only certain functional tests are performed which relate to known risks. But there are so few people utilizing these tests that I don't believe that the risks are known, and if anyone was going to discover what the risks were, or ask someone about what they might be, I would likely be the kind of consultant needed to provide that support. This is a field of rare professionals with little support. This is unlike the use of tests like the Stanford Binet or Wechsler, where there is plenty of usage and mutual community support, although I think there are many issues with these tests too, but that discussion will have to wait for a later edition of this book. All I will say now is that the problems with the popular standard tests are inherited in the higher range tests, and then the higher range tests have insurmountable problems on their own at present making them risky and untrustworthy.

Older versions of the SAT have similar claim to IQ correlation at a high range. Tests like these have

significant investment behind them, and many years of usage as standardized tests. People trust them enough to place them on resumé's and applications, to the effect that there is tracing of their personal history involved, and one might argue There is very little risk of being seriously manipulated by such tests that have such significant support. They've been adopted by major universities that have an interest in protecting the records of their students, and these universities would not be interested in storing data that may involve a strong manipulative component. Another issue with rare IQ tests is if there are only a few test examiners they may not be reputable. It may be a sign of lack of reputability.

Dr. Xavier Jouve, mentioned by Mr. Jacobsen may have some credibility for tests for which he's decided to utilize, tests not accepted by Mega and Prometheus, but that is not something I know about *him* not being a researcher of his work. My objections to tests in the category he utilizes, extended ceiling tests perhaps in the heritage of the Stanford Binet V, or experimental tests made by a small circle of researchers or individuals applying, it relate to concerns I see as foundational and would cause me to not want to become another Dr. Xavier Jouve myself, independently testing others without the support network of the APA fully backing my psychometric scoring of real people, although he may be very credible. I don't trust attempts from individual psychologists and psychometitors who work alone or in isolation, although I value their studies and research. Standardization is important for individual health, as we'll see, particularly as it relates to security and trustworthiness for self-application, for self-summarizing one's mind. Those taking high range tests will greatly want to employ and share the score they receive if it is over the test maximums of the standard Stanford-Binet and Wechsler tests, but they are more dubious. It is natural for someone who obtains a higher score to want it to supersede other test scores that are more trustworthy that are lower. When we discuss "home grown" test for the ultra intelligent ranges, we'll see that the same propensity exists for evermore dubious tests, until the most dubious is arrived at: fake tests made by individuals for themselves.

"How could such a thing exist?" you might ask. We'll see shortly.

Returning to experimental examiners like Dr. Xavier Jouve, without using his name causing him further trouble. Other risks must be noted. There are other issues with such endeavors. As a rule, there is little professional acceptance of these tests that validate their authenticity, and there could be only little support from psychological associations. That is reputation risking for the association, any who choose to support, and examiners. It is important to not that most Psychologists are not psychometitors, so it's not as though the total pool of psychologists is part of this community. Who is going to risk their reputation for independent examiners? If there is little support, why would the examiner risk their reputation standing alone(is)?

There is also the question of the size of the customer base. What is the total number of patient-customers of these high range tests that have such rarity in the population? What group is going to work to support his risks of working with less standards for fewer patients? What are his risks and what does the

insurance consist of?

These independent examiners I would suspect have less earning potential. Less earning potential is related to credibility too, for in medicine, those who do really well really might be the very best doctors. One has to think over the probabilities that independent examiners are fringe with less earning potential, having found niche work to perform to have an income. This may seem like it is inapplicable but on the smallest scale of the profession of test-design and application, we have the amateur test designer, and these are the most dubious. Some have customers like Mr. Paul Cooijmans, but earning potential is lower than for professional psychometric exams. Just above this may be the average independent examiner.

Health record requirements exist regardless of scale and popularity of tests. If there are fewer customers quality diminishes. Funding sources have less cause to provide funds. With too few people in the highest range, test takers are assured to be minimal, for that range. There is still a need of sufficient testing of test administration and not the test, and if there are few to administrated there is a poverty of data. The issue of having too few super intelligent people to need these tests makes me feel more confident that there is not a large enough customer base to support a quality product. The test is a product of instrumentation, like a medical device. It's like thinking that a luxurious new version of the iPhone with extended capabilities overcoming science could exist from a few customers and not millions. The iPhone simply doesn't exist without market expectations. The lack of other people needing such tests makes me feel plenty confident about the untrustworthiness of the tests, which would be less than amazing products, with less product testing of all kinds.

This is very different from the other tests discussed earlier, the one's I've taken, and have been exposed to, that everyone knows and uses. It does not appear that school systems accept use of these tests thinking them non-standard. This problem of having no standardization, being experimental, having a lack of norming for real rank ordering with the population, little to no adoption, and low support from major organizations really does completely diminish the value of these tests. One becomes an individual experiment. Some examiners in the High Intelligence community who created their test entirely independently, in such a way as to be very strange and idiosyncratic, like the tests of Paul Cooijmans, not demeaning Mr. Cooijmans, but honestly commenting on their truly idiosyncratic nature. I spoke with him and received a test for review, considered taking it, and decided it was risky. They are interesting and he is an independent experimenter attempting to help people self-elucidate, but I did not want to become an experiment regarding both the validity of the test and health records. I remember recommending to him one potential software tool for tracking his tests so they didn't slip out for distribution. There are few protections so these tests potentially can be shared to others, who might be informed of scores. I believe this is a concern for tests just as idiosyncratic for being independently developed by the Mega Society. Paul Cooijmans runs the Giga Society.

Being very serious, I can make tests too, and probably very good ones. I don't think it can be successful

however, for ethical application to others, even if to an extent it is for fun. Being a [guide of startups for executives, who want their technology to be tested, avoid risks, and *protect their health*, I wouldn't even start considering the [digital security needs relating to health records](#).

The independent test creators in the High IQ community are certainly not having their tests examined by ethical committees.

It creates a health risk to take these tests, and risk to records, and risks to one's own credibility, for deciding to believe results that cannot be validated, that were created and provided by an individual with vested interests. People who are assigned a score *too high* may really believe their scores, and this would impact their lives in strange and pervasive ways. The individual motive of wanting to have research that has useful and truthful results, even if the results really are not useful or truthful, is already a known risk in the sciences. One must eventually find support from peers and from institutions to have credibility, not only with papers that are published resulting from research, but more especially for anything resulting in what would require ethical committee approval for ongoing research with human participants. In my experience in Psychology, test designs involving human participants require approval in advance, and disclosures need to be made to anyone involved, including disclosures about the possible inapplicability of results. I had to be aware of committee requirements in planning experimental designs at the University of Maryland and participated as a volunteer in tests on perception, that required disclosures to me. Creating a psychological exam that will be used by people over many years, is effectively including them in a long term social-psychological study, and very definitely would invoke the involvement of an ethical committee if created in a university context before it could be administered to volunteers. In a university context, it may be possible to apply for and gain approval from an ethical committee to conduct research on experimental tests, with hopes of eventually publishing them for more general use in the larger population. But I think those efforts would be instantly thwarted by inability to actually get sufficient research done, because after all, one is attempting to measure the high range, and some are trying to measure to the millionth percentile or rarer. Can one even obtain participants, at the university, using the student population, who score at the levels that are interesting? How does one broaden such studies, to a number of universities, to gain more participants? Now consider, further, that one must definitely devote one's career to make such an enterprise successful. Has any Psychologist had success doing this, and is there any promising research on this front, to have a test finally standardized for this purpose? It appears to me that the scarcity of participants makes this an unreasonable expectation.

Let us transition to considering who is creating these tests as we prepare for the final question concerning scam artists and fraud. Many of these tests are not created in a university context, with volunteers, after approvals from an ethical committee. These test creators are operating outside of any system of checks and balances on quality of research, and on the ethics of continuing with a completed test!

These test creators seem to be those who *might* be in the immeasurable range, looking for more ways to

find self-understanding, and may simply have interest too, in explaining intelligence itself and how it scales. Producing tests is like producing games, and in a way, like producing works of art, so again, I don't want to completely diminish efforts made by independent researchers working with small groups of customer-participants. But those who are in the immeasurable range should be aware of the unethicity of these practices as it relates to health records, at least under the ethical codes existing in academic research and medical practice, and I find it surprising they would persist in making some of the tests that result in certifications and society admissions. There are huge risks. Some of these tests have not yet been connected with Psychology, and Health Records, and need for validities to be establish, protecting the minds of those who are scored and their relations. It appers once this comes under scrutiny these test preparers would need to stop and since Mega only utilizes tests like these, that are "homegrown" I can imagine this would be a threat to their continuity, unless of course they opt for a test like the MAT for acceptance, like the Prometheus society. Risk mitigation may be a cause of this selection by this society.

In my experience in the high IQ societies, there are still obviously poor motives for inventing and taking "homegrown" tests, outside the context of the Psychological sciences, making them mostly untrustworthy:

1. There is a motivation to create and lead societies on the basis of these tests, self-made, that are "higher societies", for presentation of profound giftedness to its members and the *public*.
2. There is a motivation to perpetuate societies that seem to have higher authority, and protect these already created tests that were used for admission.
3. There is a motivation to protect one's investment in having taken a dubious test created by an individual.
4. There is a motivation to protect one's investement having made a test.
5. There is a motivation to self-validate using these tests. Meaning test creators use these tests on themselves to pretend they've been proven they are the smartest, and that they are legitimate "leaders" of the entire community. Originators of societies can get away without ever having been tested, particularly if the tests were made by them, and have unexpected answers that are not those they intended. Making a test is not taking a test.
6. At the very worst, there is also the motivation to provide tests that simply inflate scores because one has not scored well on anything else, or well enough to create self-satisfaction.

There is a very unfortunate result of these observations. The first is that there are very incredible obstacles to overcome to arrive at a serious test, following the steps required in the sciences, in an academic environment. What are the costs involved in a startup business wanting to arrive at a final test to find a solution for the immeasurably intelligent? It would be *more* costly than for an equivalent of the Stanford-Binet! Because it is more complex and not less! Unless some ethics are sacrificed, and that too

is an interesting topic: to create a test that too few will utilize may require cost reductions that result in bypassing moral standards. This may explain why there is little work being performed on intelligence for the highest range, and why independent “homegrown test” creators exist, partly, and the necessity of bypassing ethics in order to do any of the work. Professional ethics is definitely bypassed in good quantity, even if there are justifications. But what then are the justifications?

I believe individual test creators are very likely to have research that does not lead to a completed test, allowed to be administered at a cost, by psychologists. Were the test creation experimental processes transparently shared for creation of homegrown tests like Mega’s Titan test? Were the tests circulated for peer review? Are there answers to questions on these tests really?

Another issue is that every test maker who is not utilizing an experimental design to arrive at an intelligence test will be unable to demonstrate that they do not have any of the above listed motives. By doing it outside of the sciences one is creating a product that definitely has not had ethical committee backing, or peer review/support.

Issues of utility and not only ethics relate to these tests:

1. Very few people hit the ceiling of IQ tests and could want to take additional tests to learn more.
2. The tests created cannot establish a rank order *with the general population*, who is going to be compared with the “test victor”.
3. Anyone who uses such a test to “improve their rank” has openly exhibited self-deception, and a motive to deceive others. We have seen that such a test could only be produced in a university setting with huge numbers of participants, otherwise it’s not as trustworthy, which means one cannot well trust self-application, but that is an objective.
4. The most intelligent should be the most aware of these limitations, and yet illustrate their self-deception by trusting such tests.

The people who hope to benefit from these tests then illustrate cognitive biases for ultimately believing the results. Notice they would have no such error, in simply stating they do not know their IQs because of the limitations of the trusted standard tests! Worse still, many may not have taken the standard tests.

There is feel in the High IQ communities that have a cross section of individuals from all societies that some in the highest societies would have failed the Mensa test. If one fails the Mensa test, does worse than expected on the Stanford-Binet, the Wechsler, Cattell, Raven, or Woodcock Johnson, one can still take more tests. But that doesn’t mean they already know they are not immeasurable on those tests. Instead they can bypass their knowledge of their true scores and take ever more dubious tests until they are in some society that is above all the others. But as I say in miscellaneous parts of this interview, their conversation is often low quality, which is the cause for suspecting they simply are not of the giftedness

level for any society.

There is a credibility to Mensa that is often overlooked. It really does seem as though the membership is more consistently reputable.

It may be that some test creators, who are researchers within the discipline of Psychology, may have fewer motivations to do anything that is not completely in the interests of science, and may exhibit a genuine desire for obtaining accurate psychometrics. I also implicitly agree, that there is a plain scaling problem in measuring intelligence, and that since one has already scaled the difficulty of subtest scores on standardized tests, one can obviously scale them further until a diminishing pool of people can respond with correct answers. As I stated, the MAT appears to be doing this fairly well. The problem is one cannot rank order them in a trusted way without overcoming difficult norming requirements required to combine the populations of the upper and lower ranges with success.

The ceiling problem exists, because once one has gotten all answers on a test, there is a clear feeling that one could go further. Meaning one is certainly smarter than one has been measured to be. However, knowing that this scaling problem exists, and knowing that there is a definite point in which problems would be too complex for me to solve, does not imply that, scaling it on my own, creating my own test, will reveal where others would fail, across the ceiling, so that I can score myself and them with a new FSIQ, higher than that provided by other tests.

The intuition that this scaling can be continued is what I think drives some to create tests and to persist even with experimental research limitations that doom them.

Every score coming from these tests involve some commitment to a rank-order that is not trustworthy. To take these tests and believe the results, often coming from a single person with no training in psychology, has a very bad effect on the test taker, who believes the number represents a summary of their mental capacity.

“I’ve used a test created by an individual to summarize my entire mind, or my entire cognitive ability.”

One is vastly more safe taking standardized tests with lower ceilings, and committing to remaining content with not knowing how far one could go beyond the ceiling. This is because there are very few bad motives in these tests, and they are well established and standardized, and believing one’s scores is not an act of self-deception. At the higher ranges, it appears there is always an element of self-deception. Again, this is what the Prometheus society seeks to avoid, by taking a totally standardized test as its only one for admission, from academia, the only place where the test could be normed. This is an extremely great difference than having a society creator make a test on their own. However the MAT suffers from the aforementioned defects, and since it is the only test accepted by the society I think there are flaws

regarding the veracity of other societies like Mega.

Moving along, it should be noted that certain societies like Mensa, Intertel, and Triple Nine Society all have a similar admissions list regarding tests. This indicates an agreement as to what is valuable, and there are far more tests to consider than those I discussed, by my interest is to discuss what is most critical in a way that covers most cases. Prometheus society uses only one test, that is also accepted by each of these other societies. But it only accepts one, while the others accept many. This is strange. Furthermore it is not like the tests of independent creators and Dr. Xavier Jouve, or older tests like the Stanford Binet LM. This makes the society a bit strange, and a bit *verbal*, because the MAT is only a verbal test. Pitting Prometheus with Mega, Mega is now strange for not accepting the Miller Analogies Test, which at least has reputation from a third party, and academic institutional backing. It made its own “homegrown” tests, making it more obscure than old tests or Dr. Xavier Jouve’s category of experimental tests with low usage (again not knowing much about Dr. Jouve).

The lack of agreement between the smartest regarding tests, their adoption of differing tests without accepting others, indicates to me confusion in the supposed upper echelons, and I believe there are risks for taking an array of separate tests on those who are already immeasurably intelligent to have an admission that is of dubious consequence, with uncertain conclusions.

As one increases the requisite intelligence to join a society, one finds that one is less and less convinced about veracity, and issues related to potential scamming behavior increase. In Mega, one is providing scores to someone who is unlike a trusted psychologist, to the organization that made it, with uncertainty as to the trustworthiness of scores, and meanwhile, the next level society down, Prometheus, is using a test that scores to 8 standard deviations, a number that no one can achieve, covering both the 5th and 6th deviations. There appears to be confusion in these societies and they appear to be examples of societies unable to really select an appropriate high range test that has the qualities of the more trusted tests like the Stanford-Binet and Wechsler. And each do not accept tests like that from Dr. Xavier Jouve, or experimental independent psychometric test creators.

Moreover, the Mega Society has selected pattern recognition tests, more mathematical, whereas Prometheus has selected a verbal test. Together they would perhaps have something of balance like a normal IQ test, testing both domains, but instead they go one way or the other.

I have explored the potential of taking alternative tests for getting a more accurate prediction of my range, having the issue of not knowing my true intelligence from attaining ceiling scores on more established IQ tests, on portions that are both culture-fair, and portions that are not culture-fair, that correspond directly in content to those tests created for the highest ranges. For example, the Mega test was created by Mr. Ronald Hoefflin, with reliance on culture fair properties that involve pattern recognition, mathematical abilities relating to visuospatial manipulation of geometric objects and the

like, areas that I score maximally on standard IQ tests. As a child I scored maximally, and did again as an adult. Similarly, the Miller Analogies Test focuses on vocabulary, which relates to a subtest, again, that I scored maximally (untestable vocabulary). Each test resembles tests I have scored at 99.89% on a well-normed standardized IQ subtest. But why split-brain test taking between two societies just to understand both verbal and visual IQ. I'm supposed to trust that each is good enough for both, but people who score maximally on matrix reasoning are *not* expected to score maximally on vocabulary and vice versa. There is risk of testing excessively to join a society in which each is deficient in one of the two domains, while I'm not.

I reached out to Mr. Hoefflin once checking to see if the Titan Test was still scored, and he responded briefly, paraphrasing, that it was "available". I chose not to take this test due to risks mentioned throughout, but recently wondered, if he might accept answers as correct, without actually scoring them. This is not faulting Mr. Hoefflin ignorantly—instead, it is just something one must consider before taking such a test. Prometheus's process does not have this extremely serious issue. It really is possible that some of these tests have many answers to questions created by individuals, like in educational instruction, where questions prompt *unexpected results by the most gifted*. Not knowing if the answer is correct or not, a teacher, or a scorer of an untimed test, would realize the time required to confirm the answer. In the profound range, on an independently made test, and unexpected answer may really prove that the test creator didn't know the answer to the question and perhaps never will. If that is the case, they may be admitted into the society for self-protection. Consider in complex mathematics, someone like Kurt Gödel, creator of Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem, just thinks "I proved it right", then a hundred or two years later it is discovered, it was wrong. This means the mathematical formulae creator creating a puzzle to be sorted out by others, would never know even with an extra lifetime that it was wrong. Likewise, someone like myself, might create an impossible matrix reasoning puzzle for the immeasurable range, with an expected score. Then I discover it is either out of everyone's range and the answer is unknown really due to an error, or I get an answer that is unexpected, that is the true answer, that I may not understand. To understand it, it may take many years. Do I admit that? Since this is a problem for the immeasurable range, only the immeasurable debate about it, like mathematicians, for years or centuries until a resolution is found. But the mathematical questions are open and international, whereas the psychometric puzzles are closed. For this reason I think it likely tests go unscored but people are admitted, to conceal that answers are unknown, sometimes. If that is not the case, there is risk that it could occur.

Folks such as myself really have no good options for establishing IQ. We can rely on an academic test that is not culture fair like the Miller Analogies test, or else resort to tests created by some very intelligent members of the high IQ Societies, and some scam artists. These tests, from my examination, having very good familiarity with reliable tests, and university training to be a psychologist, are untrustworthy; and not only for statistical limitations on norming, but much worse, the strong desire of various personalities to "prove" that they are the smartest, using alternative tests that they or their friends

created:

“I’ll create the test that says I score high, or a friend will.”

The smaller and the more focused the test, the more likely it is that this test is for finding alternative paths into societies, or that the tests will relate to subtests of the Stanford Binet on one side or other of the verbal/visual split, making FSIQ summary unreliable.

Entire societies and their credibility hinge on whether or not their tests that are used for admission really do test what they claim to test. Even societies like Mega, that draw interest and some belief in authenticity from having interesting members, hinge on tests made by individual people; these tests appear difficult, but the appearance of difficulty is not enough to create a trustworthy rank order. Tests created by individual people, arguably should not have a name that creates the impression that it is standardized, and not the creation of one person, who again, makes the test, controls its publication, and controls the scoring, like “Titan Test”, which still seems obnoxious in its attempt to sound “ultra”. And very unprofessional. Mega is interesting, but I don’t believe it to be entirely authentic; and every member who was admitted using the test provided is aware of this. Reading the publications, one finds them to be occasionally of very high quality, but the character of the writing is not more complex than what finds in mathematical publications. One cannot read the journal Noesis and conclude that the test used for Mega or the group itself is authentic.

Then there is the question as to the utility of the informal method of analysing writings for significance and velocity of ideation, and for that as well see in subsequent questions, it appears the entire community produces less than I do alone. It appears to me that there is a lopsidedness in the comparison of these member’s avowed IQ and the quality of the materials produced, that is great enough to consider that these societies have problems relating to admissions. If admissions it relates to testing.

Mega is more convincing than many other groups that exist peripherally to the more trusted societies that are more obviously serving people’s motives at pretense, like the Genius groups of Iakovos Koukas, although I don’t believe regarding the deviation scores of the members who gained admittance using any of the society’s entrance tests. There is an oddly huge number of IQ societies, and most that are not well-known are obviously not genuine. They float tests that, again, were created by individuals who do not seem to have the experience or training to create psychological exams. Tests come from individuals who appear to have a vested interest in demonstrating they are the very smartest, and that the societies they create, are authentic enough for people to join. The result however, is that people are deceived as to their own intelligence, taking false tests, and believe themselves to be amidst other people who are highly intelligent. Instead, these groups are filled with a pretender support network, where no individual appears to be authentic, and all trust, believe-in, and rely on, tests created by random people who believe themselves to be “genius” and the like. These groups can be quite humorous and are obviously false, and

their tests humorous as well. They create their own certifications with scores that are well outside of the range of what is testable by real tests, and then they quickly demonstrate they can hardly maintain an intellectual conversation. This is the sense in which I think these peripheral societies are less trustworthy than Mega, but Mega is also not trustworthy in my estimation.

There is risk of giving over to a random test constructor some claim to health information. It is unusual to trust a test creator with scoring of tests. Rather, one would expect it to be scored by trained psychometricians/psychologists who adopted the test. One puts oneself at some real risk taking an unstandardized test. One may receive results that one might believe, despite their having little validity. It appears some who have taken false tests have come to really believe their intelligence is at the very highest range; short conversations with some of these people instantly reveals deficiencies rather than high giftedness.

In short, I do not believe that any test for the upper range can be trusted, and those who reach maximum scores, like myself, have to content themselves with having an untestable intelligence that can't be scored by the trustworthy tests. Thinking carefully about what is safe, it doesn't make sense to me to risk taking alternative tests. The MAT test and other tests of verbal slant and culture-unfairness create risks as one is willing to accept perhaps an unbalanced IQ-correlate score that is higher. The meaningfulness is questionable and the MAT itself does not provide IQ scores. Instead, if one wants an IQ score, one is better off choosing:

“The most healthy and trusted tests.”

That's what I've done and where I score immeasurably, and I will share my personal test details in my next edition of this book.

It is my strong recommendation that people focus on taking test batteries or individual trusted tests, that are standardized, that might have a lower ceiling; but a ceiling that is still high and trusted. If one scores high enough, one may achieve immeasurability and this is certainly adequate.

A large issue I see in the future for those societies that have not opted to do the same, is that they will have to demonstrate in artifacts and productions, a non-lopsidedness to their avowed scores that they received from these tests that are not as trustworthy. Reading through these questions, and considering that this entire book was written in twelve days, it is confusing how some could never complete a book at all, or write articles that never approach the qualities of academic journals, containing fine examples at complexity at good rates, from people who are not immeasurably gifted like the present author. These publications are certainly better than what is provided by Noesis, although there are things I like about Noesis too. More is stated on this as it relates to Mr. Jacobsen's question concerning articles preferred from Noesis and elsewhere.

Before moving on, I'm aware of certain omissions in coverage, that I will cover for the next print edition of this book, but I hope the reader is aware that the next version will cover much that I know is missing, particularly relating to statistics and test coverage. Since this is an interview that has respondents who provided much less material, in the amount of a few pages versus several hundred, I hope the reader understands the contribution provided, and the velocity of significance provided, taking only twelve days, for more than 5/6ths of the content, at a quality that will exceed all earlier interviews.

This is in support of the entire community, and the public that needs reliable information.

This is the last answer finished in this interview, and wanting to finish, preserve the data regarding the twelve days of work, I know many inclusions I want to make *specifically* for this question. Two things will be in the next edition: 1) A process for deciding what tests to take under various conditions similar to what I provide for large organizations, handling risk in complex circumstance, that in this case will relate to a combination of want of self-understanding amidst all the tests that exist and health and security concerns that have been *overlooked* in the communities, and 2) The debunking of the upper scale intelligence tests on scientific and mathematical grounds, and not only grounds appropriate for readers expecting interview-like responses, and 3) a relationship between these and the more formalized version of the informal process of assessing conversation using [velocity of significance and ideation](#).

I expect readers in the community will know already from knowing my earlier contributions that this will be likely a debunking of the upper range high IQ communities on medical and safety grounds, and grounds relating to the assessment of productions and artifacts establishing life history and velocity of significance.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen:

Question 2: How can individuals read more on matters of IQ, societies, intelligence, and the like, outside of the references in the article?

[Learning More About Intelligent People, and How they are Measured, and Intelligence Itself](#)

The audience of this question is composed of members outside the community. I noticed that my style of answering this question, which was prepared earlier is very different than my style answering the other questions. I considered rewriting this answer, but instead, in keeping with the objective of exhibiting how styles change from the same person speaking to others in differing ranges, I have chosen to retain the style. Fascinatingly, the audience really may be the same on reflection, just my thoughts about who might want the answers, changed my idea about who I would direct my attention. This reduced the velocity of significance of ideas. The topic subject matter is also less of interest to me personally causing it to be

reduced further. In this way a person of high intelligence can switch modes of communication that can conceal the extent of the intelligence had. However, this answer should be of good interest to those within the intelligence community and I expect good ideas may result from reading along.

I commented in the article cited by Mr. Jacobsen that an effective method for gaining an understanding of highly intelligent people is watching them speak and communicate, and that it would be especially interesting to move away from watching figures who are well known, to view those who are not well-known. Fame is unrelated to the expression of extreme intelligence in humans, and very few attain any sort of fame, or interest, meaning popularity, from others who are unlike them. I suggested in my brief blog post mentioned by Mr. Jacobsen that one good approach would be to watch YouTube videos of people who are apparently very smart. On that page there are suggestions of people to watch, and that list in retrospect is not a great one, and is certainly not long enough, being originally a quick posting on a site I no longer trust called Quora (very low quality), but one can simply search for people who are famous for being extremely productive in academics, philosophy, and science, and watch them speak. Some people who were acknowledged in this interview would be worth researching.

Rather than pursuing individuals for interviews or their time discussing topics of mutual interest, it may be helpful to find them all in one place, gathering for their annual meetups and so forth. I rarely attend Mensa meetups, or meetups of other groups, but I have, and they were mostly rewarding. People in this community are welcoming, for the most part, of people outside of the community, when they are allowed to be there, because of course, their loving spouses and family members cannot be expected to fall in the same IQ range. Thus they will bring family members to events, and so not only will you find opportunities for talking with very smart people, you will have chances for talking with their significant others, and family members, who might have very interesting things to say about their highly intelligent family member(s). These people would be pleasant company too, creating a good and comfortable environment if one is wanting to know more but is not a member of the societies themselves. Family members who arrived at events with intelligence community members may be excluded from certain events, but may still spend time nearby, simply waiting for them to finish with their meetings. This would create chances to meet people with their families in contexts peripheral to the gatherings. Even if there are rules excluding family members from main events, it should be possible to join for journalistic reasons, to observe. These communities may be interested in having a public relations or media presence. Either way there are opportunities like this for getting better access to large groups of people to meet directly. There is a huge requirement though, related to the purpose of the article, and that is: be kind and respectful, and try not to present any kind of risk to these important people, who include many examples of the best minds that exist in our human populations.

This would give some ideas about how people in the societies are in person, but even still, quite a lot is not revealed about who highly intelligent people are, and how they perform under demanding circumstances, like those conditions created by proctored IQ testing. Seeing them speak together would

provide listening opportunities to discover how they talk naturally with each other, with more excitement and chances to express how they really think internally.

I remember my first IQ tests from when I was a child clearly. The reader, if schooled in a district that tests for giftedness, might have some recollections of these early tests were like too, and perhaps what they enjoyed or disliked about those tests. I think it likely that a very large population of people have a good understanding already of IQ and what IQ testing consists of, and some idea about range, and aptitudes. I recall vividly my experience doing specific tests around manipulating triangles and other shapes to construct larger shapes, with a psychometrician or psychologist, in my elementary school, in a private room. I also recall having to estimate the number of blocks that were within larger configurations of blocks at different orientations. I recall these tests, I believe, because I was quite good at them. Taking IQ tests in my thirties, many years later, I excelled at these same tests again, obtaining ceiling scores. I can obtain ceiling scores on other tests too, and in general, I do not have a fearful relationship with intelligence testing or intelligence as a result. I would suggest that if a reader has some fear around IQ tests, it may relate to some recollection at having a difficult time on IQ tests, which are intended to be difficult, and are for most of the population. This experience may typify test taking recollections.

In order to get additional confirmation about one's suspected IQ range, it may be useful to again take proctored examinations as an adult. One could take the Mensa test and get a feel for range, but I would more seriously suggest taking a proctored examination with a psychologist. These can be somewhat costly, but they give the in person experience of test selection by the psychologist (you can take these tests more than once, after a period of some years elapse, and they would not be precisely the same test, although the tests would feel quite similar). Professional, hand-written score reports are provided by the psychologist too, and these are quite nice to include as part of one's historical documents and autobiography. However, while making these suggestions, I do have some reservations, thinking the reader probably really does already have a good idea of range, and probably, if there isn't a specific personal reason to get confirmation, the primary reason for taking a test would have to be research on intelligence, or out of some interest in psychology, psychometrics and the like. Since the question above was put forth without any indication about personal self-interest in obtaining confirming scores, I suggest this in-person test taking as a very good method for gaining a better understanding of intelligence as a part of research interests.

When I was being trained to become a Psychologist in my university studies, I also obtained text books that provided a very good historical context for the development of IQ tests, and also a good foundation about the validity of the tests, and information about how they are proctored and performed by licensed psychologists who are able to obtain the published tests, and instructions for scoring. If one gets far enough along in studies of Psychology, one can obtain the tests themselves. I did not pursue this, but through the combination of reading on how tests are administered, and taking the tests with Psychologists who shared more information, I gained a very complete understanding. But beyond this, it

is possible to “get the keys to the tests” and administer the Stanford Binet and other tests to those who want to know more. This is a very valuable pursuit, because it can reveal cognitive impairments in children, and also reveal high giftedness in those who will need special education. When I obtained my tests as an adult, it appeared that the primary customers of psychologists providing the tests were to confirm definite strengths and weaknesses in children who were already known to parents and adults to have special difficulties or special strengths. There seemed to be less of an interest in parents with kids who seemed to be well balanced and have normal functioning. Functioning in the normal range there seems to be less of a need for special attention, and therefore perhaps less motivation to take costly tests with a psychologist, after having already been tested by a psychologist, perhaps for free, in the public or private education systems.

If one wants to know more, one can reach out to me as well, since I have considerable experience, all life long, with the experience of being gifted in the high range, of having training to become a Psychologist within this personal context, of having had a number of tests longitudinally over my lifespan, and of having experience with others in person, and in forums, who are extremely intelligent, in the very highest ranges of intelligence. One can reach me in the [correspondence](#) section below. I would be enthusiastic to hear from readers interested, whoever they might be, so long as they are kind and well-intentioned. I take communication very seriously these days having security concerns, and if there are any keywords indicating risks, or the slightest meanings that could be taken the wrong way, I may immediately delete it rather than absorb the information. So take some care in any correspondence that you might want to send.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen:

Question 3: What seem like the common reasons for the exceptionally intelligent and profoundly intelligent finding inappropriate employment or remaining unemployed/underemployed?

Two Pathways in Life, and the Desire to Blend Them

Note: This question was also answered at a much earlier time, about two years earlier, and exhibits a very different writing style that seemed somewhat foreign to my present disposition.

The primary pathway decision faced by those are highly intelligent appears to be the following, which is how I experienced it:

1. “Is it worth the time and frustration to attain organizational success, given I do not value it all that much?”
2. “Is it worth the time and risks to pursue a high income, for the leisure attained, or is it more

valuable to choose a modest income, easily achieved, and commit?”

3. “How can I conserve energy for thinking about what I would like to think about, and for doing what I would like to do?”

On all three points above, most will grapple, and perhaps not find a long-term solution. People have a hard time choosing to save over having material comforts for long periods of time. Some have a lot of trouble identifying what they care about as far as their use of minds and time; whereas, some highly intelligent people will choose the easiest of jobs to automate their performance, freeing their mind completely for their own thoughts, which might have nothing at all to do with work, while others observing their behavior, wonder why they might not opt for materials and organizational success? These people have not been able to disentangle that what one values doing with one’s mind is separate from pleasing others socially, and gaining materials that others find attractive.

Appropriate employment for the talented and especially gifted seems to be a greater rarity than being especially talented or gifted, and realizing this early, many have to make choices to settle into jobs and professions that simply do not provide stimulation and opportunities that might be entirely satisfying. It is an odd thing though, to think that organizations should have occupations fulfilling such a need. Employment is not for those being employed, except for in rare circumstances. Occupations, instead, fulfill market opportunities, closely related to desired extractions by a business owner. A business owner is aware of some opportunity for earning money, and creates an organizational structure, most often starting with himself/herself, which effectively gains money on their effort. Seeing more market opportunity, and understanding the desirability of having leisure time, the owners hire employees that they pay less for similar efforts. Organizations grow indefinitely on this pyramid pathway, with the ownership amassing wealth obtained from increasing market opportunity and an increase of employees who are paid less than what they would prefer. This discrepancy in value, is what incentivizes the ownership to continue to grow and improve their business, likely with much fewer hours of contribution, but greater contribution using mental contributions.

Business owners attain much of what an intelligent person wants for themselves, and likely the business owner is intelligent, but most often not as intelligent as someone in the highest ranges. People outside the highest ranges recognize the intelligence of business owners, particularly owners of businesses that are extremely desirable and high earning, and identify business success with intelligence. However, this is a misidentification. Those who are well positioned with modest intelligence are in a better position, it appears, for this type of success, than those in the highest ranges, who are interested in things like artistic creation, intellectual creations, and simply thinking about things that are not so mundane as business.

It is obvious too, however, that those in the highest ranges would benefit from being business owners, or being employees at the very top of the business, if the business is so well developed, that a special intelligentsia is needed for maintaining it. This occurs in organizations like large software companies,

scientific companies, and organizations of government, like NASA. Similar demands, exist, certainly for military organizations, like the Air Force and others, that recruit specifically for gifted people. I was fortunate to find myself moving through businesses and organizations like these as a consultant, later having real work with people in these organizations, while functioning as an executive. However, the people who become employed do not necessarily control the range or extent of their tasks, and even at the top, there may be an expectation of much specialization. So the highest range individual, who wants freedom of mind to connect diverse topics, finds themselves someone well rewarded with respect to income, and yet give up energy and hours to devote themselves to still trivial specialized tasks. From outside, these highly intelligent people may appear quite well off, when in reality they are understimulated and still have few opportunities for maximizing potential. For this reason, these roles can be filled by those who are intelligent but are still not of the very highest intelligence, and these more moderately intelligent people might be more completely fulfilled. The most intelligent would benefit most greatly from the freedoms of being the owners of the business, where wealth might enable them to go beyond their own business to a range of activities that permit higher generality, higher interdisciplinarianism, and the like, or simply time to pursue activities that free the mind. Since I planned effectively, and had and/or created opportunities that were headed in a direction consistent with these wants of the most intelligent people, I finally realized a career that included business ownership just like this.

It appears that these business ownership opportunities are still not for all those who are highly intelligent, and appears somewhat uninteresting. There is also competition with those who might already have wealth, might already inherit the businesses, might already be in a position of understanding very closely the market opportunities that creates competitive advantages even over those who are more highly intelligent. One does not necessarily have market feel and experience, and incentive to succeed when there is a market opportunity which might be invisible except for those who are more intimately and socially involved. Involvement then can provide better opportunity than raw intelligence.

The highly intelligent then, opt for pursuing whatever is satisfying to their own minds, and have to gauge the risks associated with trying to find a career that produces income, sacrificing time and energy, that could be used for thinking freely instead.

I personally prefer one of two types of employment:

1. Doing something that is so easy that it requires no thinking, but is in a healthful environment; or
2. Doing something that is so complicated nobody else can do it, that is rewarding in income. Such a job is a rarity, and I was fortunate to find myself given opportunities after expending much time, at much risk, just seeing if such opportunities would ever come into existence.

At present, I run my own organization of one, as a Consultant guiding large organizations. This is a

reiteration for those who read through, but I will repeat it very briefly for those who may have been specifically in this question but not others, or the introduction. I was able to build such a company, only after having attained Chief Architect at Adobe Systems, and Solutions Consultant, a role similar to that performed by Edward Snowden. One might think, being Chief Architect would be satisfying, and it was for a period, because I could work on tasks that were very high complexity. However, there was also the reality of limitations of colleagues and employees that could not necessarily execute in complex ways, if not for their own limitations (there were many talented colleagues), for inability to organize projects effectively. I found myself still unable to retain my intellectual property as well, and unable to eradicate manipulative tendencies of managers who wanted to shift roles, and do so without increasing income more than what was scheduled. Meaning my talents, which were obvious to all, could not create rewards in any way like if I was a business owner. So I left this job and discovered, that in business I had a much better level of control of my income, which was higher, and allowed for the total ownership of my own productions.

Even in my own business, the opportunities from clients dictate the complexity of what I'm doing. However, I can advance my business in any way I like as I perform this work, alongside, owning all my own contributions. If I wanted to work less I could work less. I could travel as desired. I ended up getting all that I wanted very precisely, exactly obtaining what I set out to obtain. However, I did not know that it would turn out this way, and many fortuitous circumstances made it possible. Having had a very good and elevated role at this software company enabled me to culminate my career as far as titles are concerned, and my subject matter expertise was desired by those in my network I already knew, and companies who had needs from an elevated consultant. Later I won many customers who were totally separate from the earlier business relationships and was able to further advance my income and range of work activities.

So I am of the few who were able to combine personal mental goals with social-organizational, academic, and income advancement goals, that are sometimes quite opposite to one's interests, sacrificing time and energy, with uncertain results. I recognize that my mental needs, are quite unlike those of many of the colleagues I have ever had, who seem more settled and less restless in their roles, even when they change little, because they seem to have a suitable level of complexity still, even in specialization, and an income level that, under social-comparison, appears good to themselves and those who might pay attention. They are able to gain material benefits that they think are enough for their personal goals, and stay in their roles for very long periods of time.

This is not satisfying to someone like myself, who needs to combine things further, have greater complexity, and greater control over income, locale, etc... What I wanted I communicated to a manager once, who upon reading my desires, must have felt quite powerless to support me. I wanted greater "Idea Execution" potential and used that exact phrase in an email and "sync up" conversation. I'm chronically having ideas that nobody finds interesting, that have high value, and are highly interdisciplinarian. They

are general and abstract, and hard to communicate, and require money to bring to fruition. These goals relate to personal interests, that I've had since I was a teenager; goals I would have sacrificed my career for, if I could have achieved them otherwise.

I wanted:

1. Time and energy to have important ideas and to be able to write about those ideas.
2. Later I wanted resources, especially monetary resources, and ownership of my own IP, to record those ideas into actual writing, and software.
3. Later I wanted those ideas to connect to business objectives supporting a range of industries, and to be able to deploy those ideas at those businesses and industries, in an organization changing way, supporting other people and their goals.
4. I wanted to connect these writings with sufficient accomplishments to create authority, creating publishing persuasiveness, and was able to do so in connecting it to my lofty titles I've had in doing business with customers, and academically, after many challenges, finally obtaining a number of degrees, and gaining admission at Harvard University, a well-enough-respected organization to make book publishing likely.

Highly intelligent people want to be able to communicate those thoughts they have that seem to be greatly valuable. As a teenager I was having many ideas I thought could change the world for the better. At that time, I knew there was a very long path ahead for having any credibility that would cause a readership to have any interest at all. I knew even my own family would not read my writings, and my friends would not either. If they would not read my writing, who would? Who would care to read anything I had to think about? These were thoughts I had in my early twenties that I recorded in a journal kept that I still have archived, called *Rational Times*.

These are other reasons why I felt the need to have organizational and academic attainments. They had to be enough to create attention or authority. Accomplishments in the High Intelligence societies was a completely unexpected phenomena, but that occurred along the way too, after reconfirming my intelligence once again, working as a software architect at the Food Network (more precisely, Scripps Networks, whose television channels were later taken on by Discovery, including HGTV, Travel Channel, etc... other businesses I also supported). While performing a complex role, I thought to myself, "Why have I not joined Mensa already?" Impressed at my seeming ability to do my job at an increasingly challenging level, at a pace that seemed to exceed colleagues, who I already respected for their abilities, I thought to confirm what I learned in youth. This was also catalyzed by an experience with the book *Outliers* as I mentioned earlier. I confirmed again my abilities and joined Mensa, and began interacting there and in a number of other groups. While simply socializing, while doing my work in software, and in academia, I attained a level of respect, and attention, and many personal relationships,

which further developed some notoriety in the High IQ societies. Now I'm quite well recognized in the High IQ community, and in so doing, developed at least some interested readership.

Today I have potential for a healthy writing career, apart from writing I do in my work for various organizations in a number of industries (making it more challenging, and more interesting, having very different customers with different needs, in different places, even international locations, like New Zealand). I have the authority requisite, and some niche readership, and an online *Book and Journal* with underlying technology I own, having written the software from scratch and from various pieces freely available (which is normal in creating software products), for artistic and communication satisfaction.

These productions feed my business value as well, so I was able to connect the value of my personal writings, and underlying software, to the creations of large organizations. For example, I have recently designed the technology for AbbVie, Inc's international website, which was deployed without issue, and connected my ideas shared with that organization, with ideas developed in my personal life and in my business. This business has many television commercials now for their various pharmaceutical products, which usually have other brand names. The company name is identifiable at the end of the commercials. If you watch television you'll notice the frequency of the commercials, because of the wide range of drugs they sell that are communicated using totally separate commercials.

There is an odd synthesis to my career, which is satisfying beyond what I thought possible, but very close to what I would most want, and it appears to be precisely what would be rewarding to others in the very highest ranges of intelligence. In fact, communicating with many of them, I become aware of their journeys, which do resemble my own. I very much wish that many who are looking for the same fulfillment are able to find it. While I find myself admiring the person who would eschew organizational attainment for purely mental attainment, and productions outside of existing organizational structures, and academia, I hope they are able to have income attainment and experiences that are able to broaden their communication potential. Because that is what is often wanted—they want to be able to share what is in their minds, that they might be unable to share without additional power to do so.

I believe the level of preparation required for someone in the very high range of intelligence to share what they would like to share from their minds, to be quite extraordinary. There is no doubt to me that many others in the community would like to have the organizational, academic, and software/writing IP ownership that I have, relating to my writings. Without having gone through decades of preparations, which may not be fortuitous, I do think smaller outlets at communicating to a perhaps receptive audience is still very desirable. Articles like that from Grady Towers, and Hank Pfeffer, listed in my [references](#) discussed earlier, are unlikely to have a wide readership, or interest, even being shared through channels like Mega and Prometheus. However, they could and did connect with audiences who can benefit directly, and I too have benefited from their works.

In the high intelligence society journals, works seems to have a lack of academic developments that would dissuade some readers from having a prolonged interest, and this again is part of what I mean about the extraordinary requirements of sharing one's mind, at this level. One seems to need to exceed what can be produced academically, somehow. This can be achieved, with some notice, if the writing has an informality that is greatly offset by the power of what is stated. Some writers seem to be able to pull this off, but it may go unnoticed by those who might not be able to discern, since the mind-matching I mentioned is required for appraising significance more fully. What they would like to say is quite remarkable, and they communicate extremely effectively and powerfully. But they lack very definitely in having the academic and career undergrowth, that would seem to provide more formal authority to their writings, and I believe they would want this for themselves, if they could have it. But alas, academic life is slow and torturous, and their minds being too fast, cannot sometimes take the frustrations associated. Again this relates to the [velocity of significance and ideation](#) they experience. I experienced this myself and many times needed breaks in college, for becoming disillusioned in the supposed objectives of higher education, easily obtained independently, but without papers.

There is a concept I became acquainted with somewhat recently, stated to be ikigai, and trusting that's real Japanese, relay it here to the reader. This word relates to the fulfillment of joining interests in such a way that time is spent doing things that seem more holistic. Work, talent, interest, and gainful employment are related to one another. Such a term might lead the reader to think there is no special interest connecting, then, to high giftedness, but that is not the case. Rather, the size of the effort at synthesizing diverse talents and interests seems to be at stake. "How do I combine all my talents into one and into gainful employment?", considering Hank Pfeffer's article, it seems a somewhat silly pursuit. This is why I think certain forms of employment, again, seem like they are not appropriate to certain people. "Will this organization create ikigai from all my interests?" appears the absurdist of questions, particularly given the objectives of owners. People like myself worked in youth believing it to be impossible to make ikigai occur in a satisfying way. "It is impossible and so I will give up on this?" appears a result of the Terman study for some. I believe it to be very challenging and wonder if perhaps there is a greater ikigai for me in the future, while at the same time, I recognize what I have is something quite out of the ordinary, and I am contented for what I have at the moment, even if it could be better in some ways. I admit it is hard to think it could be better, unless very great riches are in my future. Being retired now though, I'm less concerned even to receive riches preferring to write this to you instead.

I think many of the highly intelligent understand this issue early, and opt for choosing what appears the lowest risk pathway, for preserving energy for doing what one considers to be most valuable.

In my life, having been influenced greatly by the works of various philosophers, who could only make their achievements having very abundant leisure time, I chose to pursue the very greatest income I could attain, while simultaneously devaluing income as having only secondary value. I had an interest in being a hermit on one hand, living alone and in nature, with few needs, and a desire to live in an urban

environment, spending freely to enjoy the benefits of restaurants, not cooking, and having a nice apartment cared for by a landlord, so I had nearly no concerns whatsoever in doing mundane tasks. I value doing things with my hands in nature, and I value the benefits of having no needs for doing housework and mechanical tasks, so that I can focus exclusively on mental-academic pursuits, like reading and writing. I noticed though, that one can have all that one values if one has money. Ideally, one can have it without too much toil and self-sacrifice, and those who were born into wealth know the value of having had to do nothing at all to obtain it. Suddenly they have leisure to do anything and everything they want that they value perhaps intrinsically. The high intellect does benefit from being born into wealth, and many famous philosophers and scientists did not need to work incredibly hard to amass a savings providing security.

I was not born into such a scenario and knew, whatever success I might have in organizations, and success in income attainment, or business, would come primarily from myself, although I did have parents who were financially supportive as I was growing to be an independent adult. I would never be able to have a significant savings exclusively coming from my family, and I assumed there would never be an inheritance to wait for, which is something I personally detested as well, wanting instead for my parents to fully enjoy all their savings. My parents would deplete their resources in their interests, and I would have no ongoing connection to their financial wellbeing, ensuring they could enjoy themselves while I would live on my own merits.

So in my early 20's I strove for financial independence, in a context that was not incredibly favorable.

It was especially unfavorable for a period due to my choice to drop out of High School. I experienced the improbability of advancing in a job I had during the period of not being in school, making 6 dollars an hour, even after being promoted, and recognized that organizational success in academics, and in work, might be the only way I could gain a significant income.

“How easy or accessible is it to earn a high income, in my case? Is this something I value, and want to pursue, to advance my own interests, or are my interests incompatible with such a life? Should I choose a more modest way of living, and do what brings value, giving my worldview, or should I find a way to secure and easier life with surplus money and material resources, to give myself more leisure time for my pursuits?”

I think there is a real dichotomous divide here, and that most people have to make decisions about this in order to secure their well-being at all stages of their lives.

One difference that appears to exist, is the degree of consideration made about this question early in life, versus later. Some appear to drift along, moving from one moment to the next, as if this were not a real question. Some will struggle through business without having a real aptitude for earning. Some will not make a choice between material interests in consumption, and saving funds, and will remain in debt,

wanting both and never reconciling desires.

I think those in the very high IQ ranges are more likely to reconcile material interests with what seems to be of genuine value, and make calculations as to the reasonability of attaining a special degree of organizational or financial social success, and high income. Some eschew organizational and financial attainment early, seeing its transitory social value, and seeing the time requirements for building wealth, and simply choose a path that will never produce the awe that one might expect from an exceptional mind that finds fame. These are highly intelligent people who recognize real futility early. “Even if I attain wealth, I know the following will occur *[fill in the blank]* and I will be unsatisfied.”

Then there is another segment, who recognizes this, and yet sees a very difficult path ahead not pursuing high income. “How will I ever write what I wish to write without the leisure time and energy to do so? How can I spend my time doing mundane work, depleting my energy, only to find at the completion of their workdays, they are having less and less energy, over time, to do anything felt to be valuable?”

Scott Douglas Jacobsen:

Question 4. What was the eventual outcome or the larger conclusions from the Terman Study?

Some Comments on Maladaptation at the High Range

I am not a scholar of the Terman study, but understand that part of the results related to what was called “maladaptive” patterns of behavior, which seemed to occur at a greater rate as one approached the scores of the very most intelligent Termites. The Terman study is quite a long study, with results comprising a number of follow-ups, and for purposes of this response, I’m relying more on the article from Grady Towers, which touches on the same topic, and relies on some conclusions of the other study. There is another topic, from Mr. Michael Ferguson, called *The Inappropriately Excluded*, and because this article comes to mind, and is also quite well written, I feel I must mention it.

This maladaptive trend relates, again, to the article mentioned above, *The Outsiders*, and presents a consistent picture, that as one moves along the normal distribution rightwards one finds people increasingly unable to relate to the larger population around them, in ways that are satisfying to themselves, but are not necessarily unsatisfying those they interact with. By this I mean that other people may enjoy speaking with them, but something is missing in the experience to those who are more intelligent. Of course such a phenomenon finds expression wherever people interact, and is not exclusive to any particular environment where one might hope to have rewarding work or rewarding relationships. Seeking environments that offer satisfaction gradually becomes an exercise in futility, and one finally succumbs to a life that is somewhat lonely. Some are fortunate enough to find group membership with

others who might be hard to find for issues of geographic distribution of demographics of intelligence, and are able to finally have mutually satisfying interactions. Work environments might not be possible to find, or may have obstacles and hindrances from admission and entry, that are themselves designed for those who fall lower on the spectrum, and may present an unsatisfying situation of having to “hoop jump” along to a satisfying academic career.

“I qualify in every way and yet on paper I do not qualify”

was something I experienced and still experience to this day, wondering if a Ph.d or two, or more, would be worth anything to me, and if years of study to complete a paper dissertation was something valuable given I can easily write papers on par with [dissertations](#), having paid for no Ph.d program, and without having gone through any of the laborious steps to qualify for admissions.

This writing here, again, provides some relationship with the question as to the results of the Terman study, but not being a Terman scholar, and finding this interview a good opportunity to speak for myself, and others who experienced some degree of suffering at the thought of not finding a suitable environment for self-expression, and realization of potential, I thought I’d speak to the ultimate place it leads, which is the feeling of a repulsively slow corporate and academic edifice that strings one along with promises of doctorates and degrees, and good careers, that seem to have little tangible value for being disconnected from concrete accomplishments which flow readily from the mind, but are quite well connected with long and expensive and torturous submissive experiences being a student-customer. One wonders why one cannot read and work in labs without having to spend a decade or more paying for education in indentured servitude at a pace that is for people who are in the normal range and not the extraordinary range.

“I learned this as a child, a teen, again as a young adult, and again I must pay to certify to this, vaguely, over perhaps a decade as a university student, without any consumer controls?”

Such experiences as not being able to express oneself as oneself in a mode appropriate for accelerated learning, leads gradually to a feeling of unfulfillment and the feeling that the world has not situated its institutions or its organizations for such people. Instead they were made for others and one must simply find a way to exist comfortably, perhaps.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen:

Question 5: Why should individuals stick to professional achievements positive for individual authentic self-esteem and the common good rather than a test score?

Testing for Self Understanding, and Focusing on Personal Development

Earlier in my section on my relevant background, I spoke about my history of need for self-affirmation, given my lack of support in youth despite my demonstrated giftedness, to finally confirm my total intellectual capacity. This particular question asks why individuals *should* stick to professional achievements over test scores. I don't testing is incompatible with arriving at a more complete scientific self-understanding using tools of measurement. In education feedback on learnings is provided by testing and this is universally supported in our culture, although all can remember limitations in testing from childhood. Instead, I think if we had more tools for measurement, that were better understood, that reductionistically went to our own biology, comprehensively medically, we would want that. I personally would like to have as complete a knowledge as I can of my own body, mind and nervous system, that I can have in a reasonable time, given my intellectual capacities and level of financial and government resources. It makes little sense to me to desire less medical information concerning myself, than more, given we do not have enough medical information about ourselves due to price!

We have seen that some tests have been created for the highly intelligent that are insufficiently medical. We saw that this creates bio-ethical concerns, that partly incriminate these tests, but *not the desire* to have more tests. The desire for these tests relates to the need to have better self-awareness, and wherever test creators are being honest in their attempts, even alone, to create better measures, there are useful contributions to society. The objective is an expansion to have a better understanding of the mind.

If one has a stroke, degenerative condition, or other medical issue that results in deterioration of function, one might want to know that this deterioration is happening, by testing if any high range cognitive abilities are diminishing. This may lead to a method of correction. Currently, only the regular population can be tested regarding smaller deterioration differences in their neurological health relating to intelligence. Since members of the immeasurable range like myself, are immeasurable, I could have small signs of correctable deterioration without having *any method at all* to convince doctors that something is wrong.

In this way even certain tests lacking validities contribute to the community, and can provide an ethical justification for work, so long as that does not involve change of intellectual history as to the true motives and intentions. I don't think that test examiners have thought necessarily about this above paragraph, although now that they would be aware of it, having read this interview, we may hear back that these were the original intentions, particularly if there are no already written artifacts that demonstrate that this intention has been communicated. So this information above can be used rightly or fraudulently.

Most members of the public would benefit from truly accurate information on complete self, and anyone who wants to write an autobiography that contains open and honest information about self, wants to include good quality information that constitutes wisdom. This includes information about the mind which must use description and metrics. One cannot omit tools for measurement that are all we have at

present and arrive at wisdom that requires it.

But I think seeking self-knowledge is not incompatible with accomplishments and “doing good” for others, and think instead that wisdom blends the two. Highly significant thinking is synthetic and blends knowledge for application. Problems arise that require knowledge from all sorts of interdisciplinary sources, including that which Socrates would recommend self-understanding. The problem solving that results from this synthesis of knowledge combined with problem solving is creative ideation, and recordings of this creative ideation results in accomplishments. Accomplishments that are of good quality and high velocity of significance and ideation relate to dissertative productions that are very frequent, and should include self-knowledge and probably could not be as valuable if they are inapplicable to one’s own knowledge of one’s mind.

As I stated above regarding my career, education, and productivity, and my software system, my ethical productions for the good are expected to greatly outpace productions of others, with great significance, ideation and novelty. All these personal accomplishments are of high importance not only for being intrinsically rewarding, and for helping others, including animals, but because they create a measurable datum for further confirming profound giftedness and self-understanding I continue to seek for myself, at a diminishing rate as I approach full understanding (actually). In the future there will certainly be automated techniques for evaluating this datum for my intelligence, and can be used to compare my intelligence with the intelligence of others, to expand upon joint-self understanding of minds.

In this way productivity will eventually arise in psychometric test results. People have long stated that life itself is a kind of test, and one does have to put in effort in order to have good results. In this way a life of wise productions will be blended with test taking.

Here I would state that we want both and eventually they will both become part of the same datum.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen:

Question 6: What does a Mensa International membership mean to you?

The Value of the Mensa Membership from My Perspective

There was a quote that I’ll paraphrase from memory, from an African American Astronaut who is a Member of Mensa, who was asked the same question:

“Being a member of Mensa means, to me, that I no longer have to think or talk about how smart I am.”

I have the same view, perhaps for being exposed to his statement, under my interpretation that this

creates comforts of self-understanding. One can speak about it if there is value and obviously I have demonstrated the value. For this reason I chose to become a Life Member. It is not the case that I no longer think or write about my intelligence, although my need to prove anything to myself or others has largely vanished. It is done and I no longer need to dwell further on this topic to convince others. I told a recent acquaintance that I did not want to hear any more intelligence related questions from him, because of need to be finished. This article and the perspective above combines to finalize my proof as it relates to comforts of self-understanding.

The second extremely meaningful thing to me about Mensa, and other societies, is the access to extraordinary people, who are not necessarily extraordinary for having attained ephemeral social successes. These are people who one yearns to meet for the sort of mind-matching and communication mentioned above. This is the matching of humor and velocity of [significance and ideation](#). This is a similar mutual benefit that people strive for in academic life, wanting to finally arrive in a collaborative social context for productive [dissertative thinking](#), and nexial business relations, like collaborating with Bill Gates, Jeff Bezos, Steve Jobs, or Elon Musk, naming only a few. Similarly for my desire to work with and combine people like Professors Singer, Tao, Dawkins, and Dennett.

I've met valuable people all over, and have come to meet exceptional people quite naturally in my demanding career. But one can simply meet people who are exceptional by joining Mensa. This relates to a mistake my parents made in not introducing me as a child, along with my sister, to Mensans. My brother is also very intelligent and I don't know his test status, but both he and my parents, and friends, could have expanded our social context to include the highly gifted from the start. I regret that there is a barrier to entry, to get into this group, to talk to certain people, but it is a barrier that is necessary, even if it is arbitrary, for now—that's until better psychometrics is arrived at and this article has communicated a way to arrive at that. If Mensa is not the group to support expanding inclusiveness on new psychometrics, then other groups will arise, and already many groups of various kinds, work related, school related, or intelligence related do exist to provide a healthy and nurturing social context for children and adults.

I suggest to the reader who might be obstructed from admission (there are people who definitely belong who simply have not gained the paper test scores making it possible to enter), to focus on academic experiences and join groups interested and focused on specific sciences, arts, and experiences, because as soon as you are in these environments, you witness the results of intelligence in beautiful ways, and attention is on quality. When one visits a museum and experiences people interested in museums, quality is apparent. Quality is not always apparent in the high IQ community, and one has to be long exposed to find exceptional people, or exceptional moments, even there, with the exception of meetings in person, which were more consistently rewarding. I mention this to the reader, because genuinely, one finds the same qualities one is hoping for on both pathways, and people are appearing in these groups when they are not appearing in the high IQ societies.

It's quite a nice experience to witness people's productions and strengths without having any idea how they would perform being tested, and oftentimes one has no care or concern at all, being quite pleased with the diverse strengths one is witnessing. I don't know the metrics of my colleagues with whom I collaborated with but that doesn't stop me from wanting more interaction with them even while I more tightly control my communications to protect my interests and safety.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen:

Question 7: Do you have any particularly favourite articles from Noesis: The Journal of the Mega Society?

Selected Readings of Interest from the Community

I do not read much from the community journals including Noesis, preferring instead to read extensively materials that are often trusted and are covered in course curricula already within academia. This does not mean that there is not much that is of high quality, and I have taken steps to ensure that some specific individuals who have become deceased have had their websites archived and preserved. Expecting that none would care much about the preservation of their writings, which were numerous, I anticipated the eventual erasing of their contents from web servers and blogging applications, that are less safe from protection as library contents. When people die some others only take brief actions to say kind things, but few take actions to preserve their work. One particular deceased individual who was like-minded and very supportive, had his website vanish as expected, and for years now I've held his materials waiting to republish them charitably and anonymously. His work has little to do with my own, but I think people need ongoing access to it indefinitely. This relates to my efforts to make certain publications permanent beyond what is currently possible for any document type. I have efforts underway to ensure that publications don't vanish in geological time, and am aware that will likely not be successful, since the earth is impermanent; but I will am trying to take actions to provide at least a partial solution. This concerns all human information. My work is not deletable presently. Even if my online Book and Journal were attacked, all of it would survive. My own efforts in living autobiography call to mind this effort to preserve the works of other deceased people, but are not specifically about that in my primary motivations that relate to sharing my own mind extensively and accurately. However doing the work with my living autobiography does relate to my desire to see the works of others preserved and communicated correctly, and not only of these members who have passed away, but other historical figures who are highly intelligent whom we are misinformed about via simple advertising and propaganda. Living figures like those in the Acknowledgements will eventually pass away and if I'm living, I will work towards making sure their credibility is preserved in my basic communications. These deceased members of the community were, who are of higher intelligence than the Mensa range, are some of the few who understood the intention of my work, and exhibited comprehension, kindness in communication, and stewardship. Some have provided avenues of publication. I am very happy to have

met these people while they were living, which is now. Not all of my contacts of importance to me are mentioned in my Acknowledgements for good cause, because it relates to some of these archiving efforts that need to remain anonymous for a period, and keeping them unacknowledged may not be my long term strategy for protecting their anonymity.

Returning to the point about my preferred reading, typically my chosen materials relate to my personal projects of interest that relate to a number of fields, and have a specificity these days to specific research questions I have. This is the cause of my reading the work of Professor Tao. Outside of my research questions, and in my [reading history](#), I gobble books from preferred authors in which I always find value, like from Professors Singer, Dennett, and Dawkins, but typically my interests are so interrelational that this desire to read their works for personal enjoyment ties well to my research projects. My selected fun reading is always academic and from highly intelligent figures.

Regarding research: I don't do much of that finding it unnecessary and inappropriate to my mind and for those who are immeasurably intelligent. Instead of using my time reading other works, I spend more time creatively writing and reading my own. I'm not very information seeking already having gotten much of what I required from earlier reading. Like a child I am usually finding deep significance in little facts gleaned from experience, and I synthetically relate these to very large sets of interconnections in my life. Logically analyzing, I know what connects and what doesn't with a strong sense of reality, and blend it with my own behavior so it results in a new me. A new me as far as growth and healthful neurological brain changes create storage deltas, resulting in obvious day-to-day changes in thought and action. Notice this is required for profound giftedness but is only touched upon by science in a way currently that is not metrically comprehensible in psychometrical tests that don't cover days, weeks, years and a lifetime of nervous system development. Works like mine do provide new opportunities for measuring this. The measurable change is in the velocity of significance and ideation established in life artifacts figuring into the living autobiography falling within a total earth data and history. The exhibited velocity of significance relates to aging and establishes my own works as having plenty of growth potential for providing value in the new edition of this book, that others might want. As others get older, their significance in thinking improves too, oftentimes, and as long as they can remember being young, their shares may be of more interest than those writers who are mentally younger. The reader may recognize from some history of IQ that the 'quotient' part of IQ was mental age over chronological age. One reading this may not think the writer would be 42 years old, and this writing is not that dense. This document can be fed into tools that analyze writers for anticipated age, and using such tools that have *at least some* usefulness, I anticipate the age calculated would be much older than my actual age. As I age velocity continues and accelerates for significance. In this way I expect new works to be more worthwhile than some earlier works. The new edition of this work will be more significant and meaningful than this first edition.

There are some few readings from the High Intelligence Community that I have been exposed to, that

were very interesting during the period of elevated interest from when I first joined various societies, and these have come from figures who wrote on topics that seemed especially relevant to my characteristics, and came from supposed members of the immeasurable range, who are themselves figures I know for certain are intelligent but am uncertain as to their actual psychometrical status. Despite this the articles from these writers had personal influence since the contents do indicate high velocity of significance and ideation, even though they are written in a less academic format. Conversation of high quality does not need to be academically conveyed. Sometimes reading these conversational writings are like learning from like-minded grandmothers and grandfathers who have opted in old age to discontinue the scholastic mode of expression.

If I could afford to carry large textbooks from the highest quality professors I would, too, because those contain the most compressed summaries of current research, and providing linkings to articles that are already prioritized for importance. I don't like researching much because of the difficulty of actually locating the contents that searching says exists but doesn't provide oftentimes. This is true even having access to research locations through Harvard University or Google Scholar. Research is often returning unuseful studies as well. Digital copies of articles are also not really part of a sound digital strategy for my particular lifestyle which includes offgrid living with few reasonable energy related strategies for recharging, which relates to global poverty in my studies of *The Overlaps of Homelessness and Wealthy Camping* which I keep ultralight. Some might say you can have a library in a device, but I have thought about that extensively and only agree in part. Digital books fundamentally fail on user interface design, where books excel. That's in the flipping through pages and rapid surveying of contents. I like textbooks and large reference materials in my hands and think the Encyclopedia Britannica in a digital format would be a form of torture. For research my preference would be a general equivalency of tenured professorship status and residency, to be near the library's journal stacks. But as a continual traveller with no residency moving about internationally, I find other ways to find answers.

I have not done much reading from the journal of the Mega Society, but I found at one point one article that was enjoyable, explaining my life to an extent, and that article was entitled *The Too Many Aptitudes Problem*, written by Hank Pfeiffer. *This article is an example of one that is not of academic format but one can tell is of good significance, is well considered, and seems to confirm a large amount of experience, in short expression. This is important because the profoundly gifted may choose to never be formally educated, and what they say* may exceed what one can receive in formal academic publications.*

An article that has had a greater impact, was the article from Grady Towers, not from Noesis, but from the Prometheus society. This article discusses a topic related to the maladaptivity results of the Terman study, in a similar way to the article written by Michael Ferguson, entitled *The Inappropriately Excluded*. Each of these articles are somewhat informal and provide a conveyance of good significance nevertheless, also corroborating diverse experiences I've had personally. Each of these articles to an

extent influenced my views regarding the wants many people have, like myself, of attaining powerful roles in order to execute upon ideas, and to meet people who are of better quality to collaborate with, for creating a normal work environment, and for balancing this with financial needs or frugality to create that leisure time that is required for pursuing a large assortment of interesting personal projects that are too interdisciplinary usually for including in one's employment. In my early twenties I had already decided independently that this was worthwhile and planned my life on this basis, achieving better than expected fusion of social and business goals, and work environment because I could create that for myself, and leisure time for more intrinsically rewarding pursuits. Although I knew this well already and executed on my plans successfully, before my plans were totally complete I encountered these works, and they did help. From my conversations with Mr. Ferguson I learned that he was financially successful, traveling and retired, like myself, although he was much more advanced in age. I was fortunate to have the opportunity to chat with him on a variety of topics and had an exchange with him on his blog over the value of skull measurements for estimating intelligence. He has a work on that called *H. Macrocephalus*. I disagreed with his primary thesis but this caused renewed interest in the need to recognize brain morphology which does relate to cranial capacity, and total brain volume does relate somehow to having opportunity for growing a more comprehensively developed nervous system. This topic already was covered in my studies of Archaeology and Anthropology in college, where the increasing skull size of pre-human and human ancestors is used to estimate relative level of evolutionary development. Without the importance of advancing cranial capacity we would have no cause for thinking other animals with small brains, without observing them, would have lesser learning abilities. One can read my comments within that article starting at the datetime " Anonymous February 22, 2015 at 6:02 PM". At the time of my writing this was not anonymous, under my former name "Matt Cavanaugh", apparently because I deleted the associated Google account used to establish the conversation, that uses a Google technology. We had a long exchange together there and the conversation may be of some interest.

Exposure to these works somewhat created the same confirming experience as with the joining certain High IQ societies, as I learned that others were thinking as I thought, even if not all that I read was entirely new to me.

Also covered in these articles is the likelihood of being purged from work from being overly intelligent, and I experienced the risk of this a number of times, and active plans for it on one occasion. I will discuss this topic at another time in either an expansion of this essay or within my [living autobiography](#)

These two articles together are part of what I imagine to be somewhat necessary reading for those who have interest in understanding the minds of folks who belong to these high intelligence societies, or those who belong to no society at all, but are functioning independently in the world without any group support. This is because they have or will face challenges that require them to make decisions like that discussed in the earlier question, that covered the need to either commit to frugality and focusing one's own pursuits without necessarily having any acknowledgement or widespread attainment, or to

“jump over the hurdles” created by academia and business, using up valuable time, to expand upon one’s freedom to more fully gain notability and power relating to desired goals and achievements.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen:

Question 8: You wrote an interesting article entitled “How Do People With IQs Over 180 Act and Think?” (Cavanaugh, 2018). You bring forward individuals like Richard Feynman, Bertrand Russell, Paul Cooijmans, Grady Towers, and societies such as the Mega Society, the Giga Society, and Mensa International. By and large, these are well-known within the high-IQ communities, of which I sit out in the Oort Cloud with a telescope making notes enjoying the show and sending occasional correspondence for interviews with members of these communities. I am not a formal member of these communities. I have contributed to publications or had positions for which I’m grateful, but no formal legitimate memberships because of no formal test to determine the merit of the matter or deep abiding interest at that level, as some societies do not require test scores, permit second test scores, or utilize, widely, alternative tests with varying degrees of legitimacy in the measurement of the psychological construct of g, general intelligence. As far as I know, those societies with strict mainstream intelligence test requirements are Mensa International and the Triple Nine Society, especially with Mensa International having formal testing sites online or, pre-coronavirus, invigilation stations all over the world. These are important to consider, internationally, even sophisticated frauds exist in the high-IQ communities with a grotesque example in the multi-level marketer (scammer), human trafficker, and cult leader Keith Raniere with the organization NXIVM where he was known as “Vanguard.” To a more on-point tune and as a point of clarification to start us off here today, with Feynman’s declared IQ of 126 (no S.D. mentioned), as stated in the article, what is the factual status of Feynman’s declared IQ in contrast to professional commentary or considerations of his mathematical abilities?

Question 8 Part I: Regarding the portion on Historical figures:

The Suspension of Inquiry Concerning the Intelligence of Historical Figures](#answer-8-part-i-the-suspension-of-inquiry-concerning-the-intelligence-of-historical-figures

Section Introduction

In prior questions we have covered already the topics of stringency of measurement and the process of admissions in various organizations like those of the High Intelligence Community and Colleges. I covered those topics extensively earlier because of awareness of the relationship with this particular question. Also we have covered the value of Mensa, the value of testing for self-understanding, and the

topic of the value of focusing one's efforts on one's personal development and societal benefits in activities outside of the seeking of self-knowledge of intelligence, and ultimate unknowability of one's intelligence at present due to incomplete testing in general. It was discussed why not being in Mensa is not necessarily an indicator that one does not have special strengths worth developing, including mental traits that may exceed in quality those of many folks in the High IQ Community. In our next question, we switch to a discussion of Highly Intelligent scammers, so I will only touch on that briefly here where it appears to have relevance and where it seems preparations for that conversation would be beneficial.

The focus on this particular section will be in two parts: first the evaluation of historical figures and their intelligence, and then the evaluation of current day figures. A theme that I want to use to make my view very clear here relates to my desire to support people in their wants to make their lives accurate. I don't distinguish between living people and the deceased on this point and prefer greatly not to fabricate anything about individuals, such that recordings about them become eventually false or mythical.

Main Answer

Impressive deceased individuals leaving evidence of profound realizations and productive eminence do not leave me with questions about their smartness, although I am concerned about hypothetical scores concocted by those interested, that amount to frivolous fabrications. While confirmed writings, art, diagrams, and mathematical formulae may at some time be adequate for AI or forensic intelligence measuring systems to provide useful rank-ordered scores outside of any testing by a proctored psychologist, I believe existing numbers for notable historical figures were invented and are untrustworthy. This is known simply because intelligence tests did not yet exist.

Online one finds interesting YouTube videos in which figures are ranked with false IQ scores, disrespecting their histories and biographies with inflations. IQ is already very high at a score of 120. In these videos we learn that Goethe had an IQ of well over 200, that Gauss had an IQ in the same vicinity, and that figures like Aristotle, Plato, Newton, Einstein, Sidis, Tesla and many other figures had particular IQs that again, are inflated fabrications that are well over what they need to be to account for their works. The reality is that for each and every historical figure that antedated intelligence scoring living before psychology existed at all (it was combined with Philosophy), there is a misattribution of an IQ score. This simply distorts history, and botches the biographical record. These are figures we care about deeply for their contributions to us and the public is willing to entertaining false summaries about their mental capacities.

It is worth noting that few have read Albert Einstein's autobiography, which is the last thing he wrote. I read it and it is included in the book "Einstein, Philosopher-Scientist" in the series on the Lives of the Living Philosophers, a series intended to give living eminent figures a chance to write about themselves and respond to critics, while authors were still around. This writing is technical and autobiographical and

clarifies certain personal commitments. For example, few recognize he was an Athiest and this is made clear in his own words. He says nothing of course about his own psychometrics because they don't exist. This means we cannot provide a reasonable score to his intelligence at all, and can only go by his artifacts, which as a rule are incomprehensible to the general population. Assigning him any number jeopardizes his interests, his history, and probably his unspoken last will and testament. My living [last will and testament](<http://www.mattanaw.org>) will be written into my Book and Journal.

We have very little information about all of these figures, even if we think we have a good portion of their corpus of writing, because they cannot be interviewed and do not have living brains to test.

The case is similar with people who are still historical who lived more recently, after modern Psychology came to exist, and after the advent of psychometric testing. In the question Mr. Feynman was asked about, but I would like to refrain even from speaking much about his particular intelligence, because of several reasons. Firstly, if someone were to place in front of me a document that was supposedly a primary source medical artifact, indicating his IQ score, I would not immediately believe it. I would have to do extensive research, that I did not do and would have difficulty doing, to confirm the veracity of the document. False documents are easy to create, as I witnessed in court, and easily one could produce a document to malign Mr. Feynman. Doing real historical investigation, one would definitely have uncertainty about a document indicating a low(ish) score for Mr. Feynman. Historically, a figure like him could have had hateful people who could create a false impression of his abilities using fake documents.

It should be immediately recognized that I am quite ignorant about Mr. Feynman's medical record. Perhaps he spoke for himself about his purported intelligence score, and in that case, I would give it much more credibility, but even then he has not been tested as extensively as I have with a range of tests, and I have not seen a readout of his subtest results which may indicate extreme giftedness despite a score that might be lower than expected. There are simply too many uncertainties about his scores and a professional of history and psychology should refrain from speculating further given the dearth of reliable information, and admit that the passage of time has converted this topic into the unknowable.

Historical figures can informally be estimated regarding their giftedness by an evaluation of their various productions, and his productions would immediately create prominence in his intelligence even if we decide we don't care about his scores. The informal method of analysis I recommend in this paper for estimating range of giftedness could be applied somewhat to him if there is sufficient written record covering a range of skills including his physico-mathematical skills, his written skills, and the quality of his verbal communication in his lectures. Mr. Feynman may not score evenly on all these domains, and additionally his breadth of knowledge may be more narrow and specialized than may be appreciated. This may also be true of other historical figures. I think people highly underestimate the breadth of capacity of people who are exceptionally and profoundly gifted, and in order to really appraise any individual for the interrelationships in their brain matter, at a minimum they have to be able to discuss a

very large range of topics to see what relationships they come up with, and to estimate the total significance of those relationships. I've seen a video on YouTube in which I saw he was extremely significant in his conversation even with a basic interviewer, and had a very strong propensity to powerful ideation, but I still feel there is too much missing to ascribe him an IQ score, or a range, and in any case this is what metrical testing provides. Without a formal psychometric test, I would have to rely on conversation using my informal approach, but in order to do that I have to be speaking or conversing in text with a living person, and if that is not possible, it is forever impossible to do.

Another aspect of the analysis of the intelligence of historical figures, which is applicable also to living figures, is an appraisal of the overall comprehensibility of their productions, which communicate great significance at high velocity. Mathematics, diagrams, programming, architectural designs, blueprints, can all communicate a very great amount of information that may be novel, interesting, comprehensible, but hard for others to understand. Historically, works like Newton's *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica* ("Principia") would have created astonishment for their precision, novelty, and density of thought. This work of Newton's is not incredibly long, but obviously has profound significance and ingenuity. Its expression is diagrammatic and mathematic, and does not consume much space. If a work can generate very great commentary but not be too long, it is a sign that that work had very great idea-density, and applicability to the real world.

Who can comprehend the work is of interest because after publication, typically only a few people will become interested enough to read it and correspond with the author. These readers themselves may be interested, but it would be true that not all would understand, and of those who do understand, what they understand may not be totally analogical to what the author, like Newton, would think about it. The presumption is that Newton would have had many relationships in mind regarding connections to his work that are not present in the work. Newton, evaluating the minds of others, would use something akin to the informal process of testing for significance and velocity of ideas. If ideas from other correspondence concerning his works are novel, or cover his own ideas, it would indicate a strong mental analogy between himself and the reader. This would likely be a cause for wanting to collaborate.

In one particular area of research and publication in which I'm working, I encountered the works of Bertrand Russell, in his *Principia Mathematica*, as a Philosophy Undergrad in the early 2000's, and Gödel's proof. After being exposed to these documents, many years later, I encountered Donald Knuth's *Art of Computer Programming*. My particular work concerns the foundation of mathematics in logic, and a theory of a new architectural foundation of computer systems. This theory would change how we think of mathematics as a whole, how we think of physics and the sciences, how we understand computing, and the relationship to the limitations of computing as it relates to reality. I've published some thoughts and comments worth sharing in the intelligence community a number of times, on subtopics that connect somewhat tangentially but interestingly to this theory. An example is on the topic about the final verification of continuous movement, and to what extent movement is discrete, which is verifiable

computationally, in comparison to the view that motion is infinitesimally continuous, which is non-computable, and discussed what it means for mathematics. A work I encountered in this effort is Terrence Tao's *Analysis One*, which has some anticipations of my efforts on my differing formal proof, and shows some support for Mr. Bertrand Russell's logical atomism, contra Gödel.

The works of Russell and Whitehead, and Gödel, would be totally incomprehensible to the public, and in my review of materials, I think it true that nobody living understands these documents and their significance. Currently there are thoughts that Kurt Gödel has debunked Russell and Whitehead in various ways, but my reading of commentaries indicate that commenters uniformly do not understand either author's works! This includes books written for the purpose of *explaining* his work! This implies that even those who claim to be reading the documents do not understand the documents. Even in the High Intelligence community, when the topic of Gödel comes up, I see regurgitation about what Gödel has achieved, but close inspection of Gödel's paper shows academic sloppiness and numerous issues. It's part of my work and research to bring this to some clarity through my personal interests. I have also noticed, in *Analysis I*, by Tao, that there may also be some skipping over of *Principia Mathematica* and Gödel, but an explanation is that that is a paper, that while it appears *to me* to be doing work on formal proof contra Gödel, is still targeted for instruction of students. Mr. Terrence Tao has IQ scores online listed to be in the 200s, and of course I would apply skepticism to that given the contents of the remainder of this paper, but there is no doubt at all that he is extremely intelligent, and he is repeatedly recognized within the American Mathematical Association in which I'm a member. He has attained professional eminence already, and mathematics itself is a conveyor of significance at high velocity done well, and I've personally benefited from his work on *Analysis I*.

Returning to the point however Gödel's work is extremely complex and I suspect no one understands it, and I think this is why it stills stands as a work people think has no faults. I'm finding faults and will convey them in the near future, but his work is still brilliant. The point however is that it conveys so much that it is largely incomprehensible to everyone, and this is due to a combination of his high intelligence and sloppiness; whereas some would say it is only of high intelligence or even greater intelligence. This is untrue.

Russell and Whitehead's work is very long, and looks like an alien work of logical symbol's rewriting mathematics up to and past calculus. When I say it is 'alien' I mean it is alien even to those who would understand modern formal logic. I once had a scan of all three volumes, but no longer having that, I have to content myself with *Principia* to '56, which covers only the first to the 56's item. The cause of this is truncation is that there is no expectation that anyone will understand any of it, guessing. The entire work is not something I would expect anyone to understand in its entirety.

Many are exposed to the work of Russell and Whitehead in popular formats, especially Russell, since he published nearly or actually 100 volumes, but would not know that *Principia Mathematica* was very

important or as complex as it is in expression. Reading the popular works of either author would lead one to think that they have less capacity in the velocity of significance and ideation than they really have, and that is the importance of surveying an author's works completely before estimating intelligence. A single omission of Principia Mathematica would lead to a misappraisal.

That these are such complex works indicates certainly profound giftedness and the inability of anyone to understand Gödel, for Gödel's writing, or for being unable to research the work of Russell that Gödel contradicts and depends on for his proof, shows that the failure to understand them also indicates their profundity. They are certainly profoundly and exceptionally gifted, using the informal approach of the conveyance of significance at high velocity. But also with this is an estimation as to who could comprehend it.

I give these examples because they relate directly to my research and writing interests, but one could also mention other works, and that work mentioned from Donald Knuth is also one that I think is largely unapproachable by anyone. This work figures into my connection of the prior topic with creation of an alternative system's architecture and required design, and required algorithms. Knuth does not cite Russell, Whitehead, or Gödel in this context but they relate as I see it in my project. Of course those in electrical engineering, logic, mathematics, and computer science would know the relationship if sufficiently advanced.

While we can use this kind of thinking to conclude these authors are extremely and profoundly gifted, assigning them an IQ score includes a motive for fabrication. I would not be inclined to ascribe to any of them IQ scores. Professors Tao and Knuth are both still alive, and each could be measured into the immeasurability range very likely, at least on IQ subtests, if they haven't already. I'm very disinclined to want to attribute or believe IQ scores on the basis of tests that are not normed appropriately, even those that claim to have statistical methods of extension that make this unnecessary. It is mentioned later that the Prometheus society itself does not do this, and relies on a non-IQ test that has the norming, presumably because that society has the same view on testing I do, except I later criticize the MAT as a test to use on various grounds. I'm content with calling Prof. Tao immeasurable, even if that means I have to say his score is one that is a floor to his actual intelligence, which means he scored high enough to be unknowable regarding his intelligence. But he is alive and could do other kinds of direct neuroscientific testing which I think would be more interesting and better for the trajectory of psychometrics. The section on living figures is next, so I will discuss more there. Regarding the deceased figures Whitehead, Russell, and Gödel, we don't have psychometric test scores, from my understanding but with no additional research, and there is no way to provide a number. I would refrain from ascribing a number again, because I think that comes from a motive of fabrication.

My response here more generally is that I think we need to suspend judgement on the intelligence of historical figures in which we have insufficient information out of respect for their history. Later, as we

are better able to use artifacts, we may be able to estimate by comparison of works, but I think this is still disrespectful since they do not have living brains to test. The dislike we have of intelligence measures will only be removed when we have the ability to test living brains at high accuracy and with great comprehensiveness. This is something we can never do for the deceased. Even if they have an extremely large body of works, there is a difference between those works, and the complexity of function happening over a lifetime. Bertrand Russell himself moved on from writing *Principia* to writing only popular books in amazing volume. But he may have continued his mathematical thinking all of his life. If we appraise him only by his works, we would be under the impression that his thinking was only in a communicative style that was for everyone else's comprehension. But his *Principia Mathematica* is incomprehensible to all!

It is not clear if *Principia Mathematica*'s contents would provide a pattern that would be easy or hard to the authors, even if it were decided that one would appraise their minds by the very hardest content only. Even if specific contents are used by other author's like Newton's *Principia* for Newton, it would not tell of Newton's mental endurance.

One is not necessarily exceptionally and profoundly gifted if there is insufficient endurance, and the velocity of significance and ideation should involve great endurance. One should be able to keep it going easily, indicating this is how one usually is, and not how one is rarely. One is efficient in one's thinking to stay comfortable. A trait of the immeasurable is that they *enjoy* thinking about what only appears difficult to others. This book was written in 11 days, and was fun and easy to write.

Here I must gratuitously speak concerning my own endurance because my *Book and Journal*, that although growing in complexity and inclusiveness in materials, started as a simple blog to have sufficient content to support the design. Now that the design is in place, it can store any and all content I have in my possession. This includes work for my customers that I can redact. It would not have been possible to have as many customers I have had and as many projects, working as an architect and earlier an engineer, becoming finally Chief Architect, and later a trusted executive guiding businesses at the C-Suite level, if I was not at a productivity level that is unreachable for others. I've produced many thousands of lines of code in a number of programming languages, many technical design documents, and thousands of pages of presentations and architectural recommendations with sophisticated visual plans. I've created entire solutions consisting of distributed machines, including all the back-end and required front-end programming, architectures, deployments and tests. This establishes endurance particularly since it was all done before my current age of 42.

Colleagues have witnessed my live typing at a rate that is impossible not looking at my screen, with results on the display, of a combination of new content and what was heard, from people who were in the same room at the same time, including directors and executives. The rate and endurance of what is produced creates awe and fear in customers. But I'm socially adept so this is kindly managed, and so we

typically have great relationships with much mutual respect.

I've been the only person invited to provide vendor neutral and agnostic cross-sectional organizational analysis, and have had my results which were often hundreds of pages enacted, with my business and technical stewardship and mentorship being required. These were complex but feasible and did require organizational change, sometimes globally. Some examples include for AbbVie, Petco, Spark New Zealand, and Scripps Networks for FoodNetwork, HGTV, Travel Channel, DiY Channel, etc (Now partly acquired by Discovery Channel), BC Pensions Corporation and Adobe Systems. I welcome readers to view some of my [executive corporate recommendations](#).

A differentiator that exists between myself and Mr. Tao, taking him as an example, is that Mr. Tao produces technical mathematical papers with a rapidity I could not currently match, and may never match. However, my Book and Journal will contain mathematics that is foundational, combining the results of the authors above and providing new mathematics. I have delivered formulae which were required for decision making for customers, a good example being one related to scaling of images in the document scanning application for Fidelity Investments that is of permanent utility, creating a competitive advantage. My book additions will show the velocity of significance of an assortment of content visuospatial, mathematical, verbal and diagrammatic, but it is admitted that currently the mathematical output would not match someone like Prof. Knuth or Mr. Tao. But what is communicated is that what will be shown is an exhibition of the full range of technical talents that can be had, and perhaps artistic creations, time permitting, because the author does have talent in the traditional visual arts, but requires some time to develop upon them. Musicality is also to be included, as I am also extremely talented in both playing instruments and in writing score.

Both Tao and Russell's extreme productivity indicate they both have and had [dissertative thinking](#). Dissertative thinking means they each have a very high velocity of significance and ideation into writing. Not only were they actively writing many books and papers, their thinking is of the same sort that initially generated their first doctoral theses. The implication is in their own time, doing everyday activities, they are experiencing dense novel thoughts which have characteristics of readiness for rapid dissertation writing, even if they do not write anything. The implication is that each could have many doctorates and not only one. In the upper echelons of intelligence, there are a number of exemplars of people who pursued many degrees and have more than one doctorate. But the cost of achieving the doctorate is a time expenditure that pulls them away from leisurely project work, and one does not need to ask these people if they feel any cost of energy for pursuing the doctorates taking steps within organizations. They would. They and I choose to remain in academia for instrumental reasons, and to gain authority in a field, and an audience. Admittedly there are benefits to remaining in organizations but the slowness of progress is strongly felt, and if one is aware that one could do more work if one could do it entirely independently. It is somewhat akin to reading as much as one likes versus reading only during having a courseload. For people such as these, it would be to their benefit to have a pathway to allow for

faster productions of their dissertative thoughts into equivalency dissertations, or allow for articles and books to be converted to equivalency dissertations, to formally be awarded a number of doctorates. If this existed it would not be incompatible with receiving many doctorates *even while* formally doing work in a Ph.D program. Since I received my G.E.D., I'm aware that equivalencies already do exist for diplomas, and for High School a GED is a substitute for four years of work. This is a very long period of time when one considers what can be accomplished in that time, and a GED can be obtained very quickly. I am aware that an option existed for me to obtain a GED early, and I'm certain I was able to perform in elementary school nearly well enough to obtain it, and would have been able if I engaged in independent study outside of school. Likewise dissertative thinking in young minds could enable one to obtain doctorates while still young. For those who with immeasurable intelligence, this is almost something that is necessary to facilitate the level of growth that would benefit them and society. More interestingly, if one could write a dissertation as a child, one has a doctorate and has finished with grad school, which means they obtained all degrees from nothing to everything. Some might complain that general education is necessary too, but it may be possible to write multiple dissertations to establish the generality of an adult who may not yet be a professional. Additionally, if they obtain a doctorate, it is an indication of existing generality to a degree and existing capacity to attain generality independently. Contrasted with a person closer to the average who obtains an elevated degree, there may be a loss of understanding of earlier studies, and studies unapplied. So it appears that children with minds like Tao or Russell would benefit from having a pathway such as this. I am productive enough to probably write multiple dissertations a year and would have benefited from having an option such as this instead of pursuing many degrees, at very significant time and financial costs.

I need to be clear that I do not have a goal to simply be fast and that's important. The *Book and Journal* is an outlet I have for communicating in a rapidity that I already find natural, and this relates to rapidity of thought, in high significance. Customers witnessing my skill would also test to the facile nature of my productivity and to complexity. The facile ability to communicate complexity rapidly is something others utilize to attest to a person's witnessed intelligence informally already, because there is a perception of endurance and easyness for what is perceived as hard or incomprehensible for others. My typing speed must be witnessed by others as both easy for me but impossible for the rest. It is performed while guiding and steering meetings and conducting questioning of numerous individuals oftentimes.

A cause for the deliberate eclecticism in my publications is to have an extensive set of information in which to understand intelligence, and to exhibit my natural polymathic inclinations. The volume of the publication and the frequency and speed will indicate velocity of significance and demonstrate publication endurance. The publication endurance does not come in the way of having a much more active and fulfilling life of travel and enjoyment than nearly anyone.

In the future, as recorded artifacts are increased for each person in the public in digital format, such that the domain of their interests and breadth of thought includes recordings, in writing, audio and video, that

is authenticated, I think we can use an equivalent of the informal process using the concept of significance and velocity of ideas, translated into AI/ML or other real software not pretending to be such, in conjunction with predictive models about what a huge sample of nervous systems are able to produce along lifespans, to finally estimate the intelligence of historical figures, which will soon be us. I intend to produce for my *Book and Journal* a larger than normally possible sample of data, on myself, to make it more likely to arrive at that scenario. Given the trajectory of science and technology using my experienced judgement as an elite technologist, I think it likely if I live to an age of around 80, some time between now and then, I can use the data in my dataset to actually estimate my IQ further.

While I am quite satisfied with my immeasurable intelligence scores, I would prefer that they are measurable. In the future, I may be willing to have direct measures of my brain while performing work tasks, and while not, to get an overview of my nervous system. I'd like to have a range of visual artifacts, and data sets, that correspond to my actual brain morphology and neurochemistry as it lives. I've stated at one point that I would greatly like to have my entire life videotaped in slow motion at maximum fidelity with all information included, including private information, since I'm a highly moral person without a need to protect any personal information. I see myself as a priest and monk of naturalism and moral philosophy and exhibit priestly behavior. This would provide additionally a complete natural record of my biology if it were possible. I don't think that will be possible but I do think that actual physical testing of my brain to create additional metrics about my intelligence will be usable in conjunction with my writings and productions and we will arrive perhaps at a very comprehensive picture of my own intelligence.

Thinking this way greatly increases our sense of lack of information regarding our own lives, but greater still the lives of historical figures. Being near to Mr. Feynman's time, it is clear that everyone's artifacts will be minimal at the time of death, and only later in the future after our deaths, will some few be taking actions like those I'm taking for maximizing communication into writing, to create what is approaching complete self-record. Since I'm writing and not slow motion recording my nervous system and body in-context, I know I will still be very far from what is possible, but the innovativeness of the attempt is still obvious, and the work performed still for the benefit of myself and others, including these historical figures, because finally we can enjoy their works without pretending to know more than what the complete record can convey to us about them.

Here we have a good transition into the discussion of living figures, who overlap with history in that the state of technology hasn't aided us much in a way that facilitates easy testing. We can see that the massive difference between historical figures and living figures is that they are alive, and we can ask them questions and communicate them, and test their minds more directly as far as they are willing to have them voluntarily tested. They are also voluntarily and unwittingly involuntarily sending their communications through systems that record them, that will later be tested in ways that they did not ask for that will include intelligence testing. Their complete body of productions will include not only their

academic writings and writings with sophisticated intent, but all their writings that they have shared with software systems, that software companies will be able to correctly retain and relate to them. Much information will still be lost through inadequate technical designs of systems like those in social media, and in email, and in systems “listening in”, but much will be retained and would be usable for future testing on a much larger set of artifacts.

Understanding the informational needs for more comprehensive understanding of psychometrical measures, I think social media will be found to be a very basic style of communication that will be insufficient for most to be really scored appropriately, and for all who would be tested thusly, I think we should refrain from ascribing an IQ score, and thus protect their histories in the same way that we can protect people who are like us but are deceased.

Answer 8 Part II: The Evaluation of Living Figures

Earlier we talked extensively on limitations of testing and I want to call this to mind as we briefly cover the evaluation of living figures. But I also don't want to reveal my related answer as it relates to identification of scammers, which is the final question of the interview.

I think it very important to be as honest and truthful *descriptively* about people as we can, without adding additional speculation. Living people will eventually become historical figures, and the deceased should not have their lives altered from their truth.

I have some writing in preparation regarding other Psychological tests conveying a typology of personality, and my view regarding these tests is that an incredibly detailed case study for any individual, using specifics about behavior and thoughts is more important than a system that falsely categorizes. I think the Myers-Briggs and Big-5 tests are examples that provide some fabrication regarding who someone is in a summary way. I think short sentence and phrased diagnostics create categorizations that may be useful at times, but they also provide a too-brief picture of who someone really is. While there can be value such diagnostics can be very damaging, and cause one to have a wrong idea about one's own accurate self-description. Consider someone who is misdiagnosed with a personality disorder and comes to believe it.

Likewise ascribing an intelligence score to someone with insufficient testing, or an insufficient range of tests can give the wrong idea, both to the self and to others. What is worse than this, however, is entirely fabricated numbers applied to individuals. I have spoken above about how historical figures are simply given large numbered IQ scores to make them appear especially eminent, but these numbers are not accurate descriptions of people who have not and could not be tested, or have unconfirmed scores if only recently deceased! The same is true for living figures for whom tests do not exist or for whom test scores are unconfirmable. Prominent politicians, gamers, chess-players, authors, artists, actors, writers and

others are simply given fabricated scores, often consisting of round numbers that are very high, like 200, and these are obviously false. They distort the people these numbers are applied to, such that our historical record of them, including primary source materials in newspapers and in the media, create incorrect hearsay biographies.

One can note that most living figures who do very well and are very successful rarely tell their intelligence scores because either they do not expect to impress, or they do not want to share for various risks. Typically the former is the case, but High Intelligence scores are not that rare. Extremely profound giftedness is rare. If figures who are famous really have these IQ scores I think ultimately they would want to “show and tell”, but the rarity is so great that it is atypical that any particular famous person would have these scores. When we hear of extremely high intelligence scores they are usually coming from people who are within High IQ communities who are wanting to share with others their special gifts and traits, when they are being honest and not exaggerating to excess. However, I think many exaggerate extravagantly. I think the reader can think of many reasons why people would exaggerate their intelligence, particularly since almost anyone in the public thinks themselves to be special holders of truth somehow.

Those who exaggerate and ascribe to themselves, as living individuals, super great intelligence, have a few serious issues to deal with. Firstly, they must continue to protect their story even if it is false or has serious defects. This is how self-ascription of incorrect scores can result in a very large “pack of lies” that the person will carry through their entire biography. Their IQ score, self applied, creates a “wrong miniature summary description” of their mind and life behavior. If someone tells others they have a score they do not have, then they are certainly falsifying much more than their supposed intelligence. They can make their life inexplicable, such that the only way to correct it is to give the true information, that would correspond cleanly with the actual life lived.

In the evaluation of a living figure’s intelligence we do need as much information as we can have that consists of real artifacts *ref: [Living Autobiography](#)*, that includes demonstration of society membership, and productions that both seem to match up. If there is a lopsidedness in the intelligence demonstrable in lack of productions, then additional information about certain deficiencies apart from intelligence need to be shared in artifact form. Trusted societies like college admissions provide some trustworthy verification of claims, and we can use things like [Mensa ID](#) cards, and other membership cards, to get confirmation. Better still are actual test results from the medical and psychological practitioners, that share the actual scores, although it is understood too that this constitutes protected health information. Soon in the future I will be releasing more of my public health information that includes my actual psychometric scores from my psychometricians/psychologists, to go further than most to share society memberships and the actual test results. Anyone who has very high intelligence can eventually share this information to have the life artifacts needed to really corroborate stories, so they can become historical figures, who we really have data about.

For those who are showing tests that don't indicate immeasurability, but measurable rank ordered FSIQ in the very high range, without statistical norming, from rare tests employing extrapolation, or from tests created by individuals, I think we need to be more cautious. I think it is much more likely, since these are atypical, and unpopular, not often used by psychometricians, that fakes that are rare will still convince. If these tests are shared, how are they cross checked for veracity? Additionally, I think they are largely erroneous. I think it is much better to utilize standardized, highly popular intelligence tests, and be satisfied despite there being an inability to confirm actual maximum performance. These tests will indicate immeasurability but will be well understood and more easily cross-checked.

Coming from the field of Psychology, there is also the risk of deals between psychologists for propping up scores, scoring oneself in a fabricated way very highly, and so on. These practitioners have the actual tests and the test scoring books, and can produce reports that are fake. Psychologists who are colleagues can easily work together to fake tests. This will be more possible to fake if more rare and unconfirmable from sources. Some would be discovered to care so much about inflating their IQ scores that they would use their giftedness to obtain degrees enabling them to pretend the very greatest giftedness of all!

Another issue with the evaluation of tests is that certain authority figures within IQ societies can ask for test results from others for admission, but then utilize the same papers, alter them, and show scores that are inflated for themselves. In this way leaders of certain smaller societies can dupe others into thinking they have incredibly high intelligence, simply from altering already received intelligence tests. I have been asked by a leader of one society to provide my intelligence scores, and in retrospect almost certainly those would have been used for nefarious reasons and potentially would have been utilized to create a false report with inflated scores, using a real test result.

At present it is somewhat insurmountable to totally control for and verify the authenticity of original test documents, but in the meantime checking with the actual psychologist who performed the test, to confirm the test came from them, and confirmation that there are no special relationships between the test taker and the subject, can give us a greater inclination to believe the test could be trusted.

But we can still only partially trust those results, and rely on, what I shared to be a useful method, of using personal productions that should match up with the intelligence of the person making the claim. Productions as I stated is best in an artifact that can be used later, and a total collection of works of production, and life achievements is very useful for comparing against claims. But not all can communicate this way and some are really disabled or have other deficiencies that block communication. For that we can use verbal conversation and interviewing to allow the speaker to demonstrate very great velocity of significance and ideation, which again includes very rapid conveyance of meaning with many connections, and with immediate and frequent problem solves. If one cannot do this oneself for not being quite in the same range of expected intelligence, then one can rely on a third party like myself to have conversation in order to test for it. The larger process that can be used is described more fully in the

response to the question regarding scammers later in the interview.

People who are leaders of HighIQ societies that do not have very large numbers of members, will have processes that are likely somewhat inferior to those that are established like Mensa. Leaders of societies also bypass testing itself, simply creating them, and then making requirements for others. For those individuals who are leaders of societies, additional caution must be exercised, and for these people I especially recommend my growing writings on *Cults*, and the process described later. That someone founds an intelligence society does not mean for certain they are a charlatan, but it does mean that their membership antedates the processes that are created for others. For any member that joins the society later there was a double-standard of demonstration that did not exist for the originator. The originator has many more criteria for demonstration of personal medical artifacts, ethically being in a high authority position, to openly demonstrate they are not a predator. The nicest intelligence society leader can still be a fraud, who capitalized on memberships and false prestige. Moreover, they almost *have to* exaggerate their IQ scores in order to make it seem they have special authority. There is a strong resemblance to this kind of behavior and being a cult leader, even if nothing highly predatory occurs. However, opportunities will arise for predation once an authority has been established and can last for many decades.

Either way, like with historical figures, I think we are best to think that having the most high quality artifacts, and the best description, should be used to arrive at the most honest possible evaluation, that is not hopeful or wishful that the person being evaluated is to be greater than they really happen to be. Informally, it must also be confirmed that they can convey significance and have a high velocity of ideation, which indicates immediate problem solving and very great interdisciplinarianism, to confirm that their minds can output what they claim their brains are self-communicating internally. If their brains self-communicate great significance, and great ideation internally, it will be conveyed outwardly, or we must be very cautious.

Additionally, living individuals do produce content, unless they are never on social media or are never writing emails. In many conversations I've had on social media many responses from peers were very low quality, although some fewer were very high. Low quality postings in the form of memes of low or moderate interest are shared, instead of creative or significant writings, and some share repetitively and predictably the same ideas again and again. People of extremely high intelligence would convey curiosity that exists in want of feedback of novelties, and would write new ideas, using their own sophisticated communication style, in an often high vocabulary, and would think dissertatively often. Here is an example of a [spontaneously and rapidly written dissertative posting](#). Excess repetition indicates stagnation. Very high intelligence results in people who appear older to readers than their actual age, because of very great progress in updates to mentality, and this would be reflected in incredibly sophisticated and mature thought. But living leaders and supposedly profoundly gifted members of societies really sometimes share really basic information again and again, and yet there are many believers that they are as intelligent as they say they are. This includes people who claim over 200 IQs

which would be IQs well over the 99.9999 percentile on SD15 tests, which really do not exist. This is why the Prometheus society only accepts the Miller Analogies test to gain members scoring over 4 standard deviations, or the 99.997 percentile. But this test amounts to only a little more than the vocabulary subtest of the SB-V, one of 12 subtests given, which I score at 99.98% maximally. It is considered a standalone with features that are similar to culture fair tests using matrix reasoning, and this I also score 99.89%. But the Miller Analogies test does not contain the visual component that the matrix reasoning test provides, so anyone entering this society may have lopsided intelligence favoring verbal skills, enabling thinkers who are low on visuospatial to enter. That society does not accept any other test due to limitations on testing, and instead of recognizing that folks like myself are immeasurably intelligent, they accept the only test that scores past 4 standard deviations, even though it is only verbal and relates to only one or several subtests primarily. Later I will have to account for claims as to correlation. It cannot even be stated which ones it relates to and cannot defend its relationship to FSIQ. Yet there are societies that defend *higher* admissions entries than this, and these are ever more dubious, and some members exhibit probable thoughts rather than improbable ones, and only those, in their social productions. These productions are part of their datum for analyzing their intelligence.

Some may state “It’s unfair to use social media to determine intelligence” but how is anyone to judge if not from conversation flowing from the mind readily? Many of these conversants are slow and offer short statements only, and skip longer conversation with “too long didn’t read” rude responses. Despite their avowed exceptional scores, they fare very poorly in comparison to others who exhibit incredible writing.

Some also may think that their lacks on visuospatial may go unrecognized having incredible verbal skills, but being *incredibly strong* visuospatially, I can tell from their behavior in person, conversing with them, if they can visualize well or not, and can glean it from the writing over time too. And vice versa from visuospatial to writing. I know at least one person from Prometheus society who exhibits weak rather than strong visuospatial abilities, and believe these would also flaw culture-fair pattern relating test results.

Existing highly intelligent figures should show evidence of immediate creativity in the form of humor too, although here I do expect some variations where some are autistic or have aspergers (some are still self designated with this word). This is very different than those who use canned humor, and repeated humor that seems to come from others, and an overall inability to create a new joke “on the fly”. Rapid and frequent humor generation that is novel and never to be used again is a trait of the profoundly gifted, although I cannot say much as to the extent, as I do not have data concerning it, but can say it is related to kind wit, and social abilities, and this is instrumental for the development of careers, congenial colleague relationships, enjoyable collaborative mutual work, and even if it is not a required component of intelligence, is an expansion of intelligence into talents tying to nervous system modulating that is greater than not having it at all. All my life I’ve been a kind and goofy comedian to put it mildly.

Laziness is also a trait to be used in the evaluation of intelligence, because if one is intensely curious, seeking stimulation to satisfy an extremely active mind, that craves significance and ideation, then it is obvious that feedback loops on such ideation is needed, to progress that ideation. Otherwise the mind under evaluation would never appear older than the age of the mind. The mind would have sufficient feedback to experientially age faster and if one is lazy then one is simply not as curious as one might think one is. There is physical laziness and intellectual laziness, but the two come together in the prodigy.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen:

Question 9: How can individuals protect themselves from scammers?

A Process for Self-Protection from Highly Intelligent or Fraudulent Scammers

Much has been provided in earlier questions and the earlier sections on velocity of significance and ideation, and my [relevant background information](#) that can now be used to support the population in detecting true profound giftedness, and con-artists.

Here it is necessary to divide those who would use this process who are at special risk for having less intelligence, than those who have much more, and can cautiously read people for their potential riskiness. Those who are in the former category will certainly need a third party to support in the process, whereas people in the latter category, who on reading find themselves to be like myself, can on their own use this process.

Let's first begin with how to self-protect if one is in the group who cannot self-trust for not really being intelligent enough to determine in conversation if there is really highly significant and rapid ideation occurring, or if something only seeming that way is being presented.

Those who would need to use this process in the first category extends from those who are handicapped through to those who are still very intelligent, but are not profoundly intelligent. However, a trusted intelligent figure may fill the role of the trusted person anytime someone extremely intelligent is unavailable. Obviously there is a number issue but for now we will review the simple process, understanding there are still limitations.

If I presented a process like that I might like to create, and perhaps will, it would be unusable to others.

Those in this first group would rely on factors not relating to intelligence at all, and this advice could as easily come from a doctor, or someone in a profession that understands the risks of authority, and has an

understanding of people that are detectable as dangerous on other grounds than fraudulently claiming very high intelligence. This topic is about self protection from people, not from their ideas; and if someone is not in the same range as those who are incredibly gifted, there is nothing that is complex to be received anyway. However, the result of the process can still be a favorable finding that the highly intelligent person, like me, is a good mentor to almost anyone, conveying pathways to what might be needed to anyone who might need anything.

Firstly, I would share a list of simple questions to consider:

- “Does this person *want* anything from you?”
- "Does what they want appear to be:
 - Financial?"
 - Religious?"
 - Sexual?"
 - Attentional?"
- The reader can then consider, that I wouldn't want any of those things from anyone, and I am an example of trustworthiness. They can also consider, that if someone wants any of these things, they would be asking for:
 - Something valuable to you.
 - Something requiring big change potentially.
 - Something that could subject you to damage.
- And that what they want
 - Isn't about you as much as getting something.
 - Could come from someone else easily.
- “Are they also powerful?”
 - “Do they seem especially smart?”
 - “Are they especially attractive?”

Some super intelligent people are highly attractive, and I'm highly attractive myself, as can be seen by my photographs I included.

It will be noticed that this short part of the process could easily be developed further, and is simplistic in nature. One simply needs to identify if there are any obvious wants. If you were interacting with me, there is nothing that I want.

If any of these are present then one can move quickly to asking a trusted party to support in thinking about the riskiness of the person, but one has to choose someone who seems powerful in the same ways.

If no trusted person like this is available, the best course of action is to avoid this person, because one could not receive much from this person anyways, for potentially not being in the same thinking range as them. One can ask “What will I learn from Einstein if I can’t read his papers?”

If one can find a trusted person like in the above, and that person is themselves really able to evaluate, then they would evaluate using the method I will describe for those who might be in the same thinking range as the person to be evaluated. For that person the process becomes the same.

It is obvious that there is social awkwardness to using this process, but there is social awkwardness to needing someone to support any deficiency whatsoever. The risk here is that someone will not utilize this process due to the social awkwardness, but it is not possible at this moment to propose a process that cuts through all social awkwardness for all people who might need to use it. Speaking to one’s parents about the quality of a potential date may be useful, but culturally people won’t use it. Instead they simply irrationally engage in risky behaviors and have sex with predatory or unknown copulants over and over. What I am proposing here is actually supposed to cover this case, as a scammer and predator might be a highly intelligent person preying on someone who is deficient by comparison, and cannot make rational decisions for not being able to have sufficient information to know if the person is predatory or not.

It is possible to use this process without actually making any final determination about the person, since really still too little is known. A way to think about this is that someone might be risky and attractive, and acting rationally one should choose to “take a pass” on that person, even while admitting that not enough can be known to socially judge that person, who may actually be quite good, or relatively risk-free, or normal and both risky and not. It’s like having sexual relations with someone before knowing them for a few months.

Now let us consider those who are able to evaluate independently, who would be the same people who would be able to be the trusted support person for avoiding possible scammers.

Those in this group can still utilize the above to their benefit, but can do so easily and quickly and move on to more thorough evaluation. A more challenging consideration that must be considered quickly is:

- “Does it seem like this person wants something now, or does it seem like they will premeditate for something over a longer period?”

This is resolvable by making it possible to have, over time, numerous exposures to further evaluate, but if one is really skilled interpersonally, one should see signs that there is still something wanted, but the person is simply willing to wait for it. This is not something that can be easily described here, since the process requires a natural ability to “size people up” and detect very small behaviors and attributes, and personality traits. If one cannot do this then one may not actually be as adept at evaluating as one thinks. One might know if one is good at this or not if one is skilled in interviews, good at poker without

requiring the mathematical component of poker, or if one is great at sales, comedy and persuasion.

If it appears on inspection that this person wants something in time that is in the first set of lists then this person is advisable to be avoided by the other person, if doing it on someone's behalf, because they will be alone oftentimes without your presence. If it is for you, then you may have reason to wait, being more adept and judicious at re-evaluating, and in subsequent re-evaluations one must be rationally able to exit in an early state, without becoming stuck or too unwilling to become disconnected. The idea here is that early detection of anything that is risky should indicate that one should simply discontinue the connection.

All of the above is decision making in relation to minimizing personal risk that is unrelated to the actual testing of the other person's intelligence claims. If one uses this well, then one would be able to quickly avoid risks.

Notice that a process like this would make sexual relations with someone who would be evaluated a very risky endeavor because sexual behavior typically results fast in a relationship and not after a period of careful evaluation. I am unwilling to change this process in order to pretend that this behavior can be made rational: it cannot. The result is that with people who might be dangerous sexually are those who must be avoided, at least until an evaluation such as this takes place, and if not, it is unwise. In that case, much human behavior is designated as unwise. If one reads my bio on my choice to be celibate, one will recognize that I have already determined this to be permanently unwise, and I am simply unwilling to spend this time doing these evaluations. Recall that I've been married for 20 years and admittedly sex occurred immediately in the beginning. I am unwilling to repeat this behavior now. In any case, I am more adept at determining on my own, for having the intelligence and skills, who might deserve more caution.

Here we can progress to the next step in the process which relates to risks of simply believing and interacting with someone who is a scammer and is fraudulent, regarding their purported intelligence. This portion more clearly relates to all in this article, because few can actually perform an evaluation of *their own intelligence* and certainly not the intelligence of scammers *who really are* profoundly talented. If I *was* a scammer, or was threatening to people or animals, I'd be one of the most threatening people to ever exist. I could be creating or spreading new diseases, killing without detection, having sex with almost anyone I like, and destroying things with explosives. Fortunately, I'm more like a priest, an educator, a medical doctor, and other caring figures, and I don't care about my privacy.

For this the evaluator must be able to test conversationally, using perceptions of significance and velocity of ideation. This person must be also willing to ask for evidence and artifacts, like those I provided. Trustworthy artifacts like real membership proof, is all that would likely be received regarding health information like intelligence scores, but these should be as verifiable as possible. One can reach out to

organizations and ask if someone is really a member or not, although some may protect a members anonymity. Secondly, one can review artifacts of production. If there are none, that is instantly discrediting for a safety process. As I stated, and exceptionally or profoundly gifted person is overflowing with significance and ideation and is compelled to obtain feedback loops on productions. They should seem like me, writing this book in twelve days. There are some who have obstacles preventing this, but I would instantly reject this person because what is the point of believing their intelligence if they are unproductive? One could move on quickly to someone who is both, who cares about productivity as an additional source of verification, and they would know that already.

Now the evaluator self-protecting or protecting another would have artifacts of production indicating very high giftedness, in large quantity or extreme detail and elegance, and would have society verification. A person who claims very high intelligence based on actual psychometrics knows they need a Mensa membership or other reputable society to back it, else they will have to share the test results directly, which is typically considered private. So they really decided to obtain membership. Otherwise they would behave like a pure academic and not speak about intelligence and would only share what they've created. If they are trying to persuade regarding intelligence, then they have a society membership to be as close as they can to proving it. So now the evaluator has both sides of the artifacts required, the evidence regarding psychometrics, and the evidence regarding productions. But this still is not a complete demonstration, it is just a required minimal demonstration, because still this person could have faked their way into societies, and productions may appear to be high quality that are really only somewhat good. This process is about determining exceptional or profound giftedness, and again, it is assumed that the evaluator is capable of evaluation. Otherwise avoidance is advised or another trustworthy person is recommended for consultation.

The evaluator must be somewhat within the range of the person being evaluated, but does *not* need to be entirely in that range. They need to be intelligent enough to detect that the person is more intelligent than they are and likely much more intelligent, but have the skills required to detect significance and velocity of ideas.

Excessively erratic behavior and thinking can exist in people who are extremely gifted, but people also mellow in time, and so people who are slightly older are expected to be less erratic than say, teenagers who are highly gifted, but this would not be an evaluation about a teenage scam artist! Instead this would be an evaluation of an older person who really could scam and convince about having profound giftedness, and not cause people to think they have a deficiency causing really erratic thinking. Also, the person in question would have the skills to speak in a way that is not too far from your level of thinking, but could if they wanted to and you would likely be able to perceive that, as they go in-and-out of your thinking range.

You yourself, being the evaluator who can do this, like myself, must also be able to engage in highly

significant conversation with good ideation velocity, or at least be able to understand ideation as it occurs. Ideation is not a supply of “facts”, which is what is provided if the thinker is not an immediate problem solver but is instead an exhibition of recall. People who “have a lot of facts” are not profoundly gifted, because the profoundly gifted are disinterested in simply sharing facts.

Conversing with this person, one would need to notice the following, and it may take a couple conversations to build comfort depending on personality type, but eventually these would be present:

1. Ability to connect widely seemingly disconnected topics, in a way that has clarity.
2. Ability to spontaneously generate new ideas that seem to be solving problems that are thought of on “on-the-fly”.
3. Should be offering ideas that you would never have thought of, with the strong possibility that no one would have thought of them. **Often.**
4. Thinking should have qualities that resemble academic papers of originality, with a perception of truth, and that if developed, would result in academic success.
5. Have a significance that creates a really strong memory of the power and importance of the conversation.
6. The thinker should have very strong endurance indicating that the significant thinking and ideation could go on endlessly.
7. There should be a perception of obvious differentiation from anyone you ever talked to, because the rarity would be so great as to indicate that this is the only time you will ever talk to someone this intelligent, maybe in your life.
8. The exception to this would be within the HighIQ community but this level of giftedness would still feel rare, and to me it feels rare even there.
9. It should probably be somewhat threatening in feel, depending on the listener, such that the person would understand “too quickly” all that one might share, and might “figure you out” too fast, maybe in a very short number of days.
10. There should be a perception of very great self-sufficiency as if the person will never stop thinking of highly significant things and solutions to problems.
11. They seem to predict or anticipate most of what you say, and may seem to already know what you say, even if they didn’t (i.e. their learning is so fast that they have a reaction that is not different from already knowing it, and maybe they immediately fit it to something else or build on it in their response to you).

I would personally expect that all of these are present, and not just one or a few. I know people who exhibit all of these, and not only myself, although as I produce this I think of my own behavior in particular. I would be unable to come up with these points without having myself as the example.

Notice that this person would have all four of the following:

1. They would appear to be not risky based on the first process, regarding personal well-being other than potential unveracity of intelligence claims.
2. They would have society memberships and would openly share proof.
3. They would have productions that are of very good quality.
4. They would have all of the qualities above indicating communicative skill showing very high significance in thinking and velocity of problem solving, indicated by “live” novel ideas.

At this point you have a high probability that this person really is as gifted as they say they are, but there is still some probability that they exaggerate somewhat. One can exaggerate from high IQ to a higher one, and they do.

Much more can be said regarding this topic but it is easy to create a lengthy process that is too disinteresting to the reader. This interview will be revised in the future to provide an increasingly easy to use process, with better operationalization of the ideas of significance and velocity. It was stated earlier that what must be used initially has to be informal until there are better techniques, and in this case, probably software solutions. But a profoundly gifted person can play poker well without describing in neuroscientific detail how they win; they can use basic ways to convey how they detect mannerisms that allow them to “read” others, then consistently read them to win predictably over time. Likewise, for those who are able to act as evaluators, who are in the immeasurable range, they can already play the poker game, and these ideas will be understood very naturally and not much more elaboration would be required. They would also know the limitations I mentioned are true and that such an informal method would be necessary, and that later it would be nice to have a technological method. Since they are the people who would fare well in such an evaluation, they will immediately understand and build upon what I shared and may already use such a method without ever having created a process for it.

Before closing I want to also mention that there is an extremely large number of subtle risks and I have to admit I’ve gotten myself into some scammer related situations, once by being less cautious, letting a new person stay in my hotel room at an event, who became dangerously and criminally risky and had to be purged with careful manipulation. There were also several times I provided funds or investments to members who were in either Triple Nine Society, Prometheus, or Mega society, to provide some anonymity, who seem as though they were not entirely honest. This created lingering uncertainties as to whether or not I was really being defrauded. In one case, the funds were small enough at around one thousand dollars and the individual’s stewardship of the community was good enough that I simply considered it not unworthwhile. In another case I gave a much larger amount of funds to someone who seemed only years later to have been under financial duress, but this person had an unexpected inheritance, and paid me back with interest. So again, despite uncertainties and some stress about the

conditions of the lending, I was eventually paid back according to expectations. I do think this is an example of a lapse however, in considering the simple process above as it relates to future wants and needs that are not immediately obvious on inspection. I also don't think the process above is any cure for being potentially defrauded, because as in business, there will be times in which an opportunity looks good at first, but later sours. I am happy to relay that these people are typically very kind and helpful people, and seem to have many good relationships, and I don't see them as an ongoing serious threat to my well-being.

Concluding Response

It appears that significance relates to density of neural material, and that velocity relates to the ability to quickly form new connections and make fast transmissions over the wider denser network of tissue. What is better than the informal approach to evaluating others and oneself using this view, is tying the concepts to the actual neuroscientific underpinnings. Those reading this paper in the High Intelligence community I think will largely agree with what is stated in this paper, and will recognize that this does differentiate the highly intelligent from the less intelligent.

The purpose of this paper was to respond to Mr. Jacobsen's questions relating to verifying various living and deceased figures, detecting scam artists, determining the value of certain psychometric tests, and of course, although it was unstated, to convey why I would be the right person to be answering these questions. For that I provided extensive background information probably greatly exceeding in transparency and detail what other respondents provided, and probably unexpectedly. While unexpected I think it was necessary. Also discussed was the value of Mensa membership, some difficulties faced by people in the high range around employment, and benefits of Mensa membership and personal accomplishments.

In each of these conversations the theme of significance and ideation in communication through speaking and recordings was found to be relevant. I think one would find on reflection, that one would have to raise this in a huge number of topics on intelligence, such that it could be irritating to speak concerning it again and again. I would go so far to say that these concepts can be used to replace the word "intelligence" and tie it to neuroscience. This attests to the significance of this particular communication. If it is widely applicable for describing intelligent people, understanding their needs, understanding the value of intelligence tests, and is relevant for interpreting productions as profoundly intelligent or not, and is new, and instrumental, then what has been shared is highly general, abstract, has many relationships, and large explanatory power. This document then is a recording utilizing and embodying the concept, and it is expected that it will be novel to many members of the public and IQ communities, even if some postings on the subject from my earlier blog posts do have some early conceptual introductions to this view in a really cursory format.

A topic not incredibly well considered here is creativity. Much confusion exists concerning creativity, but creativity is not incredibly complex from my view. I think it seems complex to those who are not incredibly creative themselves, so wonder somewhat when it really happens, and have fewer examples. Ideation is directly related to learning and problem solving happening in concert, and when one learns as fast as someone in the profoundly gifted range one understands problems immediately and then solves them oftentimes immediately and the result is both a learning and a problem solve. I will say much more on this topic in the future and elsewhere, but here will simply state it really is not that complex in an experiential perspective from one who really is unusually creative. "Quickness of apprehension" is a phrase used for explaining intelligence, which means "minimally understood fast" which is even better if experienced as "learned fast". If joined with "created a problem from the learning and solved it, or solved it" and it happens often and immediately, this is ideation and learning.

On an intelligence test, one is required to learn the problem that is new on the spot, and solve it on the spot. All intelligence tests provided that are not created by individuals for questionable HighIQ Societies are timed. Even if much time is provided, the psychometrician's pay rate will time it. And someone is in front of you waiting for your answer. You have to learn the problem in front of you and problem solve it right there. The answer you found is an idea. Sometimes there are no options for answers, and you have to say the answer. That was an idea. Identification of an answer is a selection, but on the way to the selection were many ideas about mental transformations that are new, related to the learnings had immediately.

When speaking to someone to appraise whether they are intelligent or not, there should be some indication that their mind is functioning as if there is an IQ test in front of them, but they are creating the problems and are making the solutions, and they are complex and they are doing it on the spot. This is if the conversation is not purely relaxing but is interesting. In this way even psychometric test taking is related to internal communication in significance and velocity of ideas, because outside the psychometric context the problems are wider life problems with ideas being applicable to those problems, with solutions happening all the time. All life long, from childhood into adulthood, indicating that experience grows faster, and age is happening sooner, even if appearance does not show it. If I am truly myself, I appear very old, and my interests make very little sense to people my age if they hear what they really are. But if they do hear what they really are they hear that they are extremely significant and interconnected, and rely upon a need for extensive problem solving. It appears that the problem set is too large for them to solve themselves in an indefinite lifespan.

A conversation can happen about this immediately, but typically there are several before there is comfort enough to delve into these conversations. I can know if someone is profoundly gifted or not if I ever have that conversation, and since it is so rare, it never really happens.

If one has an intelligence in the immeasurable range one's intelligence can range from one in a thousand

at a minimum, to one in a billion or more. This means I will never meet anyone maybe who has my same intelligence in public. This also is the value of Mensa and other intelligence organizations because one can get satisfyingly close. An objective of mine is to record enough to provide the potential for comprehensive communication to share to others who might understand, whether some exists presently to understand it all, or who might exist in the future. There may be some who I know now who could understand it, but I don't know enough about these particular people to be sure, and in any case, they have lives and projects of their own that would limit their interest and dedication to reading hundreds of books.

Comforts around conversation between people in the immeasurable range involve sensitivities still. So even if a person met in the High Intelligence community survives the safety evaluator test above, and I know a couple who do, there is still some respect that blocks full expression, and some may have some self-protection needs around ideas to be kept for private development. This means I cannot know if there is a true match in intelligence. So even if I'm with someone who is as intelligent as me, there is this idea that I don't know if they are, and there is still a perception that I may be smarter than them. I have never been fearful of sharing my ideas, and I have never met anyone who appears to convey more than I can understand. This means effectively I do not know if I have ever or will ever meet anyone who is smarter than I am, and it gives me a feel like I'm the very smartest person who could exist, even if that is not the case.

Finally, I would like to announce something related to a serious omission of this article that is universal in all conversations about intelligence, concerning the absence of forthcomingness about actual intelligence scores from personal medical history. It will take some time and preparation, but I will provide my true psychological reports coming from my psychologists, along with interpretations. This means not only will I have provided the evidence that the process of detecting risks indicates should be provided, including proof of organizational memberships and commensurate productions, I will also include the documents I obtained for admission into the groups. This includes the test scores *and* psychological case reports resulting from conversation with the psychologists, and their reflections on the process. Their personal encapsulations of the experience administering and scoring the tests will be shared.

Thus I will have provided all the evidence I can of my immeasurable giftedness, and all the relevant context and personal details that went into the testing. There will be nothing additional I would feel could be omitted from my artifacts that one could use for appraising my intelligence. I hope it is useful for an ongoing comparative study of cases of Mr. Jacobsen and others, and I will utilize it to further substantiate level of giftedness in conjunction with my ongoing production of life artifacts, in my *Book and Journal*.

This way I will not face those same difficulties of other historical figures who are now untestable, and I

will not become a living figure who died before sharing sufficient life evidence. It is expected that I would be more trusted than I otherwise could be, despite great openness, ensuring I cannot ever be considered a High Intelligence Charlatan or Scammer. Since I was tested a number of times, since being a small child, there will be no way to claim that these scores have been altered or invented, and I would not be opposed to permitting researchers to talk to psychologists who administered the test, whom I don't know and are independently credible in their fields.

It will take some time and preparation to consider the risks of sharing these medical documents, because on first consideration, the psychometricians themselves could be at some risk, and the documents themselves could be used as sources for creating similar documents that have all the characteristics of true tests. However, I'm aware that any person can take tests and the contents of those tests they receive would have similar materials that could then be falsified, but judicious consideration is still required. Probably a primary way people fraudulently enter societies, like with college, is to take tests and simply alter the contents in the results thinking at least some college will overlook cross-checking it with test providers. If the admissions process fails to reach out to test providers, can't make contact, or forgets during a period of waiting, people will be admitted. This would be due to simple admissions forgetfulness or some normal laziness. I think people in organizations often work hard to protect their admissions processes, but to say they never do this is akin to saying employers never mishire.

Interview Query

Original Request

This is the original text from the email request sent by Mr. Scott Douglas Jacobsen. The original email files and correspondence including this text are located below in [Correspondence](#).

This is the interview as I received it, that required some deburring, reordering, and mild rephrasing. Interviews are interesting because they too present risks. These risks can include scams, personal attacks, and traps that could be utilized for personal attacks. While I think the work of Scott Jacobsen appears mostly kind, receiving such requests does require the application of the process mentioned in this text, and caution about personal risks that come after responses to the interview. Also there is risk of responding to a question in which the topic may be applied to the respondent, and where the respondent may be associated negatively with people mentioned. It can't be known if slander or defamation would result from response, or if the subject matter itself is something the interviewer wants to *apply* to the interviewed. It could indicate that already the interviewer has taken a position against the target who cannot overcome that negativity even in the response, particularly if that response is short. This lengthy response in book format controls for that potentiality.

Even if for this particular interview, some of this is inapplicable, this information is supportive to others regarding risk of the interview process, and to those who have or might be interviewed in the future.

“Scott Douglas Jacobsen: You wrote an interesting article entitled “How Do People With IQs Over 180 Act and Think?” (Cavanaugh, 2018). You bring forward individuals like Richard Feynman, Bertrand Russell, Paul Cooijmans, Grady Towers, and societies such as the Mega Society, the Giga Society, and Mensa International. By and large, these are well-known within the high-IQ communities, of which I sit out in the Oort Cloud with a telescope making notes enjoying the show and sending occasional correspondence for interviews with members of these communities. I am not a formal member of these communities. I have contributed to publications or had positions for which I’m grateful, but no formal legitimate memberships because of no formal test to determine the merit of the matter or deep abiding interest at that level, as some societies do not require test scores, permit second test scores, or utilize, widely, alternative tests with varying degrees of legitimacy in the measurement of the psychological construct of g, general intelligence. As far as I know, those societies with strict mainstream intelligence test requirements are Mensa International and the Triple Nine Society, especially with Mensa International having formal testing sites online or, pre-coronavirus, invigilation stations all over the world. These are important to consider; internationally, even sophisticated frauds exist in the high-IQ communities with a grotesque example in the multi-level marketer (scammer), human trafficker, and cult leader Keith Raniere with the organization NXIVM where he was known as “Vanguard.” To a more on-point tune and as a point of clarification to start us off here today, with Feynman’s declared IQ of 126 (no S.D. mentioned), as stated in the article, what is the factual status of Feynman’s declared IQ in contrast to professional commentary or considerations of his mathematical abilities?”

Jacobsen: Do you have any particularly favourite articles from Noesis: The Journal of the Mega Society?

Jacobsen: What was the eventual outcome or the larger conclusions from the Terman Study?

Jacobsen: What seem like the common reasons for the exceptionally intelligent and profoundly intelligent finding inappropriate employment or remaining unemployed/underemployed?

Jacobsen: The most legitimate intelligence test scores tend to come from comprehensive tests with money and research dumped at them, e.g., the SB and the WAIS. Yet, their ranges are fairly tight around 40/45 to 160/155 on S.D. 15. Some statistical, psychometric techniques, e.g., Rasch-equated, have been employed by individual experimental

psychologists, e.g., Dr. Xavier Jouve, to extrapolate for claimed scores at 175 S.D. 15, for example. Alternative tests made by independent test constructors are interesting and vary in quality, though have a far larger quantity. In the article, bluntly, you state, “140,150,160,170,180 are the numbers immediately grasped by liars and exaggerators.” When using alternative tests, fake names or pseudonyms, or more than the first test attempt to claim a score at 140, 150, 160, 170, and 180, what are first thoughts coming to mind to you?

Jacobsen: How can individuals protect themselves from scammers?

Jacobsen: Why should individuals stick to professional achievements positive for individual authentic self-esteem and the common good rather than test score?

Jacobsen: What does a Mensa International membership mean to you?

Jacobsen: How can individuals read more on matters of IQ, societies, intelligence, and the like, outside of the references in the article?

Numbered Format with Minor Edits

This is the translation/paraphrasing of the above original block formatted group of questions used above. These are the questions I utilized directly in the course of answering questions. They are organized numerically and the order was updated to enable related answering of more similar topics. I have also deburred these questions to ensure unambiguously positive intent.

- **Question 1.** The most legitimate intelligence test scores tend to come from comprehensive tests with money and research dumped at them, e.g., the SB and the WAIS. Yet, their ranges are fairly tight around 40/45 to 160/155 on S.D. 15. Some statistical, psychometric techniques, e.g., Rasch-equated, have been employed by individual experimental psychologists, e.g., Dr. Xavier Jouve, to extrapolate for claimed scores at 175 S.D. 15, for example. Alternative tests made by independent test constructors are interesting and vary in quality, though have a far larger quantity. In the article, bluntly, you state, “140,150,160,170,180 are the numbers immediately grasped by liars and exaggerators.” When using alternative tests, or more than the first test attempt to claim a score at 140, 150, 160, 170, and 180, what are first thoughts coming to mind to you?
- **Question 2.** How can individuals read more on matters of IQ, societies, intelligence, and the like, outside of the references in the article?

- **Question 3.** What seem like the common reasons for the exceptionally intelligent and profoundly intelligent finding inappropriate employment or remaining unemployed/underemployed?
- **Question 4.** What was the eventual outcome or the larger conclusions from the Terman Study?
- **Question 5.** Why should individuals stick to professional achievements positive for individual authentic self-esteem and the common good rather than test score?
- **Question 6.** What does a Mensa International membership mean to you?
- **Question 7.** Do you have any particularly favourite articles from Noesis: The Journal of the Mega Society?
- **Question 8.** You wrote an interesting article entitled “How Do People With IQs Over 180 Act and Think?” (Cavanaugh, 2018). You bring forward individuals like Richard Feynman, Bertrand Russell, Paul Cooijmans, Grady Towers, and societies such as the Mega Society, the Giga Society, and Mensa International. By and large, these are well-known within the high-IQ communities, of which I sit out in the Oort Cloud with a telescope making notes enjoying the show and sending occasional correspondence for interviews with members of these communities. I am not a formal member of these communities. I have contributed to publications or had positions for which I’m grateful, but no formal legitimate memberships because of no formal test to determine the merit of the matter or deep abiding interest at that level, as some societies do not require test scores, permit second test scores, or utilize, widely, alternative tests with varying degrees of legitimacy in the measurement of the psychological construct of g, general intelligence. As far as I know, those societies with strict mainstream intelligence test requirements are Mensa International and the Triple Nine Society, especially with Mensa International having formal testing sites online or, pre-coronavirus, invigilation stations all over the world. These are important to consider, internationally, even sophisticated frauds exist in the high-IQ communities with a grotesque example in the multi-level marketer (scammer), human trafficker, and cult leader Keith Raniere with the organization NXIVM where he was known as “Vanguard.” To a more on-point tune and as a point of clarification to start us off here today, with Feynman’s declared IQ of 126 (no S.D. mentioned), as stated in the article, what is the factual status of Feynman’s declared IQ in contrast to professional commentary or considerations of his mathematical abilities?
- **Question 9.** How can individuals protect themselves from scammers?

Correspondence

Below is the original correspondence between Mr. Jacobsen and myself, via my Harvard University mailbox.

- [Interview Request 1](#)
- [Interview Request 2](#)

Correspondence

My Contact Details:

Christopher Matthew Cavanaugh, “Mattanaw”:

- cmcavanaugh@g.harvard.edu,
- CC: mattanaw@mattanaw.com,
- CC: christopher.matthew.cavanaugh@member.mensa.org

References

Cavanaugh, C. (2018). *How Do People With IQs Over 180 Act and Think?* Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Playntext. Retrieved from: <http://www.mattanaw.com/how-do-people-with-iqs-over-180-act-and-think.html>

Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God Delusion*. Bantam Press.

Dennet, D. (2006). *Breaking the Spell*. Viking. Einstein, A. (1998). *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*. Open Court. [Editor left out to prevent editor wrapped citations]

Ferguson, M. (2014). *H. Macrocephalus*. Retrieved from: http://michaelwferguson.blogspot.com/p/blog-page_9997.html?m=1

Ferguson, M. (2015). *The Inappropriately Excluded*. Retrieved from: <http://michaelwferguson.blogspot.com/p/the-inappropriately-excluded-by-michael.html?m=1>

Gödel, K. (1962). *On Formerly Undecided Propositions of Principia Mathematica and Related Systems*. Dover

Knuth, D. (1968). *The Art of Computer Programming*. Addison-Wesley.

R. Herrnstein & C. Murray. (1994). *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. Free Press.

Mattanaw. (2003). *Rational Times*. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Plaintext. Retrieved From: <http://www.mattanaw.org/rational-times.html>

Mattanaw. (2006). *Personal Form*. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Plaintext. Retrieved From: <http://www.mattanaw.org/mattanaws-personal-form.html>

Mattanaw. (2017). *The Burden of Having Too Many Ideas*. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Plaintext. Retrieved From: <http://www.mattanaw.com/the-burden-of-having-too-many-ideas.html>

Mattanaw. (2021). *The Significance of Ideas and Creativity*. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Plaintext. Retrieved From: <http://www.mattanaw.com/christopher-matthew-cavanaugh-thoughtstream.htm?fbclid=IwAR2GhTeEVpiCxCTcTI3dOaPQdEFds0l3-t0ZsPS8lPTCl0jRgmfWD3VIuFM#the-significance-of-ideas-and-creativity>

Mattanaw. (2022). *Writing Shares, Recording of Recordings. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Playntext. Retrieved from: <http://www.mattanaw.com/site-history-archive.html>

Mattanaw. (2022). *Bio and Stats*. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Playntext. Retrieved From: <http://www.mattanaw.com/bio-and-stats.html>

Mattanaw. (2022). *Living Autobiography*. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Playntext. Retrieved From: <http://www.mattanaw.com/living-autobiography.html>

Mattanaw. (2023). *Abandoning Equality*. Unpublished Book Manuscript. Playntext.

Mattanaw. (2023). *Reading*. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Plaintext. Retrieved From: <http://www.mattanaw.com/reading.html>

Mattanaw. (2023). *Bibliography, Citing, and Referring*. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Plaintext. Retrieved From: <http://www.mattanaw.org/bibliography-citing-and-referring.html>

Mattanaw. (2023). *Certification*. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Playntext. Retrieved From: <http://www.mattanaw.com/certification-requirements.html>

Mattanaw. (2023). *Linguistic Associative Graphs, Brains, and Adaptive Organs Like Skeletons*. hBook and Journal of Mattanaw. Plaintext. Retrieved From: <http://www.mattanaw.org/thoughtstream.html#linguistic-associative-graphs-brains-and-adaptive-organs-like-skeletons>

Mattanaw. (2023). *My History of Writings in the High Intelligence Community*. Book and Journal of Mattanaw. Plaintext. Retrieved From: <http://www.mattanaw.org/thoughtstream.html#my-history-of-writings-in-the-high-intelligence-community>

Wanattam. (2022). *Mathematics*. Playntext. <http://www.mattanaw.com/mathematics.html>

Newton, I. (2016). *The Principia: The Authoritative Translation and Guide: Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*. First Edition. [Editor left out to prevent editor wrapped citations] Pfeffer, H. (1998). *The Too Many Aptitudes Problem* Noesis: The Journal of the Mega Society. <https://megasociety.org/noesis/138/aptitude.html>

Tao, T. (2016) *Analysis I*. Second Edition. Hindustan Book Agency. Retrieved from the American Mathematical Society.

Towers, G. (1987). *The Outsiders*. Gift of Fire: Journal of the Prometheus Society. <https://prometheussociety.org/wp/articles/the-outsiders/>

Russell, B., & Whitehead, A. (1910) *Principia Mathematica, Volume I*. Cambridge.

Russell, B., & Whitehead, A. (1962). *Principia Mathematica to '56*. Cambridge.

Admissions Pages of Mentioned Societies

These admissions pages were challenged and supported partially and differentially for each of the society mentioned in the article.

- [Mensa](#)
- [Intertel](#)
- [Triple Nine Society](#)
- [Volant of Elysian Trust](#)
- [Prometheus Society](#)
- [Mega Society](#)
- [Olympiq Society](#)

Glossary

Dissertative Thinking

“Dissertative thinking” is a new phraseal coinage of mine relating to the propensity of a thinker to have

so many novel thoughts, with strong internal and external communication skills to match, especially if one has strong typing or dictation skills, that chunks of thoughts had again and again in a day, or in a conversation, have such novelty and pre-development, including on-the-fly development, to be incipient Dissertations. Examples can be found on my *ThoughtStream* wherever the recordings are in paragraph form, are dense and novel, and are proven to be extremely rapid because they were timed, showing a high level of development and novelty. Oftentimes intuitions were only just prior to the writing, or recently, but the writing, usually semi-blind typed, without edits, timed for speed, were already of good quality, and provide obvious examples of incipient dissertations.

The extremely profoundly gifted would think that academia is too slow and stifling, for having so many dissertative thoughts that would relate to Ph.Ds, that one Ph.D earning over many years appears inappropriate to their intellects. Instead what is preferred is independent thinking, that gradually brings the state of dissertative thoughts to complete thoughts not requiring any dissertation to begin with. This does not imply that an exceptionally and profoundly gifted person will not want one or more doctorates for other reasons which would relate to pragmatic considerations, but they would recognize that the process does result in a number of academic writings that would not represent all the dissertation equivalents that exist in their minds.

Dissertation writing is *not* difficult as would be indicated by this article itself, and this is one of a future of 880 to 1760 dissertations that will appear in this *Book and Journal* in the next forty years. There is a review process to Dissertations not performed by the immeasurably gifted, and while review may suggest changes that would result in “defensible dissertations” increasing the quality, meaning at first they fail them then approve them after edits, there is no chance that one in 1760 dissertations would not be approved. Furthermore, additional edits to these 1760 constitute new submission variants and if there are, say, three comprehensive edits of each, that would be 5,280. If one establishes a probability of a dissertation’s acceptance from me it would be a probability of much greater than 1/5,280. Therefore I can assume doctoral status, and can simply count the topics and fields and list my numerous doctorates at a later date.

Any of these could be submitted for equivalency certifications or for peer-review at academic journals, and if any editing was required, it could be done in parallel asynchronously with other productions, considering it from a day-to-day perspective (obviously time is synchronous for writing unless I learn to write two things at the same time, and I cannot).

There will not be *just one* that’s the dissertation, as if a doctorate award prevents future works of similar quality and content would not also be dissertations. Article dissertations, book dissertations, and all sorts of *dissertations* occur after *that one* dissertation that produced a doctorate. It is a strange oversight, perhaps indicating insufficient intelligence combined with boldness, to forcefully convey, that any work that has properties of being a dissertation is one; and to the benefit of those writers who produced works

after the first, of the same quality, in other fields, there really are and have been other dissertations written by them that are doctorate equivalent.

Being sufficiently intelligent with a combination of dissertative thinking and productivity into writing, exhibiting a significance and velocity of ideation assures eventual doctoral thesis equivalencies. It is a control mechanism of higher education currently to not allow equivalency doctorates like my equivalency GED, and not being informed I could skip school to my benefit, being already identified as gifted in my school system, I will not hear any other system tell me this is not something I can do independently!

What is missing is that dissertative thinking, too, results in sufficient quality of thought, to omit writing. The implication is that between dissertations and during dissertation writing, other dissertative thinking is happening that will go acknowledged too.

The formal quantification of the velocity of significance and ideation would result in a preference for the thought that arises in dissertations over the dissertations, and if mental content could be translated into writing, there would be no writing, and people like myself would become eminent immediately.

There are many dissertations of very poor quality, that indicate low velocity of significance and ideation, which is the cause of the struggle of paper writing and Ph.D thesis completion; *and* dissertations that are not on a topic that covers a real entity, like that of Dr. Martin Luther King, which covers the conception of a diety as they exist in the work of two other authors. Being theology, a topic in which the subject ought to be known, if studied, it is unknown. It is utterly unlike, say, writing about Oceanic Currents, which is a subject that has real objects to study, measure and describe. There is no diety and the dissertation is an exploration of vacuous concepts, and it is a dissertation about nothing tracing to actual entities. I would not unapprove his dissertation thinking historically he has followed a process that assured it, but it is not a dissertation about a real entity that will be accepted as a worthwhile discussion in the future. I don't think of Theology as a topic in which dissertations can be had, although History of Religiosity would.

This is not a strange idea that an older dissertation or paper would be rejected later. One only needs to look further in history to see which papers were not really of good quality for Doctoral theses, or look at books written by certain authors from the middle ages. With sufficient time certain papers and books are rejected as being containing illusions and with sufficient time Theological works will be shown to be "illusory" too. This is when our present time becomes distant history like distant history. Seeing current times as modern is the result of cognitive bias and fallacious thinking. The cognitive bias would be one in which the current state of the world cannot be understood to be similar to history in that it will be distant history on development. Unnamed fallacies and cognitive biases outnumber those named.

The entire article must be read to understand fully this entry because premises of this perspective are

scattered throughout and are jointly compelling, and necessary to understand more fully.

Genius

Genius is a term included in this glossary because it is one I greatly dislike, and wish to reduce in popular usage, although that is not in my power. Personally however, I can choose to disuse it. In this essay, it is not used actively but is mentioned.

The cause for this is it encourages fabrications mentioned in the essay proper. People wish to be called by this designation but this designation has many poor societal effects.

Much better than to use this term is to simply provide personal details that would culminate in an accurate description of one's mind and finally would culminate in a *correct and accurate*, and *verifiable* autobiography. Notice a mission of the *Book and Journal of Mattanaw* is to provide such a living autobiography, complete with all materials needed to verify and quantify my mind.

But to make this a true glossary I need to define it here.

“**Genius**” is a popular designation applied by the public, eventually after being convinced, even without reading or comprehending the original works of the person, that their minds and productions together constitute evidence of velocity of significance and ideation, acceleration, and dissertative thinking at the extremity of what is humanly possible. The term is applied to too few people, and those who it was applied to are historical figures in which we have insufficient data, although some were certainly in the profoundly and exceptionally gifted ranges. These figures have then received a partly unwitting popular vote, unwitting because advertising and propaganda is the cause of the messages resulting in the superficial knowledge. “Genius” figures are as a rule incomprehensible to all but matching-minds, as described in the article. There is great variation in these minds and this is a cause for some not having the designation. As a popularly applied concept it gets misapplied through misinformation also stemming from propaganda and advertising and short messages. This means the word “genius” is simply not a word that is psychometrical, and is instead a popular term, part of the history of organic growth of the English language, and other languages that use an approximate translation.

The psychometrical identification of people who would perhaps become identified as “genius” is the subject of this paper. But the objective of this book/dissertation and upcoming writings is to formalize our understanding and provide better scientific rigor. The rigor will result in the finding that complete descriptions of minds and lives and their productions is better than individual psychometrical tests. The result is that people who are outside the high intelligence community will be found to have test limitations that would have blocked their identification of being profoundly gifted for not including a more complete description of their minds and lives. This same result will also discredit those who merely want to be designated as profoundly gifted, along with dangerous scam artists. Many will discover that

while they are highly intelligent via IQ measures their complete description disqualifies them, although it *confirms* their own lives to them. There will be a better understanding within humanity what total humanity consists of via the zoological understanding of the species, and people will understand their relative standing and see it as true. Thus they will achieve better self-understanding, if this paper is utilized, and genius, along with too-short statements, becomes less preferable to longer descriptions.

It must be noted here that if the word “genius” is applied to an unknown person, almost nothing is known about that person. If a detailed description is applied with details, knowledge begins.

Significance

Significance relates to complexity of meaning, generality of application, abstractness, and network size of interdisciplinary and topical connectedness. Significance relates necessarily to usefulness for life or for innovation, and is not frivolous; although frivolity is to be defined by the thinkers knowing well what significance is, and not listeners who would claim certain kinds of thinking are as much. Significance is often only detectable by minds, or nervous systems, that have sufficient analogy to each other.

Velocity of Significance and Ideation

Velocity of significance is the speed of very large and accurate interdisciplinary and intertopical meaning, related to a very large and actively networked neuronal functioning. This is conveyed in conversation that is characterized by density of meaning, sometimes representing paragraphs and pages of thought not totally expressed but understood, by other with the same capacities and experience preparation only. This is due to both brains having analagous structure even at high complexity.

Velocity of Ideas is also related to brain activity in the immediate formation of new connections, including newly intuited problems and immediate solutions found. This is conveyed in conversation in novelty, also with great significance, repeated again and again, at a velocity that would be measurable ultimately as brain scanning is gradually improved.



-
- [Contents](#)
 - [Main Contents](#)
-

