

prudentia

HIGH IQ SOCIETY FOR THE TOP 1/250 OF THE POPULATION



A NOTE ON IQ ON HIGH IQ SOCIETIES

Journal Issue #11 – March 4th, 2021

EDITORIAL

Welcome to the eleventh issue of Prudentia Journal!

A month after the tenth issue, I present a new issue of the journal to you. This time with an article named "A Note on IQ", written by Kenneth Myers, and a piece I wrote, called "On High IQ Societies". I hope you will like these articles. Of course feedback is welcome.

Enjoy reading!

Claus Volko, [cdvolko \(at\) gmail \(dot\) com](mailto:cdvolko@gmail.com)

A NOTE ON IQ

Kenneth Myers

Briefly

I don't really like talking about IQ—really! But someone asked me recently what I thought with the question, “What do you think IQ is?”, so I answered them with the following. Hopefully, forgiving my ignorance on the subject, this note is at least anecdotally noteworthy and sardonically entertaining if not even completely and utterly untrue.

The Note

Take IQ to be a measure of intelligence and intelligence to mean after Piaget, “...what you use when you don't know what to do: when neither innateness nor learning has *prepared* you for a particular situation.” In other words, intelligence is what you use when anything *puzzles* you, when you find something confusing, baffling, ambiguous, difficult, obscure or just downright incomprehensible and IQ is an operational *measure* of such an endowment or *talent* of handling that said bewilderment. For the standard IQ test, this represents a presentation to the tester of a series of questions generally administered under some acceptable time constraint. In other words, the IQ test is a delimited or truncated microcosm of perplexity (at least it should be), if properly constructed and suitably administered, designed to present an unclear and mystifying experience to its test taker. If it does not, then what it is measuring is not intelligence and hence not IQ. For instance, if I take a test on the meaning of words, I am not exercising intelligence, I am merely, and for arguments sake, parroting something I memorized from a dictionary—recalling by rote as it were, what's already digested. If, however, I take a test of those same words recombined in a creative manner such as the following:

geese : gaggle :: quail : _____

then I am being asked to evaluate a relation of those said words on multiple levels of meaning, i.e. the meaning of the words, the meaning of the inner analogies (:), the meaning of the outer analogy (::) and finally the explicit recall of a word that logically fits in meaning the blank space provided after all else is evaluated—*bevy*. Whether this taps into our intelligence is another question. If we've a history of solving such analogies, of learned behavior regarding as such, then the answer might be and probably is no, it does not tap into our intelligence. However, provided the same mechanisms, but with much more difficult and puzzling analogous machinery, with more subtle relations and meanings so to speak, well, then it could be said to tap into intelligence even in the most learned way.

Of course, an overt obsession with IQ and IQ testing greatly tips the equation in the testers favor. That's why people who constantly take IQ tests, are consistently involved with material related to IQ, etc. do so much better than those that aren't. Think about it, if I continually go online and practice IQ test after IQ test, then, by definition, I am not

exercising intelligence when later taking a truly proctored test and hence, not accurately measuring my intelligence and IQ. What I am measuring is some “learned” or “modeled” experiences, something(s) I’ve acquired by mentally modeling several iterations of IQ testing online thus conditioning and patterning my behavior toward success on future tests. In other words, there is nothing *puzzling* henceforth about what I’m encountering on *any* IQ test, nothing presents itself that I’ve not already learned or encountered, unless, and again, the stakes are raised and most drastically in this case! Of course, this idea greatly limits the idea of the so called, power test—the test that has no time limit, compensating thus by making huge resource, e.g. *temporal*, and cognitive demands on the tester of which the tester is liable to conduct a his, hers, or otherwise cost/benefit analysis, if simply for increasing time demands. However, it cannot be a test where one simply utilizes their favorite search engine, accordingly easily obtaining the results and thus greatly inflating that cost/benefit ratio. If, for instance, I design an *at home* test with questions like the following:

1, 2, 4, 6, 10,...

Asking the tester to fill in the next three values of this infinite sequence, the tester is not exercising intelligence if they simply go online and use an integer sequencer to determine the answer (my favorite, {for all $k : k^2 + 1$ is prime}). Granted, one’s ego might get a boost from getting a high score on the test by utilizing said mechanisms, but, and I must be emphatic, it does not test their intelligence! I’ve seen some tests online that do a good job at circumventing this problem. However, even these have their weaknesses; generally resulting in a sort of clustering or networking effect developing around the test over time and within a relatively short period the test becoming obsolete, the answers being posted for one’s viewing pleasure on countless social media gatherings and such. Indeed, we may be testing *hive* or crowd mentalities, but we are not testing individual intelligence and hence an *individual’s* true IQ.

Provided though, one has taken a supervised or *proctored* IQ test and scored high controlling for all other said factors, then, what does it all mean? Well, for starters, it means you have a high IQ. And as IQ is a most likely more or less correct measure of intelligence, intelligence being a talent for what you use when you don’t know what you are doing or more concisely what to do given a puzzling or confusing situation, well, then—that means you have an endowment, natural or otherwise, for making up your mind, as a rule quickly and successfully, in the face of these rather abstruse situations. That is all! It does not mean you’ll play the piano at concert level, it does not even mean you’ll be great at mathematics or physics although, and all other things being equal, you will on average have a better chance of doing so. Of course, and this is agreed, given all the tools at your disposal in some puzzling or perplexing situation, you will, *on average*, do better than let’s say, 98% of the population if your IQ meets or exceeds 130.

I hate to break the news to you, but having a IQ does not necessarily mean you will win the Nobel Prize or even get a university degree, although, as said, all other things being equal, you have a better chance of doing so. Still, though a minimal IQ may be necessary for such accomplishments, it is definitely not sufficient. So, sitting on the laurels of high IQ is a

definite NO–NO. What’s required in most cases is a good knowledge of some subject matter, hard, sustained mental concentration (really the sine qua non of genius), a resilience to the many blind alleys and absurdities one will encounter, a realization of the loneliness of some subjects, e.g. try explaining tensors to your dog or possibly your boss and see where it gets you; and a spirit to keep going even when the best of efforts releases but meager or trifling results. However, and I say this to end, high IQ will give you something, and that something is a rare talent for accurately appraising *what to do* even when not *knowing* – what to do.

ON HIGH IQ SOCIETIES

Claus Volko

In the World Genius Directory currently 157 high IQ societies are listed, and that list is not exhaustive – there are several more than these. At the same time communication via Internet resources is highly developed, and many high IQ people are connected to each other via Facebook. In the following essay I want to investigate whether high IQ societies make sense nowadays.

We all know the story of Mensa: two passengers in a train noticed that both of them enjoyed solving logical puzzles, and so they decided to found a club for people who enjoy solving logical puzzles. Now the question is why they made an IQ of 130 the requirement for joining this club. After all, enjoying logical puzzles does not necessarily require a particular IQ. So perhaps the basic idea of Mensa is wrong; instead of requiring a high IQ, they should select their members for whether they enjoy solving logical puzzles. Mensa might be based on a categorical mistake.

However, that does not mean that the idea of high IQ societies as such is nonsense. A high IQ society might also make sense if there is anything that connects people with a high IQ, if there is anything they share and have in common. With Prudentia, this particular thing is interest in science and philosophy. While Prudentia requires only evidence of an IQ of 140 to join, I have written at the website that "people with high education (university level) and/or interest in science and philosophy are especially welcome". That is a clear sign that Prudentia is trying to nurture people with these particular interests. People who are not interested in science and philosophy might not be satisfied with Prudentia, no matter what their IQ is.

Of course it is questionable whether Prudentia should have an IQ requirement at all. All I can tell you is that I know some very good computer programmers whose IQ is in the 120s, so it is not high enough to join Mensa or Prudentia. Indeed, I have been thinking about loosening the IQ requirement. Abandoning it completely is not possible as otherwise Prudentia would not be a high IQ society. But maybe 140 is too high an obstacle.

Another question is whether the multitude of high IQ societies makes sense. Why did I found Prudentia when there were already so many high IQ societies? In fact I did so originally because most high IQ societies are based on the Internet and do not have real-life, face-to-face meetings. I wanted to create a new high IQ society that would also have real-life meetings. However, I have not been able to live up to this goal as it turned out that people from many different places joined Prudentia and the distances are too large to be able to arrange real-life meetings on a regular basis (let alone the current situation with Covid). But of course I am happy that there is Prudentia and that we already have more than fifty members simply because it is my own high IQ society, I have control over it and am the editor of its publications, all these being privileges I would not have in any other high IQ society since I would not be the founder.

The next question is: Do high IQ societies make sense in the days of Facebook when it's easy to connect with each other online? I think they do, simply because they enable people to discover each other. If there were no high IQ societies, I would not be friends with many of the people with whom I am now connected via Facebook. I would have never met them.

It is just debatable whether this multitude of high IQ societies we currently have is needed, especially as many societies are dormant and not much more than websites with member lists.

LEGAL STUFF

Prudentia Journal is an electronical magazine edited by Dr. Claus Volko. Prudentia Journal is freeware, you are allowed to spread the magazine provided it remains unmodified. The editor assumes that the person who submits a contribution for Prudentia Journal (the contributor) has not violated any rights of third parties. Contributors preserve all rights and responsibility for their original contributions, but they give the editor the right to adapt them. There is no guarantee that a contribution will be used in Prudentia Journal. If you want to use articles from Prudentia Journal, you must arrange that with their authors. For any questions contact Claus Volko.

Official website of Prudentia Journal:

<http://www.prudentia.club/>